

Appendix E

Public Participation Summary

The entire documentation of the I-66 Corridor Planning Study public involvement process is on file at:

Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
Division of Planning
125 Holmes Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40622
(Telephone number: 502-564-7183)

PROJECT TEAM MINUTES

I-66 PLANNING STUDY From William Natcher Parkway to I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item No. 03-66.00

DATE: June 6, 2001

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District Office 3 (Bowling Green)
Construction Conference Room

TIME: 1:30 P. M. (CDST)

ATTENDEES: Daryl Greer, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Carl D. Dixon, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Charlie Powers, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. (BLA)
Vince Bernardin, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc
Kenneth W. Kuehn, Western Kentucky University
Dot Darby, Barren River Area Development District (BRADD)
Patrick Tyndall, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) – Frankfort (KY)
John B. Matheney, Barren River Area Development District (BRADD)
Anthony Goodman, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Andrew Layson, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Henry Mathis, H.C. Nutting, Co.
Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey (KGS)
Jason Siwula, KYTC – Division of Multimodal Systems
Charles Schaub, KYTC – Division of Multimodal Systems
Tom Cervone, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc
Kenneth Cox, KYTC -- Preconstruction, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC -- Division of Planning, District 3
Charla Aaron, KYTC -- Division of Planning, District 3
Mark S. Mudd, KYTC -- Traffic, District 3
Greg Meredith, KYTC -- Construction, District 3
Chris Proffitt, KYTC -- Construction, District 3
Chuck Phillips, KYTC -- Operations, District 3
Renee Slaughter, KYTC – Design Environmental Coordinator, District 3
Tony Vinegar, KYTC – Division of Environmental Analysis
Keirsten Jagers, KYTC – Information Officer, District 3
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
G. A. “Lonnie” Yates – KYTC – Chief District Engineer, District 3

The first Project Team meeting for the subject project was held in the KYTC District 3 Construction Conference Room in Bowling Green on June 6, 2001 at 1:30 P.M. (CDST). This meeting follows the initiation of the project and served as an opportunity to review related studies, the project approach and schedule, the roles of participants, and the initiation of the public involvement process.

Welcome and Introductions

Jeff Moore opened the meeting and stated that I-66 was the largest project in the Bowling Green District since the completion of the parkways. Then, those present introduced themselves and their role in the study. Jeff Moore continued saying that the purpose of the planning study was to identify and evaluate alternates between the project termini on the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway near I-65 and the William Natcher Parkway near Bowling Green. The study process is to answer three basic questions:

- ? What are technically feasible alternates?
- ? What are the environmental concerns (including cultural and community concerns)?
- ? What alternates have viable public support?

These questions would be answered through technical, political and public input through the planning study process.

Status of Southern Kentucky I-66 Corridor

Carl Dixon stated that the Southern Kentucky I-66 Corridor originated with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 that called for a feasibility study of the Trans-America Corridor. Prepared by HNTB and Wilbur Smith Associates, the Trans-America Corridor Feasibility Study concluded that the corridor was not economically feasible overall, but that some portions of the corridor would be economically feasible. The study of the I-66 corridor in Kentucky was legislatively mandated by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21). In May of 1997, the Kentucky Transportation Center completed a statewide feasibility study of the Southern Kentucky Corridor. *The Southern Kentucky Corridor I-66 Economic Justification and Financial Feasibility Study* concluded that I-66 was economically feasible in Kentucky and would serve areas that had been traditionally underserved (such as the Appalachian area of southeastern Kentucky).

Following up the statewide feasibility study, the KYTC has undertaken subsequent studies of gaps in the parkway system across Southern Kentucky. The gap in the parkway system from Somerset to London has the first priority according to Carl Dixon. The corridor feasibility has been completed for this gap, and the Phase I Design and Environmental Impact Statement is presently underway. The second priority for I-66 is from Hazard to West Virginia. The Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Impact Statement for I-66 in Pike County from US 23 to West Virginia is scheduled to be completed in January of 2002.

Carl Dixon stated that the KYTC had initiated two more I-66 corridor studies this year: one in western Kentucky from Paducah to Missouri and the other in Bowling Green. The I-66 Planning Study in the Bowling Green Area was initially defined as the Bowling Green Outer Loop Study, but was expanded to the I-66 Planning Study from Natcher Parkway to the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway at I-65 in the *KYTC 2000 Six Year Highway Plan*.

Related Studies

KY 101 Reconstruction. Daryl Greer described several related roadway studies in the I-66 Bowling Green Study Area. An Intermediate Planning Study is being finalized for KY 101 near Smiths Grove from I-65 to US 31W. The KY 101 corridor runs from Exit 38 on I-65 through Smiths Grove to US 31W, involves a difficult railroad crossing, and addresses the particular concern of I-65 traffic diversion through Smiths Grove to US 31W when accidents close I-65. A

bypass of Smiths Grove is proposed in the KY 101 Study that would help the revitalization of Smiths Grove. He also noted that KY 101 is being reconstructed from US 31W northward into Edmonson County through the escarpment (Knobs area) with a Rhoda bypass and a three-lane section from Rhoda to Brownsville.

KY 259 Reconstruction. Jeff Moore noted that KY 259 was also being reconstructed into Edmonson County to provide improved commercial truck access. In the *KYTC 1998 Six Year Highway Plan*, the reconstruction of KY 259 into Edmonson County was proposed, and consideration was given to tying KY 259 into I-65 at the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway interchange. The portion of KY 259 through the Knobs area is authorized for design, and WMB is doing the reconstruction design with a possible interchange with I-65. Reconstruction of KY 259 has a \$70 million price tag, and a public meeting on the reconstruction is scheduled for July 16, 2001. KY 259 is proposed as a two-lane facility with 12-foot lanes and good shoulders north of US 31W and as a possible four-lane facility from US 31W to I-65.

Transpark. Keirsten Jagers briefed the Project Team on the proposed Kentucky TriModal Transpark, passing out a map showing the proposed location of the facility in the area between US 31W and US 68/KY 80 to the west of Oakland. To serve the proposed park, the ITA wanted a connector from I-65 through the site to US 31W that might coincide with the Bowling Green Outer Loop, and improvements to US 68/KY 80, US 31W and KY 259. The ITA has completed an environmental assessment, but has not initiated a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. At present the KTT does not involve federal funding; however, a full EIS will be required for Federal Aviation Administration approval of a new airport as part of the KTT.

Bowling Green Outer Loop. Jeff Moore stated that HNTB recently completed the Bowling Green Transportation Plan. As a result of urban growth, Bowling Green is close to becoming a Metropolitan Planning Organization for transportation planning. Preparation of the Bowling Green Transportation Plan began two years ago under the oversight of the Bowling Green-Warren County Transportation Committee, and involved stakeholder participation without formal public review. At present, the traffic model for Bowling Green includes the possible future trip generation for the KTT. Included in the Bowling Green Transportation Plan, the Bowling Green Outer Beltway or Outer Loop has been proposed since 1971-1972 as a controlled-access facility around Bowling Green incorporating the Natcher Parkway. Jeff Moore also noted that the eastern extension of the Natcher Parkway from I-65 to US 231 is presently in design and scheduled for construction in calendar year 2005. I-66 and the Bowling Green Outer Beltway could be the same facility, and should be investigated as part of the I-66 Planning Study. Consideration should also be given to KTT access in the I-66 Planning Study. The Outer Beltway would consist of the extension of the Natcher Parkway from I-65 to US 231, a new route from US 231 to I-65 east of Bowling Green, a connector from I-65 to US 31W, and a new route from US 31W around the north side of Bowling Green to the Natcher Parkway. The town of Hadley does not presently have access to the Natcher Parkway, and there have been accident problems on US 231 south of Hadley. Thus, an interchange with the Natcher Parkway near Hadley is a possibility for the Outer Beltway or I-66. According to the Bowling Green Transportation Plan, the priorities for the Bowling Green Outer Loop are:

1. The connector from I-65 to US 31W.
2. The eastern bypass from US 231 to I-65 east of Bowling Green.
3. The northern bypass.

Carl Dixon noted that a planning study for the southeast quadrant of the Bowling Green Outer Loop from US 231 to I-65 appeared in the *KYTC 2000 Six Year Highway Plan*, and would begin next year. [According to Jeff Moore, Mark Nouri of HNTB in Louisville should be contacted relative to details of the Bowling Green Transportation Plan. David Ripple noted that BLA would be obtaining the travel model from the KYTC for use in creating an expanded travel model for the I-66 Planning Study.]

I-65 Widening. Jeff Moore said that I-65 was being widened to six lanes from the Tennessee State Line to Elizabethtown, and that the structures and overpasses would be simultaneously reconstructed to accommodate eight lanes in the future. I-65 was presently under construction from Cemetery Road/KY 234 (milepoint 26) to US 68 at Oakland (milepoint 36). By the end of the calendar year, two more sections of I-65 would be under reconstruction: Smiths Grove (KY 101) to KY 1339 (just east of the Cumberland Parkway interchange) and US 68 to Smiths Grove (KY 101). In the future, I-65 would be reconstructed from Cemetery Road (KY 234) to the Natcher Parkway and, then, farther northward into Barren County. A new interchange is proposed on I-65 at Cemetery Road (KY 234) and the Natcher Parkway interchange will be rebuilt.

Kenneth Cox noted that the forecasted traffic volumes on I-65 were 87,000 vehicles per day in the year 2025 and that new traffic counts were being taken on I-65. While I-65 might serve as a possible connector for I-66 from the Cumberland Parkway to the Natcher Parkway, there may be a future capacity problem on I-65 even with eight lanes.

KY 90 Reconstruction. Jeff Moore indicated that the Intermediate Planning Study for KY 90 from the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway at Glasgow to the Barren-Metcalf County Line was being finalized. This project has been forwarded to design, and would involve four lanes near the Cumberland Parkway and two lanes for the balance of the route.

Study Approach and Schedule

Project Termini/Study Area. David Ripple passed out the map of the proposed study area for I-66. While the *KYTC 2000 Six Year Highway Plan* defined the termini as from the Natcher Parkway to the I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway interchange, the study area would permit the identification of alternate corridors north and south of Bowling Green from the Natcher Parkway to the Cumberland Parkway. Thus, the termini would be the Natcher Parkway (north or south of Bowling Green) and the Cumberland Parkway (from I-65 to Glasgow).

Identification of Issues. Tom Cervone asked to what extent had the National Park Service been involved in previous roadway studies in the region. Jeff Moore responded that the National Park Service had actively participated in other studies including the Kentucky TriModal Transpark and the improvement of KY 70 from Cave City to the Mammoth Cave National Park entrance. The National Park Service also proposed a Heritage Cultural/Tourism Information Center at the Park City Exit on I-65 (milepoint 48). The National Park Service is also concerned about truck traffic through the Mammoth Cave National Park, would like to ban truck traffic through the park on KY 70, and favored KY 101 over KY 70 as a truck access route from I-65 to Edmonson County. Jeff Moore also noted that the National Park Service is also concerned about headwater water quality and possible 8-hour ozone air quality standard problems (particularly if Warren and Edmonson Counties are designated as non-attainment areas for air quality). Although the National Park Service did not make a formal comment on the

KY 101 and KY 259 Reconstruction studies, they did participate in the KY 101 public meeting. In the past, the National Park Service has expressed concern about ground water contamination during roadway construction and accidental hazardous material spills on public roadways.

Tom Cervone noted that there is a cave east of Smiths Grove that is home of the Indiana Bat and that the cave is connected to the Mammoth Cave system four miles to the north. Daryl Greer noted that a western realignment of KY 101 from I-65 to US 31W is proposed.

Patrick Tyndall suggested a review of the Public Involvement Plan for the project to ensure the inclusion of all interested parties.

John Matheney stated that the planning study should be well researched and well founded on reliable data because of public concern over the Kentucky TriModal Transpark. The quality of what is said and ability to justify what is said is very important in this planning study. Even if the planning study conclusions are valid, all statements and data must be accurate.

Charlie Powers noted that the number of meetings may need to be increased as the study unfolds. He noted that the study may recommend two possible corridors or none at all.

Project Goals Discussion. The Project Team identified and discussed needs and preliminary goals for the project. It must:

- ? Consider economic development statewide.
- ? Improve access for tourism and recreation.
- ? Balance economic development and quality of life.
- ? Provide access to major traffic generators.
- ? Fulfill the ISTEA requirements for I-66.
- ? Address the Bowling Green Outer Loop consistent with the Bowling Green Transportation Plan.
- ? Address safety and congestion concerns on I-65 relative to the need for increased capacity.
- ? Consider the secondary safety issue on US 231 near Hadley.
- ? Address the connection of Edmonson County to any arterials.
- ? Enhance economic development in the study area.

Jeff Moore noted that the I-66 Planning Study in Bowling Green and I-66 Corridor statewide are stand alone and separate from the Kentucky TriModal Transpark planning effort. I-66 at Bowling Green is only 25 miles of the 400-mile I-66 corridor through southern Kentucky. The Bowling Green Outer Loop concept has existed since 1971-72.

Data Needs Discussion. Jeff Moore noted that it was important to get problems to the table early on in the process to help. There is significant public sentiment about managed growth in the region. Tom Cervone stated that public input on cumulative impacts of I-66 and the extent to which it supports resources would be most helpful. According to John Matheney, Warren and Edmonson Counties have comprehensive plans; the National Park Service should have a plan for Mammoth Cave National Park; and Barren, Butler, and Allen Counties are thinking about preparing comprehensive plans. [John Matheney noted that there were background studies for the Bowling Green/Warren County Comprehensive Plan and would provide copies to BLA.] Charles Schaub said that Rob Bostrom should be contacted at KYTC Multimodal Programs for the Bowling Green and Statewide travel models. John Matheney

cautioned that the I-66 Planning Study should find out about the status and information used for the Kentucky TriModal Transpark, but that their data should not be used or referenced. Regardless of the status of the Transpark, there is a need for a connector route from I-65 to US 31W as part of an existing need and as part of the Bowling Green Outer Loop.

Project Schedule. David Ripple passed out the project study schedule milestones and an outline of activities in the I-66 Planning Study Process. The Project Team asked that the time period in months be added to each of the tasks. References to Draft Purpose and Need Statement were changed to Project Goals, as this is an environmental overview and not an environmental impact statement process. In addition to the three Planning Advisory Committee (later renamed Citizens Advisory Group) noted in the schedule, a fourth meeting was added during the refinement of corridors. The reference to selection of the recommended corridor was changed to final evaluation of corridors because more than one corridor or no corridor may be preferred at the end of the process.

Subconsultant Roles

Jerry Weisenfluh said that the Kentucky Geological Survey (KGS) (based at the University of Kentucky) would gather information on karst geology, participate in public meetings and reports on the possible impacts of the corridors on geological factors. Geographic information system on geology would be mapped at the 1:24,000 scale. The KGS would summarize geographic information, provide illustrations of geology for the study area, and assemble information on water drainage.

Henry Mathis said that H. C. Nutting would identify innovative ways to handle the construction of I-66 through karst terrain, look at the preliminary corridors and generate geo-technical solutions to problems identified.

Meetings with Local Officials

The Project Team discussed the logistics for meetings with local officials and concerned citizens that should occur in July. It was decided to have one meeting with local officials and another meeting the same day with stakeholders. Officials from Allen, Barren, Butler, Edmonson and Warren Counties would be invited. Jeff Moore indicated that a subset of the five county transportation councils established by the Barren River ADD would be a source of names for the stakeholders. The meetings would be scheduled in the period of July 9th to July 13th with the public officials meeting beginning around 2:00 P.M. and the stakeholders meetings beginning around 5:00 P.M. The list of invitees would be determined by Jeff Moore, Keirsten Jagers, Patrick Tyndall, Daryl Greer and John Matheney beginning with the local transportation committees in each county and including the National Park Service and Emergency Medical Service of Warren County. By the end of the discussion, John Matheney was able to reserve the Barren River ADD Conference Center for July 11th for 2:00 P.M. for elected officials and 5:00 P.M. for stakeholders.

Public Advisory Committee Meetings

Derived from the I-66 Public Involvement Action Plan, a preliminary list of interest groups was passed out by David Ripple. Jeff Moore said that those attending the public officials and stakeholders meetings on July 11th would provide a starting point for identifying those interested in participating on the Public Advisory Committee (later termed the Citizens Advisory Group). Tom Cervone asked for an opportunity to review the preliminary list of invitees, and suggested

that a representative from the State Police be added because of their personal knowledge of accident problem areas and traffic congestion. Jeff Moore noted that the State Police participated on the KYTC District Safety Committee. In discussions about possible membership on the Public Advisory Committee, suggestions were made to consider representation from the Kentucky Speleological Society, local planning staffs, city/county engineers, and representatives from five counties in the region. While the initial list of members may be large, the number would probably drop through attrition. Daryl Greer asked that at-large citizens be added to the committee. Patrick Tyndall suggested that consideration be given to representation from major employers, EMS, fire departments, local police, speleological interests, trucking associations, the Urban League (for minority representation), and environmental interest groups for the Barren River such as the Sierra Club, Ducks Unlimited, etc.

Jeff Moore said that it was important to organize and conduct the Public Advisory Committee meetings in a way to maintain interest. Tom Cervone suggested that community leaders from the political and religious groups also be considered for membership.

Coordination with Resource Agencies

Tom Cervone passed out an I-66 Early Agency Review Mailing List for discussion. During the study, KYTC and BLA will coordinate with resource agencies at the federal, state and local level. BLA will provide the information and KYTC will transmit the information on the study requesting comment from the resource agencies. Initial contacts would be made with the resource agencies prior to the formal "resource agency review meeting" of December in the project schedule.

Media Relations

Tom Cervone and Jeff Moore noted that it was important to keep the media informed about progress on the study in order to inform the public and ensure informed public comment on the study. Keirsten Jagers said that she would be meeting with the media on July 11th prior to the meetings with local officials and stakeholders to inform them about the purpose and schedule for the study. The Project Team concluded that media inquiries should be handled by the KYTC Central and District Offices, and that all inquiries should be forwarded to Keirsten Jagers.

Conclusion

Patrick Tyndall requested a copy of the work program and public involvement plan for the study. Lonnie Yates welcomed all to the District offices. Anthony Goodman asked about the coverage for the environmental footprint in the study area, and Daryl Greer and Jeff Moore concluded that it should cover significant environmental features in the study area excluding the incorporated area of Bowling Green. Daryl Greer noted that the next Project Team meeting would be in September after the initial meetings with officials, stakeholders and Public Advisory Committee and before the first round of public information meetings. The meeting adjourned at about 4:00 P.M.

**Public Media Meeting Minutes
I-66 Planning Study
From William Natcher Parkway
to I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item No. 03-66.00
1:00 PM CST, July 11, 2001**

A meeting was held with the local media at the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center on July 11, 2001. This meeting was to brief the local media about the initiation of the I-66 Planning Study prior to meetings with local public officials and stakeholders (concerned citizens) that day. Each media representative was given a copy of the handout to be given to local public officials and stakeholders. Those present at the briefing were:

Jason Dooley, Bowling Green Daily News
Amy Wagner, WBKO
Pete Phelps, Chairman of BRADD Transportation Council/Butler County Road Supervisor
N. E. Reed, Edmonson County Judge/Executive
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Keirsten Jagers, KYTC – Public Information Officer, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC -- Division of Planning, District 3
Daryl Greer, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Jim Wilson, KYTC -- Division of Planning

Jeff Moore stated that the purpose of the briefing was to inform the public media about the initiation of the I-66 Planning Study and answer questions about the project prior to meetings with local public officials and stakeholders later that afternoon. Then, those present introduced themselves and their role in the study. Jeff Moore continued saying that the purpose of the planning study was to identify and evaluate alternates between the project termini on the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway near I-65 and the William Natcher Parkway near Bowling Green. The study process is to answer three basic questions:

- ? What are the corridors and are they technically feasible?
- ? What are the environmental, economic and community concerns about the project?
- ? Does the public support the project and does it meet an identified need?

According to Jeff Moore, the process of answering those questions would begin later in the day with the meetings with local public officials, stakeholders and citizens. Based on today's meetings, a public advisory group of local officials, stakeholders and citizens will be identified to assist KYTC in this process.

Daryl Greer provided a report on the status of the I-66 Corridor through southern Kentucky. He noted that the I-66 Corridor originated with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 that called for a feasibility study of the Trans-America Corridor. That feasibility study concluded that the corridor was not economically feasible overall, but that some portions of the corridor could be economically feasible. Accordingly, the study of the I-66 Corridor in Kentucky was legislatively mandated by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21). The Kentucky Transportation Center completed a statewide feasibility study of I-66 in

southern Kentucky in May of 1997 that concluded that I-66 was economically feasible in Kentucky.

Following up the statewide feasibility study, Daryl Greer stated that the KYTC has undertaken five studies to fill gaps in the parkway system across Southern Kentucky. With the corridor study completed, the segment of I-66 from Pikeville into West Virginia is presently in the preliminary engineering and environmental impact statement phase. With the corridor study completed for I-66 between Somerset and London, there are two more preliminary engineering and environmental impact statement studies underway – the Somerset Bypass and the route from the bypass to London. Two planning studies are underway for other gaps in I-66 – Bowling Green from the Cumberland Parkway to the Natcher Parkway and from Paducah to Missouri.

In addition to the I-66 Study in the Bowling Green area, Daryl Greer mentioned that another study will be started for the eastern outer loop of Bowling Green between US 231 and I-65. Jeff Moore noted that the 1972 Transportation Plan for Bowling Green had the first idea for a freeway beltway around Bowling Green. The I-66 Planning Study would take this proposed beltway into consideration.

When asked about the source of funding for the I-66 Planning Study, Daryl Greer responded that TEA-21 authorized funding for the study of the Bowling Green segment.

David Ripple gave a brief overview of the public handout for today's meetings. He noted that the Study Area would permit the eventual identification of corridors north or south of I-65 or even the use I-65 of itself. These corridors would be at least 2,000 feet wide and would not represent specific alignments. The planning study would identify one or more possible corridors or none at all, and then future preliminary engineering and environment impact studies would define the desired alignment in a selected corridor. He also noted that other figures show future congestion on regional roadways if no improvements are made, highways with accidents exceeding that of similar facilities statewide, and proposed major highway improvements in the region that would serve as the base for evaluating the performance of alternate corridors for I-66. At the present time, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. is gathering environmental information in the Study Area and no corridors have been identified. The study is scheduled for completion in October of 2002 with numerous public meetings proposed throughout the process.

Judge/Executive N. E. Reed asked about proposed access to Edmonson County from the I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway interchange. Jeff Moore responded that WMB Engineering was looking at the reconstruction of KY 259 to that interchange.

\\BLA\VOL1\SHARE\Projects\300-0004\public task 1\officials stakeholders\round 071101\mediaminutes071101.doc

**Local Officials Meeting Minutes
I-66 Planning Study
From William Natcher Parkway
to I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item No. 03-66.00
2:00 PM CST, July 11, 2001**

A meeting was held with the local officials at the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center on July 11, 2001. This meeting was to brief local officials about the initiation of the I-66 Planning Study and to receive input on project issues, needs and concerns. Those present at the meeting were:

N. E. Reed, Edmonson County Judge/Executive
Walt McCay, Mayor of Smiths Grove
Don Butler II, Metcalfe County Judge/Executive
Gene Recher, BRADD
Sandy Jones, Mayor of Bowling Green
Bill Phillips, Mayor of Hiseville
Dottie J. Sims, State Representative
Sandy Simpson, Field Representative for Congressman Ed Whitfield
LeAnn Boling, Field Representative for Senator McConnell
Pete Phelps, Chairman of BRADD Transportation Council/Butler County Road Supervisor
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Keirsten Jagers, KYTC – Public Information Officer, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC -- Division of Planning, District 3
Daryl Greer, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Jim Wilson, KYTC -- Division of Planning

Introduction. Jeff Moore welcomed all present and noted that KYTC had just met with the local media about the initiation of this Planning Study for I-66 in the Bowling Green area. The purpose of this meeting was to inform local public officials about the study and to receive input on project related issues, needs and concerns.

Jeff Moore continued, saying that the purpose of the study was to identify and evaluate alternate corridors for I-66 between the William Natcher Parkway and the Cumberland (Louie B. Nunn) Parkway. The study process is to answer three basic questions:

- ? What are the corridors and are they technically feasible?
- ? What are the environmental, economic, social, cultural and community concerns about the project?
- ? Does the public support the project and does it meet an identified need?

Then, those present introduced themselves. Jeff Moore stated that the process begins today to answer those questions. The study will also address policy and funding options for the project and whether there is public support or opposition for the construction of I-66. He noted that the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 identified the Trans-America Corridor from Washington to Los Angeles. However, the Trans-America Corridor Feasibility Study found that the corridor was not economically feasible overall, but that some portions of the corridor might be economically feasible. In 1997, the Kentucky Transportation Center

completed a feasibility study for I-66 in southern Kentucky, concluding that I-66 would be feasible across Kentucky.

Status of Southern Kentucky I-66 Corridor. Following up the statewide feasibility study, Daryl Greer stated that the KYTC has undertaken five studies to fill gaps in the parkway system across Southern Kentucky. The segment of I-66 in Pike County from the King Coal Highway in West Virginia to US 23 is presently in the preliminary engineering and environmental impact statement phase. For the segment of I-66 between Somerset and London, there are two more preliminary engineering and environmental impact statement studies underway – the Somerset Bypass around the north side from the Cumberland (Louie B. Nunn) Parkway and the route from the bypass to I-75 at London. Two planning studies are underway for other gaps in I-66 – Bowling Green from the Cumberland Parkway to the Natcher Parkway and from Paducah to Missouri. Daryl concluded that these studies address how the Commonwealth can fill in gaps in the current network to create I-66 as soon as possible.

Metcalf County Judge/Executive Don Butler II asked if the KYTC was building a new interstate or upgrading the existing network and commented that looking at the pieces in the existing network made sense from a financial standpoint. Daryl Greer responded that the State might upgrade the parkways after gaps are filled in the current network. Jim Wilson noted that most parkways do not meet interstate design standards due to the median width, shoulders and interchange configuration, but that completion of a continuous route for I-66 was more important at this stage.

When asked about the viability of I-66 across the nation, Jim Wilson responded that I-66 was no longer viable across the United States as a result of the Trans-America Corridor Feasibility Study. In some of the western states, the population densities were too low. Jeff Moore reiterated that portions of I-66 would still be desirable in the eastern states. Thus, the I-66 Planning Study in the Bowling Green area is to answer the question: “How do we get from the Cumberland Parkway to the Natcher Parkway?”

Metcalf County Judge/Executive Don Butler II asked if the Transpark would be a problem for the I-66 Study. Jeff Moore responded that Transpark was a consideration relative to land use impacts. Daryl Greer added that I-66 would proceed regardless of the viability of Transpark and that the 1972 Transportation Plan for Bowling Green had identified an Outer Belt that preceded the conception of Transpark.

State Representative Dottie Sims asked if another corridor could be studied. Jim Wilson responded that another corridor was beyond the scope of this study, but could be examined if the General Assembly funded another study in the Six Year Highway Plan. He noted that federal legislation defined the cities that I-66 was to serve in Kentucky and that Kentucky had defined a fifty-mile wide corridor centering on those cities. (After the meeting, Representative Sims suggested a corridor from the Cumberland Parkway near Columbia to the Western Parkway near Leitchfield. Jim Wilson said that he would get a response from the KYTC for her.)

Someone asked if all projects associated with the Bowling Green Outer Beltway were being studied? Jim Wilson noted that only the eastern portion of the Outer Beltway from US 231 to I-65 was included in the Six Year Highway Plan for a study in FY 2002.

Process, Project Schedule and Study Area Conditions. David Ripple provided an overview of the public handout for today’s meetings. Beginning with the Study Area map, he noted that the study area was in the shape of a parallelogram with the eastern edge defined by the

Cumberland (Louie B. Nunn) Parkway and the western edge defined by the Natcher Parkway. Thus, the eastern terminus could be anywhere along the Cumberland (Louie B. Nunn) Parkway between I-65 and Glasgow and the western terminus could be the Natcher Parkway either north or south of Bowling Green. This Study Area would permit the eventual identification of corridors north or south of I-65 or even the use I-65 of itself. The eventual corridors to be identified would be at least 2,000 feet wide and would not represent specific alignments. The planning study would identify one or more possible corridors or none at all, and then subsequent preliminary engineering and environment impact studies would define the desired alignment in a corridor.

The Study Process and Schedule summarizes key milestones and public involvement through October of 2002 according to David Ripple. Public involvement included four meetings of a proposed Public Advisory Committee and two rounds of public information meetings. One round of the public information meetings would occur before the identification of corridors and the other round would occur during the evaluation of the corridors.

A traffic count map for Warren County appears in the handout. David Ripple said that this map was available at the KYTC web site. Next, he described the congestion on regional roadways in the year 2025 if no improvements are made. Congestion is described by a "level-of-service" (LOS) rating A through F, like a grade card. LOS F represents a failure of traffic to flow. LOS E is the maximum possible traffic flow or the traffic flow capacity of the facility. Desirable traffic flow is LOS C or better. Without roadway improvements, the congestion map shows that I-65 and US 231 southeast of Bowling Green will be at LOS F in the year 2025. It should be noted that KYTC has several projects underway (shown in a later figure) to address the congestion problems on this map.

The next map shows accident information for the regional highway network. If the critical rate factor exceeds 1.00, the facility experiences an accident history above that of similar roadways in the State. David Ripple stated that an accompanying table records segments of roadways where the critical rate factor exceeds 1.00 or where there are more than 100 accidents over a three-year period. While the number of accidents on I-65 exceeds 300 over a three-year period, the accident rate on I-65 is comparable to other interstate roadways when vehicle-miles of travel on the facility are taken into consideration.

The last figure and table show major improvements in the region to address much of the congestion shown in the earlier figure. The major roadway improvements fall into three categories. "Construction" projects are funded in the current KYTC Six Year Highway Plan through construction. "Pre-construction" projects are funded in the current KYTC Six Year Highway Plan for earlier phases (such as design, right-of-way acquisition or utility relocation) preceding construction. "Planning" projects are those projects that are proposed or currently in the planning stage only. "Construction" and "Pre-Construction" projects will be added to the existing roadway network to establish the "existing-plus-committed" network against which any I-66 corridors will be evaluated.

Discussion of Project Needs. David Ripple then asked for comments on the preliminary project goals. Jeff Moore stated that the project goals help establish how a project is determined. In fact, the project goals set the framework for what we want the project to do.

Mayor Sandy Jones of Bowling Green said that she recognized the benefits of an east-west corridor in southern Kentucky and the Governor's initiative. However, she was concerned that a new road creates urban sprawl, preferred the improvement of existing roadways, and favored using an existing roadway rather than a new roadway for I-66. Jeff Moore responded that in

building any road we should always ask the question – are we encouraging growth where it may be detrimental? Mayor Jones stated that there are some areas where growth is desired and some areas where it is not as reflected in community plans. David Ripple suggested that it might be desirable to add a project goal concerning the achievement of local community growth objectives.

When asked about the status of I-66 in other states, Jeff Moore responded that I-66 was being planned from Norfolk (Virginia) to Beckley (West Virginia) and from West Virginia to Paducah and onto Missouri.

Someone asked how much additional traffic would be drawn through the Bowling Green area if I-66 were completed across many states. Daryl Greer responded that I-66 might divert traffic from heavily congested I-40. Judge/Executive Don Butler II of Metcalfe County stated that there was a great need for an east-west facility in southern Kentucky and that it was the goal of Congressman Rogers to open up the mountain areas. David Ripple noted that the Kentucky statewide travel model would be used to determine the additional traffic on I-66 if it were completed across Kentucky.

Asked if the current parkways across southern Kentucky met interstate standards, Jeff Moore responded that KYTC would first fill the gaps in the existing network and then upgrade the existing parkways. Someone asked how the economic impacts of I-66 would be addressed, and David Ripple responded that preliminary project goal six (6) would address economic impacts.

Judge/Executive N. E. Reed of Edmonson County asked what was being done to improve access to his county. Jeff Moore responded that a study was underway on KY 259 to connect Rhoda to I-65 at the Cumberland Parkway interchange.

Someone suggested that it would be helpful to have a map of the proposed I-66 corridor from Virginia to Missouri to show that I-66 in Bowling Green was part of an overall facility in Kentucky and the eastern states. Someone else indicated that it was important to involve others from surrounding counties in the process because of the heavy employee commuting into Bowling Green.

David Ripple asked if maintaining the existing community character was important. Mayor Walt McCay of Smiths Grove responded that maintaining rural character was a high priority to Smiths Grove, Oakland and Morgantown.

Pete Phelps said that Butler County was concerned that the Natcher Parkway had bypassed much of Butler County and Warren County between Morgantown and Bowling Green where there was so little roadway infrastructure. He noted that Butler County was now becoming a bedroom community for Bowling Green.

Mayor Walt McCay of Smiths Growth said that the community was concerned about the Transpark proposal because of the potential for increased truck traffic around Smiths Grove. He further stated that Smiths Grove didn't want all the traffic to bypass the community, but that it didn't want truck traffic. He felt the I-66 study should recognize the importance of Smart Growth ideas. Daryl Greer responded that meeting local comprehensive plan objectives might be added as a project goal.

Conclusion. Jeff Moore stated that one of the purposes of today's meeting is to identify participants for the Public Advisory Committee to assist in the planning process. In addition to the Public Advisory Committee meetings, there would be two rounds of public meetings in the process and that each round would be over two days, possibly one day in Warren County and the other day in Edmonson County. Relative to the Public Advisory Committee membership, Jeff Moore said the KYTC wanted a broad cross section of the communities. He further stated that the representation should come from at least five counties in the area (Warren, Edmonson, Barren, Butler and Allen) and that the representatives would bring information to the committee and disseminate information to their communities. Daryl Greer suggested that representatives be included from the National Park Service, planning and zoning commissions, KICK 66, environmental resource interests, and citizens. Mayor Sandy Jones said that she would provide a list of ten people and their area of interest for Public Advisory Committee membership.

Jeff Moore asked if there were any other concerns or issues relative to I-66. In particular, he asked if there were any environmental justice concerns relative to family clusters, low-income groups or minorities in the project Study Area. There was no response. Daryl Greer asked what do we need to avoid in planning I-66. He noted that KYTC was aware of community concerns about Transpark, but that this I-66 study was separate from Transpark. Daryl Greer and Jeff Moore stated that it was important to hear from supporters, as well as those who may have concerns about I-66.

Regarding future activities, Keirsten Jagers stated that the Public Advisory Committee would be meeting in August and that the first round of public information meetings would occur in late September.¹ Jeff Moore closed the meeting at about 4:00 PM thanking all for their presence and stating that the KYTC staff and consultant would be available to answer questions until the stakeholders meeting convened at 5:00 P.M.

\\BLA\VOL1\SHARE\Projects\300-0004\public task 1\officials stakeholders\round 071101\officialsminutes071101.doc

¹ The Public Advisory Committee was later renamed the Citizens' Advisory Group (CAG), and held their first meeting on August 30, 2000. The first round of public information meetings proposed for late September was deferred to address public notification issues associated with the National Environmental Policy Act.

**Stakeholders Meeting Minutes
I-66 Planning Study
From William Natcher Parkway
to I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item No. 03-66.00
5:00 PM CST, July 11, 2001**

A meeting was held with concerned citizens at the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center on July 11, 2001. This meeting was to brief interested parties about the initiation of the I-66 Planning Study and to receive input on project issues, needs and concerns. Those present at the meeting were:

Gayla Cissell, Commissioner, City of Oakland
Tommy Hunt, Magistrate, Warren County Fiscal Court
Denby Huff, Magistrate, Edmonson County Fiscal Court
Ruth Long, National Resource Conservation Service -- Mammoth Cave
Ken Kuehn, Western Kentucky University
Harold Walker, Allen County
Melissa Causler, City of Bowling Green
Chris Houchens, Downing-McPeak/Glasgow Chamber of Commerce
Les Bale, South Central Bank
Robbin Taylor, Western Kentucky University
Lou Ellen Johnson, Warren County
Melinda Hill, InterModal Transportation Authority
Alan Glennon, Western Kentucky University -- Hoffman Institute
Helen Siewers, City-County Planning Commission
Jim Bullington, City of Bowling Green
Willard Thompson, Glasgow Chamber of Commerce
David A. Eakles, Warren County Schools
Emmett Wood, City of Bowling Green
Joey Roberts, Warren County Citizens for Managed Growth
John B. Stone, 55 Alive
Darlene Applegate, Western Kentucky University
Sara Shipley, The Courier-Journal
Michael Briggs, BRADD
John B. Matheney, BRADD
Keirsten Jaggars, KYTC – Information Officer, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC -- Division of Planning, District 3
Daryl Greer, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Jim Wilson, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Anthony Goodman, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.

Introduction. Jeff Moore welcomed all present and those present introduced themselves. He noted that the Study Area for the I-66 Corridor ran from the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway to the Natcher Parkway. Jeff Moore stated that local media and public officials were briefed earlier in the day about the initiation of this Planning Study for I-66 in the Bowling Green area. The purpose of the study was to identify and evaluate alternate corridors for I-66 and to answer three basic questions:

- ? What corridors are technically feasible?
- ? What are the physical and human (social and cultural) impacts of the project?
- ? Are any of these corridors feasible for public support and do any meet a need of the community?

Jeff Moore stated that the process of answering these questions began in June with a meeting of the Project Team, consisting of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), Bernardin-Lochmueller & Associates and the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD). To answer these questions, we also need to know the technical information on transportation facilities and the environment and public input on needs, issues and concerns. Further, we need to know the political atmosphere and how the project fits into public policy.

Status of Southern Kentucky I-66 Corridor. Daryl Greer stated that I-66 began with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 that identified the Trans-America Corridor from Washington (D.C.) to San Luis Obispo (California). The resulting Trans-America Corridor Feasibility Study found that the corridor was not economically feasible overall, but that some portions of the corridor might be economically feasible. In 1997, the Southern Kentucky Corridor Feasibility Study by the Kentucky Transportation Center found I-66 to be feasible across Kentucky. The next step was how to fill in the gaps in the existing parkway network to provide continuity for I-66 across southern Kentucky. Then, the State would go back to upgrade the existing parkways to interstate standards.

Daryl Greer explained that the KYTC has undertaken five studies to fill gaps in the parkway system across Southern Kentucky. The segment of I-66 in Pike County from the King Coal Highway in West Virginia to US 23 is presently in the preliminary engineering and environmental impact statement phase. With the planning study completed for the gap in I-66 from Somerset to London, preliminary engineering and environmental impact statement studies are underway for the northern bypass of Somerset and the route eastward from the bypass to I-75 at London. Two planning studies are underway for other gaps in I-66 – Bowling Green from the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway to the Natcher Parkway and from Paducah to Missouri.

Daryl Greer noted that the I-66 Study in the Bowling Green area would identify funding and segment priorities. Further, because the 1972 Bowling Green Transportation Plan identified an Outer Loop, the I-66 Study would examine the Outer Loop concept and try to avoid duplication.

Asked about the status of the Somerset to London segment of I-66, Daryl Greer responded that the more detailed studies to define an alignment and the associated environmental studies had just begun. Thus, the KYTC has established a corridor, but not an alignment.

