



Public Comment Summary

Section 1 Kennedy Interchange Open House October 27, 2005

A public Open House was held on October 27, 2005 at the Louisville Marriott Downtown to discuss the progress to date on the redesign of the Kennedy Interchange, Section 1 of the Louisville-Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project. Comment sheets were provided at four exhibit stations (Mellwood-Story Avenue Study, Waterfront Park Impact Reduction Study, Potential Noise Walls, and Historic Preservation Planning), and a general comment sheet was distributed at the sign-in table. A summary of the comments received follows.

Mellwood-Story Avenue Study Comments:

1. Do the advantages of converting to two-way traffic outweigh the impacts?

- At this point it seems the advantages of two-way traffic outweigh the impacts. That is what the study will show.
- Yes, the Butchertown Neighborhood
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes – It seems this would allow the Story Avenue Area to become more friendly for living. With the development of the North End of Frankfort it looks as if this would add the ability to travel in the open.
- Not sure what negative impact would result from 2 way streets
- Yes
- Yes – very much so. Will move secondary interstate access off of Story Avenue which his a residential street.
- As a resident, I prefer the Mellwood Avenue single point urban interchange. This makes the neighborhood more pedestrian and non-motorized friendly.
- Yes

2. Are you in favor of conducting additional studies to determine environmental impacts associated with the SPUI alternative?

- Yes
- Single point urban Interchange performs best of the alternatives. Widening Mellwood is a task with impacts that must be studied.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Just do it
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes

3. Are there other options that should be considered? If so, what are they?

- Make sure all changes comply with the complete streets format
- No!
- Pedestrians don't care if streets are 2 ways or not, but improving side walks, other benefits of street upgrade would make a walker like me happy.
- Leave them as one way streets
- No
- No

4. Do you have any additional comments about the study?

- Pedestrian and non-motorized accessibility and user friendliness to these two groups are critical to maintaining the residential abundance / character
- This should be typed into a larger plan or Urban Development inside the Butchertown area. With these changes commercialization of Mellwood would be accelerated, it seems.
- The study shouldn't take decades. Get a plan, get the work done.
- Seriously encourage making Mellwood a 2-way street. Will spur additional economic development.
- If you close the 3rd Street ramp and route I-71 & I-64 downtown traffic onto River Road (already bad) – much more traffic will divert onto Rt. 42 and backup Story much more. Thus, you need to fix Story & Mellwood.

Waterfront Park Impact Reduction Study Comments:

1. Do the advantages of reducing the width of I-64 over the Great Lawn outweigh the proposed changes to downtown access?

- It seems to me the advantages would outweigh the access to downtown. Nature is much more attractive than human-made concrete structures of pillars, canapé and tunnels.
- Absolutely! Especially the choice of 5-M provides a better trade off
- Yes. Definitely. Great Lawn needs to be preserved as the residential migration into downtown depends on the vitality of the Great Lawn.
- Yes
- Absolutely
- No. It does seem like some of the alternatives still provide the same functionality with significant savings.
- Minimize the width over the Great Lawn.
- No
- Yes
- Yes
- No

2. Which alternative do you prefer: D18-FEIS, Layout 1, Layout 5 or Layout 5-M?

- I prefer 5-M
- Layout 5-M is best
- None of the above. I would like to stack ramp 21 over ramp 42 to minimize the horizontal impact.
- 5
- 5-M
- I prefer 5-M
- 5 – although 2 & 3 seem much more attractive
- FEIS Alternative
- 5M
- 5M
- FEIS Alternative

3. Is there another option that should be considered? If so, what?

- No
- Yes, as stated under 2

- Please keep a ramp at 3rd street. We need access to all of the great things we have downtown. Busy access is a major concern of mine.
- Public Transit
- No
- No

4. Do you have any additional comments about the study?

- Other than the above, I believe that new downtown residents' opinions were not considered in the selection of Layout 1, 5 or 5-M. Commuters opinion is outweighed in the preferences.
- Protect the extreme park
- You should not dump I-71 & I-64 exiting traffic onto River Road! It is already backed up. We need the 3rd street exit & arena exit.
- Change in access should not create additional traffic with Witherspoon
- Keep 3rd street ramp open

