



Meeting Summary

Section 1 Kennedy Interchange Area Advisory Team Meeting No. 4 October 25, 2005

The fourth Kennedy Interchange Area Advisory Team meeting was held on Tuesday, October 25, 2005 at the TARC Administration Building. An update on the progress made in Section 1 was presented, ending with discussion.

The following individuals from the Area Advisory Team were in attendance:

Jim Segrest	Butchertown Neighborhood Association
Emily Boone	Clifton Community Council
Bill Marzian	East Downtown Business Association
Mohammad Nouri	Louisville Metro Planning & Design Services
Mark Adams	Louisville Metro Public Works Dept.
Michael Kimmel	Louisville Waterfront Dev. Corp.
Carol Hensley	Main Street Association
Steven Kersey	Phoenix Hill Neighborhood Association
David Karem	Louisville Waterfront Development Corp.
Aida Copic	Louisville Metro Planning & Design

Other individuals attending:

Bill Wright	Clifton Neighborhood
-------------	----------------------

Project management present:

Kentucky Transportation Associates: Glen Kelly-Project Manager; Richard Sutherland-Deputy Project Manager; Brian Aldridge, Dan Byers, David Smith, Maurice Sweeney, Chuck Wood

Community Transportation Solutions – General Engineering Consultants (CTS-GEC): John Sacksteder,-Project Manager, Steve Hoefler, Tom Gallagher, Dave Kroll, Kristen Jordan, Tim Lawson, Kevin Senninger

Project Staff: Bart Bryant-Acting Ohio River Bridges Project Manager, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Lee Walker-KY Ombudsman, Eddie Atchley-Matrix Consulting Group

1. Mellwood-Story Connector Study

Key study elements:

- Determine if two-way operation of Story and Mellwood Avenues is feasible
- Study the elimination of the connector proposed in the environmental document
- If two-way operation is feasible, investigate new full interchange at Mellwood

Alternatives Considered:

- D18- Selected Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Alternative
- Improved Split Diamond Interchange
 - Two-Way Traffic on Mellwood and Story Avenue
- Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)
 - Two-Way Traffic on Mellwood and Story Avenue

Traffic Summary:

- Conversion of Mellwood and Story Avenues to two-way traffic is feasible only with the SPUI alternative
- The SPUI alternative performs better than the D18-FEIS alternative
- Story Avenue would operate at an acceptable level with two lanes under the SPUI alternative
- Mellwood Avenue would require four lanes (two per direction)

Potential Issues:

- Cost for new interchange with Mellwood improvements = Approximately \$20M
- Business and right-of-way impacts along Mellwood
- Environmental Impacts

Conclusions:

- FEIS commitment has been fulfilled
- Additional preliminary engineering and environmental analysis would be required to move the project forward and determine all the impacts

Discussion:

- Do the advantages of converting to two-way traffic outweigh the impacts?
- Are you in favor of conducting additional studies to determine environmental impacts associated with the SPUI alternative?
- Are there other options that should be considered?

2. Waterfront Park Impact Reduction Study

Study Phases:

- Phase 1
 - Development of alternatives to reduce width over the Great Lawn
 - Consider raising elevation of I-64
- Phase 2 – Bridge Type Study
 - Iconic Bridge
 - Reduce number of piers

Study status:

- Preliminary information has been presented to BSMT
- A determination has been made to present this information to the public to assist in the decision making process

- Study includes alternatives that would modify access in downtown

Comparison of Alternatives:

	Existing	D18-FBS	Layout 1	Layout 2	Layout 3	Layout 4	Layout 5	Layout 5-M
Ingress Provided Into Waterfront Area/Downtown Louisville								
Exit at Third St. from:								
I-64 WB/I-71 SB	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
I-65 NB/SB	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Exit at River Rd. from:								
I-64 WB/I-71 SB	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Egress Provided Out of Waterfront Area/Downtown Louisville								
Entry from Second St. to:								
I-65 NB	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
I-65 SB	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
I-64 EB/I-71 SB	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Entry from Witherspoon St. to:								
I-64 EB/I-71 NB	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Entry from River Rd. to:								
I-65 NB	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
I-65 SB	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Reduction of Impacts to Great Lawn								
Total Width (feet)	154'	318'	267'	222'	192'	192'	225'	225'
Reduction from D18-FEIS	-	0'	51'	96'	128'	128'	93'	93'
Other issues				Access from I-64 EB to Story Ave. is not provided.	Second Street Ramp is closed.	Second Street Ramp is closed.		Third Street Ramp is closed.
Estimated Cost Savings	-	\$0	\$16,000,000	\$27,000,000	\$32,000,000	\$36,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$24,000,000

*Note: All widths are approximate and are subject to change based on more-detailed design.