Someone asked about the status of I-66 in other states. Daryl Greer responded that the King Coal Highway in West Virginia from Williamson to Beckley was in a comparable phase to I-66 from Somerset to London and from US 23 through Pike County to Williamson in West Virginia. The segments of I-66 in Virginia from Norfolk to Charlottesville, in West Virginia from Charlottesville to Beckley and in Missouri are in an early planning phase, possibly behind I-66 in the Bowling Green and Paducah areas.

Process, Project Schedule and Study Area Conditions. David Ripple provided an overview of the meeting handout. He noted that the Study Area was defined by the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway on the east and the Natcher Parkway on the west. Thus, the Study Area would permit the eventual identification of alternate corridors north and south of Bowling

Green as well as the possible use of portions of I-65. The alternate corridors would be at least 2,000 feet wide and would not represent specific alignments. While this planning study would identify one or more possible corridors (or none at all), preliminary engineering and environment impact studies would be necessary to define the desired alignment in a corridor.

Someone asked where I-66 would continue or connect outside the I-66 Study Area. Daryl Greer responded that the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway would be a continuation of I-66 east of the Study Area. West of the Study Area, the Natcher Parkway to the Western Kentucky (Wendell Ford) Parkway and I-24 to Paducah would serve as the continuation of I-66 for the time being. Later on, the KYTC may consider an extension of I-66 from Bowling Green to Hopkinsville to I-24.

The Study Process and Schedule summarizes key milestones and public involvement through October of 2002 according to David Ripple. Public involvement includes at least four meetings of a proposed Public Advisory Committee and two rounds of public information meetings. One round of the public information meetings would occur before the identification of corridors and the other round would occur during the evaluation of the corridors.

The attached traffic volume map for Warren County is available at the KYTC web site according to David Ripple. The level-of-service map describes congestion on regional roadways in the year 2025 if no improvements are made. Congestion is described by a "level-of-service" (LOS) rating of A through F, like a grade card. LOS F represents a failure of traffic to flow. Desirable traffic flow is LOS C or better.

Someone asked if the additional lanes being constructed on I-65 had been taken into account in projecting the LOS for I-65 in the year 2025. David Ripple responded that this congestion map reflected no proposed improvements to I-65 or any other facility; however, programmed improvements to I-65 and other facilities would be taken into consideration in the evaluation of alternate corridors for I-66. A later figure shows several projects underway (such as I-65 through Warren County and US 231 southeast of Bowling Green) to address the congestion problems on this map.

The next map shows accident information for the regional highway network. If the critical rate factor exceeds 1.00, the facility experiences an accident history above that of similar roadways in the State. While the number of accidents on I-65 exceeds 300 over a three-year period, the accident rate on I-65 is comparable to other interstate roadways due to the high traffic volumes.

The last figure and table show major improvements in the region to address much of the congestion shown in the earlier figure. "Construction" projects are funded in the current KYTC Six Year Highway Plan through construction. "Pre-construction" projects are funded in the current KYTC Six Year Highway Plan for earlier phases (such as design, right-of-way acquisition or utility relocation) preceding construction. "Planning" projects are those projects proposed or currently in the planning stage. David Ripple stated that the "Construction" and "Pre-Construction" projects are to be added to the existing roadway network to establish the base condition for evaluating the performance of the alternate corridors for I-66.

Discussion of Project Needs. David Ripple then asked for comments on the preliminary project goals. He noted that the Mayor of Bowling Green (in the earlier meeting with local officials) had suggested that a project goal be added to address the extent to which a corridor would help achieve (or be compatible with) the development objectives of local comprehensive plans. Jeff Moore stated that alternate corridors would be tested against the project goals.

A stakeholder asked how much money had been set aside for this study. Daryl Greer responded that the current KYTC Six Year Highway Plan set aside \$700,000 for the I-66 Study in the Bowling Green Area.

Another person asked if more lanes could be added to I-65 rather than build I-66. David Ripple responded that I-65 was currently being widened from two lanes to three lanes and that the reconstruction would permit the addition of a future fourth lane in each direction in the median without the reconstruction of interchanges or the purchase of additional right-of-way. The traffic model being developed for this study would determine whether or not the future fourth lane would be adequate to accommodate I-66.

Someone else asked if the Bowling Green Outer Loop (referring to the Major Highway Improvements Figure) could be an option for I-66. Daryl Greer said yes.

Referring to the listing of future transportation projects, Ruth Long stated that Kentucky should develop a priority list for emergency response teams that deal with hazardous materials and other contaminants that may spill into the water shed if an accident were to occur. Maybe federal funds should be requested to aid in developing such a list. Simpson County is currently preparing a hazardous materials response plan.

Another person asked if the location shown for the Bowling Green Outer Loop (on the Major Highway Improvements Figure) was an alignment. Jeff Moore responded that the location shown was just a general corridor and did not represent a specific alignment.

A stakeholder asked if there was any effort to separate automobile and truck traffic. Daryl Greer said no, and further explained that dedicated lanes for high speed or for high occupancy vehicles were not considered feasible.

Someone else asked if commuter rail would be considered in the I-66 Corridor. Jim Wilson responded that the Trans-America Corridor Feasibility Study examined passenger rail in the corridor and found it infeasible. Thus, passenger rail was not included in further studies of the Kentucky I-66 corridor. On the other hand, Daryl Greer stated that park-n-ride lots might be considered.

A stakeholder spoke about the Greenbelt Master Plan for Bowling Green that included bikeways, recreational facilities, and the use of overpasses and underpasses for such facilities. Daryl Greer responded that the KYTC was developing a bicycle and pedestrian use policy.

Harold Walker of Allen County said that there was never a good way from Glasgow to Bowling Green. Daryl Greer agreed that such may be the case, but that the I-66 Planning Study was more than just linking two cities.

Joey Roberts stated that the I-66 Planning Study had started with the wrong question. The question should be: "Is I-66 viable across Kentucky?" He continued saying you all are making a huge assumption that I-66 is feasible. The question that needs to be asked is: "Is the I-66 project needed and do the people of Bowling Green want it?" David Ripple responded that I-66 in Bowling Green should stand as a segment of independent utility and should stand on its own merits without depending upon the completion of all or a portion of the remainder of I-66 across Kentucky. The I-66 Planning Study for Bowling Green would not specifically address the question of economic feasibility, and such a question should be carried to a higher level in the

KYTC. Jim Wilson stated that the feasibility of I-66 had been determined in the 1997 Southern Kentucky Corridor Feasibility Study. Joey Roberts countered that the 1997 Study was out of date.

A stakeholder asked if Goal 1 was a realistic goal and could be accomplished. Someone asked if we might still need I-66 to address truck traffic. Another person noted that the Study Area was cavernous. Dave Foster should be called at the Cave Society to get information on the Study Area. Someone asked if the National Park Service was involved in the study, and Keirsten Jaggars responded that they had been invited to the meeting. A stakeholder noted that any corridor for I-66 east of KY 101 and north of I-65 would involve caves. Another person asked if tourism people had been invited to the meeting, and Keirsten Jaggars said yes. A citizen stated that the study needed to address water quality issues.

A stakeholder asked when the KY 101 Intermediate Planning Study would be available to the public. Daryl Greer responded that the report would be available in about two months. Asked about the composition of the proposed Public Advisory Committee, Keirsten Jaggars explained that it would include officials, stakeholders and citizens and that today's meeting would help in the identification of members.

Another stakeholder asked how Transpark related to the I-66 Study. Daryl Greer responded that the I-66 project is not tied to Transpark and that the I-66 project would still exist if Transpark were not built. However, the traffic from a possible Transpark would be a consideration in the I-66 Study.

Conclusion. Regarding future activities, Keirsten Jaggars stated that the Public Advisory Committee would be meeting in August and that the first round of public information meetings would occur in late September.¹ She closed the meeting at about 7:00 PM thanking all for their presence and stating that the KYTC staff and consultant would be available to answer questions.

S:\Projects\300-0004\PUBLICTA\OFFICIAL\ROUND711\STAKEHOL.DOC

¹ The Public Advisory Committee was later renamed the Citizens' Advisory Group (CAG), and held their first meeting on August 30, 2000. The first round of public information meetings proposed for late September was deferred to address public notification issues associated with the National Environmental Policy Act.

**Citizens' Advisory Group Meeting Minutes
I-66 Planning Study
From William Natcher Parkway
to I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item No. 03-66.00
6:00 PM CST, August 30, 2001**

The first meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Group (CAG) was held at the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center on August 30, 2001. This meeting was to brief members about the initiation of the I-66 Planning Study and to receive input on project issues, needs and concerns. Those present at the meeting were:

Roger Thomas, State Representative – 21st District
Charles B. Honeycutt, Mayor of Glasgow
N. E. Reed, Edmonson County Judge/Executive
Hugh C. Evans, Butler County Judge/Executive
Gayla Cissell, Commissioner, City of Oakland
Sandy Jones, Mayor of Bowling Green
John and Joanna BluBaugh, KICK-66
William (Bill) Foster, Bowling Green
Henry Holman, Mammoth Cave National Park
Sarah Ann Bowers, Glasgow
Jim Shanahan, Bowling Green
Janet Dennison, Edmonson County
Doug and Pam Cropper
Tom Hart, Bowling Green
John W. Smith, Smiths Grove
Scott Young, Bowling Green Planning Commissioner
Nelson Sander, Edmonson County
Steve Hunter, City-County Planning Commission
Darrell Cassody, Edmonson County Board of Education
Pete Phelps, Butler County Road Supervisor
Joey Roberts, Warren County Citizens for Managed Growth
James Tabor, Bowling Green
Woody Martin, City of Morgantown
Steve Owens, Warren County Road Administrator
J. T. Hardin, Quality Personnel
Howard E. Bailey, Western Kentucky University
Susan McPherson, National Resource Conservation Service
Kathern Jennings, Butler County
Trisha Lawrence, Inter-Modal Transportation Authority
Gary Mathis, Scottsville-Allen County Planning Commission
John B. Matheney, BRADD
Keirsten Jaggars, KYTC – Information Officer, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC -- Division of Planning, District 3
David Kratt, KYTC – Central Office Design
Daryl Greer, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Carl Dixon, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Anthony Goodman, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.

Andrew S. Layson, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.

Introduction. Jeff Moore welcomed all present and those present introduced themselves. He explained that the purpose of this meeting was to organize the Citizens' Advisory Group (CAG), to inform the CAG about efforts to date and to receive input on project issues, needs and concerns. The concept of I-66 came from the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) Trans-America Corridor Feasibility Study. That study found some, but not all, of the corridor across the nation was desirable. In 1997, the Southern Kentucky Corridor Feasibility Study by the Kentucky Transportation Center found I-66 to be feasible across Kentucky. (The Executive Summary of the I-66 Southern Kentucky Corridor Project was handed out to all present.) Following up the Southern Kentucky Corridor Study, we are looking at the section of I-66 from the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway to the Natcher Parkway.

Jeff Moore explained that the overall purpose of the I-66 Planning Study in the Bowling Green area was to identify and evaluate alternate corridors. The objectives of the study are:

- ❑ To identify and evaluate potential corridors;
- ❑ To determine if these corridors are technically feasible;
- ❑ To identify the social and environmental impacts of the corridors; and
- ❑ To determine if any corridor can be supported by the public.

Jeff Moore stated that the CAG was part of the scope of the study and was to assist in addressing these objectives. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to define roles and responsibilities -- "This is a conversation for all to be heard." Then, he initiated a group exercise involving post-it notes. He asked everyone to write on the notes a response to: "What are the issues and concerns that must be considered about the connection of I-66 from the Natcher Parkway to the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway?" He noted that the responses could be positive or negative, and that the results would be presented later in the meeting.

Organization of Citizens' Advisory Group. Keirsten Jagers explained that the CAG consisted of interested parties from Warren, Edmonson, Butler, Barren and Allen Counties and interest groups such as KICK-66. Later in the meeting, questionnaires on the project were passed out for the CAG members to take to their constituents for completion. She then explained the CAG ground rules listed on a board and asked if there were any additional rules. The ground rules listed on the board were as follows:

- ❑ Everybody talks.
- ❑ No interruptions.
- ❑ No insults.
- ❑ All ideas are worthy.
- ❑ Status does not count. The idea counts.
- ❑ Any idea can be challenged.
- ❑ Start on time – Be on Time.
- ❑ Keep meetings to two or three hours in length.
- ❑ Have an agenda for every meeting.

No rules were added.

Highway Project Development Process. Daryl Greer described the content of the KYTC handout titled "Public Information Meeting Project Planning Process and Road Building Steps

and Timelines.” Beginning with the long-range planning step, he stated that the KYTC maintained an “unscheduled needs list” of roadway improvement projects proposed by local officials and citizens. The “unscheduled needs list” includes about \$50 billion in projects; however, the KYTC receives only \$800 million per year for roadways, about 50% for maintenance and 50% new and expanded roadways.

Roadway improvement priorities are developed by each Area Development District, each Highway District and, then, the KYTC Central Office. Next, the improvement projects move into the 20-year long-range Statewide Transportation Plan followed by the Six Year Highway Plan. The State legislature approves the first two years of the Six Year Highway Plan that is updated every two years. Daryl Greer noted that there has been a shortfall in the gasoline tax this year that may constrain project implementation.

The second step in project development is “project planning.” “Project planning” determines the need, project limits, goals, public concerns, implementation strategy and funding sources. The third phase involves “preliminary design and environmental studies” to define an alignment for the roadway improvement. This is followed by final design, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, construction and maintenance of the new facility. The typical project development timeline is about 10 years according to Daryl Greer. This I-66 Planning Study falls in the “project planning phase,” and the project may or may not be funded to move into the “preliminary design and environmental studies” phase. The project development handout describes the numerous issues to be addressed in the road building process.

Someone asked what mix of funds would be used to build I-66. Daryl Greer responded that funding for I-66 would probably come from special federal funds matched with State funds. When asked about the project cost, Daryl Greer said that the cost was not known at this time. Carl Dixon noted that if no special federal funds were provided for I-66, I-66 would have to compete with other improvement projects statewide. Thus, if the people thought the construction of I-66 was important, it might advance. At this juncture, only this Planning Study for I-66 is funded, no subsequent phases are funded.

Someone commented that US 68/KY 80 is being improved west of Bowling Green, but has little traffic. Another person commented that I-66 is being forced to go through Warren County if the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway and the Natcher Parkway (even as a temporary route) are components of I-66. Daryl Greer responded that US 68/KY 80 is not being built to freeway standards west of Bowling Green and that the corridor for I-66 westward from Bowling Green is not known at this time.

Project Overview. Daryl Greer explained that the impetus for I-66 was the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and the 1997 Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). These acts stated that the I-66 corridor would be centered on certain cities, and the KYTC has used about a 25-mile radius from these cities to define the corridor in Kentucky. The KYTC is presently filling gaps in the existing parkway network to provide continuity for I-66 across southern Kentucky.

The segment of I-66 in Pike County from the King Coal Highway in West Virginia to US 23 is presently in the “preliminary engineering and environmental studies” phase. For the segment of I-66 from Somerset to London, preliminary engineering and environmental studies are underway for the northern bypass of Somerset and the route eastward from the bypass to I-75 at London. Two “project planning” studies are underway for other gaps in I-66 – Bowling Green from the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway to the Natcher Parkway and from Paducah to Missouri.

Once these gaps are filled, Daryl Greer said that the State might upgrade or construct other facilities. Carl Dixon commented that Bowling Green was one of the cities specified in the federal legislation defining the I-66 corridor and that was why we are here tonight.

Someone asked about coal-hauling around London. Carl Dixon responded that the parkways may eventually have to be upgraded and that West Virginia was constructing the King Coal Highway from Beckley to Williamson as part of I-66.

Asked about the right-of-way width of I-66, Daryl Greer responded that the right-of-way width varies with the terrain and that there would be fewer problems where parkway right-of-way is used for I-66. Carl Dixon added that the Daniel Boone Parkway with only two lanes would need to be upgraded before the Natcher Parkway with four lanes.

Someone inquired if the KYTC was working with other State departments of transportation. Carl Dixon responded that West Virginia has comparable plans and funding to Kentucky in Pike County. Although federal legislation says that the I-66 corridor would go through Illinois, Illinois has stated that they don't want I-66. The Missouri delta region is economically depressed, and the Missouri DOT plans to upgrade US 60. Kentucky wants to tie I-66 into I-57 in Missouri.

Another person asked if the location for I-66 had been determined west of Bowling Green and wouldn't the location west of Bowling Green affect the location through Warren County. Daryl Greer responded that this study would review the issue and that I-66 might eventually go westward to Hopkinsville. Carl Dixon explained that this study would determine the best location north or south of Bowling Green for I-66 and the level of public support for I-66. West of Bowling Green, I-66 might use the Natcher Parkway or US 68/KY 80.

A CAG member commented that the best route is a straight line. Carl Dixon responded that there is a need to know the impacts to help decide on the best route. Asked if a part of the Western Kentucky Parkway was in the I-66 Corridor, Carl Dixon responded that the portion of the Western Kentucky Parkway from the Natcher Parkway to I-24 was in the I-66 Corridor. The Natcher Parkway will be used for I-66 until a decision is made on any extension of I-66 to Hopkinsville. Someone else asked why the KYTC would build a parallel facility to upgraded US 68/KY 80 to Hopkinsville. Carl Dixon replied that the decision to improve US 68/KY 80 had been made before I-66 was initiated and that US 68/KY 80 could be a continuation of I-66 for the time being.

Someone asked how I-66 and the proposed Bowling Green bypass were related. Daryl Greer said that the I-66 Planning Study would examine if I-66 and the Bowling Green Outer Loop can be accommodated on the same alignment. On the other hand, the Bowling Green Outer Loop was identified in the 1972 Bowling Green Transportation Plan before I-66 planning was initiated. He noted that the Natcher Parkway was to be extended from I-65 to Scottsville Road (US 231) and that a study of the Bowling Green Outer Loop from Scottsville Road north to I-65 would soon be initiated. In conclusion, Daryl Greer noted that the travel model being developed for this study would assist in the evaluation of corridors.

Judge/Executive N. E. Reed of Edmonson County asked where the I-66 Corridor might go relative to Mammoth Cave. He stated that the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway was already congested and that he preferred an Outer Loop of Bowling Green from the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway through Edmonson County to the Natcher Parkway to remove the through traffic from the Bowling Green traffic. Such a corridor would be an economic benefit to Edmonson and Butler Counties and relieve congestion in those counties.

Another CAG member suggested that a greater loop of Bowling Green tying the six-county area together might be considered relative to economic impacts on the region. Traffic congestion on I-65, the Natcher Parkway and the Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway is greater each year.

David Ripple gave a brief overview of the handout. He noted that the Study Area would permit the eventual identification of corridors north or south of I-65 or even the use of I-65. These corridors would be at least 2,000 feet wide and would not represent specific alignments. The planning study would identify one or more possible corridors or none at all, and then preliminary engineering and environmental studies would define the desired alignment in a corridor. He also noted that other figures show future congestion on regional roadways if no improvements are made, highways with accidents exceeding that of similar facilities statewide, and proposed major highway improvements in the region that would serve as the base for evaluating the performance of alternate corridors for I-66. At the present time, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. is gathering environmental information in the Study Area and no corridors have been identified. The study is scheduled for completion in October of 2002 with several public meetings proposed throughout the process.

David Ripple noted that the list of preliminary project goals would assist in the evaluation of I-66 corridors, and requested comment on the goals. He noted that the Mayor of Bowling Green had requested at the July 11th meeting with local officials that a goal be added to address how the corridors would achieve local growth objectives as expressed in local comprehensive plans.

Someone asked how the I-66 corridor would impact urban growth and sprawl. A project goal should be added regarding community impact. Jeff Moore noted that consideration was being given to adding a community goal. Another person asked if a land use model was being developed. Carl Dixon said no, but that the Planning Study would look at ways a freeway affects land use. Jeff Moore said that input from the community was important in defining the development impacts of I-66. Daryl Greer noted that the last handout was a contact list and that additional ideas could be submitted to anyone on the list.

Transportation Issues and Concerns. Jeff Moore summarized the results of the posting of issues and concerns by the CAG membership. (The full list of issues is attached.) Jeff Moore noted that we need more voices involved in the process and that the CAG functioned like an upside down funnel to get information out and back from the community at the base. He then hit the major themes expressed in the issues and concerns (also see the attached list):

- ❑ About half of the issues covered environmental areas – pollution in general, noise, water, karst, cultural/historic concerns from Mammoth Cave to burial mounds, air quality (as Edmonson, Warren and Simpson may become air quality nonattainment areas), endangered species and their migration, community impacts (population, minorities, income levels, urban sprawl), industrial projects and economic impacts, impacts on tourism, and feasibility questions.
- ❑ Design issues from location to access points.
- ❑ Access to I-66.
- ❑ Whether or not the Natcher Parkway and Cumberland Parkway can be upgraded and at what cost.
- ❑ Traffic issues such as can I-66 relieve traffic on I-65.
- ❑ Truck traffic impacts on the region and I-65 and the creation of more truck traffic.
- ❑ Need for more citizens on the CAG.

Jeff Moore stated that about 40 people had been invited to the CAG meeting. He asked if this was an adequate cross section, and the list of invitees was circulated. Daryl Greer noted that minutes of the meeting would be prepared with a listing of attendees. Carl Dixon asked if there were any groups that needed to be contacted. Jeff Moore asked CAG members to gather issues and concerns from the public and to report back at the next meeting. Prior to the next CAG meeting, there will be public information meetings in Warren County and in Edmonson County to receive public input on project issues and concerns.

Daryl Greer asked if there were any issues missed, and Jeff Moore recorded the additional issues (also see attached list):

- ❑ Possible environmental impacts on Mammoth Cave and Barren River State Park. How close can the highway come?
- ❑ Minimizing the impact on the karst, cave system and underground streams.
- ❑ In the case of karst and Transpark, look at both sides of the issue. Contact Dr. Watkins from the Kentucky Geological Survey and Dr. Kuehn from Western Kentucky University about these issues.
- ❑ Obtain information on cave and karst issues from Lee Florea of KICK-66.
- ❑ Consider a cost analysis of using the old versus new roadways.
- ❑ Address the hazardous material spill probability along vectors from the proposed roadway. Examine the response mechanism to hazardous material spills along I-65.
- ❑ Examine how to divert traffic from I-65 to prevent further accidents. Examine the use of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies. There is a problem associated with the diversion of I-65 accident traffic through Smiths Grove to US 31W. What would be the impact on this diversion if a second interstate were near Smiths Grove? If I-65 and I-66 are on the same alignment, we might lose the opportunity to divert traffic.
- ❑ What will be the additional traffic passing through the Bowling Green area as a result of I-66? Are you working with Bowling Green and BRADD to identify this additional traffic? (David Ripple responded that the traffic model would identify the traffic volumes with and without the completion of I-66 across the State.)
- ❑ Need to involve the State Police regarding speed enforcement and the increase in traffic volumes.
- ❑ What is the greater priority: the Natcher Parkway or Hopkinsville? (Carl Dixon responded that the KYTC might decide not to improve US 68/KY 80 to Hopkinsville. Yet, State and Federal legislation identified Hopkinsville as a city in the I-66 corridor. Nevertheless, the route to Hopkinsville should not be the driving force in choosing a corridor in this study.)
- ❑ If two-lane roadways are upgraded as a result of I-66, what is the impact on the community? What is the impact if an existing roadway is made limited access? (Carl Dixon noted that this was the same issue addressed on the segment of I-66 from Somerset to London. Widening an existing highway or imposing access control proved cost prohibitive due to the need to maintain access to abutting property and to increased displacements near the urban areas.)
- ❑ Provide a population density map of the Study Area.
- ❑ Make the information on karst available at public meetings. (Daryl Greer responded that the Kentucky Geological Survey was preparing such information for the public information meeting to be held in the next 30 to 60 days.)

Daryl Greer concluded the listing of additional issues by asking if anything had been missed. Then, Jeff Moore asked if there were any comments on the preliminary project goals, and

recorded the comments in the attachment. David Ripple noted that a goal would be considered regarding consistency or coordination with local land use plans.

Someone asked when the section of I-66 through Warren County would be done. Daryl Greer replied that the information from this planning study would determine if this segment had independent utility and should be carried forward in the road building process. Another person asked if one goal had more weight than others did. Carl Dixon responded that there was no weighting of the goals at this time.

A CAG member commented that an advantage of an alternative route to I-65 was the opportunity to address diverted traffic while hazardous material spills were being cleared. Another member stated that the amount of traffic attracted or diverted from Bowling Green might be another goal. Consideration should be given to how other routes are affected by I-66. (Carl Dixon stated that this would be addressed by the study. If additional traffic cannot be minimized, the additional improvements will be identified.)

David Ripple explained that the public involvement plan for the project involved at least four meetings of the CAG at critical project milestones and two rounds of public information meetings. Jeff Moore stated that the first public information meeting was planned for the next 30 to 60 days, one in Warren County and the other in Edmonson County.¹ Daryl Greer asked the CAG if there was a preference for an open meeting format or a formal presentation. David Ripple noted that for other corridor studies the first public meeting involved the review of the environmental footprint, the identification of issues that may have been overlooked, and the generation of ideas for possible corridors. Jeff Moore asked how do we get the people to attend? Jeff Moore recorded a number of ideas in the attachment including:

- ❑ Putting information about the meeting where people are, such as an information booth at shopping centers.
- ❑ Placing meeting notices at high volume intersections.
- ❑ Holding a walk-in meeting at 11 AM and providing a short presentation at an evening meeting.
- ❑ Contacting children at schools to inform their parents about the meeting. The school system newsletter might be used for this purpose.
- ❑ Use the new Bowling Green Junior High School for an information meeting during the day and a presentation at night.
- ❑ Contacting the press for pre-meeting publicity.

Jeff Moore noted that I-66 was the largest project in the region since I-65 and the parkways were developed.

John Blubaugh said that the community would connect the I-66 project with Transpark, and that this negative relationship had to be removed. Jeff Moore responded that the Transpark was separate from I-66 because the concept of I-66 had preceded Transpark. John Blubaugh responded that people would feel that the two were connected and that the KYTC had to convince people that I-66 was in no way connected to Transpark. He said, "People tend to reject anything that appears to be a done deal." Using environmental information from Western Kentucky University would add credibility to the I-66 Project. While a portion of the population is looking at Transpark at a distance, it would be a mistake to ignore those people who are

¹ The first round of public information meetings proposed for late September or early October was deferred to address public notification issues associated with the National Environmental Policy Act.

emotionally affected by Transpark. Daryl Greer volunteered to meet with any interest groups during the project, but noted that the schedule for I-66 was mandated by the Kentucky General Assembly.

Someone else commented that people think I-66 is connected to Transpark because I-66 may tie into the Bowling Green Outer Loop and the Outer Loop is proposed as a connector from I-65 to Transpark. Carl Dixon responded that I-65 is already in the process of being improved and that the concept of I-66 across the State of Kentucky preceded Transpark. A CAG member noted that the CAG should not take sides on Transpark.

Jeff Moore noted that consideration might be made to a drop-in information meeting in Butler County. Someone else suggested that the public information meeting be televised with an opportunity to call in questions. Another person suggested that a promotional game be developed to publicize the project such as guess how many cars will use the new road. A fair was coming up in October 4, 5 and 6 where publicity about the public information meeting could be posted. Daryl Greer noted that the date of the public information meeting would appear on the KYTC web site.

Conclusion. Daryl Greer said that everyone should take a pile of questionnaires to be completed by their constituents and summarize the responses for the next CAG meeting. Jeff Moore noted that every CAG member would be notified of the dates of the public information meeting that might occur as early as October 9th and 11th.² Notice of the public meeting should also be placed on the web sites of Western Kentucky University, Warren County Economic Development and others. Daryl Greer noted that information on the Somerset to London I-66 study was available on the KYTC web site. The next CAG meeting was set for Thursday, December 6th at 6:00 PM at the BRADD Conference Center. Jeff Moore closed the meeting at about 8:30 PM thanking all for their presence and stating that the KYTC staff and consultant would be available to answer questions.

S:\Projects\300-0004\PublicTask1\CAG\CAG Meeting 083001\CAGMinutes083001.doc

² The first round of public information meetings proposed for late September or early October was deferred to address public notification issues associated with the National Environmental Policy Act.

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

I-66 PLANNING STUDY

From William Natcher Parkway to I-65 / Louis B. Nunn Parkway
ITEM NO. 03-66.00

DATE: September 19, 2001

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Construction Conference Room

TIME: 10:30 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, CDE - District 3
Patrick Tindall, FHWA
Annette Coffey, Director - Division of Planning
Daryl Greer, Division of Planning
Tony Vinegar, Division of Environmental Analysis
Richard Wilson, Division of Materials - Geotechnical Branch
Jeff Moore, District 3
Lancie Meredith, District 3
Keirsten Jagers, District 3
Renee Slaughter, District 3
Kenneth W. Cox, District 3
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Keith Lochmueller, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. (BLA)
Vince Bernardin, BLA
David Isley, BLA
Andrew S. Layson, BLA
David Ripple, BLA
Tom Cervone, BLA
Anthony Goodman, BLA
Jason DuPont, BLA
William Andrews, Kentucky Geological Survey
Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey

The second project team meeting was held on September 19, 2001 at 10:30 a.m. in the Construction Conference Room of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of this meeting was to review the progress to date on the project and to discuss the information to be provided at the forthcoming Public Information Meetings.

Welcome and Introductions

Daryl Greer opened the meeting and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss information that was to be presented at the First Public Information Meetings. It was also explained that it was the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet's belief that a Notice of Intent should be filed for this project so as to bring this Planning Study under the umbrella of the NEPA

process. In order to have the Notice of Intent in place prior to the First Public Information Meetings, these meetings will need to be delayed until late October or early November.

Progress to Date

Dave Ripple gave an update on the public involvement that has taken place to date on the project. This involvement included the June 6th Project Team Meeting, the July 11th Early Coordination Meetings with the media, public officials and stakeholders, and the August 30th Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting. Draft minutes of these meetings were distributed.

There was some general discussion about these meetings and the issues that were raised during them. Some issues that were brought up at the public officials meeting included wanting consistency with local growth objectives and questions as to the relation to Transpark. It was stated that there were only approximately 25 attendees for the stakeholders meeting (well short of the 175 + invitations that were sent out). Issues raised during this meeting included the relation to I-65, the relation to the Bowling Green Outer Loop, questions about viability of the project (1997 study outdated?), concerns about traffic diversion through Smith's Grove, and hazardous material spills. The CAG Meeting was described as being well attended (35 out of 40). Some of the items brought up at the CAG Meeting were described as: the relation of the I-66 corridor to Hopkinsville, the relation to the Bowling Green Outer Loop, the possible affect on urban sprawl, effects on the environment (from caves and karst to air quality to economic impacts), access concerns and impacts to local roads, traffic and truck issues, project feasibility and the relation to Transpark. The post-it note exercise, which took place at this meeting, was also reviewed. There was interest expressed at this meeting as to the possibility of including additional project goals - such as "minimize environmental impacts and cost".

Open dialogue followed the review and included additional comments about the meetings. Daryl Greer noted that Kick-66 raised the point of the general population's linkage of Transpark to I-66. He also stated that the goals should be kept simple so as not to hinder the project as it progresses through the NEPA process. Jeff Moore discussed how managed growth should be kept in mind and as a matter for conversation, but should not be a primary goal. Vince Bernardin stated that many items are part of the screening process but should not be mixed with project goals. Jeff described how he thought the CAG meeting had helped develop a level of confidence with the members. Daryl stated that CAG appreciated what they had been told. He also described how the CAG members were to distribute questionnaires/surveys to those they represent (friends, family, civic groups, ect.), and that each member was to return at least 25 completed surveys and have them summarized. Keirsten Jagers said that she had followed up with the CAG members who were unable to attend and had sent out the information to them that was distributed at the meeting. Jeff and Keirsten both noted that some CAG members thought that there should be more citizen representation in the group and that there were too many officials. However, they also noted that there were actually only four officials in the group. Rick Wilson inquired as to what we want out of CAG. Daryl responded that CAG is an advisory group, but not a decision making body. They will help with alignment development, serve as a touchstone to the public, and assist in impact definition. Keirsten added that this group would be utilized to generate information for use in the project. Jeff stated that they were to provide a balance of technical, political and public input. Annette Coffey added that CAG may agree to support, but are not being asked to endorse the project. Jeff also noted that there was good interaction in the group, and that no one attempted to dominate the CAG meeting.

Dave Ripple then discussed some of the technical activity that has been taking place on the project. He discussed traffic volumes, crash rates and committed projects in the study area.

During the discussion of crash rates, Lencie Meredith questioned the crash data. He stated that many of the accidents, particularly within Bowling Green, could have taken place in parking lots and coded to the adjacent roadway. He also stated that some of the routes have changed and cited US 231 as an example. Dave replied that the data was taken from KYTC Highway Information System (HIS), and that crashes without valid milepoints were discarded. Due to the large study area and the early stage of the study, it was determined that investigating individual crashes was not beneficial. Jeff suggested that the data be presented as a “snapshot” and not get into detail. Vince added that the data was not intended for evaluation of alternates and that perhaps national rates should be used. Daryl replied that the interior or urban information should be removed. John Matheney suggested that a definition of critical rate factor (CRF) be added to the exhibit along with the years of analysis. Daryl added that I-65, the Natcher Parkway and the Nunn Parkway are not necessarily accident prone due to the traffic volumes they carry. John sited that I-65 not being accident prone is not convincing to the public due to the high number of accidents known to occur. Dave stated that he would add traffic volumes to the crash rate exhibit.

Daryl stated that a preliminary statement of project goals should be presented to get public input. Annette added that the goals should be in “plain” English and simplified - avoiding using terms such as “accessability”, “mobility”, and “future traffic”. Vince voiced concern about case law of the NEPA process and suggested that it would be good to have an environmental legal counsel review the project goals. He cited economic development as an example project goal that would be difficult to measure relative achievement. Annette replied that they have legal counsel to consult. Patrick Tyndall suggested adding an attorney to the project team and changing the title from “preliminary project goals” to “preliminary purpose and need”. Dave added that economic development has been used as a goal for I-66 across the state. Daryl replied that without the completed network across the state, the complete benefits cannot be realized. Vince warned of too narrowly defining the purpose and need. It was agreed that the project goals would be simplified and rewritten and would then be provided to the KYTC to have their legal counsel review prior to Public Information Meetings.

Keith Lochmueller inquired as to whether we were meeting NEPA regulations on segmentation and if this project can stand on independent utility. Daryl stated that the study will address independent utility, and that it can be related to the Bowling Green Outer Loop which has been identified as a need in Bowling Green for many years. Daryl also added that the traffic volumes on I-66 may not result in a project of independent utility and we may need to revise the project goals and the study advances.

Tom Cervone then discussed the environmental progress made to date. He stated that Geographic Information Systems (GIS) maps were being developed and contacts were being made. Tom distributed a list of GIS layers showing those which had been completed to date and those dependent on obtaining additional data. Tom also stated that his staff is working to ensure coordination with the Kentucky Geological Survey (KGS) so that they will function as a team. Jerry Weisenfluh stated that Ken Kehhr of Western Kentucky University was not present, but would be attending the public meetings.

The meeting adjourned for lunch from approximately 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

First Public Information Meeting Preparation

Annette began by saying that we needed to get a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the FHWA to get it placed on the federal register and that BLA should prepare a draft NOI and forward it to the Division of Planning for review. Daryl noted that we are preparing an environmental document

that will lead to an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement, and would prefer to identify this project as a "Planning Study" instead of a "Scoping Study" on the NOI.

Keirsten stated that the Public Information Meetings were originally scheduled for October 16th and 18th and were to be held at the KYTC District 3 Office in Bowling Green and the Edmonson County Courthouse respectfully. They were scheduled to last from 10:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. These meetings will be postponed until the NOI issue is decided. Keirsten suggested an open format approach similar to one recently used in Morgantown which worked well. She went on to say that she and Jeff would be developing a looped video that would run continuously. She also suggested that the meeting be set up in a walk-through fashion utilizing "tour guides". She also commented that CAG members had agreed to be present and could help in guiding people through the exhibit stations. Some general comments made about the exhibits included ensuring that the titles on the exhibits are large enough to be seen from a distance and that all exhibits have a similar format. Annette added that the exhibits would need to be reviewed prior to the meetings.

Patrick asked about the purpose of the meetings. Keirsten stated that they were to educate the public about the project. Annette added that they were to gather public comments, concerns and issues. Daryl continued that they were to let the public know the study area, the issues that have been identified, gather information of issues that might have been missed, get comments on the project goals and input on possible corridors.

David Isley asked if a meeting with the media will be held before the public meetings. Keirsten indicated that there would be a meeting a day or so before. Annette stated that BLA is to draft an informational article on the project to be distributed to the print media. Tom emphasized the idea of partnering with the news media to get the information to the public.

Annette noted the amount of information and asked how it could be made available. Keirsten suggested possibly including some information in the mailout, while Daryl suggested posting it on the website.

Patrick inquired about the sources of public input to be present at the meetings. Keirsten replied one-on-one communication, post-it note exercise and public comment survey. Annette added that a tape recorder or court reporter could be useful as well as a flip-chart to write down comments.

The location of the meetings was discussed. It was decided that the anticipated attendance would be too great to be adequately served by the District Office Conference Room or the Edmonson County Courthouse. These locations were also not large enough to provide necessary spacing between exhibit locations. The District will look at the availability of the Convention Center on US 231 in Bowling Green for the Warren County meeting, and for someplace in Brownsville for the Edmonson County meeting. The meetings are to be set up in stations which are to include: sign-in table with handouts, video viewing station, stations for exhibits (traffic, environmental, karst, etc.) to include one-on-one conversation, and an area to fill out the questionnaire/post-it note exercise where a court reporter is to be present.

The handouts were discussed. Their contents are to include general information such as why are we here, purpose, etc., preliminary project goals, environmental footprint map, questionnaire, environmental information, post-it notes, and "roadbuilder" handout. The handouts may be placed in folders with a business card. Five hundred handouts should be prepared for the meeting in Warren County and three hundred handouts prepared for the meeting in Edmonson

County. Daryl stated not to change “project goals” to “purpose and need” until the revised goals are reviewed by KYTC. Annette added that KYTC would have their attorney review the revised goals.

The questionnaire was then discussed by the group. It was decided to simplify the questions and provide choices for the public to check instead of requiring only “write-out” answers. It was the opinion of the group that this will result in obtaining more information from the public since past history shows that a significant percentage of people will not answer questions that require much writing. The first two questions are to be removed and either asked at the sign-in table or placed on a separate sheet of paper to be filled out at the sign-in table. The questionnaire will have either the return address on the form, be accompanied by a postage paid envelope, or both.

