Appendix A. Master Map, On-Alignment Map and Off-Alignment Map
CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVES

KY 536 SCOPING STUDY

LEGEND

- Improvements included in both alternatives
- KY 536 on-alignment alternative
- KY 536 off-alignment alternative
- Future intersection modifications

NOTE:
Intersection will be addressed with future improvements that will be designed in future phases of the project.
Appendix B. Phase 3 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix
This chart was created as a type of “Report Card” on how each alternative addresses the established goals of the KY 536 Scoping Study using available data and analysis conducted during the study’s planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Goals</th>
<th>Spot Improvements Only (No Build)*</th>
<th>On-Alignment Alternative</th>
<th>Off-Alignment Alternative (Recommended by PDT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Rural Character</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Safety Concerns</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Multiple Travel Modes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Number of Structures Impacted</td>
<td>16 structures</td>
<td>66 structures</td>
<td>37 structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Number of Parcels Impacted</td>
<td>52 properties</td>
<td>177 properties</td>
<td>137 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Farmland Impacted (acres)</td>
<td>15 acres of farmland</td>
<td>95 acres of farmland</td>
<td>77 acres of farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize the Number of Stream Crossings</td>
<td>0 stream crossings</td>
<td>4 stream crossings</td>
<td>9 stream crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Number of Turns Required</td>
<td>All existing turns (5) remain</td>
<td>0 turns required</td>
<td>0 turns required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Travel Time (minutes) to get from KY 17 to the Licking River</td>
<td>14.6 minutes required</td>
<td>7.1 minutes required</td>
<td>6.9 minutes required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize KY 536 New Roadway Construction Length (miles)</td>
<td>1.7 miles of new construction</td>
<td>5.9 miles of new construction</td>
<td>5.5 miles of new construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Additional Roadway Miles to Maintain</td>
<td>0 additional miles to maintain</td>
<td>1.4 miles of “old KY 536” to maintain</td>
<td>2.6 miles of “old KY 536” to maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Cost Estimate by Project Phase (M = millions)</td>
<td>Design: $0.3M Utilities: $0.2M Right-of-Way: $1.0M Construction: $1.2M Total: $2.7M</td>
<td>Design: $2M Utilities: $6.5M Right-of-way: $21M Construction: $64M Total: $93.5M</td>
<td>Design: $2M Utilities: $4.5M Right-of-Way: $12M Construction: $68M Total: $86.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *This alternative was not recommended for further study as a result of the Project Development Team meeting on 7/31/15. This decision was supported by public comments received during Phase 2 of the study. However, the no-build alternative must be included in the alternatives analysis as a benchmark against which the impacts of other alternatives can be compared.
- The term “impacted” is used to provide an estimate on the number of resources that could potentially be “touched” by the proposed alternative. The next phase of the project (Design) will help determine whether partial or whole parcels, structures, etc. may be acquired to accommodate the transportation improvement.
- The On-Alignment and Off-Alignment alternatives in this matrix include approximately $15M in their cost estimates for the Visalia Bridge over the Licking River. The On-Alignment and Off-Alignment alternatives in this matrix include two, eight foot multi-use paths (between KY 17 and KY 16) and a single, separate, 10 foot, multi-use path (between KY 16 and the Campbell County line).
Appendix C. Project Development Team (PDT) Members and Alternates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenton County Fiscal Court</td>
<td>Kris Knochelmann*</td>
<td>Judge Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone County Fiscal Court</td>
<td>Gary Moore</td>
<td>Judge Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Webster</td>
<td>Govt &amp; Community Relations Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell County Fiscal Court</td>
<td>Steve Pendery</td>
<td>Judge Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone County Planning Commission</td>
<td>Kevin Costello</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell County Planning &amp; Zoning Commission</td>
<td>Cindy Minter</td>
<td>Director of Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Hutchinson</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city of Alexandria (Campbell County)</td>
<td>Bill Rachford</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city of Covington</td>
<td>Sam Trapp</td>
<td>Maintenance Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city of Independence</td>
<td>Chris Reinersman</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city of Taylor Mill</td>
<td>Dan Bell</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton County Fiscal Court</td>
<td>Beth Sewell</td>
<td>Commissioner, 1st District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton County Planning Commission</td>
<td>Marc Hult</td>
<td>Commission Member for Covington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gailen Bridges</td>
<td>Commission Member for Kenton County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton County Public Schools</td>
<td>Sherry Eagler</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte Wayman</td>
<td>Area Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Bicycle &amp; Bikeways Commission</td>
<td>Jason Ramler</td>
<td>Commissioner for Northern Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, District 6</td>
<td>Rob Hans</td>
<td>Chief District Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Callan-Ramler</td>
<td>Planning Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kentucky Area Development District (NKADD)</td>
<td>Jeff Thelen</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Spatholt</td>
<td>Community Development/Public Administration Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Alex Kraemer</td>
<td>Manager of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKI Board Member / Resident</td>
<td>Roger Kerlin</td>
<td>OKI Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKI Board Member / Resident</td>
<td>Larry Maxey</td>
<td>OKI Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Services of Kenton County</td>
<td>Dennis Gordon</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Scribner</td>
<td>Director of Planning and Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kenton County Citizens Group</td>
<td>Kathy Donohoue</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Representative Arnold Simpson</td>
<td>Marshall Slagle</td>
<td>Covington resident appointed by Rep. Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold Simpson</td>
<td>State Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK)</td>
<td>Andrew Aiello</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elad Mokadi</td>
<td>Manager of Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PDT Chair
Appendix D. Summary of August 18 Site Tour
August 18, 2015 KY 536 Scoping Study Site Tour