Potential Noise Walls

- 1. The noise wall proposed for Section 1, on the west side of I-65 between Chestnut Street and Floyd Street, is anticipated to be between eight (8) and twelve (12) feet tall. Do you feel that this wall should be considered for further analysis?**
 - Yes
- 2. The noise wall proposed for Section 2, on the east side of I-65 between Floyd Street and Main Street, is anticipated to be between eight (8) and eighteen (18) feet tall. Do you feel that this wall should be considered for further analysis?**
 - Yes
- 3. The noise wall proposed for Section 5, on the west side of I-64 between Cable Street and Story Avenue, is anticipated to be between ten (10) and twenty (20) feet tall. Do you feel that this wall should be considered for further analysis?**
 - Yes
 - Yes
- 4. The noise wall proposed for Section 6, on the west side of I-64 between Story Avenue and Mellwood Avenue, is anticipated to be approximately ten (10) feet tall. Do you feel that this wall should be considered for further analysis?**

- Yes
 - Higher
5. **The noise wall proposed for Section 7, on the east side of I-64 between the existing railroad overpass and Mellwood Avenue, is anticipated to be between ten (10) and sixteen (16) feet tall. Do you feel that this wall should be considered for further analysis?**
- Yes
 - This section is definitely needed!
 - OK
6. **Do you have any additional comments about the noise study?**
- Look at existing highways as well.
 - Please have it look as much like nature as possible.
 - Add wall from East to West on North side of Witherspoon
 - Please no noise walls. They look like an ugly afterthought and cost too much. They hide the city and are bad for economic development. We need to integrate the expressway into the city, not wall it off. I-64 was integrated into Waterfront Park (maybe vice-versa.)

Historic Preservation Planning

1. **In the preliminary plans for the Kennedy Interchange, the proposed Witherspoon Extension is located parallel to the southernmost interstate ramp, north of Butchertown. Do you favor the concept of relocating the Witherspoon Extension, as proposed in the Immediate Needs Report, to roughly follow the existing alignment of Geiger Street?**
- Only if it is 2 lane
 - If 2 lane
 - I prefer the proposal offered by Norman Tasman & the Butchertown Neighborhood that would minimize traffic on Witherspoon and have Geiger by as a pedestrian and local traffic connector going completely from East to West in Butchertown.
 - No – Geiger should be extended as bike and walking
2. **In the preliminary plans for the Kennedy Interchange, the only north-south access through the interchange connecting Butchertown to the Ohio River is at Clay Street. Do you favor additional access for movements from Butchertown to the north? If so, which locations?**
- Yes, Campbell

- Yes – As shown in schematics
- Yes if Butchertown is to have “local” access to the new river opening there must be additional connectors. Also, they should be bicycle and pedestrian friendly.
- No
- No

3. Are there additional concepts for the relocation of the proposed Witherspoon Extension or for additional north-south access points that should be studied?

- Yes
- Get Witherspoon over as close to highway as possible. Maybe create a wall and have the wall as the Northernmost Boundary. Or maybe have Witherspoon slightly elevated and built into the berm.

Open House Comments

1. Did this evening’s Open House provide the right kind of information about the Kennedy Interchange Project, Section 1 of the Louisville-Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project? If not, please tell us what should have been addressed.

- Provided adequate information
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes – Handout of construction phases would have been helpful
- I found it helpful and informative
- The information was comprehensive, useful and easily understandable. I was impressed by the sheer volume of info.
- Yes
- Yes

2. Would additional Open House meetings in the future be of value to you? Do you have any suggestions for potential future meetings, such as time, location, or other comments?

- None, unless serious consideration given to downtown residents
- Yes as decisions are completed
- Yes, construction phases
- Sure – more would be great, no preference to time location, etc.
- Yes, change venue to increase convenience and input; walls, schools, etc.

- Yes

3. Do you have any other ideas / suggestions?

- No
- Make the Witherspoon extension 2 lanes for new public transit
- Even though news coverage encouraged public participation, it appears a very little portion of the public attended. That's really very discouraging.
- This Open House has been extremely valuable and all the work it took to present this project is to be commended. All the people I talked to were friendly and helpful.
- What about flood protection for the Butchertown area?