Tom Cervone and Jason DuPont then went over the environmental exhibits. Tom explained that the exhibits to be used at the public meetings would be approximately twice the size used for this demonstration. Tom then went on to explain the different GIS layers that have been developed and others that are being developed. These layers included study area boundary, roads, populated areas, county lines, roads, rivers and streams, airports, historic structures, institutions (may add fire and police), karst features, underground water routes, parks, wildlife management areas, mineral resources (oil, gas, coal, etc.), points of interest, major utilities, soils (prime farmland, etc.), and wetlands. Jerry Weisenfluh demonstrated and discussed additional exhibits that included karst features with underground water drainage basins and geologic maps. Jerry stated that there was little cave information available in digital format, but it may be possible to create an exhibit showing outlines of known caves (nothing more due to security reasons). There was a significant discussion on how much information to provide on karst topography. What is it? What concerns are associated with it? Why it needs to be addressed? How drainage functions in this area (underground drainage)? Jerry stated that he had a three-dimensional block diagram that could aid in educating the public about karst. It was decided to condense the GIS layers into only a few exhibits. Tom stated he would try to condense into “human environment” and “natural environment”. It was also decided to display only general karst exhibits while more detailed information could be on hand to answer any specific questions.

Keirsten stated that she has been communicating with WKU and local cable about taping the video. She stated that the video could be shown on local cable prior to the public meetings. Daryl suggested that the video be no longer than ten minutes in length.

The time schedule was then discussed. A draft NOI will be prepared by BLA and submitted to KYTC by the end of the week. A meeting was scheduled for October 18th at 10:00 a.m. at the District 3 Office to review and comment on exhibits and other materials to be utilized at the public meetings. The revised project goals will be forwarded to KYTC to review and have legal counsel review prior to this meeting. An additional meeting was also scheduled for November 8th at 10:00 a.m. at the District 3 Office. This meeting is to serve as a “dry run” for the public meetings, and everyone who is going to be working at the public meetings should be in attendance. The First Public Information Meetings were tentatively rescheduled for November 13th and 15th.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

I-66 PLANNING STUDY

From William Natcher Parkway to I-65 / Louis B. Nunn Parkway
ITEM NO. 03-66.00

DATE: October 18, 2001

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Construction Conference Room

TIME: 10:00 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning - District 3
Lancie Meredith, TEBM for Traffic - District 3
Keirsten Jagers, Public Information Officer - District 3
Renee Slaughter, Environmental Coordinator - District 3
Kenneth W. Cox, TEBM for Preconstruction - District 3
Charla Aaron, Planning – District 3
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Daryl Greer, Division of Planning
David Martin, Division of Planning
Richard Wilson, Division of Materials - Geotechnical Branch
William Andrews, Kentucky Geological Survey
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. (BLA)
Tom Cervone, BLA
Anthony Goodman, BLA
Jason DuPont, BLA
Ken Kuehn, Western Kentucky University

The third project team meeting was held on October 18, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. in the Construction Conference Room of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of this meeting was to review the handouts, survey sheets and exhibits to be utilized at the first round of Public Information Meetings and to discuss the format of these meetings.

Welcome and Introductions

Daryl Greer opened the meeting and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to identify any changes that were needed before the first Public Information Meetings. It was also explained that the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet was currently reviewing the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted by BLA and that no decision had been reached at this time about publishing the NOI. It was decided that the Public Information Meetings would be postponed until a decision on issuing the NOI had been reached.

Handout Discussion

Daryl Greer asked if anyone had any questions about the sheet that asked the public “How did you hear about this meeting”? The only comment was to place a box labeled variable message board

under question one and web-site under question three. These questions would be orally administered as people signed in for the meeting.

Discussed next were the project goals. After a lengthy discussion it was decided that the project goals were to be:

- Support the completion of I-66 across southern Kentucky to carry out the legislative intent of the ISTEA and subsequent Federal Highway Legislation as amended in the 1995 NHS Act.
- Increase safety, reduce congestion and improve connections on the highway network in the region (Allen, Barren, Butler, Edmonson, and Warren Counties)
- Help achieve the transportation needs of the Bowling Green urban area as defined in the Bowling Green Urban Transportation Study.
- Improve access to economic development and recreation opportunities in the region (Allen, Barren, Butler, Edmonson, and Warren Counties)

The Project Overview was discussed with only minor changes. In the first sentence, the word “freeway” was removed and replaced with the words “interstate route”. On the second page, the project goals were replaced with the revised project goals listed above. Last, Jeff Moore’s phone number and e-mail address, and the KYTC web-site were added as contacts on the bottom of page two.

Next, the Public Comment Survey was discussed. It was decided that questions one and two need to be combined and questions four and five need to be removed. Also, question three and six need be reworded and moved before question 1. In the case of question 6, the words “impacts” and “effects” were to be removed; “water quality (surface and subsurface)” was substituted for “underground streams and groundwater”; “future development” and “endangered species (animal or plant)” were added; and “other environmental impacts” was dropped. In the case of the possible concerns under question 6, the respondent should be asked to identify only their top three concerns.

Questions were raised as to where the Public Meetings would be held and if variable message boards could be used. As it stands, the meetings will take place at the Community Center in Brownsville and at the Convention Center in Bowling Green. The meetings would use an open format, and would run from 10:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. for one day at each location with an intervening day for preparation. After a decision on the NOI is made, times and dates for the public meetings can be officially announced. Variable message boards will be placed in appropriate areas one week prior to the public meetings.

Environmental Issues

Anthony Goodman spoke about the early coordination that has taken place between the consultants and the Mammoth Cave National Park. On September 11th, a meeting was held to obtain environmental information from the Mammoth Cave National Park and to get an idea of where they would like to see the proposed I-66 corridor. According to Henry Holman, Assistant to the Superintendent, the Mammoth Cave National Park Service would like to see the roadway constructed north of I-65. The park has had commercial vehicles using the roads through the park. This is not only illegal, but it increases the potential risk of a hazardous waste spill within the park boundaries. It is their hope that if the proposed route were constructed north of I-65, it would provide commercial traffic an alternate route and discourage such traffic from cutting through the park.

Anthony went on to explain that in September 2001, Jason Dupont and he drove a large portion of the study area to further obtain information for the Environmental Overview Exhibits. He then introduced Jason Dupont who has worked on developing the environmental exhibits.

Jason went through and explained what was on each exhibit. Comments were as follows:

- Change the title on the exhibits from Environmental Footprint Map to Environmental Overview Map and Scoping study to Planning study.
- Keep the oil and gas wells on the exhibit but use smaller icons and larger legends.
- Make two additional exhibits with photos: one exhibit showing photographs of the human environment and the other showing photographs of the natural environment.
- Shade the Bowling Green area on the exhibits to reduce the congested look of the exhibit.
- Karst maps should have reference points such as communities, parks, etc.

Traffic Exhibits

Dave Ripple discussed the traffic maps. The following comments were offered:

- Change the title on the exhibit from “Accident and Current Traffic” to “Crash and Current Traffic”.
- Relocate the definition of Critical Rate Factor closer to the bottom legend on the exhibit.
- Place a short description of LOS somewhere on the exhibit.
- On the Major Highway Improvement Map, add Southwest Parkway to the table.

Public Information Meetings

Jeff Moore started the afternoon meeting by discussing the information packets that will be used at the public information meetings. Previous public meetings have involved a “post-it” note exercise with a question about project benefits and another question about project concerns. These two questions would be generally worded as follows for the I-66 Planning Study:

- What are the issues and concerns associated with the building of I-66?
- What are the possible benefits of I-66?

BLA is to supply 800 folders that will contain the handouts. Jeff Moore suggested that we not use blue or red folders because they had been used in past public meetings. Information contained within the folders will be as follows:

On the left-hand side there would be placed the public comment survey form and post it notes for the post it note exercise. On the right-hand side, there would be placed the project overview, an exhibit of the environmental overview map, a karst diagram to be provided by the Kentucky Geological Survey, and the project development process description to be provided by Daryl Greer.

Jeff Moore then went through the format that will be used to create a Powerpoint presentation video. This video will run continuously throughout the meeting. BLA will forward the public exhibits as computer files to Daryl Greer for incorporation into the Powerpoint video. Daryl asked that Jeff also forward the video narrative for review by the KYTC Central Office.

Jeff Moore suggested the following organization of the information in the public meeting room:

- Sign-In Table with sign-in sheets where the questions about how did you hear about this meeting would be asked.

- Video providing an overview of the project and the material in the exhibit room (to be provided by Jeff Moore).
- Road Building Process exhibit (to be provided by Daryl Greer).
- Study Area Map exhibit, a table with the public information folders and the Project Goals exhibit (to be provided by BLA).
- Existing Conditions exhibits – crash and current traffic, level-of-service, improvement projects, the environmental overview map flanked by the natural environment examples and the human environment examples, and the karst and groundwater geology exhibits.
- A second display of the project goals.
- Sheets for posting the responses to the questions about project benefits and project concerns/issues (“post-it” note exercise).

The KYTC will also provide a court recorder for those wishing to give oral comments, state maps and snacks. BLA should also provide flip charts at each major location of the exhibits to write down comments, questions or concerns of the attendees. BLA should also prepare a news article to be reviewed by the KYTC and forwarded to the media by the KYTC when the dates for the public meetings are known.

In conclusion, a practice session for the Public Meetings (with all exhibits and materials) was set for 10:00 a.m. on November 8, 2001 at the KYTC District 3 Office in Bowling Green. All those assisting in the public meetings should attend the practice session. Jeff Moore will be asking members of the I-66 Planning Study Citizens’ Advisory Group (CAG) to assist in the Public Information Meetings.

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

I-66 PLANNING STUDY

From William Natcher Parkway to I-65 / Louis B. Nunn Parkway
ITEM NO. 03-66.00

DATE: November 8, 2001

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Conference Room

TIME: 10:00 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning - District 3
Keirsten Jaggars, Public Information Officer - District 3
Renee Slaughter, Environmental Coordinator - District 3
Charla Aaron, Planning – District 3
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Carl Dixon, Division of Planning
Daryl Greer, Division of Planning
William Andrews, Kentucky Geological Survey
Ken Kuehn, Western Kentucky University
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. (BLA)
Andrew S. Layson, BLA
Anthony Goodman, BLA
Henry Mathis, H. C. Nutting Company

The fourth project team meeting was held on November 8, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. in the Conference Room of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of this meeting was to review the handouts, survey sheets, video and exhibits to be utilized at the first round of Public Information Meetings and to facilitate a “run-through” of these meetings.

Welcome and Introductions

Jeff Moore opened the meeting and had those present introduce themselves. Jeff then went on to give an overview of the agenda items to be discussed.

NEPA Process Update

Carl Dixon began by giving a history of the evolution of the I-66 projects in Kentucky and how KYTC is trying to include the planning studies in the NEPA process. He gave a brief summary of problems that developed during the Somerset to London planning study, and how KYTC has met with the FHWA, the Division of Environmental Analysis, and their environmental attorney to get some direction on how to include the work performed during the planning studies to be used and counted under the NEPA process. He stated that the Cabinet is now trying to develop language to use to put out public notices and to put in letters to coordinating agencies that will identify that we are in the NEPA process and that the scoping that we are doing may be used in the development of any future environmental document. Carl stated that within a week or so the language should be finalized.

Carl continued that once the language is set, we would be able to send out coordination letters, put out public notices, legal ads, some newspaper advertisements, and possibly place a notice in the Federal Register (not a Notice of Intent). Carl went on to say that we would be putting together a news article or news release.

Carl summarized by stating that the goal is to allow the corridor development and environmental overview work that is conducted as a part of the planning projects to be included in the NEPA process and to be included in the development of any future environmental document. He went on to say that by proceeding under the NEPA process, there are certain rules and guidelines that must be followed and gave the example of allowing proper response time for letters to coordinating agencies and sufficient lead time for public notices.

Carl stated that the other part of this evolutionary process, in particular to this project, was that we were looking at the potential of three separate projects in this one study. These projects are an I-66, an I-66 that could be a northern outer loop, and a northern outer loop that might not be I-66. Additionally, since these projects are so closely interrelated, a southern or eastern outer loop should also be considered during the development of this project even if a southern alternate for I-66 is not. He said that essentially he saw I-66 and a southern or eastern outer loop as two separate projects that would need to be looked at simultaneously, and if a northern outer loop turns out to not be I-66 but a separate project, then we have three separate projects that may require three separate reports.

There was some additional discussion about the project goals and how even though the project to this point had been focusing on I-66, the goals had become more local in nature. It was the consensus of the project team that the goals were to be modified such that the “primary” goals would be in line with the regional and statewide goals for an interstate facility, while identifying “secondary” goals that would be more local in nature that I-66 may or may not be able to address. It was stated that these secondary goals would probably be similar to project goals for an outer beltline.

Carl also informed the project team that a policy decision had been made that I-66 was going to follow the Nunn and Natcher Parkways and would not follow the US 68/KY80 Corridor. Considerable discussion followed as to how to proceed with the public and whether this policy decision essentially ruled out an I-66 corridor south of I-65. At the conclusion of this discussion, it was decided that a corridor south of I-65 would still be considered until the study process showed that such a corridor could be eliminated.

I-66 Video Update

Jeff Moore passed out a transcript of the video and asked the project team to write down comments for discussion after he had completed the video presentation.

Upon completion of the video run-thru, Jeff stated that it was the District’s intention to try to get the video played on public access television in the five counties that the study area borders upon. Daryl Greer made the comment that it needed to be stated somewhere in the video that we will be looking at the outer beltline projects at the same time as we are looking at I-66. Anthony Goodman and Carl Dixon suggested placing more emphasis on the public involvement portion of the discussion. Verbiage such as “A very important part of the planning process is public involvement...” was suggested. Daryl also suggested that there be a comment on wanting input on the outer beltline project as well and on how these projects should fit together. Another comment was to emphasize the “inter” state aspects of I-66 and how it involves other states besides Kentucky. Additionally, it was stated that some reference needed to be made of where the Bowling Green outer loop project came from – that it was a Bowling Green project – that it was identified originally in the *1972 Bowling Green Transportation Study*.

Daryl asked how we were going to get public input on the outer beltline. A very lengthy conversation followed regarding numerous issues. These issues ranged from what kind of information we wanted to get from the public about the outer beltline to whether we should be trying to get information on both (all three) potential projects at the same time to what efforts were going to be the same (or overlap) if these projects were looked at together – or if they should be looked at together. There was considerable disagreement among the project team as to how this project had been envisioned to develop and how it should proceed. From this considerable discussion, it was decided to take this discussion before the Citizens Advisory Group and solicit input from them as to whether to present these potential projects at the same time to the public or to separate them in an attempt not to overwhelm/confuse them with information.

CAG Meeting Agenda and Format

Jeff began this discussion by stating that based on the previous conversation during this meeting, that we were going to have the CAG help us in determining where we should go next. Jeff then began going over the agenda. “Welcome and Introductions” is first on the agenda and needs no discussion.

The second section under this heading is “Follow Up on Issues Raised at Last Meeting”. Jeff stated that we need to clear up the issue of what is going on with I-66 to the west and present it not for discussion, but a statement of policy. Carl suggested that mentioning the budget shortfall could be mentioned and that we would never have funds to make a western corridor a pertinent alternative. Daryl stated that we were making the best use of facilities already in place. Next there needs to be an update of project goals. Jeff continued that next, we need to have a discussion on the interrelation of the outer beltline and I-66, and how we are going to accomplish looking at the outer beltline and I-66 simultaneously. Daryl stated that the question to the CAG should be, “When we go to the public meetings, should we try to combine these projects all into one and ask for advice on all of these projects at the same time, or is that going to be too much for everybody to deal with?” There was a lengthy discussion among the project team as to the best way to get this feedback from the CAG and how to present the different projects and connection possibilities. In response to a question brought up at the last CAG meeting, Jeff said that Kenneth Cox would be available at this meeting to explain the precautionary measures being taken on the I-65 widening projects to handle possible HAZMAT spills (roadway drainage and retention basins). As far as the status of the public meetings, it was decided to inform the CAG that these meetings were tentatively going to be scheduled for February.

The third section under this heading is “Summary of Questionnaires Distributed by CAG Members”. Each member will be given one minute to summarize the comments from their questionnaires, and the issues and comments would be written on a flip chart at the front of the room.

The fourth section under this heading is “Overview of Public Meeting Setup & Exhibits”. This section will be removed from the agenda and the pertinent information included in the second section.

The fifth section under this heading is “Next Steps and Wrap-Up”. This will basically be housekeeping information to let them know that we will be having another Team Meeting before the Public Meetings and that the Public meetings will probably be sometime in February.

Public Meeting Run-Thru and Exhibits

Basically, the public meeting run-thru was stated to be the exhibits that were located around the room and the video presentation. The handout material and the logistics of the Public Meetings will be pending information obtained from the CAG members.

It was stated that the CAG letters should go out as soon as possible and that they should include language about how this project is in the NEPA process and that the scoping from this project may be used for any future EIS that may be developed. The letter should also inform the CAG members that each member should have their questionnaires summarized prior to the meeting.

A couple of housekeeping items were discussed. Daryl stated that he needed a letter from BLA indicating a possible revised schedule to put in the file with the contract. Daryl went on to say that we are working these projects all together as of right now under one contract, and that the Cabinet would need to have a revision to the contract. Therefore, he is going to need a revised scope and fee proposal outlining the additional work required for the addition of the outer beltline as part of the existing contract. Carl stated that he realized things have been changing on this project on a weekly basis, and that if BLA thought we needed to sit down and discuss revisions to the scope that we could certainly do that. Andy stated that BLA would get a letter out with a revised schedule that would at least bring us up to date and that he felt we should wait until after the CAG meeting and subsequent Team Meeting before sitting down to discuss revisions in the scope and the project approach from here on out.

The meeting adjourned.

**Citizens' Advisory Group Meeting Minutes
I-66 Planning Study
From William Natcher Parkway
to I-65/Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item No. 03-66.00
6:00 PM CST, December 6, 2001**

The second meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Group (CAG) was held at the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center on December 6, 2001. This meeting was to update members about progress on the I-66 Planning Study, to inform them of the upcoming public meetings and to review comments from the questionnaires distributed by the members. Those present at the meeting were:

Gayla Cissell, Commissioner, City of Oakland
John BluBaugh, KICK-66, KEEP
Henry Holman, Mammoth Cave National Park
Ronald R. Switzer, Mammoth Cave National Park (non-member)
Doug Cropper, Bowling Green
Ronald Doyle, Park City
Harold Walker, Scottsville
Chris Houchens, Glasgow-Barren County Chamber of Commerce
Freddie Travis, Barren county Judge Executive
Danny Watts (non-member)
Debby Spencer, W. K. Corporation
Mae Burch, Warren County Emergency Management
Nelson Sander, Edmonson County Water District
Steve Hunter, Bowling Green - Warren County Planning Commission
Pete Phelps, Butler County Road Supervisor
Joey Roberts, Warren County Citizens for Managed Growth
Howard E. Bailey, Western Kentucky University (WKU)
Trisha Lawrence, Inter-Modal Transportation Authority
Deborah Highland, The Daily News (non-member)
John B. Matheney, BRADD
Kenneth W. Cox, KYTC - TEBM for Preconstruction, District 3
Keirsten Jagggers, KYTC - Information Officer, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC - Division of Planning, District 3
Carl Dixon, KYTC - Division of Planning
David Martin, KYTC - Division of Planning
Henry Mathis, H. C. Nutting Company
Ken Kuehn, WKU
Anthony Goodman, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. (BLA)
Andrew S. Layson, BLA
David Ripple, BLA
Jason DuPont, BLA

Welcome and Introductions. Jeff Moore welcomed everyone in attendance and explained that the purpose of this meeting was to update the CAG members on the progress to date of the

I-66 Planning Study. Additionally, the issues raised at the last meeting would be discussed, there would be discussion on the upcoming Public Information Meetings, and comments received from the questionnaires distributed by the members would be presented.

Jeff reminded the attendees of the ground rules for the meeting. The ground rules are:

- ❑ Everybody talks.
- ❑ No interruptions.
- ❑ No insults.
- ❑ All ideas are worthy.
- ❑ Status does not count. The idea counts.
- ❑ Any idea can be challenged.
- ❑ Start on time – Be on Time.
- ❑ Keep meetings to two or three hours in length.
- ❑ Have an agenda for every meeting.

Follow Up on Issues Raised at Last Meeting. Carl Dixon began by stating that several issues/concerns had been brought up at the last CAG meeting, and that we would now answer and respond to those. On the issue of drainage and retention basins, Kenneth Cox informed the attendees that current I-65 widening projects would be incorporating erosion control measures and retention basins that would contain spills of 10,000 gallons (approximately the contents of 1 tanker truck). K.C. explained that grass lined ditches would be used to the extent possible to help filter out any possible contaminants. The question was asked that if retention basins were built to retain 10,000 gallons, “What happens if two trucks spill at the same time?” K.C. answered that the spill will overflow. He continued by saying that we can build basins to retain 20,000 gallons. But what happens if three truck spill at the same time? K.C. stated that there has to be some judgement used as to the size of spill to protect against.

Carl discussed funding of the I-66 project and stated that no further phases have been funded beyond this study. Carl continued by explaining that an executive decision had been made to utilize the parkway system as much as possible for I-66. This includes the Nunn Parkway, the Natcher Parkway, and the Western Kentucky (Wendell Ford) Parkway to I-24 near Paducah. This study is investigating how to make the connection between the Nunn and the Natcher Parkways. Carl went on to say that the US 68/KY 80 corridor was not an option.

Carl then asked for input from the CAG as to the feasibility of including discussion of a Bowling Green Outer Beltline study in conjunction with the I-66 study. There is some concern that the many corridors, combination of corridors, and corresponding information might be overwhelming to the public. Carl continued by stating that it is KYTC’s intent to educate the public on these projects and since these projects are in the same area and will have impacts and influences on each other and the traffic patterns of the region, it would be beneficial to discuss them simultaneously if it is believed that the public could understand and absorb the data. Feedback from the CAG indicated their recommendation that it would be best to inform the public of both projects.

Summary of Questionnaires Distributed by CAG Members. The CAG members present were asked to have a summary prepared of the questionnaire responses they received. It was requested that each summary be limited to two minutes. (A summary of the CAG questionnaire responses is attached.)

Overview of Public Meeting Setup and Exhibits. Jeff Moore stated that it was the KYTC's intent to educate the public about these two projects and gave a brief overview of the video that was being prepared for airing on local access television. The CAG members offered some suggestions for informing the public about the meetings. These suggestions included: place a Powerpoint presentation on the website; do a cable access television show – not just a video but a full-length show; use direct e-mail response to website; place flyers in the Country Peddler; do personal presentations to certain groups (civic); place flyers in the utility bills.

David Ripple gave an overview of the materials that would be included in the packets for the public meetings.

Jeff explained the meeting setup and how people would walk through the exhibits. Jeff stated that the meetings would be open house type format meetings with one meeting in Edmonson County and the other in Bowling Green. Jeff gave a brief run-through of how the exhibits would be set up. The order is presently anticipated to be as follows:

- ❑ Video
- ❑ Road Building Steps and Timeline
- ❑ What Issues are Addressed During Planning
- ❑ Project Goals
- ❑ Study Area Map
- ❑ Crash and Traffic Data
- ❑ Major Improvements Exhibit
- ❑ Future Congestion
- ❑ Environmental Exhibits
- ❑ Sinkhole/Karst/Subterranean Exhibits
- ❑ Post-It Note Exercise

It was recommended that an exhibit showing the nationwide I-66 corridor be included. Another recommendation was to get people to fill out the survey form before they left the meeting. An idea to promote this was to have a prize or contest for those who filled out their survey – those filling out the survey would have a ticket placed into a hat for a drawing at the end of the meeting.

Next Steps and Wrap-Up. Jeff Moore thanked everyone for their attendance and assistance and asked if anyone had any additional questions or anything else to discuss. There was some discussion as to what would be prepared for the next CAG meeting. The consensus was that potential corridors for the projects would be presented along with preliminary traffic and other data.

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

Bowling Green Eastern Outer Beltline Planning Study From Scottsville Road (US 231) to I-65 Warren County Item No. 03-103.00

DATE: January 17, 2002

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Conference Room

TIME: 9:30 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, Chief District Engineer - District 3
Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning - District 3
Keirsten Jagers, Public Information Officer - District 3
Renee Slaughter, Environmental Coordinator - District 3
Kenneth W. Cox, TEBM for Preconstruction - District 3
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Anthony Goodman, FHWA
Daryl Greer, Division of Planning
Michael Blevins, Division of Materials - Geotechnical Branch
Carl D. Dixon, Division of Planning
Todd Morrison, Construction - District 3
Daryl Price, Construction – District 3
Andrew S. Layson, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Tom Cervone, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
David Arrington, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.

The first Project Team Meeting for the subject project was held in the KYTC District 3 Conference Room in Bowling Green on January 17, 2002 at 9:30 a.m. (CDT). This meeting provided an opportunity to review data, develop project goals, discuss possible corridors, review the environmental footprint, and discuss design criteria, agency coordination, and public involvement.

Introduction and Purpose

The meeting began with background information on the Eastern Outer Beltline Project. The Eastern Outer Beltline Project and the I-66 Project were both a part of the Approved 2000-2002 Biennial Highway Construction Program. The extent to which these two projects should be combined was then discussed. It was agreed that there should be separate goals for the Eastern Outer Beltline Project although there would be some overlapping of tasks with the I-66 Project.

Review of Data Gathered for I-66 Project

A review of data gathered for the I-66 Project indicated that additional traffic model data would be needed for the Eastern Outer Beltline Project. This additional data should include more detail for areas inside the I-65 and Natcher Parkway corridors, as this data was not to be included with the I-66 study. The environmental footprint for the I-66 Project would need to be enlarged to accommodate the Eastern Outer Beltline Project. The updated environmental footprint should be expanded to include the proposed Southwest Parkway. The southern edge of the environmental footprint would then extend to approximately two miles south of the I-65/Natcher Parkway Interchange.

The discussion then turned to the location of logical termini for the Eastern Outer Beltline. A potential northern terminus could be the I-65 interchange near the Corvette Plant. Possible southern termini could include the Natcher Parkway Extension at US 231 and the proposed Southwest Parkway at I-65. Of these two potential southern termini, the terminus at the Natcher Parkway Extension would seem to do more to relieve congestion on Scottsville Road, which was part of the original purpose and need of the Eastern Outer Beltline Project. However, the location of the extension of the Natcher Parkway from I-65 to US 231 could be affected by the potential location of a proposed PGA golf course. It was agreed that a meeting should be set up to clarify the location and layout of the proposed golf course.

Project Goals and Objectives

The revised project goals and objectives were discussed in detail. After much discussion, it was agreed that the preliminary project goals for the Eastern Outer Beltline should be:

- Accommodate the transportation needs of the Bowling Green urban area by completing an Outer Beltline, a highway that can only be accessed by interchanges, consistent with the *2000 Bowling Green Urban Transportation Study*.
- Reduce existing and forecasted traffic congestion on the highway network in Warren County by diverting traffic to a new facility.
- Strengthen the regional highway network by improving the connectivity to other major roads in the region.
- Provide improved access to major employment activity centers, regional retail activity centers, major educational and health facility concentrations, and regional recreation facilities in Warren County.

Design Criteria

The discussion on design criteria focused on the type(s) of access control that the study would initially consider for the Eastern Outer Beltline. The debate centered on how the Eastern Outer Beltline should function: as a boulevard with access controlled by permit or as a freeway with access fully controlled. The point was made that the general public was expecting the Eastern Outer Beltline to be some type of bypass facility similar to the Gene Snyder Freeway in Jefferson County. A question was then raised concerning the volume of traffic that a freeway type facility would carry compared to a boulevard type facility. The response was that a freeway

with fully controlled access would probably carry as much traffic and have as much overall benefit as a boulevard with access controlled by permit. After some discussion it was agreed that the draft statement of project goals should indicate that the proposed Eastern Outer Beltline would only be accessed by interchanges. It was noted that preliminary design criteria for the proposed Southwest Parkway indicate that it will be a boulevard type facility. If the Southwest Parkway becomes the southern terminus for the Eastern Outer Beltline, the control of access for these facilities should be compatible. This issue could be addressed later in the study when the locations of the termini for the Eastern Outer Beltline are better established.

Public Involvement Needs

The handout for the public information meetings should include two questionnaires: one pertaining to the I-66 project and one pertaining to the Eastern Outer Beltline project. The displays should include an exhibit documenting the history of the projects. A project orientation video, roughly 20 minutes in length, is being prepared for the upcoming meetings. An effort is underway to have this video played on local television or on a public access channel. Utility bills will include two flyers with information on the two projects. These flyers should help inform rural residents who may not have access to project information through other means. A project overview similar to the one created for the I-66 project will be created for the Eastern Outer Beltline project.

Documentation and Reports

There should be two final reports: one for the I-66 project and one for the Eastern Outer Beltline project. However, some of the information gathered while completing these projects, such as traffic and environmental data, may be presented as stand-alone documents. These stand-alone documents could then be referenced in the final reports.

Final Comments

The I-66 project and the Eastern Outer Beltline project will be discussed in the same public information meeting. The public information meeting will be held in two locations. One meeting will take place in Brownsville in Edmonton County and the other meeting will take place in Bowling Green in Warren County. Both of these meetings should take place on different days during the week of March 4 through March 8.

An effort will be made to get the project orientation video on the air before February 18. There will be a meeting at the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) conference center on February 12 to confer with the media, local officials, and stakeholders. The 1972 Bowling Green Urban Area Transportation Study exhibit, the 2000 Bowling Green Transportation Plan exhibit, and the revised Environmental Overview exhibit should be ready for these meetings.

The meeting was then adjourned.

MEDIA, LOCAL OFFICIALS, AND STAKEHOLDERS MEETINGS MINUTES

Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Study
From Scottsville Road (US 231) to I-65
Warren County
Item No. 03-103.00

MEETING WITH THE MEDIA

DATE: February 12, 2002

LOCATION: Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center

TIME: 9:00 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Al Arbogast, WKCT/WDNS
Heath Myrich, WBKO
Jim Waters, Bowling Green Daily News
Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning - District 3
Daryl Greer, Division of Planning
Keirsten Jaggars, Information Officer - District 3
David Martin, Division of Planning
Carl Dixon, Division of Planning
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Andrew S. Layson, Bernardin, Lochmueller and Associates, Inc. (BLA)
Jason Dupont, BLA
Rusty Yeager, BLA
David Arrington, BLA

Jeff Moore, Keirsten Jaggars and Daryl Greer provided the media with background material on the project and then participated in interviews conducted by the various members of the media.

MEETING WITH LOCAL OFFICIALS

DATE: February 12, 2002

LOCATION: Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center

TIME: 11:00 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: This meeting was not attended by any local officials.

MEETING WITH STAKEHOLDERS

DATE: February 12, 2002

LOCATION: Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) Conference Center

TIME: 1:00 p.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Henry Holman, Mammoth Cave National Park
Albert Petersen, Resident on Old Scottsville Road
Mary Beth Stanesu, Resident of Alvaton
Dan Chaney, City of Bowling Green
John W. Smith, Smiths Grove Vision Committee
Joey Roberts, WCCMG
Shawn R. Bryant, Hunting Creek Neighborhood Association
Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning - District 3
Keirsten Jagers, Public Information Officer - District 3
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
David Martin, Division of Planning
Daryl Greer, Division of Planning
Carl D. Dixon, Division of Planning
Andrew S. Layson, BLA
Rusty Yeager, BLA
Jason DuPont, BLA
David Arrington, BLA

Jeff Moore began the meeting with background information for the project, an explanation of the exhibits on display, and some discussion on the format of the upcoming public information meetings. Jeff noted that the exhibits displayed at the meeting could also be viewed on the I-66 website. Jeff stated that there was some intertwining of the Eastern Outer Beltline Project with the I-66 project. Daryl Greer stated that the projects had some overlapping because some of the same information was required for both projects. He said that some information, such as traffic forecasting, was easier to assess if both projects were analyzed simultaneously because potential locations for I-66 would affect the forecasted traffic volumes for the Eastern Outer Beltline and vice versa. Daryl continued by discussing the handout.

Carl Dixon stated that even though there was some overlapping of projects, that one project does not preclude the other. Carl said that the Eastern Outer Beltline could be built even if I-66 were not built. He said that the two projects, I-66 and the Eastern Outer Beltline, should be seen as two separate projects with similar information and some overlapping of tasks. He added that simultaneous planning was being utilized because the various options for the Beltline Project were dependent on the possible locations of the I-66 project. Carl explained that these were large projects and if these projects were constructed that they would be built in sections as funding became available. Carl stated that the first step in the process was input from the community.

A stakeholder asked why the Beltline was being considered for eastern Warren County instead of northern Warren County. The response was that the original termini for I-66 were the Natcher and Nunn Parkways. If these termini were used for I-66 then the I-66 corridor would traverse through northern Warren County. When consideration was given to a possible beltline, the study area was expanded to the east of Bowling Green. It was noted that the break in the band that represents the study area for the Eastern Outer Beltline is a section that is already programmed for design. It was noted that the Southwest Parkway is also scheduled for design using only city funding. However, the design standards currently utilized for the Southwest Parkway are not compatible with design standards used for the Eastern Outer Beltline. It was noted that this study will look at alternatives that

would tie into the Southwest Parkway and if one of those alternatives were to become the preferred alternative, then the design of the Southwest Parkway could be modified so as to be compatible with the Eastern Outer Beltline.

One of the stakeholders was concerned about increased right of way costs associated with development occurring along the preferred corridor if or when a preferred corridor is selected. The response was that it would be necessary for transportation planning to work closely with city planning/zoning to leave potential corridors open. A meeting should also be set up with developers to discuss the location of a proposed PGA Golf Course near the Natcher Parkway Extension.

A stakeholder asked where the traffic will be diverted. The response was that an analysis of existing and future traffic patterns is underway. This analysis would include all possibilities and travel patterns. The study would look at the need for the Beltline if I-66 was built to the north of Bowling Green. The study would also weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the various issues.

A stakeholder asked about considering the use of walls to reduce the traffic noise along the proposed corridors. He also suggested using these walls along some of the existing highways to reduce the added noise associated with increased traffic volumes. However, the point was made that additional noise from increased traffic volumes should be expected along a major highway corridor such as an interstate. This potential for increased noise should be taken into account when considering new development near existing interstates. It was also noted that it is extremely difficult to anticipate all factors that could change traffic patterns and volumes over the course of 20 to 30 years. This difficulty is just another reason it is important to have stakeholder participation early on in the planning process.

A stakeholder asked when the Nunn Parkway could expect to see I-66 traffic from Eastern Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia. The response was that Eastern Kentucky and West Virginia were proceeding with I-66 and Virginia was proceeding with a connector to I-66. It was estimated that it could be 20 years before there was an increase in traffic volumes generated from I-66 traffic to the east. It was noted that this timeline was dependent on funding issues and therefore construction would take place in sections, as funding becomes available.

Another stakeholder asked about access points on the Eastern Outer Beltline. The response was that the Beltline was being studied as a fully access controlled facility with interchanges. The location of the interchanges would be decided as the primary goals become more defined.

Another question concerned the widening of I-65 and at what point would it be no longer feasible to continue adding additional lanes. The response was that I-65 is currently being modified to accommodate up to eight lanes of traffic. It was noted that this is another example of the difficulty in forecasting traffic volumes so far in advance. Some of the unintended consequences of the original design of I-65 were some drainage issues and increased illegal truck traffic through Mammoth Cave National Park. The potential for unintended consequences was one of the reasons these two projects were looked at in tandem.

Daryl then summarized the project schedule, project goals, contact personnel, website address, and dates for the upcoming public information meetings. It was requested that stakeholders attend the public information meetings if at all possible. The need for a variety of input from as many people as possible was emphasized. The question was asked of the stakeholders if there should be a special focus group for the Eastern Outer Beltline Project. This focus group could be a subset of the Citizens Advisory Group. However, there was not a consensus on whether this focus group was necessary and no decision was reached.

The meeting was then adjourned.

MINUTES OF MEETING WITH MAYOR OF BOWLING GREEN AND WARREN COUNTY JUDGE EXECUTIVE

I-66/Outer Beltline Planning Studies
Warren County
Item Nos. 03-66.00 and 03-103.00

DATE: March 18, 2002

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Conference Room

TIME: 10:30 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Sandy Jones, Mayor of Bowling Green
Mike Buchanan, Warren County Judge Executive
Keirsten Jagers, Public Information Officer - District 3
Charla Aaron, Planning – District 3
Daryl Greer, KYTC, Division of Planning
Andrew Layson, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc. (BLA)
David Arrington, BLA

Daryl Greer began the meeting by stating that the purpose of the meeting was to obtain input from the Mayor and Judge since they were unable to attend the Local Officials and Stakeholders meeting for the Outer Beltline that was held on February 12, 2002. He then asked if there were any questions or comments about the projects. Mayor Jones indicated that she thought the video shown on TV was well done and easy to understand. She suggested using similar videos for other projects.

Andy Layson asked for suggestions for the location of the next round of public information meetings. Mayor Jones said that the Justice Center would be her recommendation. Keirsten Jagers added that the Justice Center could hold up to 100 people, had ample parking, provided access for the handicapped, and also had a small kitchen where a video could be shown. Schools were also mentioned as possible sites for the meetings. However, it was pointed out that a 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. meeting format would pose a conflict with school activities. Other possible meeting sites included Hillview Heights Baptist Church (located on US 31W) and the Fiscal Court. It was thought that the Fiscal Court would not have enough room to accommodate the various displays and exhibits needed for these meetings.

Andy questioned how the exhibits should be displayed at the next round of public information meetings. He was concerned that the layout used in the first round of meetings would lead to congestion since the exhibits at the next round of meetings will show the alternate corridors. Daryl said that it might be necessary to make several copies of the exhibits and have multiple, but identical, paths that would allow people ample time to study each exhibit while minimizing congestion.

Mayor Jones then asked when the lines depicting the study corridors would be ready to be shown on maps. Andy stated that the exhibits showing the study corridors could possibly be ready in July, but that he would need to recheck his schedule to verify that date.

Daryl mentioned that there was some concern from the Cabinet about the level of public participation in the first round of public information meetings. Both the Mayor and the Judge indicated that they had similar problems with their public meetings. They indicated that until there was more detailed information (i.e., potential corridors), the level of public participation would likely be light. They expect heavier turnouts when the corridors are presented to the public. Judge Buchanan responded that the normal reaction from most people is to state that they were unaware of the project when the project is in the initial phases. Mayor Jones suggested that fliers be included in the County Peddler when the next round of public information meetings is announced. Keirsten stated that fliers could also be included in the utility bills when the next announcements are made.

Daryl continued by saying that the initial feedback from the public information meetings had been very positive, especially from the Brownsville area. Judge Buchanan added that he was unaware of any property owners who were opposed to the project. He said that most of the opposition came from people or organizations that were opposed to the Transpark project.