Participants: Chris Clemons, Alex Kramer, James Fausz, Beth Sewell, Gailen Bridges, Kathy Donohoue

We met at Maverick & Taylor Mill roads and took a look at how that intersection would work and the impact it would have on the homes there. We also walked out to Taylor Mill to see how a school by-pass would work. We then drove 536 with Chris explaining where each route would come in and possible connectors. We drove to the Licking Bridge and Chris explained the two options, ramps versus raising the road. We also drove down Mann Road to see that.

After the drive tour, Gailen, Beth and Kathy went with Chris to the public library to look at the maps and discuss possibilities. Gailen asked Chris if he could give us a large map to work with so that streams and parcel lines would show clearly. Chris delivered the map to Gailen the next day.

Kathy dropped-off the group’s Off-Route Alternative to Chris on August 20, 2015. Along with the map drawing the group’s alternative included their reasoning or rationale. The group believed that the alternative was the best off road that they could do, with the least harmful impact.
TO 536 STUDY GROUP-OFF ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE

Dear Parson Brinckerhoff and 536 Study Group:

Kathy Donohue, Garden Bridges, and Marc Hult collaborated for an off-alignment alternative. Kathy's primary concern was looking out for the residents. Garden's primary concern was preserving farm land and Marc, as a hydrologist, was concerned with preventing stream degradation. This is the alternative that we propose, along with our thinking process.

We made our own evaluation of alternatives 5 - 8 and give you the following table. We looked at stream crossings, taking of businesses and houses and how many parcels were severely impacted. We defined "severely impacted" as splitting property in two rather than skirting along the property line or skirting a corner or just separating a small fraction of the property. Taking a house was considered severe per se. Obviously, choosing these parcels as severe impacts was subjective, but we tried to use the same yardstick on each parcel. Our analysis is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>STREAM CROSSINGS</th>
<th>BUSINESS/HOUSES TAKEN</th>
<th>SEVERE IMPACTS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOUSES TAKEN &amp; SEVERE IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7, Also 2 ponds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 House by Decoursey</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our alternative is marked in black marker on a five foot map. It begins at the white dotted line of Alternative 9 where it intersects with Taylor Mill Road. We are proposing slightly altering that intersection alignment and then going south. It immediately crosses a 30 acre parcel, but we are proposing to go as close to the stream as possible to not go through productive land and stay far enough away from the stream to not cause an engineering or stream problem. It then skirts below the existing road impacting no houses. It then crosses Staffordsburg and tries to skirt along property lines and edges of property before crossing Alternative 7 and then skirting property lines through forested areas. It goes north of Alternative 7 to avoid the streams and then joins back with Alternative 7 to Decoursey. By our reading of the map, the only house or business taken is whatever has to be taken at the intersection with Decoursey, which appears to be one house that is unavailable.