Conclusions:

- Layouts 1, 5, and 5-M are considered feasible alternatives
- There are no significant differences in traffic impacts between Layouts 1, 5, and 5-M
 - All alternatives require minor improvements to surface streets
 - Not possible to quantify perceived intangible impacts to specific locations
- Layout 5-M introduces operational concerns at Jefferson Street

Note: Future development along River Road was not considered in these analyses

Discussion:

- Do the advantages of reducing the width of I-64 over the Great Lawn outweigh the proposed changes to downtown access?
- Which alternative do you prefer: D18-FEIS, Layout 1, Layout 5, or Layout 5-M?
- Is there another option that should be considered?

3. Discussion

Following is a summary of discussion following the presentation

Regular Text: Attendee comment or question

Italicized Text: Project Team response

Post-Meeting Addition: Indicates additional information not shared at the meeting.

The following items were discussed after the Mellwood-Story Presentation:

1C. Mellwood does not touch Clifton but does go through Butchertown. It does not interfere with any historic buildings in the Clifton Community. I hope this group goes on record as supporting a supplement.

Mr. Segrest made a motion to support the additional studies necessary to determine the environmental impacts associated with improving Mellwood Avenue and constructing a single interchange. The motion was made second by Emily Boone.

2C. I would like to enlist a meeting held with Clifton and would like their full cooperation with this. A meeting is important prior to any action taking place.

3Q. Are there any more costs associated with the environmental impacts?

3R. That is currently unknown. However, it is anticipated that right-of-way costs will be significant if Mellwood Avenue is improved.

4Q. Does this include any mitigation to occur around Butchertown?

4R. No, this is separate.

5C. This concept is in fact mitigation and this is a great blessing to Butchertown and will far outweigh adverse effects.

The AAT Members voted unanimously in favor of conducting the additional studies.

The following items were discussed after the Waterfront Park Presentation:

6Q. My impression from earlier meetings is that we want to eliminate all piers and minimizing them would be a fall back. Is that correct?

6R. That is correct. If all cannot be eliminated, we will explore ways to reduce the number of piers necessary.

7Q. Do you have all necessary approvals from Bi-State Management in order to conduct these studies?

7R. Not yet, but that should occur soon.

8Q. What do numbers mean on the System Wide Performance Measures? What do you mean by Average Delay?

8R. The software used in the analysis assumes that if a vehicle is incapable of traveling the desired "free-flow speed" (i.e. no congestion), then the vehicle incurs some delay.

9Q. So you are saying that people coming downtown in the morning will require four more seconds of travel time under a particular option? I have a hard time visualizing a four second difference between morning and evening. I would say more people are working closer to downtown than Preston Street.

9C. The model is simply a prediction of travel conditions twenty years in the future.

9R. *That is correct. In addition, the delay values presented are for all motorists traveling through the study area. Therefore, the delay that is incurred depends largely on from where the vehicles are coming, and to where they are traveling. Relocating an access point may significantly reduce the travel time for one particular trip while adversely affecting another.*

10Q. Is it correct that according to Layout 2 you can gain access off Witherspoon?

10R. *That is correct. However, KTA feels that Layout 2 is not a feasible option. Layouts 1, 5, and 5-M should be considered the feasible options.*

11C. There is currently access to I-65 from Muhammad Ali Blvd.

12Q. Would access from I-65 to Third Street remain?

12R. *Under Layouts 1 and 5, access from I-65 northbound and southbound would remain. Layout 5-M would close Third Street completely.*

13Q. So you don't think any ramps off Witherspoon are worth considering?

13R. *None of the layouts considered feasible for further study have direct access from Witherspoon to the Interstate System.*

14Q. Under the proposed Interchange there would be three left turn lanes at the end of Jefferson Street. Did you model under present conditions?

14R. *No, the present conditions at Jefferson Street were not modeled other than in the existing, "base-year" traffic model. It was assumed that the modifications to Jefferson Street and the exit ramp from I-65 would occur regardless of this project.*

15Q. A Butchertown goal is for Witherspoon to be constructed within the smallest right of way possible. Which would be supportive of having fewer trips coming through Witherspoon?

15R. *There is not a significant difference between Layouts 1, 5, or 5-M with respect to traffic on the proposed Witherspoon Extension.*

16C. Waterfront Development Corporation wants to make sure Second Street is open for Alternatives. However, we are in favor of eliminating the Third Street ramp.

17Q. Why eliminate the Third Street Ramp?

17R. *Waterfront Development Corporation: The Third Street ramp is the last major impediment to better pedestrian/bicycle access to Waterfront Park and opening up the waterfront.*

18C. The proposed intersection at River Road seems awkward.

19Q. Will the proposed new arena cause a problem? Was it considered?

19R. *Arenas are typically not peak-hour traffic generators; therefore it was not considered in this analysis.*

20C. This may present an opportunity to further open the riverfront. Prior to speaking about potentially closing the Third Street ramp, I had not thought about why it would be beneficial.

21Q. Can we get copies of the study alternatives?

21R. *Copies will be sent to all AAT Members.*

The AAT Members voted unanimously in favor of Layout 5-M.

The next Section 1 AAT meeting has not yet been scheduled. Invitations will be mailed to all representatives approximately one month prior.