The discussion then turned to possible corridors for proposed I-66. The group discussed, in general terms, the corridors that had been identified from the public information meetings, the local officials meetings, the stakeholders meetings, and the Citizens Advisory Group efforts. Judge Buchanan stated his preference that the route should be common with I-65 from the I-65/Nunn Parkway interchange to a new I-65 interchange northeast of Bowling Green. Judge Buchanan stated that having I-65 and I-66 share the same alignment for ten miles could potentially save millions of dollars in right of way and construction costs. Daryl stated that if I-65 and I-66 share the same alignment, then I-65 would need to be modified to accommodate the additional traffic. He said that the total number of lanes required to accommodate projected traffic volumes for the next 30 years would be analyzed as part of this study. He added that the effect that an Eastern Outer Beltline would have on traffic volumes would also be analyzed. Andy noted that having I-66 common with I-65 may or may not realize any cost savings. He stated that the amount of savings (if any) would depend on the total number of lanes needed for an I-65/I-66 common section and the corresponding amount of additional right of way that would be required. He continued that this is of particular concern in the areas adjacent to interchanges. If more than eight lanes are required, then significant additional right of way will have to be acquired and the overpasses will need to be modified to accommodate the additional width of the roadway. Andy also noted that when looking at potential corridors west of Bowling Green, it is important to minimize major stream crossings. Andy stated that all of the options discussed would be analyzed for traffic, environmental concerns, cost, and other factors during the course of this study.

Daryl added that public input from the Brownsville public information meeting indicated that the people in that area would like for the proposed corridor to be close to Edmonson County. He also noted that some had suggested a corridor that ran from the Nunn Parkway/I-65 interchange directly to the Ford (Western Kentucky) Parkway/Natcher Parkway interchange. Judge Buchanan noted that a corridor close to Edmonson County would be inside the drainage area that flows through Mammoth Cave National Park. He also thought that this corridor would lead to higher excavation costs than corridors further south due to the rougher terrain of the northern area. Daryl noted that Mammoth Cave National Park officials wanted to keep through truck traffic out of the park area. Daryl also said that park officials recognized that impacts from truck spills along the proposed roadway could be minimized through the use of catch basins and other methods. It was also noted that only a small portion of the Park's drainage basin was located within the study area.

The discussion then turned to the exhibit of the drainage basins. It was pointed out that the vast majority of the study area was within the southern/western drainage basin that drains toward the Barren River. Both Mayor Jones and Judge Buchanan requested hard copies of the exhibit. Daryl noted that the exhibit should also currently be on the web site set up for these projects. Judge Buchanan noted that in order for the water in the southern drainage system to enter the northern

drainage system (which includes Mammoth Cave National Park), the water table in the southern system would have to rise 80 feet, while the water table in the northern system had no change in the water level.

Daryl said that BLA was trying to assimilate the feedback received to date and to develop potential study corridors based on this feedback. Andy stated that it would be necessary to meet with various resource agencies and the Citizens Advisory Group before the next round of public information meetings. He suggested that the next round of public information meetings should be held in September or October. It was agreed that the Justice Center should be used as the meeting site, if practical.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Monday, May 20, 2002

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Construction Conference Room

TIME: 10:00 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, Chief District Engineer – KYTC District 3
Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning – KYTC District 3
Keirsten Jaggars, Public Information Officer – KYTC District 3
Kenneth W. Cox, TEBM for Preconstruction – KYTC District 3
Carl D. Dixon, KYTC Division of Planning
Daryl Greer, KYTC Division of Planning
David Martin, KYTC Division of Planning
James Simpson, KYTC Division of Highway Design
Anthony Goodman, FHWA
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Steve Hunter, Bowling Green-Warren County Planning Commission
William Andrews, KY Geological Survey
Tom Cervone, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Kent Ahrenholtz, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Andrew S. Layson, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.

A Project Team Meeting for the subject projects was held in the KYTC District 3 Construction Conference Room in Bowling Green on Monday, May 20, 2002 at 10:00 a.m. (CST). This meeting provided an opportunity to review progress of BLA, review information for the upcoming Environmental Agency Coordination Meeting, and discuss possible corridors. An agenda for the meeting is attached.

Introduction and Opening Remarks

The meeting began with introductions of those in attendance, background information on the two projects and review of the agenda.

Review of Project Status

Dr. Tom Cervone, BLA, reviewed the tasks completed by BLA to date that included development of the project goals for both the I-66 Corridor and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline, the collection and inventory of data related to the existing conditions within the study area, the preparation of an environmental overview map showing the existence of various environmental issues or concerns within the study area, and the conducting of the initial set of public information meetings in March 2002.

The discussion then turned to the recent inclusion of a new interchange along I-65 northeast of Bowling Green in the KYTC's Recommended 2002-2004 Biennial Highway Construction Program and Identified Preconstruction Program for FY 2005 through FY 2008. The KYTC District staff explained the extent of the project being from an interchange at I-65, located between Exit 28 (KY 446 "Corvette Interchange")



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

and Exit 36 (US 68/KY 80), to an at-grade intersection at US 31W, east of KY 526. The project was included in the recommended program to accommodate proposed economic development in the area where the proposed Kentucky Trimodal Transpark would be located, though the new roadway would probably be part of the proposed Outer Beltline now under study and would, therefore, be a freeway facility with no direct access from the Transpark development. Extensive discussion ensued with the conclusion that the development of the interchange project would have little or no effect on the completion of the study of these two projects. It may be possible for one or both projects to utilize an alignment similar to that proposed for the programmed improvement, but development of the programmed improvement isn't likely to begin until early 2003, near the completion of this study.

Environmental Review Agency Meeting

Dr. Cervone then reviewed the preparations for the upcoming early agency coordination meeting scheduled for Thursday, May 30, 2002, from 9:30 to 12:00 noon, with lunch and a tour of the study area to follow. An agenda, PowerPoint presentation, tour itinerary and map were reviewed during the meeting and have been attached. Changes or deletions were recommended for certain slides within the presentation that have been incorporated for the meeting. **ACTION ITEM (Cervone/Ahrenholtz, BLA): Recommended revisions to the Environmental Review Agency Meeting agenda, presentation tour itinerary and map will be incorporated prior to the meeting on May 30.**

A tentative list of attendees was also discussed among those in attendance at the meeting. **ACTION ITEM (Greer, KYTC): Send list of respondents to invitation letter to BLA.**

Dr. Cervone also requested guidance relating to the development and inclusion of a section in the final reports concerning the purpose of and need for the projects. After discussing the issue and its relation to development of a consistent Purpose and Need for statewide I-66, it was determined that KYTC and FHWA would further address the statewide I-66 issue and BLA would proceed with "fleshing out" of the previously developed goals to serve as a purpose and need section. **ACTION ITEM (Cervone, BLA): Obtain a copy of the I-66 Corridor, Pike County, Purpose and Need Statement for review by the group.**

Following the meeting, Carl Dixon talked to John Mettelle, Deputy Executive Director of the KYTC Office of Project Development, who suggested that we stick with Project Goals for the planning study, rather than Purpose and Need. He agreed that there is a need to have a dialogue among the project staff for the five I-66 sections now underway, in various stages, to draft one overarching national/statewide "Goal" or "Purpose" that should be used in all of the documents.

Dr. Cervone also noted during this discussion that the end result of this planning study would be separate documents/reports for each of the two projects, I-66 and the Outer Beltline. Each document would include an environmental overview, a geotechnical overview, each project's alternative corridors and their respective traffic forecasts. A single document covering both projects would be developed relating to the compatibility of the two projects and the various combinations of each project's alternative corridors, as well as the travel demand modeling effort. For the most part, the study areas for each project coincide, but for the ease of future development of the projects and review by agencies, it was determined that separate documents were appropriate.

Carl Dixon of KYTC's Division of Planning informed the group that a public notice was being published in the Federal Register this week for the two projects. He noted that they were not a "Notice of Intent" in the strict sense, but a notice that work on these planning studies had been initiated and was being developed in accordance with NEPA requirements. Copies of the public notices are attached.

Travel Demand Modeling



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Kent Ahrenholtz of BLA introduced the topic of travel demand modeling focusing on the efforts of BLA's modeling staff to replicate the running of the Kentucky Statewide Travel Model (KYSTM). He explained the approach that BLA is going to use is to develop a new model that encompasses the entire study area using elements of both the KYSTM and the Bowling Green Regional Travel Demand Model. Questions arose as to the use of the KYSTM and, in particular, traffic forecasts developed for the statewide I-66 Corridor. It was noted that these forecasts would be used for the external volumes that enter the east and west end of the study area as I-66, but that the model that is being developed would estimate the volumes using each of the various alternative corridors. **ACTION ITEM (Ahrenholtz, BLA):** *Contact Rob Bostrom/Barry House, KYTC Division of Multimodal Programs, to discuss BLA's travel demand modeling approach and the need to schedule a meeting to further discuss this approach.*

I-66 Corridor/Outer Beltline Corridors

Andy Layson of BLA reviewed for the group the preliminary corridors that are being developed for each of the two projects. It was the original intent to show large-scale study area maps with these general corridors at the Environmental Review Agency Meeting. Following extensive discussion of the topic, it was determined to continue with development of the corridors, but to not show the maps with the corridors at the meeting on May 30th. The reasoning was that the process being followed is for initial contact with groups (i.e., Citizens Advisory Group, stakeholders, public, agencies, etc.) to focus on sharing of issues and concerns and that since this is the first contact with the environmental review agencies, we should not show maps with general corridors. It was determined, though, that a more detailed environmental overview map with certain "red flags" highlighted (i.e., the "Escarpment", Mammoth Cave National Park, Barren River State Resort Park, etc.) would be displayed and discussed at the Environmental Review Agency Meeting. It was also suggested that a more, "geographically generic" study area map be developed to demonstrate the relationship of the I-66 Corridor with the Bowling Green Outer Beltline. **ACTION ITEM (Ahrenholtz/Layson, BLA):** *Prepare more detailed environmental overview map and "geographically generic" study area map for Environmental Review Agency Meeting.*

Other Topics and Next Meeting

Mr. Ahrenholtz informed the group present of the status of the Scope of Work for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline stating that a draft "Scope of Additional Work" had been submitted to KYTC on April 24th and that comments were received from KYTC on May 13th. Comments were still being awaited from the KYTC Division of Multimodal Programs. BLA is revising the scope based on the comments received to date and will resubmit following receipt of the additional comments from the Division of Multimodal Programs. **ACTION ITEM (Greer, KYTC):** *Obtain comments from Division of Multimodal Programs and forward to BLA.*

The meeting concluded with discussion of the upcoming tasks, in particular, the public involvement efforts. Based on the revised schedule, it was determined that the next Citizens Advisory Group meeting would be in mid- to late July, followed by the second set of Public Information Meetings and then, a second Environmental Resource Agency Meeting. This would allow for incorporation of comments from the agencies into the corridor development process and travel demand modeling effort. KYTC wants to be sure to have traffic forecast information available for these meetings. **ACTION ITEM (Greer, KYTC & others):** *Work with KYTC District 3 Staff to schedule date for next Citizens Advisory Group meeting in mid- to late July. Also, initiate preparation for the second set of Public Information Meetings to be held in August.*



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

A question arose as to the need to revise the project orientation video for the second set of public information meetings. **ACTION ITEM (Cervone/ Ahrenholtz, BLA):** *Review the Video prepared for the 1st set of Public Information Meeting to determine if it needs to be revised.*

The meeting was then adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

This summary is my best understanding of the items discussed and conclusions reached. If there are any additions or corrections, please contact me no later than five (5) days from receipt.

Minutes prepared by:

Kent L. Ahrenholtz, P.E.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, July 10, 2002

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Construction Conference Room

TIME: 10:00 a.m. (CDST)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, Chief District Engineer- KYTC District 3
Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning- KYTC District 3
Keirsten Jagers, Public Information Officer- KYTC District 3
Renee Slaughter- Environmental Coordinator-KYTC District 3
Daryl Price, KYTC District 3-Construction
Charla Aaron, KYTC District 3-Planning
Daryl Greer- KYTC Division of Planning
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey
Ken Kuehn, Western Kentucky University
Tom Cervone, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Kent Ahrenholtz, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Jason Dupont, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Wendy Southworth, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.

A Project Team Meeting for the subject projects was held in the KYTC District 3 Construction Conference Room in Bowling Green on Wednesday, July 10, 2002 at 10:00 a.m. (CDST). This meeting provided an opportunity to review progress of Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc. (BLA), review information for the upcoming third Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting, and discuss possible corridors. An agenda for the meeting is attached.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

The meeting began with Daryl Greer explaining that BLA has developed corridors for the I-66 and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects. Daryl continued by saying that the purpose of the meeting is to discuss these corridors and the agenda for the CAG Meeting that is scheduled for Thursday, July 18, 2002 from 6:00-8:00 p.m. at the Barren River ADD Conference Center. Daryl noted that on Friday, July 19, 2002, there will be a Press Release Conference in the morning. The next set of Public Information Meetings will be held on Wednesday, August 14th, at the Old Depot Building in Bowling Green, Kentucky and on Thursday, August 15th at the Brownsville Community Center in Brownsville, Kentucky.

Jeff Moore noted that the I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline video will be revised by the end of July and that the original video is still being aired on the local television stations. Dr. Tom



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Cervone noted one addition to the Tentative Agenda for the Project Team Meeting, which was under III, A, 2, to add “Video” to the agenda. The format for the video needs to be a topic of discussion.

Project Status

Dr. Tom Cervone began the discussion by asking if it was appropriate to incorporate the Project Goals into the Purpose and Need section of the two different planning studies. Jeff Moore explained that John Metille does not want the Projects Goals to be identified as the Purpose and Need until the Notice of Intent to develop the Environmental Document is approved. He stated that the plan is to develop the Project Goals into the Purpose and Need for the formal NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process. Jeff noted that incorporating the Project Goals in the Purpose and Need is not an issue with the Public Information Meetings, but must follow the correct procedures for the Agency Review Meeting. Jeff referred to the comment that Ramona McConney made at the Agency Review Meeting on May 30, 2002. She expressed the importance of the Purpose and Need in the Environmental Document. Tom noted that BLA plans to get each section of the report to the KYTC as it becomes available so that by the time the report is complete, there is nothing new in the report.

Tom Cervone explained that the general corridors have been placed on the Environmental Footprint map. The map contains all of the environmental information pertinent to the study area. Tom noted that the corridors are 2,000 feet wide.

Upon discussion of the Agency Coordination Meeting, which was held on May 30, 2002 at Mammoth Cave, Tom Cervone expressed that the meeting went very well and in a nice direction. Everyone seemed to work together to answer questions and provide information. Tom noted that, as a result of the Agency Coordination Meeting, several letters were received from many of the participating agencies. The responding agencies included: the United States Coast Guard, KYTC-Permit Branch, KYTC-Geotechnical Branch, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet-Division of Forestry, Kentucky State Nature Preserves Commission, Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, Senator Richard Sanders, Inter-Model Transportation Authority, KYTC-DEA, City of Bowling Green-Public Works, City of Bowling Green Planning and Zoning, Cabinet for Workforce Development, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Dr. Hilary Lambert for the Bluegrass Group Sierra Club-Cumberland Chapter, U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, City/County Planning Commission and the KYTC-Multi-Modal Division. It was noted that the letters received from the City of Bowling Green-Public Works and Planning and Zoning recommended upgrading I-65 in conjunction with a Southern Outer Beltline. It was questioned whether these two letters could cause problems later on in the development of the corridors because of the way the letters were worded. Jeff Moore replied no, but the letter is now a part of public record. Jeff noted that the agencies that responded to the last Agency Coordination Meeting could respond completely differently to the next Agency Coordination Meeting.

The question of how the Native American Consultation becomes involved in the project was raised by a Project Team Meeting member. Jeff Moore responded by saying that the Native American Consultation is a coordination effort through the Federal Highways (FHWA) and the



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) **Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)**

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

KYTC- Department of Environmental Analysis (DEA). Coordination through KYTC (DEA) and FHWA is needed for identification and contacting these representative tribes.

Overview of Upcoming Meetings

Kent Ahrenholtz noted that the tentative agenda for the Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting was attached in the handout. Kent asked for comments or questions pertaining to the agenda. No comments were made. The meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 18, 2002 from 6:00-8:00 p.m. at the Barren River ADD Conference Center. Kent noted that the agenda has changed slightly from the agenda that was sent to the CAG members. There have been some organizational changes within BLA, therefore, some of the names have changed. The traffic model will not be completed for the meeting; however, will not be illustrated at the meeting for the alternate corridors.

Kent emphasized that the corridors are not set in stone and he would like to have even more corridors after the next series of meetings. He noted that there is a large amount of information to share with the CAG members and only two hours to share it in, leaving a limited amount time for discussion with the members afterwards. It is essential to provide them with the necessary amount of information in enough time to discuss the information after the presentation. John Matheney, with the Barren River ADD, commented that to ask someone for immediate reactions to the corridors would not be easy. He asked if they have previously seen a map showing the corridors. The reply was no, but written comments will be taken for up to two weeks after the meeting. Daryl Greer noted that it was decided that if maps were sent to the CAG members, there would be some misinformed comments as a result. Tom Cervone reiterated that we want to build relations with these members and utilize their feedback and concerns with the corridors. Jeff Moore noted that the CAG members are our touchstone to the public. John responded that the CAG members will perceive the corridors as overwhelming when asked to respond to them. Kent explained that we want all possible corridors to be shown on the exhibit and if the CAG members feel that a corridor should access a certain area then a corridor will be added to address the area of concern. The CAG members will not be expected to rank or pick a corridor at the meeting, but just to respond to the corridors shown. John suggested that two different maps be shown, one for the I-66 corridors and one for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors. Kent noted that at the beginning of the meeting he will explain that one map is the I-66 corridor and the other is the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors, and that each is a separate project with separate project goals. Also discussed will be the compatibility of the two projects by showing each individual I-66 corridor with possible Beltline corridors.

Tom Cervone questioned whether there could be a break somewhere in the meeting agenda. John Matheney stated that a break would be a good idea if there were some exhibits on the walls that the members could look at during the break. It was also recommended to show the Mammoth Cave slides in five-second intervals throughout the break.

Kent Ahrenholtz noted that for the CAG meeting there will be a handout, maps with the corridors, and a table illustrating the criteria used to compare the corridors. The table used criteria based on engineering, planning, and environmental issues. Jeff Moore stated that it would be necessary to remind the CAG members of the project goals and how the corridors fit in with the goals in mind.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

It was concluded that the project goals will be included with the handout. The project goals will also be utilized in the survey as well. The CAG members can use the goals as a measuring stick to evaluate the corridors and answer survey questions. John Matheney noted that the environmental information does not have to be included in the survey map and should have one map for the I-66 corridors and one, somewhat smaller, for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline corridors. It is also suggested to use the whole backside of the survey form to display the map and just use a paid postage envelope to send in survey forms. Daryl Greer noted that it would be necessary to include an address at the bottom of the survey so that if copies were made, an individual would know where to send the survey. It was determined that there will be two separate surveys for the I-66 corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline corridors, each containing its own map. It was suggested to use different colored paper for each survey.

Keirsten Jagers commented that the Balloon Classic was coming up soon and needed to know what information could be given to the public. It was concluded that the corridor maps would not be provided, and instead the Areas of Interest map showing a swath to the north, south and along existing, would be enlarged and put onto a board to display at the Balloon Classic. Also shown at the Balloon Classic, will be a large board showing the date, time and place of the next set of Public Information Meetings.

It was suggested to emphasize the width of the corridors for the two projects. The word "PRELIMINARY" should be included on all exhibits and maps pertaining to the corridors. No centerlines should be shown on any of the exhibits, only corridors.

The information needed for the Press Release, which is scheduled for Friday, July 19, 2002 in the morning, should include: survey, "Area of Interest" map, criteria table used for comparison, and information that from the public and what has been done with it. It was suggested that instead of using the criteria table for the comparison of corridors, the human and natural environment slides from the Agency Coordination Meeting could be displayed in a poster form. It was concluded that the table will be utilized for the meeting but will be put in a different format. The posters would be used at the CAG meeting as well. It was noted that when talking to the CAG members at the meeting, it is important to ask them if it is okay to record their comments so that others can read them and react. A suggestion was made to have a Right-of-Way person from the District present at the meeting to answer any related questions. Tom Cervone noted that the CAG meeting and all other public meetings will offer opportunities for the public to get involved in the decision making process. Tom noted that a brochure entitled, "Protecting Historic Properties, Citizen's Guide to Section 106 Review" was created by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. This brochure enables the public to participate in the Section 106 process for historic properties. It was determined that if this brochure can be obtained, it would be available at the CAG Meeting and the Public Information Meetings.

The format for the revised video was discussed and it was determined that the corridor exhibits that will be shown at the CAG Meeting, will be the background set for the video. The video will provide an update on where the project is at this point.

The Public Information Meetings will be held on Wednesday, August 14, 2002 at the Old Depot Building in Bowling Green and Thursday, August 15, 2002 at the Brownsville Community



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Center in Brownsville. Tom Cervone mentioned some ways to improve upon the meetings. He noted that refreshments should be served, for example, cookies and soft drinks. Tom requested the presence of greeters at the door to give those entering some direction and to get their names early before the meeting begins. It was also determined that soft drinks and cookies would be served at the CAG Meeting as well.

Engineering Efforts

As everyone gathered around the exhibits, Kent Ahrenholtz explained that BLA has come up with some corridors to present at the CAG Meeting. Kent asked the Project Team if it would be necessary to show a corridor that goes up the Cumberland Parkway and the Natcher Parkway. Kent noted that based on the traffic model, these Parkways may need to be modified to six or eight lanes of traffic. It was concluded that yes the Cumberland Parkway and the Natcher Parkway need to be included as part of a corridor. It was recommended to outline the No-Build by using a thick line along existing Cumberland Parkway, I-65, and Natcher Parkway. The question was raised as to the approximate location of the Glasgow Outer Loop in Glasgow. The Glasgow Outer Loop was shown to intersect with the Cumberland Parkway just east of Beaver Creek. It was determined that because of the connection of the Glasgow Outer Loop to the Cumberland Parkway, the I-66 Southern Corridor would need to be moved further west along the Cumberland Parkway. It was noted that the proposed Natcher Parkway Extension was not to be included as a portion of the I-66 or Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors. Tom Cervone gave a brief description of the buffered areas (escarpment to the north, communities, parks, Barren River, etc.). It was noted that a buffer around two knobs located along existing I-65 should also be shown on the corridor maps. Kent Ahrenholtz stated that there are several additional corridors that should be discussed because the public could mention them at the meetings. For instance, those who attend the Public Information Meeting in Brownsville may want a corridor that goes further north to access the Brownsville area. Kent mentioned that existing I-65 could be used to a certain point to limit any impact on the Mammoth Cave drainage basin. The corridors could then shift to the north and south to create two additional I-66 corridors. When discussing the Mammoth Cave drainage basin, Jerry Weisenfluh noted that the only arguable evidence to the location of the drainage basin is the positive tracing of the flow patterns. He also commented that there is a large mapped cave in the I-65/ Cumberland Parkway area. It was noted that there are many ways to protect the groundwater no matter which corridor is considered at the completion of the project and that protecting the groundwater is of utmost importance.

There was a question as to the facility type of the Bowling Green Outer Beltline. It was explained that the Bowling Green Outer Beltline would be a four-lane limited access facility. It was determined that the Beltline Corridor connecting to the proposed Southwest Parkway should be deleted because the proposed parkway is not expected to be an interstate-type facility. There was a question raised concerning the Beltline Corridor connecting to Exit 28 from I-65 and why it was not shown on the Northern Corridor exhibit. It was explained that the Beltline Corridor would not connect to the Northern I-66 corridor, therefore, should not be shown on the exhibit. There was some concern as to why a Beltline Corridor connected at the I-65, Exit 28. Jeff Moore explained that since the Bowling Green Transportation Plan of 1972, the description for the Outer Beltline has included Exit 28 on I-65. It was decided that all exhibits would not include any kind



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

of definite line associated with the I-66 or Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors, instead, shadows would be utilized to illustrate the locations of the corridors.

Planning Efforts

Kent Ahrenholtz explained that BLA is currently working on the traffic model for the I-66 and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline study area. He noted that there has been some contact made with the Bowling Green Planning Commission. Kent stated that the model includes portions of 11 counties. Once the traffic model is complete, a plot of the zone maps will be available for review along with the model itself.

Other Topics

Kent Ahrenholtz stated that the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Scope of Work has been approved and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Fee Estimate is currently being worked on.

Upcoming Meetings

It was noted that the third Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting will be held on Thursday, July 18, 2002 at the Barren River ADD Conference Center. The second set of Public Information Meetings will be held on Wednesday, August 14, 2002 and Thursday, August 15, 2002 at the Old Depot Building in Bowling Green and the Brownsville Community Center in Brownsville, respectively, and the second Environmental Agency Coordination Meeting will be held in September, 2002. It was decided that another Project Team Meeting will be held between the CAG Meeting and the Public Information Meetings either in the last week of July or the first week of August.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. (CDST).



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

CITIZENS' ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Thursday, July 18, 2002

LOCATION: Barren River ADD Conference Center (Bowling Green)

TIME: 6:00-8:00 p.m. (CDST)

ATTENDEES:

- Pete Phelps, Butler County Road Supervisor
- Hugh Evans, Butler County
- Henry Holman, Mammoth Cave National Park
- James Tabor, Bowling Green
- Joey Roberts, Warren County Citizens for Managed Growth
- Tom Hart
- Janet Dennison, Citizen of Brownsville
- Barry A. Wood
- Trisha Lawrence, Inter-Modal Transportation Authority
- Debby Spencer, W. K. Corporation
- Mae Burch, Warren County Emergency Management
- Greg Meredith, Chief District Engineer- KYTC District 3
- Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning- KYTC District 3
- Keirsten Jaggars, Public Information Officer- KYTC District 3
- Daryl Greer, KYTC Division of Planning
- David Martin, KYTC Division of Planning
- Anthony Goodman, FHWA
- John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
- Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey
- Ken Kuehn, Western Kentucky University
- Tom Cervone, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
- Kent Ahrenholtz, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
- Jason Dupont, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
- Wendy Southworth, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
- Tommy Cervone, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.

A Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting for the subject projects was held at the Barren River ADD Conference Center in Bowling Green on Thursday, July 18, 2002 from 6:00-8:00 p.m. (CDST). This meeting provided the CAG members with an opportunity to review progress of the subject projects, review information for the upcoming Public Information Meetings, discuss possible corridors, and provide input in preparation for the next set of Public Information Meetings. An agenda for the meeting is attached.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Welcome and Introduction

Jeff Moore welcomed everyone in attendance and explained that the purpose of this meeting was to update the CAG members on the progress to date of the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Studies. He gave a brief description of the subject projects, introduced himself, and asked that each person introduce him/herself. Jeff reminded the attendees of the ground rules for the meeting. As shown on a display, the ground rules are:

- ? Everybody talks.
- ? No interruptions.
- ? No insults.
- ? All ideas are worthy.
- ? Status does not count. The idea counts.
- ? Any idea can be challenged.
- ? Start on time- Be on time.
- ? Keep meetings to two or three hours in length.
- ? Have an agenda for every meeting.

Jeff noted that each member received a folder as they entered the conference room. Within the folder, there was an agenda for the meeting; minutes from the last CAG meeting; agenda, bus tour itinerary, and the slide presentation from the Environmental Review Agency Meeting; several maps; a criteria table used for comparison of the I-66 Corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors; brochure published by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and a Project Overview for each project, which also included the project goals.

Follow Up on Issues from Last CAG Meeting

Jeff Moore noted that since the last CAG Meeting and first set of Public Information Meetings (held on March 4, 2002 and March 7, 2002), KYTC received a number of comments from the CAG members and members of the public. Jeff added that these comments provided important input and were used in the development of both of the projects.

Jeff emphasized the Project Goals for the I-66 Corridor Planning Study and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Study. Jeff noted that there are several issues within the I-66 Corridor and Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridor that needed to be addressed with the project goals. The first is the issue of the federal, state, and local commitment made to study the proposed I-66 corridor as an east-west route across Kentucky and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline. Further, congestion issues are evident throughout the I-66 Corridor and with the Bowling Green Outer Beltline. Thirdly, there is an issue with the connectivity of the two projects. The I-66 Corridor would eventually connect the east coast to the Mississippi River Valley and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline would provide various connections as entering Bowling Green. Finally, community accessibility to certain resources is an issue for both of the projects.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Review of Tasks Completed to Date

Dr. Tom Cervone thanked those in attendance for coming to the meeting. Tom noted that the members were provided with a large amount of information that is contained in the folders. In regard to the Inventory of Existing Conditions, Tom explained that located within this folder is a handout that identifies issues associated with the corridors. This table lists the planning, engineering, and environmental criteria used to evaluate the corridors. Tom noted that by using this table, the issues and impacts for each corridor would be revealed, which will follow the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process as closely as possible. Tom also noted that these criteria are used in the approved NEPA environmental documents.

Tom asked Jason DuPont to briefly discuss the information shown on the Environmental Footprint exhibit. Jason explained that all the information was essentially existing data that was obtained from various databases. Historic and potentially historic houses are identified on the “footprint” along with wetlands, caves, parks, managed land, etc. Jason noted the Threatened and Endangered Species and Archaeological Sites are not shown on the map due to their sensitivity. He stated that the evaluation and comparison of the corridors is based on fieldwork and the review of information that has been gathered up to this point. Jason noted that the corridors are approximately 2,000 feet wide.

Tom Cervone explained that on May 30, 2002, an Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting was held at the Mammoth Cave National Park. He noted that the agenda, itinerary for the bus route, map of the bus route, and slide presentation are included in the folders of information for review. Tom noted that the meeting was very productive and included a presentation in the morning followed by a bus tour in the afternoon. Tom stated that, as a result of the Agency Coordination Meeting, several letters were received from many of the participating agencies. The responding agencies included: the United States Coast Guard, KYTC-Permit Branch, KYTC-Geotechnical Branch, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet-Division of Forestry, Kentucky State Nature Preserves Commission, Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, Senator Richard Sanders, Inter-Modal Transportation Authority, KYTC-DEA, City of Bowling Green-Public Works, City of Bowling Green Planning and Zoning, Cabinet for Workforce Development, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Dr. Hilary Lambert for the Bluegrass Group Sierra Club-Cumberland Chapter, U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, City/County Planning Commission and the KYTC-Multi-Modal Division.

Daryl Greer noted that by utilizing information received from communications between the agencies, it is possible to begin an evaluation of the corridors. Daryl stated that if anyone has something to add to the criteria table then to let someone know and it could be added to the table. Tom Cervone noted that also located in the folders is a brochure published by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation entitled, “Protecting Historic Properties: A Citizen’s Guide to Section 106 Review.” Tom explained that the information within the brochure tells citizens how to get involved in the Section 106 issues. These issues include the impacts to historic properties and archaeological sites.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Overview of Upcoming Meetings

Tom Cervone stated that the second set of Public Information Meetings will be held on August 14, 2002 at the Old Depot Building in Bowling Green and August 15, 2002 at the Brownsville Community Center in Brownsville. There will be a second Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting in August or September. Further in early 2003, a third set of Public Information Meetings will be scheduled.

Review of Potential Preliminary Alternative Corridors

Kent Ahrenholtz explained that input has been obtained from the agencies, public, and CAG members and used to create corridors on the maps. Kent noted that there are two different projects, the I-66 Corridor Planning Study and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Study, each with its own set of goals. Some I-66 corridors could serve as a Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors and some Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors could serve as portions of the I-66 Corridors. The compatibility of the two projects is essential in determining the preliminary corridors.

There are three sets of alternatives for the I-66 corridors: North of I-65 and Bowling Green, South of I-65 with a connection to the proposed Natcher Extension, and improvements of the existing facilities that would include, Cumberland Parkway to I-65 to Natcher Parkway. Within all of these sets of alternatives, there are several different corridors that access different areas. Traffic forecasting will provide the information necessary to determine the extent of the improvements to the existing facilities. When discussing the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors, Kent explained that essentially any I-66 Corridor that loops Bowling Green could serve as a Beltline Corridor. Daryl Greer noted that the No-Build is still an option. The No-Build would begin on the Cumberland Parkway just west of Glasgow and continue on the Cumberland Parkway to I-65. It would then go along existing I-65 to the Natcher Parkway and continue along the Natcher Parkway to Hadley. The No-Build would constitute no additional construction in terms of the widening of I-65.

Kent advised all in attendance to gather around the exhibits. He illustrated the three different sets of I-66 corridors. Kent noted that all of the corridors are preliminary and are not set in stone. He explained that there are some shaded areas shown on the maps, which represent buffered zones. He explained that the 1,000 foot buffer zones are shown around the towns of Oakland and Smith's Grove, the escarpment, Barren State Park, knobs, and Three Springs Park. A 800 foot radius buffer was also placed around any historic or potentially historic structures.

Kent asked for some input from the CAG Members concerning the corridors shown on the map. He asked if the corridors were shown in the appropriate locations and if there was some corridor or corridors missing from the map. Kent noted that it is not necessary to determine what is the best route, but to determine if all possible routes are illustrated on the map. Daryl noted that if there were no corridors, then it would not be possible to evaluate the impacts associated with the corridors, further once the impacts have been evaluated then judgements can be made as to which corridor is the best. He also noted that the CAG members have the option not to add corridors at the meeting, but could send in comments after the meeting. Kent stated that there are several



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

maps located in the folders and on the back of the survey form that can be used for a reference when writing any comments.

Review of Travel Demand Modeling

Kent Ahrenholtz explained that BLA is currently working on the traffic model for the I-66 and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline study area. He noted that there has been some contact made with the Bowling Green Planning Commission. Kent stated that the model includes portions of 11 counties. He explained that in preparing the model, travel patterns and traffic analysis zones have been determined and divided into small areas similar to the Census Block areas. The assigned number of trips is based on the population in the areas and the traffic patterns. The Statewide Traffic Demand Model, along with the Bowling Green Traffic Model, were utilized to create the model for the I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline study area. Kent explained that BLA is currently in the process of determining the estimated traffic of the existing system for future forecasting, which could then be used to determine the number of lanes necessary for future travel demands. He stated that an exhibit will be presented at the next meeting that would be something like the “Future Highway Congestion” exhibit displayed along the wall, except the exhibit will contain numbers.

Daryl Greer noted that during the break, a video of Crumps Cave will be shown on the television. He explained that this cave was a destination for the Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting bus tour. Daryl noted that Crumps Cave is the second largest gated cave in the United States, and it is gated because of the archaeological finds within the cave.

Discussion of Issues/Concerns by CAG

Daryl Greer began the discussion by asking Tom Cervone to provide a breakdown of all people involved in the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects. Tom stated that Helen Powell worked with BLA to provide information on historic structures. Don Linbaugh, with the University of Kentucky Program for Archaeological Research, provided information on the archaeological sites located within the study area. H. C. Nutting provided the geotechnical information. Jerry Weisenfluh with the Kentucky Geological Survey, along with Ken Kuehn, with Western Kentucky University, provided the necessary geological information for the two projects.

Kent Ahrenholtz explained that the input obtained from the CAG Members concerning the information presented, in terms of the handouts, exhibits and other materials, is very important and will play a vital role in what is displayed at the Public Information Meetings. He noted that it will be possible to make changes to the handouts and exhibits before the next set of Public Information Meetings.

A CAG member commented that the routes shown on the exhibits seem to be very good options, but it is hard to know what to add or change. Another member thanked everyone for the information and added that the level of detail was great. There was a question as to what is a corridor. It was explained that a corridor is a 2,000 foot wide area that will be examined when determining an alignment. An alignment would actually be about 400 feet wide and this would



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

also allow for movement or shifting within that area. The narrowing down process involves locating the places or points that need to be avoided or where the roadway might pass. The next step would be getting out in the field and walking lines within a general area. A CAG member commented that any option shown has very positive impacts for the area and that an east-west route would mean great economic impacts for the area.

A CAG member raised the question of what routes can qualify for federal funds. Daryl replied that funding is currently only available for this study. It is yet to be determined whether future phases of the project will obtain any funding. Henry Holman, a CAG member, asked about the phasing of the projects. Daryl replied that the purpose of these studies is to determine the phasing for the projects. Kent Ahrenholtz noted as part of the analysis for these projects, priorities will be established. For instance, is the Bowling Green Outer Beltline a higher priority than the I-66 Corridor. Tom Cervone added that two documents will result from the two studies and then the compatibility of the two projects will be addressed in the back of each document. Both of the projects will result in interstate facilities, using interchanges to provide access.

A question was asked concerning the timeline on the two studies. The reply was that both studies will be completed at the same time. There was a question of whether or not the Bowling Green Outer Beltline project is stand alone. Daryl replied that yes the project is stand alone. There was a comment from a CAG member that the I-66 Environmental Footprint with Corridors exhibit shows the corridors as red and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Environmental Footprint with Corridors as blue. However, the I-66 Corridors exhibits show the corridors as blue and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors as red. He noted that it would be less confusing if the I-66 corridors were the same color for all of the exhibits and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline corridors were the same color for all of the exhibits. A comment was made to define the corridors on the exhibits by providing the width of the corridors.

A CAG member commented that the all the information is overwhelming, but was very impressed that the general public will get to comment on the project. Daryl reminded the CAG members to talk to people and encourage them to come to the Public Information Meetings. Keirsten Jagers added that during the Balloon Classic and the ribbon cutting at the Riverfront Park, information will be available to the public, informing them of the Public Information meetings. Jeff Moore noted that a revised video will air on the cable access channels. A suggestion was made to add "Public Input" to the criteria table. A CAG member asked if the public will be told that corridors will be shown at the Public Information Meetings. The reply was yes, and that information will be released to the media as well. There was a question as to how much of the updated information is on the I-66 website. Daryl replied that there is nothing on the website yet, but will be posted before the next set of Public Information Meetings. Daryl noted that between now and the next set of Public Information Meetings, no exhibits will be released to individuals.

A question was asked about the timeline for the two studies and when approval is expected. Daryl answered that an approval depends on a large number of things. For instance, whether the project will be federally or state funded, political issues, and whether there are a number of other committed projects in the project area. There was a comment concerning the traffic flow through the area. Kent Ahrenholtz replied that the traffic flow would determine how many lanes would



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

be needed through the Bowling Green area. It was noted that traffic efficiency would play a vital role in assessing the environmental impacts to the area. Kent added that BLA will look at the impacts on I-65 with different I-66 and Outer Beltline Corridors. It was noted that a new roadway could reduce or induce traffic on other roadways. It was asked when the traffic information will become available to the public and Kent replied this fall. A CAG member posed the question of why I-65 was not widened more than is currently being widened. Greg Meredith replied that there are a number of reasons why I-65 was not widened more. He stated that money was a huge factor and there is fiber optic cable running along I-65 which is very expensive to relocate. Greg noted that by widening I-65 to only six lanes, no additional right-of-way was required since it was possible to widen toward the median. There was a question about the cost differences from going along existing I-65 as opposed to an alignment not along existing I-65. Daryl stated that there would be impacts involved with all of the corridors. It just depends on what is out there as far as utilities, interchanges and land is concerned. Tom Cervone added that in order to compare corridor impacts, a story has to be told about the resources for each corridor. There are direct resources and indirect resources that when combined equal cumulative resources.

A CAG member commented that the meeting was very informative, but a more detailed description of the corridors would be very beneficial. The number of total possible routes would be helpful. A suggestion was made to use letters describing I-66 corridors and number for the Outer Beltline Corridors. The CAG members were reminded that there are other projects that are currently planned for the area to help other counties promote economic growth. By incorporating the Outer Beltline Corridors into the I-66 Corridors, it is possible to reduce the overall cost of the two projects. It was suggested to use the existing roadway as much as possible.