There are two streams that traverse the entire study area, and thus are mandatory to be crossed, unless the existing alignment is kept. This proposed alignment only makes those two mandatory crossings and avoids all other stream crossings or proximity to streams.
We believe that this alternative would have the least impact on streams, only crossing two as opposed to the other ones having six or seven crossings. It takes the fewest houses and has the least severe impacts on other parcels.

If the curve leaving 16 before it crosses Staffordsburg is too severe, it can be flattened somewhat but still stay behind the houses. It does not appear to be any worse than the Alternative 6 curve south of Staffordsburg Road.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Kathy Dobson

Ted A. Swell

Billie Stull
Appendix E. PDT Final Alternative Refinement Input
PDT Final Input Received to Refine Off-Alignment Alternative

From: Roger Kerlin
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2015 9:56 AM
To: Robyn Bancroft <rbancroft@oki.org>
Subject: RE: REMINDER!! KY 536 -- YOUR RESPONSE IS REQUESTED by AUGUST 21

Robyn:

Re. 536, any of the tight alternative range that you gave us should be selected.

And that selection should be left up to Jim & PB based upon economics, geography/terrain, site dispositions, & etc...They have a better handle on all of the matrix of factors woven into the landscape.

Any of those are a far better solution than the existing conditions.
I hope this helps.
Kindest Regards,
Roger

______________________________

Larry Maxey
August 21, 2015 phone message left for Robyn Bancroft (transcribed by Regina Brock)
I have 2 points,
1. Highly favor #5 option – it’s the only option of 5 through 8 that moves intersection at KY 16 north and away from school and cleans up congestion at intersection.
2. I’m not opposed to stay closest to existing route but opposed to any kind of diagonal cut across the hill side. I am not an engineer but have experience in that going way back. If you try to make a diagonal cut and go down existing hillside you will have same issue that have now on Visalia road with slippage. “you cannot maintain structural integrity of road bed by diagonal cut – it’s a nightmare for any engineer to try to build road around hill side”
That’s my input. I prefer to clean up mess on 16 and get away from school. Option #5 does this. Lastly, favor of a modern type intersection with 177 to move intersection west of existing intersection do not like idea of 30 foot elevated ramp to existing road to get to it.

______________________________

From: Dennis Gordon
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2015 2:06 PM
To: Robyn Bancroft <rbancroft@oki.org>
Subject: RE: REMINDER!! KY 536 -- YOUR RESPONSE IS REQUESTED by AUGUST 21

Robyn, I’m sending our response to your call for general feedback.
• Being off alignment is better because it reduces curb cuts and provides for greater through traffic movement.
• Getting the intersection away from the school and fair grounds should be included in the preferred alternative.
• The fly over of KY 177, RR, and river should be included in the preferred alternative.
• If at all possible the roadway should be aligned along existing parcel lines to minimize impacts to property owners (i.e. don’t split farms).

We propose an alignment shown on the attachment as a black line.
• Built upon two of the discussed alternatives.
• Follows Alternative 7 west of KY 16 and Alternative 5 continuing to the east.
• Is completely off alignment from the existing road but is generally the closest option to the existing route.
• Greatest ability to move traffic safely via reduced curb cuts and access management controls.
• Avoids the school/fairground area.
• Includes the fly over of KY 177, RR and river.