There was some concern of US 231 access near Hadley. A question was raised concerning the employment numbers used in the modeling and where the information was obtained. It was noted that the organizations involved were Workforce Development, Barren River ADD, and City and County Planning and Zoning. Reports for various developments around Bowling Green were also utilized, as well as future and current employment numbers. A comment was made stating that Edmonson County could benefit greatly from a northern corridor to the Natcher Parkway. But there was some concern about the major chemical storage areas along the Natcher Parkway. It was questioned whether this could be an issue from an emergency response perspective. It would be possible that alternate routes or detours would have to be utilized if there was a chemical spill. It was decided that contact would be made with the local Medical Centers, Fire Departments, and the Ambulance Services about response times. It was noted that school bus routes would also be important to the development of the corridors. It was decided that the School Districts and Board of Education would be contacted for input. It was also decided that the utility companies should be contacted to determine any future plans.

Next Steps and Wrap-Up

Daryl Greer noted that located in the folder, there were two survey forms, one for the I-66 Corridors and one for the Outer Beltline Corridors. Also in the folder was a postage paid envelope so that any comments can be returned promptly. Daryl asked that comments be returned by July 29th, instead of August 30th, which was the date on the survey forms. Daryl stated that the Project Team will be meeting on July 31st and would like to have all comments



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) *(Item # 03-66.00)*
Bowling Green Outer Beltline *(Item # 03-103.00)*

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

back before the meeting. Daryl commented that the intent of the next set of Public Information Meetings was to make sure all lines are shown on the maps. He continued by saying at the next CAG Meeting, there will be lines on the maps and if there are some serious concerns with one or more of the corridors then they may be deleted. At the next meeting, interchange locations will be shown and corridors may actually narrow in spots, but could also get wider. The Criteria Table will be filled out as much as possible and the CAG members may be asked for their opinion on what lines or line is best. Daryl noted that the CAG members will be notified in advance before the next CAG Meeting, but he was not sure when that would be. It was asked that the CAG members try to contact each other before the next meeting. It was decided that a CAG member list would be mailed to each CAG member. Daryl asked the CAG members present to talk to those not at the meeting about attending one or both of the Public Information Meetings.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m. (CDST).



PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, July 31, 2002

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Planning Building (Frankfort)
1st Floor Planning Conference Room

TIME: 9:00 a.m. (EDT)

ATTENDEES: Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning- KYTC District 3
Daryl Greer, KYTC Division of Planning
David Martin, KYTC Division of Planning
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey
James Simpson, KYTC Central Office Highway Design
David Kratt, KYTC Program Management
Anthony Goodman, FHWA
Robert Farley, FHWA
Tom Cervone, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Kent Ahrenholtz, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Jason DuPont, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Wendy Southworth, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.

A Project Team Meeting for the subject projects was held in the KYTC Planning Building 1st Floor Conference Room in Frankfort on Wednesday, July 31, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. (EDT). This meeting provided an opportunity to review the progress of Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc. (BLA) and review information for the upcoming second set of Public Information Meetings. An agenda for the meeting is attached.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

The meeting began with Daryl Greer explaining that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the information that was received from the Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG) members. He noted that a CAG meeting was held on July 18, 2002 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. (CDT) at the Barren River ADD Conference Center. Several comments were received from the CAG members. Tom Cervone noted that the agenda passed out for this meeting was tentative.

Comments Received from CAG

Jeff Moore expressed concern with certain organizations not understanding the process of the projects. He noted that Bowling Green Planning and Zoning is pushing a specific scenario, but KYTC is not at a point where scenarios are being chosen. Jeff suggested having a meeting with Planning and Zoning before the Public Information Meetings to be held on August 14th and 15th,



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

2002. It was determined that a meeting with Planning and Zoning would tentatively be scheduled for August 12, 2002. Jeff noted that it is important to emphasize that there are going to be two outcomes from the two projects, one outcome pertaining to the I-66 Study and the other pertaining to the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Study. He continued by saying that there may be a question at the 2003 Public Information Meetings about the priorities of the two projects.

Jeff Moore explained that, after talking with the Mayor of Bowling Green at the CAG Meeting, it was decided to schedule a meeting with Judge Buchanon. Jeff noted that he had talked previously with Senator Sanders and that the Senator expressed his approval of a northern I-66 corridor. Jeff was concerned that several individuals are trying to make decisions too early in the process. He noted that he explained things to Senator Sanders by saying that the study area encompasses two different projects so it is essential to look at the Northern, Southern and Existing corridors in detail, as well as the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors. He continued by saying that he had a meeting with the Bowling Green Lions Club on July 30, 2002. At the meeting, he discussed the variety of levels within the Northern, Southern and Existing Corridor areas and that within each level there were several possible corridor options. Kent Ahrenholtz suggested displaying a project timeline exhibit at the next set of Public Information Meetings, illustrating the I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline process and where we are currently. Daryl Greer noted that there is an exhibit showing the entire process for a typical project that was used at all of the previous meetings. It was decided that an illustration showing where we are in the planning process should be displayed at the next set of Public Information Meetings.

Jeff Moore noted that one of the comments from a CAG member was to contact all communities located within or around a proposed corridor. He continued by saying that Freeport and Loving were two African-American communities that need to be contacted. Jeff stated that it would be necessary to meet with them on a Sunday. He suggested August 11th and August 18th, 2002. A comment was made that Freeport and Loving are just two of the many communities that need to be contacted.

Jeff stated that contact has been made with Emergency Services through Mae Burch (a CAG member). There are several benefits and issues involved with Emergency Services. For instance, detours can be determined if an accident occurs on the proposed roadway and several access improvements can be made to ensure the safety of those utilizing the facilities. Jeff noted that Mrs. Burch is trying to get a meeting together with Emergency Services. It was determined that Tom Cervone would contact her to follow up on a meeting date.

Jeff Moore explained that the booth at the Balloon Classic went very well. There was a large amount of conversation about the projects. The information included where the project is and what has previously been completed. Jeff noted that an interview with one of the local talk radios is scheduled for August 8, 2002. The meeting with the media that was held on July 19, 2002 went very well and resulted in a nice newspaper article. The article emphasized the process for the two projects and was positive and accurate.

Jerry Weisenfluh commented that he has some concerns about karst issues from various organizations and wondered if there has been any effort made to organize direct contact with these groups. Daryl Greer noted that, yes, contact has been made to these groups, but a response



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

has not been received from them. Daryl commented that there is some concern that all organizations are being contacted and given a chance to respond to the issues. Any contact that is anticipated with the organizations will involve sitting down and discussing the two projects with the officers of the organizations. It was commented that the underground drainage is a rather large issue because of the questions about the underground flow paths. It will be necessary to present the facts without any skewed data.

Daryl passed out the comments that were received from the members of the Citizen's Advisory Group. He noted that some members are pursuing their own agenda and others want something done now. Daryl stated that several members are not understanding the process and where things are currently. For instance, one of the CAG members was interested in understanding I-66 as a national route.

Overview of Upcoming Public Information Meetings

Tom Cervone explained that environmental justice is very important in the development of the projects and that more environmental justice should be brought into the projects. He noted that, when going to the communities to talk about the projects, we are bringing more environmental justice into the project. Daryl Greer noted that identifiable communities that could be impacted by a corridor had previously raised environmental justice issues in other projects. Tom stated that the second set of Public Information Meetings are scheduled for August 14, 2002 at the Old Depot Building in Bowling Green and for August 15, 2002 at the Brownsville Community Center in Brownsville. Tom noted that public relations are very important to the development of the projects. Therefore, he suggested having a public relations person at the Public Information Meeting. Due to the sizable Hispanic and Bosnian population in Bowling Green, it was questioned whether or not a translator would need to be present at the Public Information Meetings. It was determined that a translator would not be necessary for the Public Information Meetings. However, it was decided that contact should be made with the Refugee Center in Bowling Green to notify individuals of the projects.

Handouts

There was a question about whether the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline project overviews needed to be on two separate sheets instead of one sheet. Jeff Moore replied that they should be on the same sheet because it would show the companionship of the two projects. Jeff asked if it would be possible to put the survey forms on one sheet as well. It was decided that they should be on separate sheets because they would be in black and white, making the map indistinguishable between project corridors. Daryl Greer commented that the survey sheets will need to be reproduced for the Public Information books and to make sure that the I-66 survey is with the I-66 map and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline survey is with the Bowling Green Outer Beltline map. There was a comment that the maps need a title block, scale and definition table. A CAG member suggested, in a comment sheet, to enlarge the titles on the handouts so that they were distinguishable at first sight. It was determined that a bigger title would also be added to the 11"x17" Preliminary Corridor maps. It was asked whether to include the Preliminary swath of corridors map in the handouts and it was decided that they should be included. Tom asked if the Evaluation Table would be included in the handout as well. Jeff responded that it would not be



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

included in table form, but a listing of all criteria could be given in the handout. An exhibit could also be made of the list to show at the Public Information Meetings as well. It was noted that public participation is a major part of the data collection process and that it is possible to get the best results from the best resources. Tom noted that the pamphlet on the Section 106 process could be handed out, as well as a pamphlet entitled “A Citizen’s Quick Reference Guide to Transportation Decisionmaking.” Robert Farley made the comment that this is too much information to give to the public. Anthony Goodman suggested opening the meeting at the top of each hour with an explanation of the projects. Daryl Greer commented on how we have often talked about making things as simple as we can for the public and asked for suggestions on how to simplify information. No suggestions were received.

Tom suggested showing the prepared video on a big screen. The video will be the first thing that the public encounters. If they do not want to view the video, they can move into the next room and look at the exhibits. Jeff noted that the video will also be shown on the cable access channel.

A Project Team member asked what are we trying to get from the Public Information Meetings. Kent Ahrenholtz responded that it is necessary to obtain input on the corridors that need to be further developed and to have the public identify any impacts that are not currently identified on any exhibits.

Jerry Weisenfluh asked if he should update the Kentucky Geological Survey exhibits to show the corridors. It was determined that the exhibits should be updated and a meeting would be set up with Kentucky Geological Survey to discuss putting the corridors on the exhibits.

The Project Team concurred that the public will receive a base packet of information. The information will include the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline Overviews and maps, I-66 survey and map, Bowling Green Outer Beltline survey and map, listing of the environmental issues used to evaluate the corridors, and a road building process chart. There will be other information available that individuals will be able to pick up at the door as well. This information will include various maps and pamphlets. Daryl Greer noted that he will need electronic copies of all the information so that it can be posted on the I-66 webpage.

The Purpose and Need for the entire I-66 facility across the state was discussed. It was explained that there are common goals from east to west for the proposed I-66 Interstate facility. The Purpose and Need would provide a statewide link for I-66. There was a question as to how to get such a large group together. Several people would be invited to a meeting to discuss the Purpose and Need for the entire proposed I-66 route. Also discussed at the Purpose and Need meeting would be the Purpose and Need for each I-66 Section of Independent Utility.

Exhibits

Anthony Goodman suggested removing the No-Build line from the “Preliminary Northern I-66 Corridors with Possible Preliminary Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors”, “Preliminary Southern I-66 Corridors with Possible Preliminary Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors”, and the “Preliminary I-66 Corridor Common with I-65 with Possible Preliminary Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors.” It was determined that the No-Build would not be included on the



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

above noted exhibits. He noted that it is important to emphasize at the Public Information Meeting that the No-Build only involves maintaining and operating the current Highway System. Anthony also suggested sending a letter to the Agencies involved in the Environmental Agency Coordination Meeting updating them on when the next meeting will be held. He stated that it is important to let them know that the meeting was tentatively scheduled for September but may not actually be scheduled until November or December. The reason for the delay is so that all the necessary information can be available to the involved agencies.

Jason DuPont noted that, at the previous set of Public Information Meetings, an individual commented on the “Committed Projects Table” exhibit, saying that two numbers were flip-flopped and need to be changed. Jeff Moore noted that he will check the exhibit to make sure that the revision was made. It was noted that the Kentucky Geological Survey exhibits will be located in the same room with the other exhibits showing the corridors. The environmental exhibits will be displayed prior to the exhibits showing the corridors. It was decided that the presentation of the corridor exhibits will be different for the two Public Information Meetings. For the Public Information Meeting at the Old Depot Building in Bowling Green on Wednesday, August 14th, the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridor exhibits will be displayed first, followed by the I-66 Corridor exhibits. It was decided that the exhibits showing the combinations of the I-66 Corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors exhibits would not be displayed at the Public Information Meetings, but they would be handy if someone had a question about the combinations of corridors. For the Public Information Meeting in Brownsville at the Brownsville Community Center on Thursday, August 15th, the I-66 Corridors exhibits will be displayed first, followed by the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors exhibits. It was decided that all of the exhibits showing the corridors should include a table of definitions. The definitions included in the table will be Corridor, No-Build, and Study Area. There also needs to be an enlarged title shown on each exhibit.

There was some concern about informing the public of all participants involved in the Public Information Meetings. It was suggested to create a board listing all of those to be involved in the meetings. There was a question as to who should attend the meeting as far as sub-consultants are concerned. KYTC decided that it was up to BLA as to whether the sub-consultants needed to be at the meeting. There was a question about letting the public know who the CAG members are and whom they are representing. Jeff stated that, for this set of Public Information Meetings, a list would not be appropriate since the CAG members have not been asked if they wanted to reveal their names to the public.

Layout

The Sign-In table will be located at the door and will contain the packets of information, as well as any additional information. It was noted that having a knowledgeable person at the table will be very important. In Bowling Green there will be two different rooms and in Brownsville there will be one big room. Daryl Greer stated that it is important to know who is going to work what areas. He suggested that BLA come up with detailed layouts for the two buildings and to show layout zones and who will be working those zones. Kent noted the dimensions of the rooms will be needed in order to figure out how many exhibits can fit along the walls. Jeff replied that he will get the information.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

It was noted that the Public Information Meetings will begin at 10:00 a.m. and continue to 7:00 p.m. (CDT). There was a question as to how to get the public to the meeting. Jeff noted that there is going to be some construction several days before the meetings, which will utilize a variable message board, and it will be possible to put the dates and times of the Public Information Meetings on the boards. There will also be some media events and a ribbon cutting ceremony where the Public Information Meetings can be announced.

It was noted that a right-of-way person will need to be at the Public Information Meetings to explain the right-of-way process to any individuals who have questions about it. Kent Ahrenholtz asked if there were any tables and chairs at the two Public Information Meeting locations. Jeff Moore replied that he was not sure about the Old Depot Building in Bowling Green but the Brownsville Community Center had tables and chairs.

Other Topics

It was decided that three to five flip charts will be used at the two Public Information Meetings for public comments. Legal pads will be provided for all personnel to record any additional comments.

It was noted that the refreshments for both Public Information Meetings would include cookies and soft drinks.

Upcoming Meetings

The Second Environmental Agency Coordination Meeting will be held in late fall or early winter. Daryl Greer stated that he did not think that he could send a letter informing the agencies that the meeting tentatively scheduled for September would not be held until November or December to the involved agencies until after the Public Information Meetings.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m. (EDT).



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: September 23, 2002

LOCATION: Richardsville Volunteer Fire Department

TIME: 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Jeff Moore, Division of Planning-KYTC
Keirsten Jagers, Division of Planning-KYTC
Jason Dupont, Project Engineer-BLA
James Mosley, BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

A Public Information Town Meeting of about 50 residents from Richardsville, and staff members from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on September 23, 2002 at the Richardsville Volunteer Fire Department in Richardsville, KY. The meeting was held to present information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

I-66 Overview

Jeff Moore opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending the meeting and then introduced himself, Keirsten Jagers, Jason Dupont and James Mosley. Jeff began with an overview of the I-66 project. He stated that the entirety of I-66 is planned as a Transcontinental Highway designed to connect the East Coast to the West Coast. He explained that the exhibits illustrate the I-66 corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors and how these two projects may be complimentary. Jeff mentioned some of the project goals for I-66 are to support the completion of I-66 across southern Kentucky and to provide improved and efficient interstate access. He stated project goals for the Outer Beltline includes accommodating the transportation needs of the Bowling Green area, reducing existing and forecasted traffic congestion, and strengthening the regional highway network. He stated that the I-66 project is funded primarily as a planning project with a focus on efficiently connecting the Cumberland Parkway and the Natcher Parkway.

Environmental Overview

Jeff introduced Jason Dupont who directed attention to the exhibits, and presented an overview of the environmental process for both projects. Jason discussed the different kinds of natural and human environmental issues being considered in the planning studies and the work that's been completed on the projects. The activities completed included the location of the preliminary



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

corridors, data collection, and GIS plotting of sites onto the corridor maps. He stated that the KYTC is continuing to conduct field reconnaissance/surveys to confirm and identify additional sites. Jason emphasized that the public's input is very important and urged them to provide comments, while the proposed (preliminary) routes are in the evaluation stage. Jeff stated that KYTC and BLA are evaluating the routes with a focus on narrowing them down to two or three by January or February of 2003.

Public Outreach and Input

Jeff Moore stated that two public information meetings have been held in Bowling Green and two public information meetings have been held in Brownsville on these projects to determine the public's concerns of the proposed routes and interchanges. He explained; however, that the meetings did not appear to reach all of the surrounding communities and towns. Therefore, Richardsville was the first of a series of outreach efforts to surrounding towns in the coming weeks. Keirsten Jagers added that some of the proposed towns may include Alvaton, Chalybaete, Gott, Hadley, Oakland and Smiths Grove. She emphasize the need for public input from the residents on the issues and concerns about these two projects. Jeff reported that they are almost half way through the evaluation process, and that public input and comments are needed at this stage. At that point, KYTC requested comments from the public. Their comments were as follows.

Comments from the Public

- Margaret Alford said constructing Interstate 66 would be good for Warren County, but she wants to make sure historic sites are protected.
- Ms. Alford pointed to a map with potential corridors for the road that would be a loop around Bowling Green and possibly be a part of an east-to-west new interstate. She stated that it looks like that the most northern route goes right over the area where there is a historic church. The Green River Union Church, which was constructed in 1830, is fallen in and abandoned. There is a huge graveyard with more than 1,100 graves there. She stated, "some of them are family members."
- Mr. H.C. Alford noted that a stream runs through the same area named Indian Creek and there are Indian artifacts all up and down there, and that it's awfully close to Green River. He also pointed out unmarked cemeteries on Young Ferry Road at the top of the hill and off Lodge Hill Road before crossing Indian Creek.
- One resident stated there was an unmarked cemetery at the intersection of Wayne Watts Road and Highway 1320. At that location behind an old gate at the top of the hill contains about 50 unmarked graves.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

- Larry Moore is concerned about how the project might affect him. He has two farms on Anna Sandhill Road where one potential route crosses. He stated that he moved a half-mile off the road to get away from everything, and this looks like it would take his house and farm. He feared that if an interchange is placed near Sandhill Road and Highway 1320, it could cut through the front of both his farms. He stated access roads would only go in one direction, therefore making him landlocked.
- Jason Dupont responded that every effort will be made to keep farm landowners from being landlocked by access roads.
- Mr. Dupont emphasized to the residents that there are some 50 different potential routes which are months away from being narrowed to a few. The state says construction is eight to 10 years away and that depends on funding.
- Derrick Young said he was excited about the potential of an I-66 interchange near Richardsville. A dairy farmer, who travels to Owensboro frequently, Young said an interchange would cut 30 miles off his trip. Now I have to go all the way back into Bowling Green and get on the parkway.
- One gentleman welcomed the I-66 stating that the community is dead-end. He stated the Barron and Green Rivers serve as natural barriers forcing residents to go to Bowling Green to crossover. He said I-66 would open the area to Morgantown, Gracing, Edmondson Co. and Owensboro all of where they sell crops.
- Raymond Harold, Firefighter stated the property in Billy Goat Hill has belonged to his family for four generations. He said the surrounding area is home to bald eagles, horned owls, blind cavefish, deer and black bears.

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. The meeting ended at 9 PM.

The next public information town meeting is at 7 p.m. on September 30, 2002 (Monday) at the Chalybeate Volunteer Fire Department.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: September 30, 2002

LOCATION: Chalybeate Volunteer Fire Department

TIME: 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Keirsten Jagers, District 3 Public Information Officer -KYTC
Tom Cervone, Project Manager – BLA
James Mosley, BLA
Josh Sherretz, Environmental Technician-BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

A Public Information Town Meeting of about 35 residents from Chalybeate, and staff from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on September 30, 2002 at the Chalybeate Volunteer Fire Department in Chalybeate, KY. The meeting was held to present information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Keirsten Jagers opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending the meeting and then introduced herself, Tom Cervone, James Mosley and Josh Sherretz. Keirsten began with an overview of the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects. She then introduced Tom Cervone of BLA for his presentation. Tom gave a brief description of the project, its goals and how a planning study is performed and the kind of information it provides. He explained that the exhibits illustrate the I-66 corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors and how these two projects may be complimentary.

Tom stated project goals for the Outer Beltline includes accommodating the transportation needs of the Bowling Green area, reducing existing and forecasted traffic congestion, and strengthening the regional highway network. Tom explained that the routes were preliminary only and could be changed anytime during the course of the project. He then went on to discuss the importance of public involvement and the attendee's input regarding the project.



Environmental Overview

Tom introduced James Mosley who directed attention to the exhibits, and presented an overview of the environmental process for both projects. James discussed the different kinds of natural and human environmental issues being considered in the planning studies and the work that has been completed on the projects. James used the exhibits to illustrate the potential environmental issues concerning the project. He talked about the types of environmental issues that would need to be addressed and how they may or may not affect the project.

James then gave examples of natural environmental considerations which included springs, sinkholes, endangered species, etc. He also described the human environment such as homes, businesses, schools, historical structures and areas, cemeteries, etc. He reassured people that we are not here to take homes or destroy unique land features. James stated that KYTC would use avoidance, minimization, and mitigation in addressing the aforementioned environmental considerations.

James stated that the completed activities included the location and plotting of the preliminary corridors, data collection, and GIS plotting of sites onto the corridor maps. James stated that the KYTC is continuing to conduct field reconnaissance/surveys to confirm and identify additional sites.

Public Outreach and Input

Keirsten stated that two public information meetings have been held in Bowling Green and Brownsville on these projects to determine the public's concerns of the proposed routes and interchanges. She explained however, that additional meetings are being held to insure maximum feasible public participation from the surrounding towns and communities. She emphasized the need for public input from the residents on the issues and concerns about these two projects.

James emphasized that the public's input is very important and urged them to provide comments, while the proposed (preliminary) routes are in the evaluation stage. Tom asked again for individuals to give their concerns and comments so that Josh could record them onto the flip charts for consideration. Tom reiterated the issue of historic properties, farmland and forestland, but also mentioned the human livability factor as especially important in the evaluation process.

Keirsten thanked everyone again for attending the meeting. She then asked them to walk around look at exhibits, review their packets and to direct questions to KYTC and BLA staff. Their comments were as follows.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Comments from the Public

- Further widening and expansion of I-65 would have too much traffic for it to handle.
- What about the 7 Springs area, there are a lot of homes in the area that may be impacted.
- A new subdivision contains an old slave cemetery that predates the 1900's. The cemetery has a 16 to 19 feet public easement and some residents would like it placed on the Historic Preservation register.
- Ms. Gena Yoakum of Brownsville finds the northern most route interesting. She says it seems to be the route with fewer sinkholes, historic sites ect. "The area population is growing at a fast rate and the commuting potential for people working outside the county is great".
- Bringing this project to Edmondson County would be a great boost to our well being and would open doors of opportunity. Our county has been "cut off" from the main stream, which discourages businesses and industry to locate here.
- Ms. Yoakum stated, "As with any city that grows, changes have to be made. Bowling Green streets can hardly handle the traffic it has now. I believe it is vital to help alleviate some of the traffic through town".

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. The meeting ended at 9 PM.

The next public information town meeting is at 6 p.m. on October 5, 2002 (Saturday) at the Plano Volunteer Fire Department's Annual Meeting and Chili Dinner.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: October 5, 2002

LOCATION: Plano Volunteer Fire Department

TIME: 6:00 PM to 8:30 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Jeff Moore, District 3 Planning Branch Manager - KYTC
James Mosley, BLA
Josh Sherretz, Environmental Technician-BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

A Public Information Town Meeting of about 62 residents from Plano, and staff from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on October 5, 2002 at the Plano Volunteer Fire Department in Plano, KY. The meeting was held to present information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

I-66 Overview

Jeff Moore opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending the meeting and then introduced himself, James Mosley and Josh Sherretz. Josh circulated the sign-in sheet and James disseminated the blue information packets. Jeff explained the history of I-66 and the Beltline stating that the project was initiated through the ISTEA (Intermodal Transportation Efficiency Act). He stated that the entirety of I-66 was planned as a Transcontinental Highway designed to connect the East Coast to the West Coast. He explained that the exhibits illustrate the I-66 corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors and how these two projects may be complimentary.

Jeff stated that this I-66 project is funded only through this planning project with a focus on efficiently connecting the Cumberland Parkway and the Natcher Parkway. He mentioned the activities completed on the project to date and discussed the location of the preliminary corridors. Jeff explained that the planning project is halfway completed and that public input is key at this point in the evaluation process. Jeff mentioned that the proposed interstate is to support the completion of I-66 across southern Kentucky and to provide improved and efficient interstate access. He stated project goals for the Outer Beltline includes accommodating the transportation needs of the Bowling Green area, reducing existing and forecasted traffic congestion, and strengthening the regional highway network.



Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Environmental Overview

Jeff introduced James Mosley who directed attention to the exhibits, and presented an overview of the environmental process for both projects. James discussed the different kinds of natural and human environmental issues being considered in the planning studies and gave examples of both types. He utilized the exhibits to show how the environmental considerations were documented (GIS plotting) onto the corridor maps. James mentioned the kinds of field work and data collection performed by KYTC the two days prior to the meeting. James talked about identifying and documenting historic properties, homes, businesses, environmental resources, etc. He stated that the KYTC would try to avoid impacts on homes, businesses and environmentally sensitive areas. He stated KYTC would also practice minimization, mitigation and enhancements to the greatest extent possible where deemed appropriate and/or feasible. James stated that the KYTC is continuing to conduct field reconnaissance/surveys to confirm and identify additional sites. He emphasized that the public's input is very important and urged them to provide comments, while the proposed (preliminary) routes are in the evaluation stage.

Public Outreach and Input

Jeff Moore gave a summary overview of the corridors and stated that a series of public information meetings have been held to determine the public's concerns of the proposed routes and interchanges. He stated KYTC would continue outreach to the surrounding communities and towns. He emphasized the need for public input from the residents on the issues and concerns surrounding the two projects. Jeff stated that KYTC and BLA are still evaluating the routes and reiterated the need for public input. Jeff then directed their attention to the flip charts and shared comments and concerns ascertained from previous meetings. Jeff and James began to illicit questions, comments, issues and concerns from the audience. Their comments were as follows.

Comments/Questions from the Public

- Q** How long before construction of the new I-66?
A Construction is 10 to 15 years away. Currently the project is only funded through this planning study.
- Q** When is the Natcher Parkway Extension scheduled for completion?
A Year 2005 Pending EIS Report according to Jeff.
- Q** What is the Transpark consideration in this project?
A The Transpark is only considered as it may impact future traffic volumes.
- Q** Will Crossovers be used during the widening process?
A Because of the median wall being added for the I-65 widening, crossovers will not be possible.
- Q** Will service roads be included in new construction?
A Yes, frontage/access roads would be anticipated for new construction where necessary.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Q What are the funding sources?

A I-66 utilizes federal dollars and the interchanges utilize state and federal dollars.

Q What are the concerns for too much commercial development along the selected corridors?

A Development along the roadway could be an issue and will be considered. However, control of this development is regulated by local planning commissions.

Q The dotted line on the map is in design stage? (referring to Natcher Parkway Extension)

A Yes, this is the Natcher Parkway Extension to US 231, which is currently under design.

Additional Comments

- Better access to Brownsville and Mammoth Cave is needed.
- Road maintenance is a concern.
- The Interstate system was originally planned as part of the National Defense initiative.
- I-65 is as wide as it needs to be. Don't widen it.

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. The meeting ended at approximately 8:30 PM. However, the Fire department continued with their scheduled auction and other activities.

The next public information town meeting is at 7 p.m. on October 8, 2002 (Tuesday) at the Alvaton Volunteer Fire Department.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: October 8, 2002

LOCATION: Alvaton Volunteer Fire Department

TIME: 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES:

Daryl Greer, Division of Planning - KYTC
Keirsten Jagers, District 3 Public Information Officer -KYTC
Lance Meredith, District 3 Traffic Branch Manager - KYTC
Tom Cervone, Project Manager – BLA
James Mosley, BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

A Public Information Town Meeting of about 60 residents from Alvaton, along with staff from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on September 30, 2002 at the Alvaton Volunteer Fire Department in Alvaton, KY. The meeting was held to present information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

Introduction: Public Outreach and Input

Tom Cervone opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending the meeting Tom gave a brief description of the project, its goals and how a planning study is performed and the kind of information it provides. He stated that KYTC are concurrently working on two separate projects: the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and the I-66 project between Bowling Green and Glasgow. He explained that the exhibits illustrate the I-66 corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline corridors and how these two projects may be complimentary and possibly work well together. He urged them to speak to what they like and/or not like about the project.

Tom gave an example of how consultants have spent hours walking and talking with individuals to find out about concerns such as churches, cemeteries, environmental concerns etc. He stated that another focus of the study is to see if the corridor would divert traffic from I-65. Tom stated that the KYTC planning studies talk about the human environment focusing on people and their environment as well as the natural environment. He stated that KYTC has assembled a team consisting of the Kentucky Geological Survey, historic and cultural resource experts, consultants and others working together to help them determine the outcome. He went on to say that we are trying to learn more about the corridors and stressed the importance of the public's input.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Environmental Overview

Tom introduced James Mosley who directed attention to the exhibits, and presented an overview of the environmental process for both projects. James discussed the different kinds of natural and human environmental issues being considered in the planning studies and the work that has been completed on the projects. James used the exhibits to illustrate the potential environmental issues concerning the project. He talked about the types of environmental issues that would need to be addressed and how they may or may not affect the project.

James gave examples of natural environmental considerations which included springs, sinkholes, endangered species, etc. He also described the human environment such as homes, businesses, schools, historical structures and areas, cemeteries, etc. He assured people that we are not here to take homes or destroy unique land features. James stated that KYTC would use avoidance, minimization, and mitigation in addressing the aforementioned environmental considerations.

James stated that the completed activities included the location and plotting of the preliminary corridors, data collection, and GIS plotting of various resources sites onto the corridor maps. He mentioned that the KYTC is continuing to conduct field reconnaissance/surveys to confirm and identify additional sites. James reemphasized that the public's input is very important and urged them to provide comments, while the proposed corridors are in the evaluation stage.

I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Tom introduced Ms. Keirsten Jagers of the KYTC who in turn introduced Daryl Greer along with Lance Meredith representatives of the KYTC. She also acknowledged John Matheney and Michael Briggs of the Barren River Area Development District. Daryl Greer stated project goals for the Outer Beltline include accommodating the transportation needs of the Bowling Green area, reducing existing and forecasted traffic congestion, and strengthening the regional highway network.

Daryl explained that I-66 under the auspices of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) was initially funded as an intercontinental study. However, in the early 1990s the KYTC wanted to see if that study could potentially benefit the southern portion of the state by providing economic development to the distressed communities therein. Daryl stated the study section of I-66 from Somerset to London, KY is one year ahead of the Bowling Green projects. He stated there was currently no funding available for the Paducah, KY to Missouri portion of I-66.

He stated that KYTC is undertaking the study because it will provide a basis to present to Congress for evaluating the completion of the project. He stated the I-66 project could be anywhere from 10 to 15 years away because it entails design, buying right-of-way, moving utilities, and the appropriation of monies for construction of the project. Daryl explained the importance of planning ahead stating "projecting future growth and development now will prevent KYTC from starting all over again should the project receive funding in the future".



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Daryl went on to discuss the materials found within the information packets including the fold-out map/comment sheet, Steps and Timeline and the “Citizen’s Guide on Decision Making”. He referenced the Evaluation Criteria and noted the extensive review process for the various areas of concern therein. Daryl went on to discuss the goals for the project.

Daryl indicated that the overview materials include contact information and a website on I-66. Kiersten stated the public may contact her or Jeff Moore and may feel free to schedule a visit to the KYTC office. Daryl stated that many concerns expressed from earlier public meetings centered on safety and access. At that point the KYTC opened the floor for questions and answers. The comments and questions were as follows:

Comments/Questions from the Public

- Q.** What is the timetable for the Beltline project?
- A.** Anywhere from ten to fifteen years away. Need to further analyze traffic models, hold public meetings etc. as referenced in the “Road Building Steps and Timelines”.
- Q.** Is the KYTC considering over commercialization along the outer loop of the Beltline?
- A.** Development may occur as a result of the roadway. This development will be considered in the cumulative impacts evaluation. Ultimately, KYTC can not control land use or growth issues. It is a function of the local city planning commission.
- Q.** Why not use the I-65 as connector between the Natcher and Cumberland Parkway?
- A.** That is why the build or no-build options are available. One of the focuses of this study is to determine whether additional lanes on I-65 serve to relieve traffic as opposed to diverting traffic to other routes.
- Q.** Is Warren County locked into I-66 or is it optional?
- A.** Yes and no. There is a possibility of 55 different modeling combinations to be considered. Various layers on the map are being charted, that is why we need your input at this point in the process to help determine how Bowling Green should look in the future.

Additional Comments

- Residents would like to protect, preserve and enhance the farmland and housing character of the community along the outer corridor in the Old Scottsville and Great House Road area.
- Ray Miller stated an Indian graveyard that contains members of the Cowles family is located along Highway 31 W north of Highway 68 and is not plotted on the map.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) *(Item # 03-66.00)*
Bowling Green Outer Beltline *(Item # 03-103.00)*

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

- The interchange before you cross the Barren River has restrictive covenants on growth for that area. It is located on the corridor and needs to be addressed.
- Response time is slowed for emergency medical vehicles because sections of access roads do not have proper address signage.

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. The meeting ended at 9 PM.

The next public information town meeting is to be announced.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Monday, October 21, 2002

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Conference Room

TIME: 9:30 a.m. (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, Chief District Engineer- KYTC District 3
Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning- KYTC District 3
Renee Slaughter, Environmental Coordinator-KYTC District 3
Lancie Meredith, TEBM for Traffic-KYTC District 3
Daryl Price, KYTC District 3-Construction
Stacey Beason, KYTC District 3-Operations
Chris Proffitt, KYTC District 3-Construction
Phil Carter, KYTC District 3-Construction
Kenneth Cox, KYTC District 3-Preconstruction
Daryl Greer, TEBM for Planning-KYTC Division of Planning
Dave Harmon, KYTC Division of Environmental Analysis
James Simpson, KYTC Division of Highway Design
Anthony Goodman, FHWA
John B. Matheney, Barren River ADD
Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey
Tom Cervone, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
James Mosley, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Wendy Southworth, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.

A Project Team Meeting for the subject projects was held in the KYTC District 3 Conference Room in Bowling Green on Wednesday, October 21, 2002 at 9:30 a.m. (CDT). This meeting provided an opportunity to review the progress of Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc. (BLA) since the last Project Team Meeting, discuss the development of the corridors and begin to discuss the possible elimination of several corridors. An agenda for the meeting is attached.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

The meeting began with Daryl Greer explaining that BLA has developed corridors for the I-66 and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects. Daryl continued by saying that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss these corridors and further begin the screening process for the possible corridors. Daryl noted that the last Project Team Meeting was held on July 31, 2002, which was before the Public Information Meetings held on August 14th and August 15th in Bowling Green and Brownsville, respectively.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Daryl provided an update on the project goals for the Statewide I-66 projects. Daryl noted that a meeting was held on October 16, 2002 to discuss the project goals for Statewide I-66. Each I-66 segment would operate on it's own project goals, but the project goals need to be tied together with the Statewide I-66 project goals. Daryl noted that the project goals that are being utilized for the Cumberland Parkway to Bowling Green section of I-66 were also utilized for the Statewide I-66 project goals. He commented that there were some minor wording changes and one goal was added. The four project goals for this segment of I-66 are:

- Support the completion of I-66 across southern Kentucky to carry out the legislative intent of ISTEA, the 1995 NHS Act, and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA21).
- Provide an improved, efficient interstate facility between the Natcher Parkway and the Nunn Parkway to allow for system continuity of I-66 from West Virginia to Missouri.
- Improve accessibility throughout southern Kentucky to jobs, industry, urban centers, educational facilities, tourism and recreational facilities, with emphasis given to the KY portions of the Appalachia and Lower Mississippi Delta regions.
- Improve interstate movement of people and freight by ensuring a safe transportation system that is accessible, integrated and efficient and offers flexibility of transportation choices across southern Kentucky.

Daryl stated that three meetings were to take place on October 21, 2002. First the Project Team meeting was taking place. Second, a conference call was to take place with the CSX Railroad and other BLA staff in Evansville. Finally, a Field Review meeting with J. L. Young and BLA staff in the Rocky Hill area was to take place that afternoon.

Daryl continued by saying that the objective to be accomplished with this project, as issued by the Department of Transportation, is a final decision made on Public Interest. Air, noise, water, natural resources, community cohesion, employment rates, property values, farms, people and regional growth all need to be resourced to accommodate Public Interest.

Daryl directed attention to Tom Cervone, who stated that originally the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the corridors and the elimination of several corridors, if warranted. But instead, BLA is asking if all possible corridors are shown on the exhibits. Tom noted that the screening process for the corridors is to begin in the following week and by November the screening process will be shown along with the Final Preliminary Corridors for both the I-66 project and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline project.

Tom wanted to issue a "thank-you" to those who helped with the meetings since the last Project Team Meeting. Tom issued an apology to those who were not involved in the project since the last Project Team Meeting. Tom stated that project updates should have been sent out to several individuals, but were not. He, therefore, apologized to those individuals.

Timeline and Meetings Map



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

In reference to an exhibit found in the handout for the meeting, Tom asked for any comments concerning the "I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline Timeline." Tom noted that the timeline has not yet been completed and that several meetings were scheduled in the near future. Tom asked about showing a vertical line indicating the progress to date of the projects. Several individuals concurred that a vertical line should be shown on the exhibit. Lencie Meredith noted that the town meeting in Hadley had been rescheduled for November 14, 2002 and did not take place on October 15, 2002. Tom asked those in attendance if a timeline like this should be shown in the document. Everyone agreed that a timeline should be shown. Tom also posed the question of showing the locations of the meetings within the document. The locations would include Public Information Meetings, Town Meetings, Environmental Agency Coordination Meetings, and other meetings. There was a question as to what the "other meetings" included. Tom noted that the other meetings included those meetings set up with the local residents to conduct a field review. For example, Lynda Prather took several BLA staff members on a field review of the Rocky Hill area and Billy Grimes took several BLA staff members on a field review of the Billy Goat Hill area. It was agreed that a timeline and location map should be included in the final document.

Public Involvement Since Last Team Meeting

Jeff Moore noted that a total of 304 people participated in the Public Information Meetings held on August 14th and August 15th in Bowling Green and Brownsville, respectively. Because Bowling Green is so large compared to the number of participants, Jeff was concerned that a large portion of the community was not getting touched. By utilizing the Emergency Management Agency and the local Fire Departments, several small meetings were scheduled to get in touch with other smaller communities within the Bowling Green area.

Jeff stated that there was a lot of misinformation and rumors circulating throughout the communities. Therefore, the small meetings would clear up some of the misinformation. Jeff noted that at least half as many people that attended both Public Information Meetings have been contacted via the small town meetings. These people are being utilized as a touchstone for the development of the two projects.

Jeff noted that there are several future meetings scheduled for the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects. This afternoon there will be a meeting with the CSX Railroad to determine how I-66 and the Outer Beltline will affect the CSX Railroad and to discuss any future plans for the railroad. Jeff continued by saying, that also this afternoon will be a field review meeting with J. L. Young along KY 185 and in the Billy Goat Hill area. There are meetings scheduled for the Barren River Fire Department on October 24, 2002, Gott Fire Department on October 25, 2002, and Hadley Fire Department on November 14, 2002. Jeff stated that there are several communities for which a meeting had not yet been scheduled. These communities include: Oakland, Smiths Grove, Freeport, Loving, Red Cross and Rocky Hill. Jeff noted that a meeting with the Barren River State Park may be scheduled to discuss how I-66 would affect the traffic through the park. An Environmental Resource Agency Meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 5, 2002. There has been a meeting with the Warren County School System. In this meeting, surveys were given to the students and they were encouraged to take them home to their parents and get feedback from them. Jeff noted that he received many calls from parents that had



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

read the survey and who were not aware of the project until then. Jeff noted that more classroom activities are planned with the school systems when the screening process is complete. It was asked, if anything had been scheduled around Glasgow. Jeff stated that Red Cross would be the closest community to Glasgow and that nothing was likely to be scheduled in Glasgow because of a lack of interest.

Jeff gave a brief description of what the town meetings are like. He noted that at Plano, a chili supper was served and the attendance was nearly twice the usual attendance. Jeff stated that it is sometimes difficult to hear at the meetings, but by giving the public an alternate venue and by having the meetings in different places, many people have been contacted. He continued by saying that through the interaction with the public, we are working as partners with them in the development of the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects.

Lancie Meredith commented that he has found out a lot of information from the public and that there are many things that they are concerned about. For instance, there have been some concerns about sign placement along the roadways and mowing along the right-of-way. He noted that the town meetings have really helped him get in touch with the public for even those things not directly related to I-66 or the Bowling Green Outer Beltline.

Tom Cervone introduced James Mosley to discuss the town meetings and some of things that were revealed from the meetings. James noted we are getting information from the public about many environmental concerns. For example, from the Chalybeate Meeting many people had some concerns about cemeteries, caves and churches. These individuals also located the places of concern, which helped when the field work was being conducted. As a whole, James noted that the concerns were mostly local concerns. The major concern for many Edmonson Countians was river crossings and access to an interstate facility. The major concern in Bowling Green was congestion. For the people of Alvaton, farmland is very important to them and maintaining the harmony within the subdivision was also a major concern. Tom noted that there are still three sections left before the field review is completed for all of the corridors.

Tom stated that a future meeting with Mammoth Cave and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be beneficial for the projects in order to obtain information from them about threatened and endangered species within the Mammoth Cave Area. He noted that the Critical Habitat information from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has not yet been obtained, but should be available within the next couple of weeks. They have information concerning the habitats of the Indiana Bat and the Kentucky Cave Shrimp. Tom stated that the Kentucky Cave Shrimp are prevalent within the Turnhole Springs Drainage Basin, and further, several corridors are impacting the Turnhole Springs Drainage Basin. Tom noted that there is also some concern with Priority One Caves. He stated that the Northern most Corridor is approximately three and a half miles from a Priority One Cave. Tom noted that typically, a corridor should be at least five miles from a Priority One Cave. Tom continued by saying, a meeting for the Kentucky Speleological Society was held this past Saturday. Many I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline packets were passed out at the meeting, so that they could become familiar with the study area. Tom noted that these individuals would be very useful when determining cave locations within the study area. It was concurred that a meeting with Mammoth Cave and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to review critical habitats would be very beneficial to the projects.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Tom then turned the meeting over to Jerry Weisenfluh with the Kentucky Geological Survey to discuss any problems with crossing the Turnhole Springs Drainage Basin. In reference to an exhibit shown at the meeting, Jerry noted that the groundwater displayed in pink generally flows to the north into Mammoth Cave and the groundwater displayed in blue generally flows west into the Graham Springs Basin. Jerry stated that the Cumberland Parkway, where it intersects with I-65, is within the Turnhole Springs Drainage Basin. There are two ways of looking at the effects to the Drainage Basin. If an accident was to occur and a hazardous spill resulted, it would be very difficult to mitigate the spill because there are no surface streams in the area. Therefore, making the Turnhole Drainage Basin at the most risk. If a spill were to occur outside the sinkhole plain, it would be easier to clean up the spill before getting in the groundwater because there are more surface streams.

Tom noted that within the Turnhole Springs Drainage Basin there are improvements, other than I-66, that are at I-65 and the Cumberland Parkway. For example, proposed improvements to KY 259 would originate at the I-65/Cumberland Parkway interchange. Tom turned to Greg Meredith for feedback on the progress of the KY 259 and KY 101 projects. Greg stated that there is nothing scheduled in the future for KY 259. He noted that a Design Study had been conducted for the project but that there were no plans to further progress the project. He commented that currently, mitigative measures are being conducted for I-65. Tom asked if it would be necessary to take the I-65 improvements to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Services and Mammoth Cave Meeting to be discussed. It was determined that yes the I-65 improvements should also be discussed at the meeting. It was noted that the mitigative measures being utilized for the I-65 improvements include sedimentation basins to slow down the flow of the water and grass-lined ditches as well.

Tom noted that the Northern most Corridor shown on the exhibits was added as a corridor after an individual suggested a shorter route across the sinkhole plain. Jerry Weisenfluh stated that there are karst issues associated with the escarpment as well. Construction issues would result because of the vertical conduits and caves within the escarpment. Jerry noted that unexpected construction costs would result from a corridor running through the escarpment. Jerry commented that there is a way to minimize the karst issues and that would be a corridor to the south. It was noted that Mammoth Cave has not said anything negative about the Northern most Corridor. The Corridor would provide reasonable access to Mammoth Cave and it would help in getting the through truck traffic off of KY 70 (which is a park road). Tom stated that Mammoth Cave and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Services should be approached with ideas on how I-66 will be different from how I-65 was originally constructed.

Summary of Public Comments

Tom Cervone noted that 304 citizens attended the two Public Information Meetings held on August 14th and August 15th, 2002 in Bowling Green and Brownsville, respectively. He stated that the majority of the comments received revealed an understanding of the project goals and agreement with them as well. There were several individuals concerned that urban sprawl and growth would be a result of the Bowling Green Outer Beltline, but still wanted something done about the congestion in the Bowling Green area. Several comments were made to extend the



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Beltline further out, while others commented that the Beltline should be built just beyond the Bowling Green city limits. Many of the comments favored a northern route because of access to surrounding counties, additional river crossings and economic growth. There were several comments that suggested other corridor locations.

For the Northern most Corridor, it was suggested that when the Corridor reaches Sand Hill Road, to drop down to the North Central Corridor through Billy Goat Hill and then over to Hadley. This Corridor has been added and is currently displayed on the exhibit. One individual suggested a Western Bypass around Bowling Green that would go through Woodburn and then north west up to the Natcher Parkway. It was determined that a Western Bypass would not fit into the project goals and is beyond the scope of the project. Another individual suggested an inner beltline that would go from I-65 at Exit 28 to the Natcher Parkway following US 31W, KY 880, and KY 2665. It was determined that this corridor would utilize existing roads creating large impacts along the road, since substantial upgrades would be necessary in order to construct a high speed interstate facility. Finally because of opposition from many individuals living along KY 1297, and because of archaeological and geological reasons, another southern corridor was added further south. This corridor would not run along KY 1297, but rather would run just south of KY 1297, closer to the Barren River.

Tom Cervone suggested the possibility of submitting a newspaper article entitled “Planning Studies show Public Involvement-KYTC Requests Preferred Corridors.” He noted that the article would be used as an entryway in the next set of Public Information Meetings and to help screen the corridors down to the Preliminary Final Corridors. It was decided that an article should not be submitted until after the next set of Public Information Meetings. Anthony Goodman commented that it would be necessary to narrow the corridors down to three or four corridors per project.

Information on the Study Area

General information obtained from Geographical Information Systems (GIS) was displayed within the study area. The GIS information was in the form of layers. The layers included: Counties, Incorporated Cities and Towns, Mines and Quarries, Abandoned Mines, Coal Exploration Sites, CERCLA (Superfund) Sites, TRI Sites, RCRA Sites, Landfills, Groundwater Monitoring Locations, Wastewater Treatment Facilities, Water Treatment Facilities, Water Wells, Surface Water Intakes, Water Storage Tanks, Oil and Gas Wells, Summits, Parks, Historic Sites, Potential Historic Sites, Hospitals and Clinics, Police Stations, Fire Stations, Airports, Cemeteries, Schools, Churches, State Parks, National Parks, Wildlife Management Areas, Power Transmission Lines, and Oil and Gas Pipelines.

Jerry Weisenfluh discussed the Geological Regions within the study area. He noted that there are numerous kinds of limestone in each region. The limestone in the southeast is the least soluble, meaning they do not develop karst sinkholes like other limestone regions. Edmonson County contains soluble limestone, which means that there are still karst features, but not features in the form of sinkholes. These features include vertical shafts and caves. A question, directed towards Jerry, was asked pertaining to the north west dip of the limestone and its relationship to the subsurface flow. Jerry replied that the north west dip of the limestone does indicate the subsurface flow.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Jerry stated that the issues to deal with when discussing the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors are the cave systems within the sinkhole plain. He noted that there are also many archaeological sites associated with the karst features within the sinkhole plain and along the escarpment as well.

Tom Cervone introduced David Ripple to discuss the traffic forecasts for the two projects. David noted that the traffic model utilized is consistent with the Bowling Green model, but includes more networking like there is within the Statewide Traffic model. There are thirteen counties within the modeled area. David stated that there are two different forecasts: the Kentucky Statewide Travel Model forecast which is utilized as the base and the Kentucky Statewide Data Center forecast which is a higher forecast. He noted that there are several handouts to illustrate the results of the forecasts. David continued by saying that the “E+C” terminology illustrates the existing plus committed network. He noted that the convention is consistent with the Kentucky Statewide Travel Model relative to Level of Service (LOS). By the year 2030, there is a LOS of F for existing I-65. In reference to the handout, the capacity and LOS are given for existing I-65 for different segments of I-65. David noted that the analysis for existing I-65 includes two lanes in one direction. The future (2030) capacity and LOS based on the Kentucky Statewide Travel Model Growth Scenario and the Kentucky State Data Center Growth Scenario for I-65 with lane widths concurrent with the active Six-Year Plan was also displayed on the exhibit. David stated that if I-66 was to run along existing I-65 with the lane allocations unchanged, the LOS is either an E or F for each segment of I-65. If the roadway was an eight lane facility, the LOS for I-65 with I-66 would be LOS D or C for each segment. David noted that approximately 40% of the traffic on I-65 is truck traffic, which would lower the LOS by one letter within the model.

David noted that there is substantial population growth towards the southeast in Warren County. Employment forecasts included the Transpark and utilized the Regional Model for more optimistic results. The volume of additional traffic passing through the region on I-66 is estimated to be 3,000 vehicles daily. Therefore, only increasing the traffic by 3000 ADT when I-66 is utilized in combination with I-65. David stated that according to the traffic utilizing the existing facility, I-66 along I-65 is still a viable option if a LOS of D is tolerable, although further analysis would need to be conducted to account for the large number of trucks on the existing facility.

David stated that the closer the Beltline is to Bowling Green, the more traffic it will carry and further, the more traffic it will serve. With the I-66 Corridors, it would be necessary to observe the trips through Warren County, as well as, the trips in and out of Warren County. He noted that the shortest path would generate the most external trips. Further, trips external to the region look at major employment concentrations. David noted that the travel route will eliminate several Corridors, since the roller coaster effect of the Corridor will result in less traffic. It will be necessary to narrow down the Corridors so they can be modeled with clearer results.

Development of Corridors

Tom Cervone introduced Wendy Southworth to discuss the development, naming, and length of the Corridors. Wendy stated that the study area for the two projects was set by the Scope of



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Work for the two projects. The boundaries included the Cumberland Parkway, Natcher Parkway, the Barren River and the escarpment. Next in the development process was the utilization of GIS to display environmental areas of concerns on a map, therefore establishing the Environmental Overview Map. After the first set of Public Information Meetings, comments obtained from a survey form were reviewed to determine the consensus of the public concerning the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects.

Wendy noted that buffered areas were utilized to illustrate areas of special concern. For instance, 1,000 foot buffers were placed around sensitive areas such as Mammoth Cave National Park, Barren River Lake State Resort Park, Barren River from river mile 15.0 to its confluence with the Green River since this area is considered an Outstanding Water Resource, the towns of Oakland and Smiths Grove, the escarpment, significant sinkholes and knobs, and Three Springs Park. A 800 foot diameter buffer was also placed around any historic or potential historic homes. These areas are considered “fatal flaws” to the project, meaning the corridors would stay outside of these areas if at all possible.

Wendy stated that once the comments were reviewed from the first Public Information Meeting and the special concern areas were determined, corridors were placed on an exhibit using transparent and removable segments. As far as the Outer Beltline was concerned, the Corridors were determined by the 1972 and 2000 Bowling Green Transportation Plan. BLA utilized these documents to determine the locations of the Beltline Corridors around Bowling Green. Wendy noted that the potential corridors were reviewed by KYTC in several small meetings. A preliminary field review was conducted by BLA staff to determine river crossing locations and possible interchange locations. The potential corridors were then displayed at a Project Team Meeting, a Citizen’s Advisory Group Meeting, Two Public Information Meetings and several small Town Meetings for any comments. Meanwhile, a thorough field review was being conducted for all potential corridors. Wendy noted that all houses, trailers, places of business, possible old homes, utilities, cemeteries, churches, schools, and new subdivisions were mapped. Wendy stated that a meeting was held with Jerry Weisenfluh and Jim Currens with the Kentucky Geological Survey to discuss any geological concerns with the Corridors. Don Linebaugh with the University of Kentucky Program for Archaeology Research also attended the meeting to discuss archaeological concerns with the Corridors.

Wendy noted that the I-66 Corridors were named using numbers, while the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors were named using letters. This naming scheme resulted in twenty-three (1-23) I-66 Corridors and eight (A-H) Outer Beltline Corridors. Using an exhibit displaying the I-66 Corridors, Wendy noted each Corridor by number and the length of the Corridor. Further, using an exhibit displaying the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors, she noted each Corridor by letter and the length of the Corridor.

Committed Projects

Tom Cervone asked Greg Meredith to briefly discuss several projects within the project area. Greg noted that there is nothing in the near future for KY 259 project until a decision is made on I-66. He continued by saying that the interchange proposed on I-65 depends on any commitments for industry at the Transpark. He noted that there will be an avenue through the Transpark from



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) **Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)**

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

the industries to I-65. Greg noted that the design money has been authorized for the KY 101 improvements in Smiths Grove and the KYTC is currently looking at alternate routes to study. A Western Bypass of Smiths Grove is still several years away. Greg stated that improvements to KY 101 from Smiths Grove to Brownsville will be let in the spring or late summer and will begin at US 31 W and end in Chalybeate. He noted that eventually KY 101 will be improved from I-65 through Edmonson County. The Natcher Extension project is waiting on the environmental document and Phase II Design has already been started. The right-of-way phase is expected to begin in 2005. Greg commented that the I-65 improvements are expected to begin next year. The improvements on Cemetery Road will begin when the interchange with I-65 is complete.

The question of the type of interchange for I-66 at Hadley was asked. Greg responded by saying that the interchange will be a high speed system to system linkage type interchange. It was then asked if I-66 or the Natcher Parkway would be the through route. Greg noted that the interchange would be something like what was proposed for the Cumberland Parkway and I-65 Interchange as studied in the KY 259 Design Scoping Study. Greg noted that the reconstruction of Scottsville Road will be completed with the construction of the Natcher Extension.

Field Study for the Preliminary Corridors

Tom Cervone noted that the field studies for the Corridors are about 90% complete. He stated that people are the first consideration when conducting the field studies. Also considered are any natural resources, archaeology, TES, water quality, historic properties, caves and farmland.

Environmental Review Agency Meeting

Tom stated that a second Environmental Review Agency Meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 5, 2002. He noted that the meeting will take place at Mammoth Cave in the Rotunda Room and will consist of two sessions. The first session will be from 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. (CST) and then a buffet style lunch will be served from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. (CST) followed by the second session, which will last until 2:30 p.m. (CST). The purpose of the meeting is to bring everyone up to date with the projects and discuss what has happened since the last meeting. Tom commented that letters announcing the meeting will be sent out by mid-November. It was asked if the traffic information will be available for that meeting. Dave Ripple responded by saying that not all combinations will be available, but that at least one southern corridor, one northern corridor and the corridor along I-65 will be available.

Screening Process

Tom Cervone noted that the first screening is the "Fatal Flaw" Evaluation which would include Section 4(f), Section 7 Consultation and some Section 106 issues. The second screening is the Project Goals Evaluation, in which the corridors that do not meet the project goals or those that are not part of the scope will be removed from further consideration. The third screening is a Comparison for Major Environmental Regulatory Issues as shown in the handout. Tom noted that the final corridors will get the full Environmental Evaluation Matrix.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

By describing the screening issues, all the Corridors were examined to possibly eliminate several Corridors. When discussing the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors, it was noted that Corridors G and H do not comply with the Project Goals and show a lack of connectivity and continuity. Further, Corridor F has the longest length and is the furthest from the metropolitan area, resulting in low traffic estimates compared to all other Corridors. All other Corridors seemed to be feasible Corridors for continued evaluation.

When discussing the I-66 Corridors, it was determined that Corridor 3 would provide no help to an I-66 Corridor, construction costs would be high, it crosses the escarpment and there would be several traffic issues due to the changes in direction. Corridors 6, 7, and 8 would be difficult to construct because of the location of an interchange being so close to the Cumberland Parkway/I-65 Interchange and safety issues are a concern because of the changes in direction with the splitting of I-66 and I-65. Corridor 9 was noted as having a long length, not systematically connected and because of sudden changes in direction would create safety concerns. Corridors 14 and 15 were noted as having substantial impacts on the sinkhole plain and not being systematically connected. Corridor 16 was noted as having substantial impacts on the sinkhole plain and having an interchange location that is too close to an existing or proposed interchange. Corridor 17 was noted as having sudden changes in direction further creating safety concerns and having an interchange location that is too close to an existing or proposed interchange. Corridor 18 was noted as having an interchange location that is too close to an existing or proposed interchange and having the longest length. Corridor 19 was noted as having an interchange location that is too close to an existing or proposed interchange and not systematically connected. Corridors 21 and 22 were noted as not being systematically connected.

It was noted that the Cumberland Parkway and the Natcher Parkway should be highlighted in a different color so that they are not confused with the I-66 Corridors.

It was noted that for the Environmental Review Agency Meeting, the Original Corridors will be displayed and then the Preliminary Final Corridors will be displayed and an explanation provided as to why many of the Corridors shown on the original corridors are not shown on the Preliminary Final Corridors exhibit. At the Citizen's Advisory Group Meeting, three or four Corridors will be shown for I-66 along with all other exhibits to illustrate the screening process. It was determined that at the remaining Town Meetings, the public will no longer be asked for any new corridor locations.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m. (CDT).



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: October 24, 2002

LOCATION: Barren River Fire Station # 2

TIME: 7:15 PM to 9:00 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Jeff Moore, District 3 Planning Branch Manager - KYTC
Keirsten Jagers, District 3 Public Information Officer -KYTC
Greg Meredith, District 3 Chief District Engineer - KYTC
Jason DuPont, BLA
Josh Sherretz, BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

Five people attended the Public information meeting held at Barren River Fire Station # 2. The meetings purpose was to familiarize the public with the projects and to receive input about them in return. These types of meetings are held in the hope of reaching more people on a personal level, collecting valuable information and addressing any misconceptions or misinformation about this planning process.

I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Jeff began by introducing himself, Kerstin Jagers, Greg Meredith, Jason Dupont, and Josh Sherretz. He also recognized Michael Briggs from the Barren River Area Development District. He began the meeting by discussing the relationship between the Outer Beltline and I-66 projects and how they may complement one another. He then discussed the history of the two projects, and identified that we are in the early stages of planning for the projects. He stated that these projects could be ready to start construction in 8 to 10 years emphasizing that we are still in the early stages. He next gave back ground information on I-66 including its origin as a coast-to-coast route. He then explained the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), which supported the I-66 project across Southern Kentucky. From there he explained the concept of independent utility and how the this stretch of I-66 from the Cumberland Parkway to the Natcher Parkway had become a section of independent utility as a portion that would link I-66 across Southern Kentucky from West Virginia to Missouri.

The next point of discussion was the planning study and how it weighs the positive and negative effects of each corridor. The project goals were then identified and study area and corridors explained. Jeff reminded the attendees that the corridors seen on the map were in no way shape or form permanent and they could and would be changed during the course of the study to avoid, minimize and mitigate potential impacts. Jeff reminded the public that the planning corridors were 2000 feet wide, but the right-of-way would only be approximately 400 feet wide. The 2000 feet wide corridor is identified to allow room to avoid resources where possible. He explained



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

that the I-66 Project is regional in scope and the Outer Beltline Project is local in terms of study scope and effects. Jeff then asked the question of what is in the study area and turned it over to Jason DuPont.

Environmental Overview

Jason stated the type of things recorded during the study and breaks them down into two categories natural and human environment. He then turned to the exhibits to illustrate the different types of concerns involved in the study process. The natural environment concerns include rivers, streams, wetlands, forests, endangered species, and other unique habitats and landscapes. The human environment issues include homes, businesses, cemeteries, schools, historic properties, landfills, oil wells, utilities, etc. Jason stated that most of the information attained up to this point has been from various agencies' records and GIS data. There has also been some fieldwork completed as well to verify and supplement the data gathered. Jason then stated how the data is collected during the study, including review agency meetings and input, and that all of the data will be analyzed in the evaluation process. Jason stated that the goal of the study is to narrow down the number of corridors to approximately three choices by the end of the study. He stated this is why it is very important to gather as much information as possible through research, fieldwork and public comments. Jason described the difference between the final right-of-way compared to the study corridors being shown. Along with environmental concerns the study also evaluates economic and traffic issues. The road must be able to divert traffic and reduce congestion as well as minimize the effect on the surrounding environment.

Public Outreach and Input

Jeff reiterated on the importance of public input and knowing what is in the study area. Jeff then invited the attendees to ask questions and give their input. Jason went to the flip charts and gave examples of public concerns from past meetings as well as other examples.

Comments/Questions from the Public

- Q** Will development result from these projects?
A Development may occur as a result of the roadway. Ultimately, KYTC can not control land use or growth issues. It is a function of the local city planning commission.
- Q** How much rural area will be lost?
A Estimates will be made for this evaluation process, however
- Q** Will this make the Bowling Green area become another Jefferson County?
A The new roadway could create some development at interchanges, but again, control of development is governed by local planning commissions.
- Q** Could this project help bring an airport to the Bowling Green area? Is there a relationship between I-66 and the Outer Beltline and the Transpark?
A The Transpark is a completely separate development. For the purposes of this study, our only consideration of the Transpark will be its potential effect on future traffic volumes.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

- Q** Where will the money come for these projects?
A As a part of the interstate system, I-66 would receive federal funding as well as state money.
- Q** What agencies are involved in the review of the environmental part of the study?
A Numerous agencies will be consulted for review including USFWS, USEPA, US Army Corps of Engineers, National Park Service, Kentucky State Nature Preserves Commission, Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, Kentucky Division of Water and many others.
- Q** How far along is the planning study?
A The current study is approximately halfway complete. However, this study will identify approximately three routes that will be studied further.
- Q** How will the roadway be maintained?
A The Department of Highways would maintain the road. Federal transportation funds as well as state funds would be used.
- Q** Will it be a toll road?
A Currently there is no plan for the facility to be a toll road.

Additional Comments

- Not enough notice before this meeting.
- The northern route will take my home and divide my farm.
- Upgrades to I-65 will make it a better route to take.
- One of the alternates will impact wetland areas around the Koostra Farm.
- Roadways impact many species through habitat loss and road kill.
- Roadway runoff pollution from will increase because of new roadway.
- Tanker wrecks with hazardous chemicals could occur on this roadway.
- The southern route would be the best route because of the terrain and how the city is growing.
- I like the fact that we were not just told what was going to happen.
- More law enforcement will be needed to patrol the new roadways.

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. The meeting ended at 9 PM.

The next public information town meeting is at 7 p.m. on October 25, 2002 at the Gott Volunteer Fire Department.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: October 25, 2002

LOCATION: Gott Volunteer Fire Department

TIME: 7:00 PM to 8:30 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES:

Jeff Moore, District 3 Planning Branch Manager - KYTC
Keirsten Jagers, District 3 Public Information Officer -KYTC
Lance Meredith, District 3 Traffic Branch Manager - KYTC
James Mosley, BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

A Public Information Town Meeting of approximately 35 residents along with staff from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on October 25, 2002 at the Gott Volunteer Fire Department in Gott, KY. The meeting was held to present information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Jeff Moore and James Mosley disseminated information packets and directed the resident's attention to the sign-in sheets. Keirsten Jagers indicated that packets could also be mailed out to the public upon request. Jeff opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. Jeff introduced Keirsten Jagers, Lance Meredith, and Greg Meredith from KYTC. He also acknowledged John Matheney and Michael Briggs of the Barren River Area Development District.

Jeff proceeded to give a brief history of the project stating it was initially funded through Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). He explained it was to be a cross-country route connecting the East Coast to the West Coast. He then described the route and interchanges from the East Coast the Kentucky region. He stated in 1991 monies were allocated to look at a study to show a need for the I-66 project. This led to identification of the Southern Kentucky Corridor as a feasible section thereof, and further to sections of independent utility (SIU) including the Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway to Natcher Parkway section that we are evaluating. He explained the Outer Beltline is a different project that started in 1972 from the Bowling Green Transportation Plan. Monies were allocated to look at I-66 and the Outer Beltline to see if they were compatible and how the roadways could work through the region. The KYTC subsequently developed a team consisting of BLA the Kentucky Geological Survey and others to explore the possibilities.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) **Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)**

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Jeff discussed the four primary goals for the project. He reiterated that the Outer Beltline is local in scope and I-66 is regional in scope. He elaborated on the access and connectivity goals. Jeff stressed the need to look at the natural and human environment. He stated KYTC is committed to not wipe out the natural features around the project but instead maintain a balance for livability. He mentioned the emergency management issues associated with the Outer Beltline and that I-66 is targeted towards regional and interstate markets.

Jeff stated the team has studied the area and looked at issues such as access, geology, natural environment etc. and has developed corridors. He utilized the exhibits to describe the corridors in detail. He mentioned that I-66 contains 23 potential routes, the Outer Beltline has 8 potential routes totaling 53 possible combinations altogether. Jeff stated KYTC held two major public meetings and subsequently teamed with the volunteer fire departments to gather more input from the public.

Environmental Overview

Tom introduced James Mosley who directed attention to the exhibits, and presented an overview of the environmental process for both projects. James discussed the different kinds of natural and human environmental issues being considered in the planning studies and the work that has been completed on the projects. He then gave examples of natural environmental considerations which included springs, sinkholes, endangered species, etc.

James described the human environment such as homes, businesses, schools, historical structures and areas, cemeteries, etc. He reassured people that we are not here to take homes or destroy unique land features. James stressed that KYTC would use avoidance, minimization, and mitigation in addressing the aforementioned environmental considerations. He stated the KYTC is continuing to conduct field reconnaissance/surveys to confirm and identify additional sites.

Public Outreach and Input

Jeff utilized the exhibits to explain the corridor alignments and used the “worm” analogy to describe their flexibility within the 2000 feet path. He described the Hadley area as a potential opportunity for an interchange. Jeff reiterated the corridors are movable and stressed that KYTC will consider all environmental concerns with a focus on avoidance. James reemphasized that public input is very important and urged them to provide comments, while the proposed corridors are in the evaluation stage. At that point the meeting was opened for questions and answers. The comments are as follows:



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Comments from the Public

- Q.** Does the Outer Beltline tie into I-66 or are they separate?
- A.** They are studied separately at first, but KYTC will look at how they could compliment and tie in together.
- Q.** Does the state have a priority on the order of the routes?
- A.** No. Hopefully the study will identify a priority order for pursuing the selected routes.
- Q.** Is there going to be limited access?
- A.** No. The planned facility will be fully controlled access, high-speed interstate with interchanges spaced appropriately to allow street access and knit the communities together.
- Q.** Will there be a concrete barrier in the median, which would limit emergency medical service access?
- A.** No. The study will look at a grassed median facility with a focus on placing interchanges to allow for better access.
- Q.** How far we into the project?
- A.** Between the long range planning and the project planning stage.
- Q.** Why not use the I-65 as connector between the Natcher and Cumberland Parkway?
- A.** That is why the build or no-build options are available. One of the focuses of this study is to determine whether additional lanes on I-65 serve to relieve traffic as opposed to diverting traffic to other routes.
- Q.** I don't want to build on my farm if you are coming through. When will I know for sure?
- A.** Jeff explained the building timelines in detail and assured there would be plenty of wiggle room. Greg Meredith stated the timeline is only an estimate and depends on the national economy and government expenditures. He stated that KYTC is studying the area and getting the information now so that in the future we will have done our homework in terms of whether its what the community wants or if its needed.
- Q.** What is happening along the other areas of I-66 outside of Bowling Green?
- A.** Jeff gave the status of the Pikeville to West Virginia section, which is currently in the design stage. The Somerset bypass is in preliminary design stage and the section crossing into Missouri is just starting in the planning stage.
- Q.** Will the project be piecemeal, build a little then stop and wait ten years and then start again?
- A.** That is why much of the existing parkway and roadways are worked into the process.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

- Q.** Did this much planning go into Cemetery Road? Cemetery Road seems to bottleneck at the cemetery, the interchange bypass and where it has various streets crossing it.
- A.** Cemetery Road project had a number of logistical concerns because it is being built along the existing Cemetery Road alignment.
- Q.** Are there any plans for the Porter Pike area?
- A.** Yes. Planning is very important to see what is feasible and to avoid a Scottsville Road situation. We need to look at off and on ramps, the length of ramps, median widths and traffic count information.
- Q.** Will they eliminate the toll on Natcher if I-66 is built?
- A.** The timetable for the tolls to expire is a part of the original bond issue. It may be scheduled to expire for the Cumberland and Natcher Parkway in 2005.
- Q.** How are folks to be compensated for losses or relocation and what is the process?
- A.** The right-of-way section of the KYTC will evaluate land and other properties therein. They will review properties utilizing a before-and-after value comparison method.
- Q.** How are cemeteries treated in the process?
- A.** Cemeteries are avoided if possible in the planning process.
- Q.** Is noise being studied?
- A.** Yes, along with historic sites, air and hazardous materials with focus on appropriate barriers for protection.
- Q.** How much consideration is given to traffic volume at various roads and intersections?
- A lot of traffic from outlying areas travels through Gott.
- A.** KYTC looks at modeling to see where it can best serve traffic flow from various towns and counties utilizing the road system.

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. James reminded them of the postage paid envelope within their packets. Jeff stated that this is a public works project with inputs from both the general public as well as elected officials. Keirsten indicated that she would coordinate with any group, church or organization that is interested in meeting with KYTC. The meeting ended at 8:30 PM.

The next public information town meeting is to be scheduled for Hadley... TBA



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, November 12, 2002

LOCATION: KYTC Planning Building, First Floor Conference Room in Frankfort, Kentucky

TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. (EST)

ATTENDEES: Jeff Moore, TEBM Planning- KYTC District 3
Daryl Greer, TEBM Planning- KYTC Central Office
David Martin, KYTC Planning- Central Office
James Simpson, KYTC Division of Highway Design
Anthony Goodman, FHWA
Tom Cervone, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Jason DuPont, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Wendy Southworth, Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc.

A meeting for the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline was held at the KYTC Planning Building in the first floor Conference Room in Frankfort on Tuesday, November 12, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. (EST). It concluded at 12:00 p.m. The purpose of this meeting was to review the Level 1 screening process for all of the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors.

Tom Cervone noted that a second Environmental Resource Agency Meeting, which was tentatively scheduled for December 5, 2002, needed to be rescheduled. He asked if Thursday, January 16, 2003 would be a good date to reschedule the meeting. It was decided that the second Environmental Resource Agency Meeting would be tentatively scheduled for January 16, 2003. Tom asked if it would be appropriate to put a date of January 31, 2003 on the survey forms as a deadline for the survey to be completed and returned to KYTC. It was agreed that a date of January 31st would be sufficient.

Tom stated that the Level One Screening has been completed for the I-66 Corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors and that there are tentatively seven I-66 Corridors remaining for consideration and four Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors remaining for consideration. Tom questioned the naming of the Corridors. He suggested naming the initial twenty-three I-66 Corridors and the eight Beltline Corridors "Level One Screening Corridors." Further the seven remaining I-66 Corridors and the four Outer Beltline Corridors would be "Level Two Screening Corridors." Jeff Moore noted that the Corridor numbers should remain the same, for example, Corridor 2 in the Level One Screening would remain Corridor 2 in the Level Two Screening and Corridor 23 in the Level One Screening would remain Corridor 23 in the Level Two Screening.

Tom noted that a meeting needed to be scheduled to discuss the initial evaluation table utilized for the screening of the Corridors. It was decided that a meeting would be scheduled for the morning of Friday, December 6, 2002 in Bowling Green at the District 3 Office. It was stated that this meeting would be a project team meeting.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

The Environmental Review Agency Meeting Agenda was discussed. It was determined that Daryl will check with Annette Coffey to see if she will speak during the introduction of the meeting, and Anthony Goodman will speak during the introduction. Tom noted that Henry Holman with Mammoth Cave National Park will be put on the agenda instead of Jim Carroll. Tom noted that the input obtained from the Environmental Review Agency Meeting and from the Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting will be utilized as part of the Level Two Screening process. It was noted that a CAG Meeting will be scheduled for the first week of February. Jeff stated that he will check on the availability of the Barren River ADD Conference Room and if it is not available, then the meeting can be held at the District 3 Office.

When discussing possible locations for Public Information Meetings, it was noted that the Train Depot Building in Bowling Green would not be available due to construction within the building. However, the Brownsville Community Center could be used as a facility for the meeting in Brownsville. It was suggested to have several smaller Public Information Meetings after the CAG Meeting. Possible locations would include Bowling Green, Richardsville, Chalybeate, Smiths Grove, Brownsville and Plano/Alvaton. It was determined that these meetings could take place within the last three weeks of February. It was questioned whether there would be enough time between the CAG Meeting and the Public Information Meetings to receive comments from the CAG members. It was stated that the CAG comments would need to be received by January 31, 2003 in order to incorporate their comments into the information presented at the Public Information Meetings.

It was stated that none of the meetings would be more important than any other. It was suggested that the meetings be informal and that a walk through of the exhibits would be greatly beneficial. The meetings would be similar to the second set of Public Information Meetings held in Bowling Green and Brownsville. Jeff Moore suggested that Keirsten Jaggars gather the mailing lists from all of the small town meetings and send out a mailing to all those on the list. Essentially the mailing would inform them of the upcoming Public Information Meetings in their area. Daryl stated that he also has a mailing list and would need to coordinate his mailing list with Keirsten's.

It was stated that the Final Corridors to be presented at the Public Information Meetings could be ready by February 10, 2003, so that the meetings could be scheduled. It was noted that the questions on the survey forms will need to be updated and modified to pertain to the Final Corridors. There would be a need to express to the Environmental Agencies that any information that they have about the Level Two Screening Corridors would need to be available as soon as possible. Any information that could eliminate or support a specific corridor would need to be available during the screening process.

It was decided that at the Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting, the twenty-three I-66 Corridors and the eight Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors will be displayed, as well as the seven I-66 Level Two Screening Corridors and the four Bowling Green Outer Beltline Level Two Screening Corridors. The Environmental Agencies, as well as the CAG members and the public will have the opportunity to comment on the seven I-66 Level Two Screening Corridors and the four Bowling Green Outer Beltline Level Two Screening Corridors. Jeff Moore suggested a meeting with



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

the Media after the CAG Meeting to update the public on the progress of the project and to advertise for the Public Meetings.

It was decided that an Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting will be held at the Mammoth Cave National Park on January 16, 2003. A Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting will be held in the first week of February, followed by a Media Meeting to be held the day after the CAG Meeting. Six Public Information Meetings will be scheduled for the last three weeks in February and they will take place in Bowling Green, Richardsville, Alvaton/Plano, Chalybeate, Smiths Grove/Oakland, and Brownsville. It was noted that a letter would be mailed to previous Public Information attendees the week after the CAG Meeting and that no survey forms would be attached with the letter. Finally, a Project Team Meeting was scheduled for December 6, 2002 at the District 3 office.

Level One Screening

Jason DuPont gave a brief overview of the forms utilized to conduct the Level One Screening analysis for the twenty-three I-66 Corridors and the eight Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors. Each sheet contains: a description of the corridor with a figure showing the corridor on a map. The advantages and disadvantages of each corridor are also displayed on this sheet along with recommendations for the corridor. The second side of the sheet screens each corridor for fatal flaws, project goals, major environmental issues, major engineering and traffic issues and public and review agency input.

Tom noted that the Level One Screening process would be documented in an appendix in each report. He continued by saying that fieldwork, professional judgement and public input were all involved in the Level One Screening of the Corridors. It was noted that the Threatened and Endangered Species information would be utilized when evaluating the corridors.

Jason DuPont explained that Corridor 1 was discarded in the Level One Screening process due to the relative distance of the Corridor from Bowling Green. The Corridor is too far from Bowling Green to influence local and regional goals for Bowling Green. Corridor 1 creates an impact on an Outstanding Water Resource, impacts more farmland and impacts Richardsville.

Corridor 2 was retained and carried on to the Level Two Screening. Jason explained that Corridor 2 provides positive access to Edmonson County and better satisfies the local and regional goals than Corridor 1 by being closer to Bowling Green. Corridor 2 has less of an impact on Richardsville and has no direct impact to the Barren River section designated as an Outstanding State Resource Water.

Corridor 3 was discarded due to the relative distance of the Corridor from Bowling Green, as a result, local and regional goals would not be met. Corridor 3 creates an impact on an Outstanding Water Resource, impacts Richardsville, and creates possible impacts on Krump's Cave System.

Jason noted that a field review was conducted with Helen Powell to review all of the corridors. As a result of the field review, a potential historic district was located along US 31W and continues east to the Warren/Barren County line. The area of the potential historic district cannot be determined until the boundaries are mapped for the historic properties. Jason stated that there are several potential



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

historic structures located on KY 1435 just north of Bowling Green on the westside of the Barren River. He noted that the corridors within this area may need to be adjusted so as to prevent an impact to the property. Jason noted that it would be difficult to move the corridors to another bend of the Barren River because of the terrain along the River.

Jason revealed that Corridor 4 would be carried to the next level of screening. This Corridor meets all local and regional goals, has the shortest length, and provides local benefits to Bowling Green while improving access to Edmonson County.

Corridor 5 was also retained and carried on to the Level Two Screening. This Corridor meets all local and regional goals and provides local benefits to Bowling Green while improving access to Edmonson County.

Corridor 6 was discarded from further evaluation because of farmland and historic issues, close proximity of interchange spacing, impacts to an Outstanding Water Resource, creates potential impact to Krump's Cave and the related cave system, and impacts to Richardsville.

Corridors 7 and 8 were discarded from further evaluation because of the close proximity of interchange spacing and the potential to impact to the Krump's Cave system.

Corridor 9 was discarded from further evaluation because of the relative distance from the Corridor to Bowling Green, which results in the failure to influence the local and regional travel needs.

Corridors 10 and 11 were carried to the next level of screening because they are expected to perform well when traffic is analyzed. Both Corridors have a relatively short length and the new terrain distance is shortened because the Corridors utilize a portion of existing I-65.

Corridor 12 was carried on to the Level Two Screening. Corridor 12 provides improvements of an existing route and it would not involve any new terrain construction. On the other hand, Corridor 12 would not eliminate local traffic through Bowling Green and has a longer total length than any of the northern corridors that were retained.

Corridors 13 and 14 were discarded from further analysis due to a long length compared to the existing route length and inefficient transport for an I-66 route.

Corridors 15 and 16 were discarded from further analysis due to an inefficient connection to existing I-65 and close proximity of interchange spacing.

Corridor 17 was discarded from further evaluation because of the close proximity of interchange spacing and increased public opposition along KY 1297.

Corridor 18 was discarded from further evaluation because of a long total length and the close proximity of interchange spacing.

Corridor 19 was discarded from further evaluation because the Corridor did not demonstrate an efficient means of transport and has a close proximity of interchange spacing.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Corridor 20, 21, and 22 were discarded from further evaluation because of public opposition along KY 1297 and the significant number of impacts to the sinkhole plain.

Corridor 23 was carried on to the Level Two Screening because it improves access to Allen County, does not greatly affect the sinkhole plain further eliminating the number of possible archaeological site impacts.

Corridor A (BGOB) was carried on to the Level Two Screening because it is the closest Beltline corridor to Bowling Green and is expected to draw the most traffic and provide the most improvements to local traffic.

Corridor B was carried on to the Level Two Screening because of its relative proximity to Bowling Green and is expected to provide significant local traffic improvements.

Corridor C was discarded from further evaluation because the northern section is too far removed from Bowling Green to have any positive local traffic impacts.

Corridor D was carried on to the Level Two Screening because of its relative proximity to Bowling Green and is expected to provide significant local traffic improvements.

Corridor E was also carried on to the Level Two Screening because of its relative proximity to Bowling Green and is expected to provide significant local traffic improvements.

Corridor F was discarded from further evaluation because it is too far removed from Bowling Green to have any positive local traffic impacts, and is the longest Beltline corridor.

Corridor G was discarded from further evaluation because the connection of the corridor at the Corvette interchange precludes the continuation of the Beltline, which does not meet the current project goals.

Corridor H was also discarded from further evaluation because the connection of the corridor at the Corvette interchange precludes the continuation of the Beltline, which does not meet the current project goals.

Following the Level One Screening review, the Project Timeline documenting project milestones and public and agency coordination was discussed. Suggested revisions for the timeline included moving the reference to the public access videos to the dateline and increasing the font size. It was identified that the first video began airing March 1, 2002, and the second video began airing August 1, 2002. Jeff stated that they anticipate the third video to be ready by February 1, 2003, and requested a revised corridor map to be used in the new video. It was also suggested to bold all of the public meeting lines. Jeff also had some additional local transportation meetings to be added to the timeline.

A comment on the Level One Screening forms was to include a general discussion of the route with the advantages and disadvantages in paragraph form instead of as bullet items.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) *(Item # 03-66.00)*
Bowling Green Outer Beltline *(Item # 03-103.00)*

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

The final discussion item was the Evaluation Matrix that will be used for the Level Two Screening. Essentially the same criteria that were presented at the public information meetings will be used. Consideration was given to identifying higher vs. lower impacts for each criteria by color coding.

The meeting concluded at 12:00 p.m.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: November 14, 2002

LOCATION: Hadley Volunteer Fire Department

TIME: 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, District 3 Chief District Engineer - KYTC
Jeff Moore, District 3 Planning Branch Manager - KYTC
Keirsten Jagers, District 3 Public Information Officer -KYTC
Tom Cervone, Project Manager – BLA
James Mosley, BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

A Public Information Town Meeting of about 60 residents from Hadley, and staff from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on November 14, 2002 at the Hadley Volunteer Fire Department in Hadley, KY. The meeting was held to present information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Keirsten Jagers opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending and introduced Jeff Moore. Jeff introduced the Hadley Fire Chief and mentioned the Air EVAC Life team would be making a presentation later in the evening. Jeff stated that KYTC is concurrently working on two separate projects: the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and the I-66 project. He explained how the exhibits illustrate the I-66 corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors. He mentioned that they initially started out as two separate studies and then KYTC later examined how the two projects may be complimentary and possibly work well together. Jeff stated that KYTC assembled a “team” consisting of the Kentucky Geological Survey, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates and the Barron River ADD to study the possibilities.

Jeff explained the first meeting focused on the area within the white diamond (study area). He stated KYTC established a set of goals for both the I-66 and the Outer Beltline projects. Jeff went on to discuss the goals for each project. Jeff then introduced Tom Cervone who passed out the information packets and referred to the comment sheets therein.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Tom discussed the importance of public involvement and referenced the meeting distribution and location exhibit. Tom stated how the first meetings were held in Bowling Green and Brownsville and then KYTC teamed with the volunteer fire departments to cover the surrounding towns and communities.

Tom referenced the Timeline Exhibit, which illustrates the different environmental, engineering and planning meetings held and their respective dates. He utilized the flip chart that listed the various issues and concerns expressed by the general public, environmental review agencies, citizens advisory group and others. Tom went on to explain the Building Steps and Timeline Exhibit and discussed the corridor maps. He indicated there were potentially 27 I-66 routes and 10 Outer Beltline routes. He stated the routes would be narrowed down to fewer corridors in the near future. Tom stated that KYTC would come back in February with a second round of meetings to illicit public comment on the remaining corridors. Tom then referenced the Project Goals Exhibit and reiterated they are two separate planning studies; however, KYTC is examining these project together to see if they are compatible with each other.

Tom appealed to the group asking for their help with identifying additional caves, cemeteries and other historical or archaeological sites. He explained that KYTC has traveled throughout the corridors to identify human and natural environmental issues. He stated however, that the consultants did not travel onto private property unless invited by the owners. Tom urged the group to open their information packets and reviewed the comment sheets and corridor maps. He highlighted the Planning Study Overview and Timeline sheets and showed how they correlated to the exhibits along the room. He stressed the importance of reading the information and providing comments in the envelopes therein. He went on to say that the KYTC team is trying to learn more about the corridors and stressed the importance of the public's input.

Environmental Overview

Tom introduced James Mosley who directed attention to the exhibits, and presented an overview of the environmental process for both projects. James discussed the different kinds of natural and human environmental issues being considered in the planning studies and the work that's been completed on the projects. James used the exhibits to illustrate the potential environmental issues concerning the project. He talked about the types of environmental issues that would need to be addressed and how they may or may not affect the project.

James then gave examples of natural environmental considerations which included springs, sinkholes, endangered species, etc. He also described the human environment such as homes, businesses, schools, historical structures and areas, cemeteries, etc. He reassured attendees that KYTC is not here to take homes or destroy unique land features. James stated that KYTC would use avoidance, minimization, and mitigation in addressing the aforementioned environmental considerations.

James illustrated the completed activities which included the location and plotting of the preliminary corridors, data collection, and GIS plotting of sites onto the corridor maps. James stated that the KYTC is continuing to conduct field reconnaissance/surveys to confirm and



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

identify additional sites. James emphasized that the public's input is very important and urged the group to provide comments, while the proposed corridors are in the evaluation stage.

Public Outreach and Input

Jeff indicated the corridors are 2000 feet wide, which allows wiggle room for avoidance. He stressed the need to get input from the public relative to the corridors. He stated how the Richardsville and Barren River area folks have to travel to Bowling Green first in order to coordinate their community-based initiatives. Jeff followed that this is a prime example of an access issue. Jeff stated that many concerns expressed from earlier public meetings centered on safety and access. At that point the KYTC opened the floor for questions and answers. The comments are as follows:

Comments/Questions from the Public

- Q** Although the 2000 feet wide corridors are needed I feel like it divides the area and can serve to be disruptive and what about the ITA project?
- A** Jeff responded if corridors divide the area we would study to see how to avoid minimize or adjust them by hearing and addressing public concerns, and that the process for evaluating I-66/Outer Beltline corridors was not similar to the process for the development of ITA. There were no foregone conclusions. Tom stated that he appreciated the question and realizes its sensitivity. He went on to explain the no-build option and encouraged that the residents consider it. Consider if the existing I-65 with eight lanes would serve to take traffic off other routes or improve access.
- Q** Are those red lines on the map going to wipe out our little communities?
- A** Jeff indicated that KYTC investigates and identifies areas of concerns with a focus on your input. He stated KYTC has identified the sink hole plains and the escarpment area and placed 1,000 feet buffers around communities and sensitive areas. KYTC also moved the proposed route to avoid Richardsville because of comments received. Additionally, they have placed 800 feet buffers around historic sites, caves, cemeteries and other sites. Jeff stated that KYTC is not perfect but with your help we can get better information.
- Q** Are buffers placed around bluffs too and will tolls or increased taxes be used to pay for the new roads?
- A** It depends on where it has to go. Greg Meredith indicated generally interstate highways such as I-66 are not tolled because because it could serve to discourage folks from using them.
- Q** How about cemeteries do you relocate them?
- A** Yes if necessary, but we prefer not to.
- Q** Will traffic studies be completed before the corridors are reduced?
- A** Yes, because we would have to know this information to make informed decisions. There are three screening levels and each will require input and comments from the public.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Q Does access consider traffic flow with a focus on connections?

A Yes, we don't want to be too far out or too close but we will consider all those issues that will reflect the best routes and be consistent with the four project goals.

Q What is a buffer?

A It is a stay-away zone or no-play zone.

Q What are you going to do about straightening out the infamous Hadley Hill area on US 231?

A Greg Meredith stated that KYTC has spent \$70,000 on a design study placed within the Six Year Road Plan's Hazard Elimination System (HES). He explained the HES monies are utilized for quick fixes with a maximum of 1.5 million or less. He stated that KYTC has looked at the Hadley Hill situation and found the monies, however, construction may not start until the end of next year.

Q Will US 231 at Hadley Hill be straight once the project is finished?

A No, not straight as an arrow because that would cost over 5 million dollars. However, it will be improved with the 1.5 million dollars allocated for the project.

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. The meeting ended at 9 PM.

The next public information town meeting is at 7 p.m. on November 21, 2002 at the Smith's Grove's new city government building.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: November 21, 2002

LOCATION: Smith's Grove City Hall Building

TIME: 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES:

Keirsten Jagers, District 3 Public Information Officer -KYTC
Lance Meredith, District 3 Traffic Branch Manager - KYTC
Tom Cervone, Project Manager – BLA
James Mosley, BLA
(Sign-in sheet attached)

A Public Information Town Meeting of about 40 residents from Smith's Grove, and staff from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on November 21, 2002 at the Smith's Grove City Hall Building in Smith's Grove, KY. The meeting was held to present information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

Introduction: Public Outreach and Input

Keirsten Jagers introduced Lance Meredith of KYTC, Tom Cervone and James Mosley of BLA. She also acknowledged John Matheney and Michael Briggs of the Barren River Area Development District. She stated that BLA would give an overview of the I-66 and Outer Beltline planning projects. Keirsten disseminated the information packets and explained the information therein and urged the group to review it. She then introduced Tom Cervone of BLA.

Tom went on to discuss the materials found within the information packets including the fold-out map/comment sheet, Steps and Timeline and the "Citizen's Guide on Decision Making". He referenced the foldout maps and explained the purpose of the corridor lines and reviewed the project goals. He stated both projects are in the planning stage and the KYTC team is here to talk about the project and to listen to what the public has to say. Tom appealed to the group asking for their help with identifying additional caves, cemeteries and other historical or archaeological sites. He discussed the survey forms and mentioned that comments can be made on each project separately.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Introduction: Public Outreach and Input (cont.)

Tom referenced the Project exhibits and delineated the proposed routes. He pointed out the cities, knobs, caves, and historic/old homes along the corridors. He mentioned that KYTC placed 800 to 1,000 feet buffers around these sites. He stated that KYTC have assembled a team consisting of Helen Powell (historian), Western Kentucky University, Kentucky Geological Survey, BLA and others to look at the corridors within the diamond (study area). He illustrated where changes were made to the Richardsville alignment because of input based on traffic concerns.

I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Tom reiterated the two projects are planning studies and KYTC's focus is on doing the homework up front. He proceeded to give a brief history of the projects stating I-66 was initially proposed as a cross-country route connecting the East Coast to the West Coast. He briefly described the route in the Kentucky region. He explained that the Outer Beltline is a different project, originally identified in the 1972 Bowling Green Transportation Plan.

Tom went on to discuss both Build and No-Build options. Tom stated I-65 currently carries 30,000 to 40,000 cars daily and has approved right a way for four lanes on each side. He urged the audience to look at and weigh all the options carefully. He stated the options will be narrowed down in the future and KYTC will return with Level 2 screening routes. Input on those routes will be obtained from six different public meetings. Tom stressed that planning, input and planning is the order of the process.

Environmental Overview

Tom introduced James Mosley who directed attention to the exhibits, and presented an overview of the environmental process for both projects. James discussed the different kinds of natural and human environmental issues being considered in the planning studies and the work that has been completed on the projects. James asked the audience to please help the team identify caves, cemeteries, old homes, historic properties, endangered species and groundwater concerns. He stated that there are many issues in the area and urged the group to please help identify them.

James then gave examples of natural environmental considerations which included springs, sinkholes, endangered species, etc. He also described the human environment such as homes, businesses, schools, historical structures and areas, cemeteries, etc. He reassured attendees that KYTC is not here to take homes or destroy unique land features. James stated that KYTC would use avoidance, minimization, and mitigation in addressing the aforementioned environmental considerations.



Environmental Overview (cont.)

James stated that the completed activities included the location and plotting of the preliminary corridors, data collection, and GIS plotting of sites onto the corridor maps. James stated that the KYTC is continuing to conduct field reconnaissance/surveys to confirm and identify additional sites. James reemphasized that the public's input is very important and urged them to provide comments, while the proposed corridors are in the evaluation stage.

Comments/Questions from the Public

Q How much affect will the Transpark have on the corridors in this area?

A BLA looks at the Transpark as a traffic generator and would examine it from a traffic modeling standpoint based on existing, proposed and projected traffic volumes. For example the development of a large factory with lots of traffic coming and going is to be treated as a different function separate from the I-66 projects.

Q How far into the future will traffic information be projected?

A Approximately 30 years. Statewide and Bowling Green models are also used to project traffic patterns.

Q What is the timeline for the next round of public meetings?

A Kiersten explained the second round of meetings would consist of six meetings in six different locations and the times may vary. The findings will then go to the environmental review agencies and at the end of February KYTC will again illicit comments to further narrow down the routes. She stated that we are in the project planning stage and no additional funding has been approved at the current time.

Q Does the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provide a 9 to 1 match for interstate new construction?

A Not certain must defer that question to the FHWA.

Q The KY 101 project is in the planning stage and could be designed and finished before I-66. Will this be considered as part of the I-66 study?

A Yes, in fact there are three different projects currently on-going. The feasibility study of improvements to KY 259 from the Nunn Parkway to Pig. The KY 101 project study at Smith's Grove. Thirdly, a new interchange on I-65 and connector route to US 31W near the proposed Transpark.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Additional Comments

- We would like to see more crossovers along the interstates.
- The gas line on the map extends all the way to Smith's Grove and can be seen as Little Knob Road crosses KY 101
- If access could be connected to KY 259 it would greatly benefit Smith's Grove because accidents cause the city to shut down due to traffic backup.

Concluding Remarks

KYTC and BLA requested that the public provide comments on the two projects using the survey forms in their packets. The meeting ended at 9 PM.

The next round of public information town meetings is scheduled for the month of February. Times and locations will be announced at a later date.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Friday, December 6, 2002

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Conference Room

TIME: 9:00 a.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, Chief District Engineer- KYTC District 3
Jeff Moore, TEBM for Planning- KYTC District 3
Renee Slaughter, Environmental Coordinator-KYTC District 3
Kenneth Cox, KYTC District 3-Preconstruction
Keirsten Jagers, KYTC District 3, Public Information Officer
Daryl Greer, TEBM for Planning-KYTC Division of Planning
David Martin, KYTC Division of Planning
Michael Briggs, Barren River ADD
Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey
Tom Cervone, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Kent Ahrenholtz, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Jason DuPont, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Wendy Southworth, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.

A Project Team Meeting for the subject projects was held in the KYTC District 3 Conference Room in Bowling Green on Friday, December 6, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. (CST). This meeting provided an opportunity to review the progress of Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc. (BLA) since the last Project Team Meeting, discuss the Level One Screening of Preliminary Corridors and discuss the Level Two Screening for the Final Corridors. An agenda for the meeting is attached.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

The meeting began with Daryl Greer explaining that the purpose of this meeting is to review information that is to be presented to the Environmental Agencies on January 16th, 2003 and to the Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) in the first week of February. Daryl then turned the meeting over to Tom Cervone to discuss the status of the project.

Project Status

Tom Cervone stated that with the completion of the Town Meetings held in various locations, the Level One Screening of the Preliminary Corridors has, likewise, been completed. As a part of the Level Two Screening, Tom noted that several environmental field studies have been completed,



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

including a field study with Helen Powell to review potential historic properties and potential historic districts. Tom stated that local residents have also been very helpful when conducting the field studies. He commented on the amount of effort that has been put forth for the Town Meetings. The meetings provided BLA with the opportunity to build relationships with the people of the communities. Many individuals contributed a great deal of information while in the field which may not have been known otherwise. Tom explained that these relationships made it possible for BLA to call on these people when information was needed about the area. For example, Willis Grimes located a substation for BLA that is located along KY 185.

Tom explained that at the previous Project Team Meeting the twenty-three Preliminary I-66 Corridors were tentatively narrowed down to ten corridors and the eight Preliminary Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors were tentatively narrowed down to four corridors. Tom stated that after the completion of the Level One Screening of the Preliminary Corridors, BLA has narrowed the I-66 Corridors down to seven corridors and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors down to four corridors.

Overview of Upcoming Meetings

Tom noted that the Second Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting has been scheduled for January 16, 2003. It is important that all agencies receive a packet of information before the meeting therefore, all information needs to be ready by December 13, 2002. The packet of information should include: a revised agenda for the meeting, Project Overview for each project, Evaluation Process document, Level One Screening forms for both projects, assumptions for the Level Two Screening of the Corridors, the Level Two Screening Impact Matrix Table for each project and maps of each project. In order to begin the Level Two Screening process of the remaining corridors, it would be necessary to get a response from the Environmental Agencies, the Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG) members and the Public.

The Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting agenda was discussed. Tom noted that he had talked with Henry Holman with Mammoth Cave National Park. Mr. Holman informed Tom that he would be attending the Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting in January.

Jeff Moore stated that a media meeting (Press Conference) needs to be scheduled for the day after the CAG Meeting.

When discussing the format for the Public Information Meetings, it was questioned whether the meetings would include a presentation or open-format discussion of the subject projects. Jeff noted that the meetings would most likely take place from 4:00 to 7:00 in the evening. He suggested having the video showing with a round-about format for the exhibits. Something similar to the Public Information Meetings which took place on August 14th and August 15th in Bowling Green and Brownsville respectively.

It was concluded that the Public Information Meetings would take place in six different areas. The locations include Richardsville, Chalybeate, Plano/Alvaton, Red Cross, Smiths



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Grove/Oakland, and Bowling Green. It was suggested to have three meetings a week for two weeks when scheduling the meetings.

When discussing the surveys, which would be given out at the Public Information Meetings, it was questioned whether the public would be choosing a preferred Corridor or if they would just rank the Corridors. It was stated that it would be important to include that the No-Build is still an option on the survey. It was decided that the survey will show check boxes for the seven I-66 Corridors with a no-build option and the four Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors with a no-build option. It was noted that, each survey should indicate which meeting the survey was intended for so that when the surveys begin to come in the mail, it will be evident which meeting the recipient attended. It was concluded that the survey form for the CAG Meeting will also be organized in this manner.

Level 1 Screening

Kent Ahrenholtz explained that a Level 1 Screening form was utilized to evaluate each of the twenty-three I-66 Corridors and the eight Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors. The form based evaluation on five specific areas. These areas included: fatal flaws; project goals; environmental issues; engineering issues; and constructability issues. Kent noted that, essentially the forms resulted in elimination of the same Corridors, as were eliminated at the October 21, 2002 Project Team Meeting held in Bowling Green. Kent stated that the Corridors along KY 1297 (Corridors 20, 21, and 22) remained after the Project Team Meeting held in October, but were eliminated after the Level 1 Screening. As a result, there were only seven I-66 Corridors remaining after the Level 1 Screening compared to ten I-66 Corridors after the October 21, 2002 Project Team Meeting.

Kent explained that any Corridor longer than a Corridor going along the existing routes was eliminated. Kent noted that a Corridor was added prior to the Level 1 Screening. Corridor 23 which begins at the Cumberland Parkway and traverses south of Corridors 20, 21, and 22 to lessen the impact on the sinkhole plain and further any environmental issues or karst issues associated with the sinkhole plain. Since there was much opposition to a Corridor along KY 1297, Corridor 23 was developed to limit any impacts to the existing KY 1297 facility. Kent noted that this Corridor is supported by the Project Team geologist and archaeologist.

Tom Cervone noted that, based on coordination with many people within the project area, the location of a large number of caves have been determined in this area. These cave locations were, further, utilized to aid in the evaluation of the Level 1 Screening Corridors.

Level 2 Screening

Kent Ahrenholtz directed the Team's attention to an Evaluation Process handout and asked if this document should be included in the packet to be sent to the agencies involved in the Agency Coordination Meeting. It was determined that the handout should be included in the packet and Jeff Moore suggested that it be made as a display for the next set of Public Meetings and the video. Jeff requested that the handout back up one step to include the GIS (Study Area) information.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

It was noted that within the Level 2 Screening of the Corridors, several Corridors were shifted to avoid historic properties for Corridors 5 and 11. A historic district is also located within these Corridors. At a Public Information Meeting in Brownsville, a local resident located a new subdivision close to Chalybeate, therefore, the Corridors were shifted to the south to avoid the subdivision. A local resident in the Billy Goat Hill Area suggested staying on a ridge to minimize relocations and to avoid Pruitt Salt Cave and another cave in the area. This modification resulted in a slight shift of Corridor 2. The potential location of the interchange with the Natcher Parkway at Hadley was modified. The Corridors were shifted south towards Bowling Green, which eliminated a bridge crossing of the Gasper River. The proposed I-65/I-66 interchange was also shifted to avoid an existing rest area. In order to comply with the two mile spacing between interchanges, the interchange is located between the Sunnyside-Gott Road Bridge and the existing rest area. Kent noted that the Sunnyside-Gott Road Bridge could have to be modified because of the interchange ramps. Corridors 10, 11, A, B, D, and E were shifted east to avoid the Transpark property and shifted north to avoid a rock quarry. Corridors 2, 4, and 5 were shifted north and south to avoid a potential historic property.

Kenneth Cox asked what typical section would be utilized for I-66 and the Outer Beltline and what would be the width of the median. Kent Ahrenholtz added that a typical section will not be shown in any of the final reports. Kent noted that it was not necessary to limit the typical section that could be used for the facility, thus, resulting in more flexibility. This is more important with the Bowling Green Outer Beltline, for instance, where we may want to use a typical section similar to a parkway.

Kent stated that more realistic Corridors were utilized for the Level 2 Screening analysis. For instance, a 400 foot Corridor (200 feet from the center on each side) was used for the analysis. Locations of all interchanges or grade separations are shown on the 11 inch by 17 inch maps located in the handout. Kent noted that the public input was a tremendous help when determining the interchange locations.

Improvements to the Natcher Parkway and the Nunn Parkway have not been accounted for, nor are they addressed in the cost estimates. At some point, reconstruction of the Parkways to Interstate standards may be necessary to accommodate future traffic needs, but will not be included in this stage of the project development due to the scope of the project. All cost estimates shown in the handout begin at the Nunn Parkway and end at the Natcher Parkway. The additional traffic and its effect on the Parkways, however, will be addressed within the report for the two projects.

Kent noted that, where I-66 is coincident with I-65, cost estimates reflect the utilization of a 10 lane facility. Further, it was assumed that the recently completed construction will not be reconstructed, instead, any additional lanes will be added to the current facility although, existing interchanges will need to be reconstructed. Estimated bridge costs for the Barren River and Drakes Fork included bridging over the entire floodplain.

Kent explained that engineering considerations were accounted for within the Level 2 Screening analysis. Corridor 12 and Corridor 23 had the lowest estimated cost per mile, while Corridor 2



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

and Corridor 10 had the highest estimated cost per mile. In reference to a handout summarizing the Level 2 Screening, Kent noted that the red highlighted areas mean high and the green highlighted areas mean low. When determining the maintenance of traffic during construction, the estimated costs were associated with the length of the Corridors located along existing I-65. When determining the constructability of the Corridors, the type of terrain was examined. For example, those portions of the Corridors located within the sinkhole plain were labeled as flat terrain, those portions located along the escarpment were labeled as rolling terrain, and those portions located north and west of Bowling Green were labeled as mountainous terrain.

As far as the Bowling Green Outer Beltline was concerned, Corridor A has the lowest estimated cost and Corridors B and E have the highest estimated costs. The maintenance of traffic for all of the Beltline Corridors is low because they are all new locations. The constructability of the Beltline Corridors was, like the I-66 Corridors, based on terrain.

Kent noted that the next step of analysis is to pull together all possible combinations of I-66 Corridors and Beltline Corridors.

Kent stated that most costs were based on a cost per mile ratio, except for bridges, which were based on the square footage of the bridges. The cost estimates were based on other related projects, input from Daryl Greer's staff, and unit bid costs. The estimated costs are shown in 2002 dollars and the projected cost estimates would be based on the certain percent increase per year.

David Ripple discussed the traffic considerations for the Level 2 Screening Corridors. He noted that the new regional traffic model was utilized for Corridors 4 and 7 to reflect interchanges. David stated that the combination I-66 and Beltline Corridors had not yet been analyzed using the regional traffic model. David noted that Corridor 12 will need to be a 10 lane facility if it is to remain at Level of Service (LOS) C.

In reference to the traffic analysis handout, David noted that all the numbers in the table are based on the utilization of the higher growth forecast. It was noted that the utilization of the higher growth forecast should be put into the assumptions. Also included on the table, are two different growth forecasts for the traffic modeling. David stated that, generally, anytime a Corridor was closer to Bowling Green, the better the Corridor performed on the basis of traffic. Corridor A performed best when all of the Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridors were analyzed. David noted that both the I-66 project and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline project had a positive effect on traffic in the regional area meaning that congestion was relieved within the Bowling Green area. He noted that "vehicle hours of travel" (VHT) is the best representation of congestion and that "vehicle miles of travel" (VMT) is an indication of the directness of the individual corridors. When analyzing VHT and VMT, you want those values to be less than the values of the E + C Conditions. The E + C Conditions are represented by the existing plus the committed network of projects. David noted that it is important to consider how the traffic is being converted to a new facility when the VHT are examined for Warren and Edmonson Counties.

David explained that Corridor 23 does the best job of diverting traffic from I-65. This Corridor has a relatively high average volume. Corridor A does the best job in pulling down traffic from I-



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

65 to I-66 and reducing traffic from the highest volume segment. The highest volume segment for Corridors A and D is between KY 185 and KY 526. Further, the highest volume segment for Corridors B and E is between US 31W and KY 185 because of the Transpark development within these Corridors. David noted that the residential areas do not generate as many vehicle trips as a commercial or industrial area.

Jason DuPont began discussion on the Environmental Considerations for the Level 2 Screening. Jason referred to the Level 2 Screening handout when discussing the environmental considerations for the Corridors. Jason noted that water quality played an enormous role in the development of the Corridors and in the evaluation of the Corridors. There is a high rate of impact for Corridors 4 and 5, due to the Corridors placement within the sinkhole plain. Jason continued by saying, Corridor 23 has less of an effect on the Barren River than any of the other Corridors.

Jason stated that coordination with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is still ongoing as far as the critical habitats are concerned. Jason noted that there is a high probability of effecting archaeological sites along the Barren River, and, further, high probability of effecting historical sites from the Smiths Grove/Oakland area to the north and west and potentially a historic district. Jason noted a registered historic property has been located on KY 185, thus, Corridors 2, 4, and 10 have been slightly shifted to avoid this property. There are also three or four different properties potentially eligible for the National Register on the west side of the Barren River, thus, Corridors 5 and 11 have been slightly modified. Jason stated that coordination with the NRCS has been made to obtain the Prime Farmland maps for the project area. Corridors 2, 4, and 10 had the highest impact to forested land.

Also evaluated within the Level 2 Screening process, were environmental justice issues. Jason noted that, areas were mapped based on census data and identify concentrations of populations in poverty and minorities to determine where potential environmental justice issues may arise. The mapping revealed that the Red Cross area is impacted more than any of the other areas. Jason stated that a low income area was discovered and located as a trailer park just north of US 31W west of Corridors 10, 11, A, B, D, and E.

Jason noted that sinkhole information was provided by Jerry Weisenfluh with the Kentucky Geological Survey. It was stated that Corridors 4 and 5 impacted a very large sinkhole complex northeast of Bowling Green. Jason stated that the number of caves shown on the handout represents the number of openings to the caves.

Jason noted that a bicycle route was identified, but not a significant criteria when discussing the environmental considerations of the projects because it did not include any dedicated facilities.

Jason stated that the records on mussel beds is currently being looked into further, but that it seems that Corridors A and D could cause an impact at the Barren River crossing.

It was noted that, for the Public Information Meetings, a preferred Corridor will not be illustrated or recommended. David Ripple stated that the traffic modeling will be complete for the combination Corridors for the Agency Coordination Meeting in January.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Several comments were made concerning the exhibits. These comments include: showing the railroad on the exhibits, extending the Corridor numbers along the Nunn Parkway and the Natcher Parkway, and shading the Parkways different colors. Kent noted that these exhibits will be updated and shown to Daryl next week.

Keirsten Jagers revealed the preliminary schedule for the Public Information Meetings. She stated that the Public Information Meetings will take place in Bowling Green on February 12, 2003 at the Warren East High School; Richardsville on February 11, 2003 at the Richardsville Fire Department; Plano/Alvaton meeting on February 19, 2003 at the Alvaton Fire Station #3; Chalybeate on February 18, 2003 at the Chalybeate Fire Department; Red Cross on February 20, 2003 at the Red Cross Elementary School; and Oakland/Smiths Grove on February 13, 2003 at the Fire Department.

Jeff Moore noted that he will check on a date for the availability of the District office to schedule the next Citizens Advisory Group Meeting. He noted that the tentative date will be Tuesday, February 4, 2003 from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm (CST).

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm (CST).



CITIZENS' ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, February 4, 2003

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Conference Room

TIME: 6:00 p.m. (CST)

ATTENDEES: John Blubaugh, KICK-66
Henry Holman, Mammoth Cave National Park
Janet Dennison, Edmonson County
John W. Smith, Smiths Grove
Eric Larson, Bowling Green/Warren County Planning Commission
Joey Roberts, Warren County Citizens for Managed Growth
James Tabor, Bowling Green
Trisha Lawrence, Inter-Modal Transportation Authority
Michael Briggs, BRADD
Keirsten Jagers, KYTC – Information Officer, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC -- Division of Planning, District 3
James Simpson, KYTC – Central Office Design
Daryl Greer, KYTC -- Division of Planning
Carl Dixon, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Kent Ahrenholtz, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.
Jason DuPont, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, Inc.

The last meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Group (CAG) was held in the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet's Highway District 3 conference room on February 4, 2003. The purpose of the meeting was to review the work that had been done since the last CAG meeting and to present the results of the Level 1 and Level 2 screening of corridor alternatives.

Introduction. Jeff Moore, Branch Manager for Planning, Highway District 3, KYTC, convened the meeting at 6:15 p.m. He welcomed all present and, at his request, the attendees introduced themselves. He reviewed the agenda for the meeting and explained that there were three purposes for the meeting:

- (1) Solicit help from the CAG to promote the upcoming public meetings later in the month
- (2) Update the CAG on the study progress and findings to date; and
- (3) Serve as a forum for information exchange.

He then gave a brief review of the history and description of the two proposed projects, I-66 and the Bowling Green Outer Beltline.

Jeff Moore then reviewed some of the work completed to date:



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

- Project goals have been established;
- Data and information on existing conditions of local roadways and the environment have been gathered;
- Alternate corridors have been developed, using 2000-foot wide corridors, except for alternates along I-65 which used 400-foot wide corridors;
- An environmental overview has been developed and agency coordination meetings have been held with Federal, state, and local resource agencies to present the findings and get input; and
- Public information meetings were held at key points in the planning process.

Public Involvement Process. Jeff Moore said that the latest round of public meetings resulted in the return of 56 survey forms for I-66 and 37 forms for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline. Generally, this input was related to project goals, issues and impacts, and suggested alternates. In addition, a petition was received from residents on KY 1297 concerning one of the I-66 southern alternates that seemed to be located directly along that highway. This resulted in a shifting of the alternate away from KY 1297.

Jeff Moore said that, after the public meetings, the Project Team was concerned that the public involvement process was not reaching enough people. After a special meeting with emergency service officials, several local Fire Departments offered to host public meetings in some of the communities in the area. As a result, public meetings were held at eight fire department buildings in Warren, Edmonson, and Barren Counties. Another special public information effort involved project presentations that he made to an elementary school class, after which the students were asked to take a survey form home and get input from their parent(s) or guardian(s). Several completed survey forms were returned. Each student who returned a survey form was rewarded with a certificate. These extra efforts provided the Project Team with new information and insight.

Project Goals. Jeff Moore then presented and reviewed the project goals for the two projects. He said that some changes to the goals had been made since the CAG had last seen them. This was the result of public input and further review by the Project Team. He noted a couple of the changes: first, access to health was found to be an important issue; and, second, a goal was added that addressed safety, congestion, and access. He said that the goals for the Outer Beltline were similar, but they were more regional in nature than those for I-66.

Accomplishments. Kent Ahrenholtz of Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates then reviewed the study accomplishments. He discussed the changes in the study area and presented the environmental overview map. He noted that two rounds of public information meetings have been held so far, and the third set of meetings is coming up. He talked about coordination with environmental review agencies and highlighted some of their input. He described the field reviews and literature reviews that had been done to gather information, as well as additional information gathered through public input. He talked about the development of the preliminary corridors, indicating that these corridors had now been evaluated and had undergone a Level 1 screening process to reduce the number of I-66 and Outer Beltline alternates.

Kent Ahrenholtz gave a brief description of the screening process, referring to handouts in the meeting folder that showed the qualitative screening criteria for five different areas of interest. The



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

object is to reduce the number of alternates that should be considered in future phases to a more manageable size. He said that the Level 1 screening has been done, and he referred to the explanation included for all alternates in the handouts for each project. He said that the Project Team is now in the middle of the Level 2 Screening to reduce the number of alternates further, based on more detailed information. He referred to the colored tables in the handouts showing the data that had been put together to accomplish this purpose. He said that the results of the Level 2 screening will not be finalized until further input is received from the Advisory Committee and from the upcoming public meetings.

Kent Ahrenholtz said that coordination had been done using results of the environmental studies and coordination with environmental resource agencies. The information used in the screening process had been shown to the resource agencies. In some cases, additional input had been provided, and there had then been a cursory review of the input to validate the information and the location for each issue.

Kent Ahrenholtz then reviewed public involvement activities. He noted that the last CAG meeting had been held in July 2002. Public information meetings were held in August 2002. A special meeting was also held with emergency services officials, and this had led to individual community meetings at eight Fire Station locations in the region in September thru November 2002. He also said that numerous special meetings had been held with many groups throughout the region. He told about the presentations made by Jeff Moore to a 3rd grade class and civic organizations as well as information booths at local events. He said that the students from the class had then been given a homework assignment to take information about the two projects, along with a survey form that they were required to return. Information was also received from other organizations. He reminded everyone of the next set of public meetings to be held at six locations in the area on February 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, and 20.

Kent Ahrenholtz told the CAG about the two agency coordination meetings that had been held with Federal, state, and local resource agencies, one in May 2002 and the second in January 2003. He noted that letters had been sent to all of these agencies asking for input on the corridor alternates. He said that, so far, 16 letters had been received and that the study team was awaiting further comments from others.

Kent Ahrenholtz pointed out that preliminary alternate corridors were developed for each of the projects last year, and these had been presented to the CAG in the July 2002 meeting. He showed a map of the corridors and told the group that the corridor locations had continued to be tweaked to minimize impacts as they became known. He said that, as a result of the public meetings in August 2002, two new alternates were added, one directly from Glasgow to I-65 south of Bowling Green and one to provide a connector from the northernmost corridor to the one immediately below it. He told the CAG that the southeast corridor from Glasgow initially followed along KY 1297, but after a petition opposing this was received, the corridor was moved to the south to avoid direct impacts to the KY 1297 area.

Kent Ahrenholtz referred the CAG members to the handouts of the corridors and the screening process. He reviewed the process that had been used for the Level 1 screening. He also called attention to the handouts showing the data that would be used in the Level 2 screening. He asked



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

those present to look over the assumptions and methodology and to provide comments on the Level 1 and Level 2 screening process, either now or sometime after the meeting. He noted that there were primary issues used in the Level 1 screening of the “build” alternates. The first was constructability, for example, problems associated with crossing the Barren River. The second was length, since one of the main considerations was travel time and distance. The third was the rugged terrain encountered with some of the alternates. He mentioned that cost is also a major factor, since the higher the cost, the more difficult it would be to find enough funds to complete the projects. He then turned the meeting over to Dave Ripple to discuss Traffic Analysis.

Traffic Analysis. Dave Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, explained that the traffic modeling for the two projects had used a Base Year of 2000 and forecasts were being prepared for the year 2030. In making the traffic forecasts, he said that he had relied on the Kentucky Statewide Traffic Model, prepared before the 2000 Census. This data was supplemented by official population forecasts prepared by the State Data Center after the 2000 Census.

Dave Ripple said that one of the key components of the traffic model is the representation of the highway network. He said that the base network consists of what is called the Existing Plus Committed (E+C) Network, used in making traffic assignments on the highway system. He said that this includes all existing major roads in the region plus those that are already programmed for future improvement in the study period. Therefore, the E+C network would include such things as the widening of I-65 and US31W, as well as the KY 234 and KY 880 projects. The E+C network also represents the highway network for the “No Build” alternate.

Dave Ripple then presented some of the results of the analysis, referring to the handouts in the meeting information packet, indicating that the traffic analysis would look at both the Build and No Build options. He said that the analysis shows that, under the No Build scenario, I-65 would become very congested, as would US 31W and US 231. He said that population growth is expected to occur in the South and Southeast of the Bowling Green area, using the High Forecast scenario. He said that employment growth is expected to occur along I-65, Scottsville Road (US 231), and Nashville Road (US31W), again using the High Forecast scenario. He noted that the High Forecast scenario used in the analysis is consistent with the forecasts of the State Data Center.

Dave Ripple then summarized the results of the analysis from a transportation perspective identifying that Corridor 11 was the best performer relative to all of the goals for I-66, with Corridors 23 and 5 also being good performers. Corridor 2, the northern-most corridor, was the worst performer relative to the traffic goals. For the Outer Beltline, he identified that the corridors closer to Bowling Green performed better, with Corridor A being the best performer. He identified that Corridor E was the worst performer of the Outer Beltline corridors. Dave also stated that the final analysis would look at the performance of the I-66 and Outer Beltline corridors in combination.

Environmental Analysis. Jason DuPont, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates, identified that many environmental issues were evaluated, including both natural and human environmental issues. He gave some examples of issues evaluated which included: river crossings, water quality, threatened and endangered species, environmental justice, residential and commercial relocations, karst geology, and cultural resources. He explained that the evaluation included input from environmental review agencies, general public and information gathered through GIS data research and windshield



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

surveys of the corridors. The windshield surveys were conducted to gather supplemental data as well as check and update information gathered from other sources.

Jason DuPont then reviewed some of the major areas of concern within the study area. These included the sinkhole plain and associated water quality concerns, mussel beds containing endangered species in the Barren River north of Bowling Green, endangered bats associated with caves and forested portions of the study area, potential historic districts north of Smiths Grove and Oakland extending west to US31W and north of Bowling Green on KY1435, and prime farmland north and west of Smiths Grove and Oakland.

Jason DuPont identified that the corridors with the fewest environmental impacts included those which utilized existing roadways as much as possible. These corridors are 10, 11 and 12 for I-66, which utilize all or a portion of I-65 between the Natcher and Nunn Parkways. He identified that the potential impacts for the Outer Beltline corridors were very similar and that the shorter corridors had fewer impacts. He stated that Corridor A, the shortest Outer Beltline corridor had the fewest potential environmental impacts and that Corridor E the longest corridor had the most potential impacts.

Additional Evaluation. Kent Ahrenholtz then stated that the evaluation of these corridors is ongoing and that the final step in the evaluation will include looking at how the two projects work together. The preliminary findings of this evaluation show that I-66 Corridors 2 and 23 include only very short segments that would coincide with the Outer Beltline, which would result in increased overall corridor length as well as increased cost and impacts. Conversely, I-66 Corridors 10 and 11 incorporate the longest coincidental segments with the Outer Beltline and result in the shortest overall length.

Open Discussion. Daryl Greer then opened the meeting for questions and discussion by the CAG members.

John Blubaugh stated that he was concerned about proceeding without sufficient socio-economic data, and questioned how the current state of the economy would be affecting the project.

Jeff Moore stated that no future phases for the project are scheduled or funded at this time. Daryl Greer added that the KYTC is currently waiting on legislative action to appropriate funding for general operation including maintenance and new project development. Daryl added that with the current state of the economy, future funding for the projects is unknown.

Joey Roberts asked about the Mayor's commitment to move the corridor through the Transpark property between US31W and US68/KY80 in the rezoning hearing for the property.

Jeff Moore stated that the KYTC has coordinated with the Transpark representatives regarding the location of the corridor through their potential development area and there have been no problems with the location.

John Smith asked about the designation of the Parkways as interstate to receive federal funds for them.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Daryl Greer identified that exactly what would be done in relation to the Parkways for I-66 has not been determined at this point. Daryl added that the Parkways do receive some federal funding currently.

Joey Roberts asked about getting the maps of the corridors on the website.

Daryl Greer stated that the maps were on the website and described the links that direct you to the maps.

John Smith questioned who is responsible for advising planning and zoning boards about pending projects.

Jeff Moore indicated that he and others from the KYTC District 3 Office coordinate with planning and zoning boards about future projects. However, the state has no power to reserve a corridor in situations such as the golf course.

Conclusion. Daryl Greer closed the meeting by thanking everyone for their input and work on the projects and reviewed the final tasks that would be completed including the final round of public information meetings.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 13, 2003

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 3

TIME: 2:00 PM to 3:15 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES:

- Sandy Jones, Mayor, Bowling Green, KY
- Michael Buchanan, Judge Executive, Warren County
- Keirsten Jagers, KYTC – Information Officer, District 3
- Jeff Moore, KYTC – Planning Branch Manager, District 3
- Greg Meredith, KYTC – Chief District Engineer, District 3
- Daryl Greer, KYTC – Division of Planning
- Carl Dixon, BLA
- Kent Ahrenholtz, BLA
- Jason Dupont, BLA
- James Mosley, BLA

An I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Studies meeting was held at 2:00 p.m. at the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) Construction Conference Room on Thursday, February 13, 2003. The meeting was held to provide an I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline progress overview on work completed and to receive comments on the corridors carried through Level 1 screening for further evaluation from the Mayor of Bowling Green and the Warren County Judge Executive. The discussion focused on project updates, potential major issues relative to the planning studies and the location of the remaining corridors.

Introduction: I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Daryl Greer introduced Mayor Jones and Judge Buchanan to all present and thanked them for attending the meeting. He acknowledged members present from Bernardin, Lochmueller and Associates and the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Daryl started the meeting by disseminating the handout packets and explaining the contents therein. He explained how the corridors were reduced from 10 to 4 for the Outer Beltline and from 23 to 7 for I-66, as a result of the Level 1 screening and extensive input from the public. He briefly discussed some of the unique features of the remaining corridors. Jeff Moore summarized the corridors by the following three categories: (1) Corridors 2, 4 and 5 as completely “all build” and north of I-65; (2) Corridor 23 would be totally “all build” and south of I-65; and (3) corridors 10, 11 and 12 utilizing portions of existing I-65. The “no build” option is to do nothing and to leave as is.

Jeff explained the Level 1 and 2 Screening process for each I-66 proposed corridor. He went on to discuss the four Outer Beltline Corridors and pointed out the two river crossings proposed for



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

the areas north and south of Bowling Green. He demonstrated the areas where the Outer Beltline and I-66 Corridor options shared coincidental routes. When asked by the Mayor how she could be of assistance in the process, Jeff responded that Planning and Zoning agencies could provide KYTC with information on Planned Unit Development, zoning, subdivisions and other development information proposed or underway.

He then presented the detailed spreadsheets that were developed and shared with the public and resource agencies for comments. He reiterated the Level 1 Screening was essentially a “qualitative” screening process to determine if the corridors met the project goals. He stated the Level 1 screening consisted of a number of considerations including fatal flaws, major environmental issues, major engineering and traffic issues, and public and review agencies input. The advantages and disadvantages were identified and any corridor not sufficiently satisfying the project goals were eliminated from further consideration. Jeff characterized the Level 2 Screening as a “quantitative” evaluation. He explained that following the Level 1 Screening, the corridors which merit further consideration were reviewed and refinements were made to further avoid natural and man-made resources if possible. Each corridor’s performance and corresponding impacts were subsequently determined and quantified.

When asked about the funding source for the projects, Jeff indicated the Beltline study is funded with Federal and State dollars and the I-66 study is primarily federally funded. He went on to explain where there may be either interchanges or overpasses throughout the project areas, so as not to interfere with any existing traffic flow patterns. Jeff noted that corridors closer to Bowling Green are generally better performers in terms of cost, traffic, impacts etc.

The Judge asked the group to elaborate on Corridors A, B, D, and E. He asked how those corridors help avoid congestion and create connections around the Iron Bridge area southeast of Bowling Green? The Mayor asked if addressing congestion was a specific project goal for the Outer Beltline? Jeff answered yes, and then responded with an elaboration on all of the project goals for the Outer Beltline project. The Judge stated he would prefer Corridor 4 as his first choice followed by Corridor 10, because they may serve to reduce the high level of accidents along I-65 between Sunnyside and Rocky Hill. Judge Buchanan then inquired as to why so many accidents occur in the aforementioned area. Jeff replied that it might be due to speeding coupled with the darkness along that stretch of highway. However, accidents have been greatly reduced since the construction along this segment has begun.

The Mayor was then asked her preference for the proposed I-66 and Beltline corridors. The Mayor asked, “would building Corridor 10 followed by Corridor 4 be a logical way to proceed if funding was limited?” Kent mentioned one option may be to complete the Outer Beltline first, complete the eight lanes on I-65 then move on to the I-66 proposed alternatives. Jeff concluded the meeting by stating that input from the public meetings coupled with technical information and the evaluation of the data should show the outcome.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 19, 2003

LOCATION: Bowling Green/Warren County Planning and Zoning Commission

TIME: 1:00 PM to 2:30 PM (CST)

ATTENDEES: Andy Gillies - Director, Planning and Zoning Commission
Alice Burks - Deputy Director, Planning and Zoning Commission
Eric Larson - Engineer, Planning and Zoning Commission
Tonya Colley - GIS Supervisor, Planning and Zoning Commission
Greg Meredith - Chief District Engineer, District 3
Jeff Moore, KYTC – Planning Branch Manager, District 3
Daryl Greer, KYTC - Division of Planning
Carl Dixon, BLA
Kent Ahrenholtz, BLA
Jason Dupont, BLA
James Mosley, BLA

An I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Studies meeting was held at 1:00 p.m. at the City/County Planning and Zoning Commission in Bowling Green, KY on Wednesday, February 19, 2003. The meeting was held to provide a progress overview on work completed and to gain local planning information from the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding planned developments. The discussion focused on project updates, potential major issues relative to the planning studies and the Level 1 and Level 2 screening of preliminary corridors.

I-66/Outer Beltline Overview

Daryl Greer acknowledged the Planning and Zoning staff and thanked them for meeting with the Study Team. He introduced members present from Bernardin, Lochmueller and Associates and the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Daryl started the meeting by disseminating the handout packets and explaining the contents therein. Andy Gillies asked if the KYTC had received the comments submitted by his Office and if there were any questions relative to those comments. He then asked for an overview of the progress and /or the direction of the I-66/Outer Beltline projects. Daryl indicated that feedback received so far is generally in the "Build" direction coupled with traffic concerns. Daryl indicated by mid-summer the KYTC would complete this study, and make the final recommendation of corridors to be carried forward for the next level of study pending funding availability. He indicated that KYTC staff were still analyzing the comments received from over fifteen (15) agencies so far.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

The group went on to discuss the Northridge planned unit development. This proposed subdivision entails the development of 700 housing units. The group also discussed the 1100 unit planned subdivision at Plum Springs west of Northridge, of which the first phase of fifty (50) units have already been approved. Daryl requested the Planning-Zoning Commission, to provide current GIS information from updated boundary lines and all new and existing zoning projects. He also requested that any proposed rezoning cases be provided to KYTC and BLA for review. Tonya Colley agreed to provide parcel and zoning boundaries for Warren County in GIS format to Jason Dupont.

KYTC staff inquired as to the status of Scotty's proposed subdivision/golf course. Andy responded that he met with Scotty two months ago and has the new development plans for the project. Jeff suggested that the Team hold a meeting with Scotty to determine what the new plans entail and to get up to speed on the status of the project. Jeff also suggested that KYTC meet and exchange information with Scotty. Additional discussion centered on the Highway 231 beyond where the Natcher extension stops and the area beyond the creek. The group also discussed the "Restatement of Binding Elements" document where 153 acres were rezoned at the McGinnis Quarry. The group stated as long as they avoid the area it would not affect the I-66 project.

The group then briefly reviewed issues discussed at the last Community Advisory Group meeting. Discussion centered on whether the Planning and Zoning Commission could put funded programs onto their map. This would allow the Commission to deny any zoning requests for projects within areas identified for proposed highway or local Capital Improvement Programs (CIP). However, it was mentioned that authority for that type of action would require legislation from the State of Kentucky to approve. It was noted a mechanism already exist for local governments to preserve corridors for their Capital Improvement Projects but not for State projects.

Andy asked how much wiggle room does the corridor allow for avoidance if areas of concern were identified? KYTC answered the corridors are 2000 feet wide which would allow room to shift the final alignment to avoid critical issues identified in the future. Jeff stated we would want to consider the potential shelf life that this study report may have in the evaluation. He went on to say the project might need to set on the shelf for six or seven years pending funding. The meeting closed with Jason agreeing to provide Tonya with a copy of the I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline Corridor maps as well as aerial digital orthophoto tiles of the study area.



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: March 20, 2003

LOCATION: Mount Zion Baptist Church in Oakland, KY.

TIME: 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Daryl Greer, KYTC - Division of Planning
Jeff Moore, KYTC – District 3 Planning Branch Manager
Keirsten Jagers, District 3 Public Information Officer
Lance Meredith, District 3 Traffic Branch Manager
Kent Ahrenholtz, BLA
James Mosley, BLA

An open format Public Information Meeting of about 12 residents from the Oakland area, and staff from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates was held on March 20, 2003 at the Mount Zion Baptist Church in Oakland, KY. The meeting was held to provide the citizens of the surrounding Freeport and Loving communities with information on the I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects, and to illicit comments from the public via survey forms and verbal communication.

I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline

Citizens attending the meeting were asked to sign in and were given a handout packet of meeting information as they entered. This was an open format meeting and the exhibits included various displays showing the project history of each project, a timeline showing typical project development stages of highway projects, project goals for each project, traffic volumes and accident rates for the study area, environmental footprint maps of the study area including natural and human environmental issues exhibits, preliminary corridors for both the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and I-66, Level 2 Screening and Evaluation exhibits, aerial photo maps of the study area including Level 2 corridors for both the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and I-66, and geological maps and diagrams explaining the karst geology in the study area.

Level 2 Draft Screening spread sheets were also disseminated to citizens. The exhibits were arranged around the exterior of the room to allow citizens to walk through proceeding from the project history to the preliminary corridors. Various KYTC and consultant personnel were stationed at the exhibits to provide explanations and answer questions regarding the exhibits and the projects as citizens walked through.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) *(Item # 03-66.00)*
Bowling Green Outer Beltline *(Item # 03-103.00)*

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

The handout packet included a survey form, and citizens were encouraged to complete the form and return it at the meeting or via a prepaid, preaddressed envelope included in the packet as well. Tables, chairs and writing utensils were provided for the completion of the survey forms. Additional packets were left at the Church and given to attendees for further dissemination in the Freeport and Loving communities.



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, April 30, 2003

LOCATION: Kentucky Transportation Cabinet District 3 Office (Bowling Green)
Conference Room

TIME: 9:30 a.m. (CDT)

ATTENDEES: Greg Meredith, Chief District Engineer- KYTC District 3
Jeff Moore, Planning Branch Manager- KYTC District 3
Lancie Meredith, Traffic Branch Manager-KYTC District 3
Renee Slaughter, Environmental Coordinator-KYTC District 3
Keirsten Jagers, KYTC District 3, Public Information Officer
Daryl Greer, KYTC Division of Planning
David Martin, KYTC Division of Planning
David Kratt, KYTC State Highway Engineer's Office
Michael Briggs, Barren River ADD
Jerry Weisenfluh, Kentucky Geological Survey
Eric Larson, Bowling Green/Warren County Planning Commission
Andy Gillies, Bowling Green/Warren County Planning Commission
Kent Ahrenholtz, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
David Ripple, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.
Jason DuPont, Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates Inc.

A Project Team Meeting for the subject projects was held in the KYTC District 3 Conference Room in Bowling Green on Wednesday, April 30, 2003 at 9:30 a.m. (CDT). This meeting provided an opportunity to review the progress of Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates Inc. (BLA) since the last round of Public Involvement Meetings, discuss the evaluation of combination corridors (I-66 with BGOB) as well as recommendations of the Level Two Screening for the Final Corridors. An agenda for the meeting is attached.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

The meeting began with Daryl Greer reviewing a response from FHWA regarding the team meeting and plans for the final report. This response identified that the build alternatives for the project should be referred to as "corridors" as opposed to "alternatives" for this report. Also identified was consideration for a preferred corridor based on the current information in regard to potential archaeological evaluations. Daryl then turned the meeting over to Kent Ahrenholtz to discuss the status of the project. Kent stated that in regard to any identification or consideration for a single preferred corridor, additional information that will be gathered in additional studies would be necessary, and that no single corridor could be identified at this time. Jeff Moore added that any recommendations from this report must have a shelf life due to the current funding



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00) **Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)**

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

situation, which may dictate that these projects will not move forward for some time. Jeff also introduced Eric Larson and Andy Gillies from the Bowling Green/Warren County Planning Commission, who he had invited to sit in on the meeting and introductions were made around the room.

Project Status

Kent then went into the project status identifying completion of the final round of Public Involvement Meetings as well as the final Agency Coordination and CAG Meetings. Kent briefly reviewed these meetings identifying that comments from the meetings have been received and reviewed. Kent went on to identify that the Level 2 Screening of corridors has been completed, including the combinations of I-66 and BGOB.

Overview of Agency and Public Info Meetings

Jason DuPont noted that the Second Environmental Review Agency Coordination Meeting was held January 16, 2003 at Mammoth Cave National Park. The attendance was down slightly from the first meeting attributable at least partially due to the inclement weather. However, involvement in the meeting was very good and positive feedback was received at the meeting. Jason also identified that several responses were also received from agencies which were not in attendance.

Jason briefly reviewed written comments received from the Agency Coordination Meeting, noting that several agencies identified similar issues that had been identified in earlier coordination. In addition, many issues identified for evaluation have been incorporated into the screening process or will be addressed in the design of the project including mitigation.

Jason noted that some agencies did include specific corridor references. These references included preferred corridors of 10, 11 and 12 for I-66 and A, B, and D for BGOB identified by both the City of Bowling Green and the City-County Planning Commission. Also as noted by USEPA that corridors 12 and 23 would have the least number of environmental impacts and that 2, 4 and 5 could potentially impact Threatened and Endangered Species. The KDFWR also noted that corridor 23 would result in the least impacts to the karst system associated with the Mammoth Cave area and that corridors 4, 5, 10 and 11 would have less impacts overall in combination with the BGOB. Additionally, the USFWS recommended that chosen alignments be as close to Bowling Green as possible.

Additional items of discussion from the Agency comments included the Division of Multimodal Programs comments regarding the projects potential to affect air quality as well as the consideration of a separate bicycle/pedestrian facility for any new bridges. In regard to the air quality concerns, Multimodal commented that the report should identify if the projects have the potential to change the attainment status of the region for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Daryl stated that the traffic analysis reports reporting of existing and future VMT and VHT was sufficient for this study. On a related item, Jeff inquired as to the status of the TIP for the newly formed MPO. Michael Briggs from the BRADD responded that the TIP is still in a draft form and essentially includes all projects on the current 6-year plan. It was noted



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

that the BGOB and other projects from the long-range plan should be included. In response to the comment regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities, it was stated that further consideration for these facilities would be identified in the Special Considerations section of the report including a note to refer to the Bowling Green Greenway Master Plan in future development of these projects.

Jason then reviewed the final round of Public Information Meetings that were held in February noting that six meetings were held at various locations around the study area to allow for greater accessibility for the public. Jason identified that a total of approximately 350 citizens attended the meetings and that approximately 70 survey responses were received for I-66 and approximately 30 were received for the BGOB. A summary of the meetings was distributed including summaries of the survey responses received. Jason noted that of the surveys that identified a preference, the no-build was identified most often as the first choice; however, these responses only totaled 23 and 16 for I-66 and BGOB respectively. Jason also identified that although the written responses received identified a preference for the no-build most often, the consensus from attending all of the meetings indicated that support for a build alternative was more evident than support for the no-build. Daryl stated that the discussion of the public involvement should include reference to the general disposition of citizens attending the meetings and that the timeline identifying all of the public involvement should be included. Jeff then reviewed a copy of the timeline showing the extensive public involvement effort.

Level 2 Screening of Final Corridors

Kent Ahrenholtz directed everyone's attention to the revised Level 2 Screening evaluation tables for the I-66 and BGOB corridors and the new table for the combinations. Kent noted that the same assumptions that have been used previously were still in effect for these evaluations. Kent went on to review the engineering considerations included in the advantages/disadvantages comparison of corridors that was distributed. Kent noted that Corridor 2 was least desirable based on engineering due to the more rugged terrain that would be crossed and the longest length of new terrain construction. Corridors 4 and 5 are the more direct straight-line connections and have fewer engineering concerns. Corridors 10 and 11 include both widening of a portion of I-65 as well as a segment of new terrain construction; however, these corridors have worse ratings for maintenance of traffic due to the I-65 widening, fewer potential overpasses for other roadways, and the longest coincidental segments with BGOB. Corridor 12 is the lowest cost corridor consisting of widening of I-65 for the entire length between the Natcher and Nunn Parkways; this corridor has the worst rating for maintenance of traffic. Jeff questioned if estimates for Corridor 12 included secondary improvements that may be necessary (i.e. Cumberland Trace). Kent responded that no secondary improvements were included in the costs. For the BGOB corridors, Kent noted that there was little difference in regard to engineering, but that Corridor A was best and Corridor E was worst. For the combinations, Kent identified that the best performing Beltline Corridor was combined with each I-66 corridor to create the combinations that were evaluated. The combinations with I-66 Corridors 4, 5, 10 and 11 have the longest coincidental segments resulting in the shortest overall lengths.

David Ripple then reviewed the traffic considerations for the corridors. David began by identifying that the no-build comparison (E+C network) included 6 lanes for I-65 through the



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

study area and that the percentage of trucks on I-65 was 40%. David then identified that Corridor 23 provided the best reduction in traffic on I-65 but provided little relief to other routes. Andy Gillies from the City-County Planning Commission asked how the 40% trucks on I-65 compared to other interstate routes. Daryl noted that I-65 and I-75 are significant trade routes carrying large volumes of trucks and that freight predictions indicate that the future volumes will likely increase on these routes. Kent noted that essentially all of the north/south interstate routes from Dallas east are running between 30% and 40% trucks. David went on to identify that Corridor 2 was the poorest performer over all. It was also identified that of the corridors north of I-65, Corridor 5 provides the most relief to I-65 traffic. However, none of the corridors provide sufficient relief to I-65 to prevent the need for future widening. David also noted that Corridor 11 was the best performer overall in relation to the project goals. In addition, Corridors 4 and 10 have lower performance than Corridors 5 and 11 because they are further from Bowling Green. David then reviewed the BGOB corridors. David identified that the corridors closer to Bowling Green perform better for the Beltline and that Corridor A is the best performer. Corridors D and E are less attractive for traffic considerations. For the combinations, David identified that the performance of 23 is greatly reduced in combination with BGOB. David noted that the combination 11-A was the best performer for traffic.

Jason then reviewed the environmental considerations for the corridors identifying that Corridor 12 is anticipated to have the least environmental impacts because it only includes widening of existing I-65 and no new terrain construction. However, only direct impacts from an additional 50 feet of right-of-way on either side if I-65 was included in the estimates, so the socio-economic impacts of this corridor may likely increase based on more detailed studies. In addition, Corridors 23 and 11 have comparatively low environmental impacts followed by Corridor 10. Jerry Weisenfluh noted that the advantages listed for Corridors 10, 11 and 12 should not identify "Low impact to sinkhole plain", but rather less new construction in the sinkhole plain. Corridor 2 has relatively high environmental impacts including forest impacts, stream crossings, relocations, potential TES impacts and the longest new construction in the Turnhole Spring ground water basin. Corridors 4 and 5 also have relatively high environmental impacts including the longest new terrain construction through the sink hole plain, highest farmland and prime farmland impacts, potential TES impacts and impacts to historic resources. For the BGOB corridors, Jason identified that there is not a substantial difference in environmental impacts between the corridors. The shortest Corridor A has the fewest environmental impacts while the longest Corridor E has the most environmental impacts. For the combinations, Jason identified that 11-A and 10-B had the fewest impacts due largely to the long coincidental segments which reduce the overall length. In addition, the impacts of combinations including Corridor 23 are significantly increased due to the long overall length.

Kent then directed everyone to the draft recommendations which were distributed and identified the recommendation of Corridors 10, 11 and 12 for I-66. Kent identified that these corridors made the most utilization of existing facilities and included good traffic performance with low environmental impacts. Corridors A and B were identified as the recommendation for the BGOB. These corridors also incorporated the best traffic performance with lower environmental impacts.

Andy Gillies questioned what impact moving the corridors further out from Bowling Green had on LOS for future considerations. David identified that the high growth projections were used,



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

and the highest volume BGOB has plenty of excess capacity in the future year estimates. He went on to identify that the function of a beltline, as opposed to a bypass, would be enhanced by being closer in so that it could receive loading from either side, instead of causing development to leapfrog out to the roadway leaving a gap in the development and promoting sprawl.

Daryl then asked about prioritizing segments. Jeff identified that future funding and timing would have a substantial impact on priorities. David identified that the traffic needs point toward the northern segment as the top priority. Daryl noted that I-66 funding is more likely than BGOB funding, and that the connectivity is essentially completed by the northern segment. Jeff also noted that large-scale development in the eastern Outer Beltline area could have a significant impact on the project.

Keirsten Jagers raised the question of disseminating the final recommendations and information to the public, suggesting a newsletter and press conference. Kent also suggested an additional web page notification as well as web-based maps of the recommended corridors. Jeff suggested an update to the video to be run on local television. Daryl noted that he intended for the entire report to be available on-line as well. Keirsten also suggested a Frequently Asked Questions addition for the website. Jeff raised the question of who would get copies of the document. Daryl suggested that the local libraries get hard copies and that others would get electronic versions on CD.

Kent identified that the anticipated timeline was for a complete draft version to be submitted by May 31 for KYTC review, pending comments on the technical documents. Daryl stated that sections could be submitted individually for review. Daryl also mentioned in regard to the outline, that the geotechnical considerations should only be included in one location. Daryl also asked about cumulative impacts evaluation for each project considering the other as well as the Transpark. Kent noted that the cumulative impacts discussion would be include general qualitative language. Daryl indicated that the discussion should be very general. Kent then identified that BLA intends to include the appendices by reference to reduce the volume of the report. Daryl concurred with this plan and suggested that they may be able to be included in electronic format with a CD along with the document.

David Kratt questioned if the information would be presented in two separate reports. Daryl stated that they would be separate reports for considerations beyond this level of study.

Daryl requested that the design costs be separated into phase I and phase II design for future funding considerations. Kent suggested a distribution of 1/3 of the design cost for preliminary engineering and environmental and 2/3 for final design and plan development. This distribution was agreed upon.

Daryl then asked about segments of independent utility. Kent identified that for the northern section, KY 185 would be the division to create two segments, while the southeastern section would likely be one segment with a possible division at Cemetery Road (KY 234).

With no other questions, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm (CDT).

Public Information Meetings

March 2002

**I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Studies
Public Information Meetings and Comments Summary
March 4, 2002
Brownsville, Edmonson County
and
March 7, 2002
Bowling Green, Warren County**

An initial set of Public Information Meetings were held on Monday, March 4th at the Brownsville Community Center in Brownsville in Edmonson County and on Thursday, March 7th at the Barren River Area Development District Regional Conference Center in Bowling Green in Warren County. A total of 109 citizens attended the March 4th meeting and a total of 120 citizens attended the March 7th meeting. The primary focus of the meetings was to introduce the public to the I-66 Planning Study. The purpose of the planing study was to identify and evaluate alternative interstate route corridors, including the “no-build” alternate, for I-66 between the Natcher Parkway and the Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway. The study would determine one or more corridors to be further examined in preliminary engineering and environmental studies. The meeting outlined the project overview, which explained the purpose, issues, schedule and project goals for the planning study.

The public was presented with an environmental footprint of the study area. Attendees learned about issues addressed during roadway planning, design and construction. These issues include environmental, economic and engineering considerations, along with road building steps and timelines. The meeting focused on the importance of gaining the public interest and involvement with respects to how the proposed corridors should be developed. A public comment survey was disseminated to the attendees to provide written ideas, opinions and comments for consideration during the development of potential project alternatives and impacts for the proposed new interstate.

A total of 46 comment sheets were returned to the KYTC from both Public Information Meetings. The following represents a general summary of citizen’s responses received:

I-66 Planning Study

1. Do you feel that a new interstate route between the Louie B. Nunn Parkway and the Natcher Parkway would provide benefits to the area?

Eighty seven percent (87%) of the respondents indicated a new interstate would provide positive benefits by relieving traffic from I-65, reducing cross-town traffic as well as stimulate economic growth and tourism for the surrounding counties and towns. Twelve percent (12%) of the respondents disagreed stating it would be too expensive to build, promote urban sprawl and a plethora of environmental concerns.

2. Do you feel like this project would result in any problems for the area?

Thirty-three percent (33%) of the respondents perceived problems would result from relocation of homes and businesses, environmental concerns and a waste of taxpayer money on unwanted construction. Sixty-six percent (66%) of the respondents indicated “no” to this question.

3. If a new roadway is built, where should it be located? Please feel free to draw on the map on the back of the survey.

Seven respondents outlined various renderings ranging from north of Bowling Green to south of Bowling Green, with connections to abutting counties (see maps in the complete document listed below).

4. What are the potential impacts of the project, both positive and negative? Are there problems, sensitive areas, special needs or other factors that should be considered in locating or designing the road?

Respondent indicated a special need for a new bridge across the Barron River. Increased revenue from expanded economic development opportunities and better connections to existing roads and highways were viewed as positive benefits. Sensitive areas of concern listed include loss of prime farmland, the Mammoth Cave area, historical sites, churches, graveyards and the natural environment.

Bowling Green Eastern Outer Beltline Planning Study

1. Do you feel that a new road between Scottsville Road and I-65 on the east side of Bowling Green would provide benefits to the area?

Seventy-three percent (73%) of the respondents indicated an outer beltline would provide positive benefits by relieving traffic from I-65 and reducing traffic in Bowling Green and surrounding areas resulting in fewer accidents. They also viewed new locations for businesses and development opportunities as good for the area. Twenty seven percent (27%) indicated they see no benefits from promoting urban sprawl and increased traffic in predominantly low-density areas as Scottsville Road.

2. Do you feel like this project would result in any problems for the area?

Forty percent (40%) of the respondents perceived problems ranging from increased commercial development, urban sprawl, environmental encroachments, increased traffic and displacement issues. Sixty percent (60%) perceived no significant environmental, engineering or cultural problems. Respondents indicated economic development would be good for Bowling Green and surrounding counties.

3. If a new roadway is built, where should it be located?

Six respondents submitted diagrams of various proposed routes. One respondent felt it should be left to the KYTC with input from the people in the area (see maps in the complete document listed below).

4. What are the potential impacts of the project, both positive and negative? Are there problems, sensitive areas, special needs or other factors that should be considered in locating or designing the road?

Negative impacts expressed by respondents ranged from the project is not needed, too costly, increased urban sprawl and environmental concerns with green space and sink holes. Positive comments included relief from traffic congestion, increased access to public facilities and better connections to existing roadways.

Copies of the March Public Meetings Summary, public comment surveys, summaries of citizen response sheets and additional I-66 planning study information are contained within the “March Public Information Meeting, I-66/Bowling Green Eastern Outer Beltline, Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item Number 3-66.00 and 3-103.00” Report.

Public Information Meetings

August 2002



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

Public Information Meetings Summary

August 14, 2002
Bowling Green, KY
and
August 15, 2002
Brownsville, KY

The Public Information Meetings were held on Wednesday, August 14th at the Bowling Green Public Library-Depot Branch in Warren County and on Thursday, August 15th at the Brownsville Community Center in Edmonson County. The meetings were open format meetings beginning at 10:00 a.m. (CDT) and ending at 7:00 p.m. (CDT). A total of 195 citizens attended the August 14th meeting with a total of 23 personnel from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), Barren River Area Development District (BRADD), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Bernardin-Lochmueller & Associates (BLA), and Western Kentucky University also attending the meeting. A total of 128 citizens attended the August 15th meeting with a total of 19 personnel from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), Barren River Area Development District (BRADD), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Bernardin-Lochmueller & Associates (BLA), and Western Kentucky University also attending the meeting.

Citizens attending the meetings were asked to sign in and were given a handout packet of meeting information as they entered. A video presentation area was setup near the sign-in table, and the video ran continuously during the meeting. The video presentation provided citizens with an overview of the projects and the work completed to date on the projects, as well as an explanation of the handout materials and the exhibits displayed at the meeting. The exhibits included various displays showing the project history of each project, a timeline showing typical project development stages of highway projects, project goals for each project, traffic volumes and accident rates for the study area, level of service for existing roads in the study area, committed projects in the study area, environmental footprint maps of the study area including preliminary corridors for both the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and I-66, aerial photo maps of the study area including preliminary corridors for both the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and I-66, and geological maps and diagrams explaining the karst geology in the study area. The exhibits were arranged around the exterior of the room to allow citizens to walk through proceeding from the project history to the preliminary corridors. Various KYTC and consultant personnel were stationed at the exhibits to provide explanations and answer questions regarding the exhibits and the projects as citizens walked through.

The handout packet included a survey form, and citizens were encouraged to complete the form and return it at the meeting or via a prepaid, preaddressed envelope included in the packet as well. Tables, chairs and writing utensils were provided for the completion



Southern Kentucky Corridor (I-66) (Item # 03-66.00)
Bowling Green Outer Beltline (Item # 03-103.00)

Planning Study & Environmental Overview

of the survey forms. Comment boards were also placed along with the exhibits to allow for citizens comments.

In addition to the August 14th and 15th open format meetings, eight (8) town hall style meetings were held throughout the study area as an outreach effort to inform citizens in outlying areas within the study area. These meetings included: September 23, 2002 at Richardsville; September 30, 2002 at Chalybeate; October 5, 2002 at Plano; October 8, 2002 at Alvaton; October 24, 2002 at Barren River; October 25, 2002 at Gott; November 14, 2002 at Hadley; and November 21, 2002 at Smith's Grove. The minutes from the town hall style meetings are attached. The same handout packets were distributed at these meetings and some or all of the exhibits were displayed depending on the space available.

A total of 55 citizen comment survey forms were received for the I-66 project and a total of 36 citizen comment survey forms were received for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline project. The survey forms are attached including summaries of the responses.

Public Information Meetings

February 2003

I-66/Bowling Green Outer Beltline Planning Studies
Public Information Meetings and Comments Summary
February 11 – 13, 2003
and
February 18 – 20, 2003

A third series of Public Information Meetings were held throughout the month of February 2002. Six (6) Public Information Meetings were held at the following locations: the Richardsville Fire Department; Warren East High School; Smiths Grove Fire Department; the Chalybeate Fire Department; the Alvaton Fire House #3; and at Red Cross Elementary School. A sum total of approximately 350 citizens attended the meetings with an average of 50 citizens per meeting.

The third round of public meetings were held by KYTC to present a narrowed down version of the preliminary corridors for additional review and comment. The corridors were reduced from 10 to 4 for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and from 23 to 7 for I-66, as a result of the Level 1 Screening and extensive input from the public.

The primary focus of the planing study is to identify and evaluate alternative interstate route corridors, including the “no-build” alternative, for the I-66 Corridor, between the Natcher Parkway and the Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway and for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline. The study also focuses on identifying and evaluating potential corridors to determine if they are technically feasible, and to see if the public will support the corridors for future engineering and environmental studies.

Citizens attending the meeting were asked to sign in and were given a handout packet of meeting information as they entered. Exhibits displayed included aerial photo maps of the study area including Level 2 preliminary corridors for both the Bowling Green Outer Beltline and I66. Information contained in the packets included Survey forms with maps on the back, 2 Project overview forms with Maps on the back, an Evaluation Process "funnel" diagram, a public involvement process timeline, Level 1 screening forms for both projects and Level 2 Draft screening spreadsheets for both projects.

The handout packet contained a survey form, and citizens were encouraged to rank the top three (3) routes that they prefer for the location of the I-66 Corridor, to complete the form and return it at the meeting or via a prepaid, preaddressed envelope included in the packet as well. A total of 95 citizens comment survey forms were received by KYTC for the I-66 project and a total of 30 citizens comment survey forms were received from the Bowling Green Outer Beltline project. All respondents were asked to submit their preferred 1st, 2nd and 3rd corridor choices. However, some citizen's responses included combinations anywhere from one to three corridor selections. Therefore, the results does not reflect the respondent's first, second and third choices consistently.

The following results are presented as percentages of respondents holding certain beliefs about a particular issue and/or views commonly held by the respondents on specific topics. These percentages and views should not be interpreted as having any “statistical” significance in terms of the respondents being representative of a broader segment of the population of the study area.

1. With the project goals in mind and based on the corridors shown on the map, rank the top three (3) routes that you prefer for the location of the I-66 Corridor.

I- 66 Citizens Responses

| I-66 Corridor | 1st Choice | 2nd Choice | 3rd Choice |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| “No Build” | 23 | 1 | 0 |
| Corridor # 4 (Blue) | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| Corridor # 10 (Yellow) | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Corridor # 12 (Magenta) | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Corridor # 2 (Red) | 8 | 5 | 6 |
| Corridor # 5 (Orange) | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| Corridor # 11 (Green) | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Corridor # 23 (Light Blue) | 3 | 0 | 1 |

A total of seventy-four (74) respondents submitted survey forms for the I-66 Corridors. The table reflects those response sheets which indicated preferences for various routes.

2. With the project goals in mind and based on the corridors shown on the map, rank the top two (2) routes that you prefer for the location of the Bowling Green Outer Beltline.

Outer Beltline Citizens Responses

| Bowling Green Outer Beltline | 1st Choice | 2nd Choice |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| “No Build” | 16 | 0 |
| BG Outer Beltline B Yellow | 6 | 5 |
| BG Outer Beltline E Green | 4 | 2 |
| BG Outer Beltline A Blue | 2 | 8 |
| BG Outer Beltline D Red | 1 | 1 |

A total of thirty (30) respondents submitted survey forms for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline.

General Summary

The “No Build” option was selected for both I-66 and Bowling Green Outer Beltline projects. Corridor Five (5) was the preferred second choice for the I-66 project. Alternate A was the second choice for the Bowling Green Outer Beltline. Moreover, twenty-one (21) respondents indicated their opposition to Corridor 23 of the I-66 project.

Copies of the February Public Meetings Summary, public comment surveys, summaries of citizen response sheets and additional I-66 planning study information are contained within the “February Public Information Meetings, I-66/Bowling Green Eastern Outer Beltline, Warren/Edmonson Counties, Item Number 3-66.00 and 3-103.00” Report.