Thanks!

From: Callan-Ramler, Carol (KYTC-D06)
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2015 8:08 AM
To: Robyn Bancroft <rbancroft@oki.org>
Subject: RE: REMINDER!! KY 536 -- YOUR RESPONSE IS REQUESTED by AUGUST 21

Robyn,
Jim and I met yesterday morning for me to pass of to him some suggested ideas. I had hand drawn and wanted to share w/ Jim the “why” behind what I did.
Thanks,
Carol

Marc Hult and Beth Sewell both sent emails on 8/20/15 to Robyn – stating that they had provided their final input on the alternatives via the big map from the tour.

Robyn,
I was able to meet with Chris at PB and appreciated his time and information on the tour that Kathy D. hosted earlier this week. As Marc noted, I was able to view and discuss the off-line alternate that will be presented to you. My signature on the document that analyzes the proposed off-line alternate route indicates my support of the efforts of these citizens.
Please allow their submittal to represent my response to your request.
Thank you,
From: Marc Hult  
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2015 4:06 PM  
To: rbancroft@oki.org  
Cc: Gailen Wayne Bridges Jr; 'Marc F Hult'; Beth Sewell; Kathleen Donohoue  
Subject: Re: KY 536 -- Public comment period closed = 210 responses received!

Robyn,  
Gailen and I, in collaboration with Commissioner Sewell and Kathy Donahue, have prepared and will submit tomorrow an "Off-Alignment Alternative" as a five-by three-foot map with a two-page explanation to Chris at Parson-Brinckerhoff.

This constitutes Gailen and my joint comment due August 21 as requested.

Thanks! Marc

---

Wed 8/11/2015

Mayor Bill Rachford phone message received by Robyn Bancroft (transcribed by Regina Brock)

This is Bill Rachford Mayor of Alexandria it is around 9:00 it is I think Tuesday, August 19 on 536 I am going to dictate what preference is...start at Rt17 I like orange route. I think it is Alternative 7 heading East and then orange becomes dash line then dash yellow line then solid yellow line north of school then dash yellow line merge into orange line to Visalia bridge that is the route I prefer. So orange then dash orange then dash yellow dash yellow to solid orange. I think that minimizes disruption to residential area and put all new construction into farmland area. I think better way to do it that my input to you. I am not certain I’ll be at next meeting or not have to be in Frankfort September 25 and 26 so may not make meeting wanted to get my comments to you. You have my email and my cell 859-466-9664 if you want to discuss if my interest are not clear.

Thanks.

---

From: Marshall Slagle  
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 11:19 AM  
To: Robyn Bancroft <rbancroft@oki.org>  
Subject: Alignments 5 and 8
I have reviewed alignments 5 thru 8 and fine that alternatives 5 and 8 provide the most direct routes thru the area and would provide for a more direct connection from route 536 on the west to the Bridge crossing the Licking River. Alternative 8 would be my preferred Alternative. Thank you,

Marshall Slagle FAICP
September 25, 2015 PDT Meeting Minutes: CORRECTIONS
Robyn Bancroft, KY 536 Scoping Study Project Manager, received four correction requests in response to the October 8, 2015 emailing of the minutes to the PDT members. This document records the corrections that were included in the PDT’s approval of the minutes at their November 16, 2015 meeting.

1) Page 4, fifth paragraph: Mr. Bridges indicated that he did not recall the following sentence and noted that it did not make sense. Sentence read: "He also said that Mr. Bridge’s alternative would require the road to run parallel to the streams rather than beside them, may require that portions of the streams to be relocated, and could result in more impacts and costs." Mr. Bridges recommended that the sentence be removed.

2) Page 7, under PDT consensus: Mr. Bridges noted that the vote totals should be included. He recommended that the following italicized text be added. "After discussion, Judge Knochelmann asked group members to share their preferences of either an On-Alignment or an Off-Alignment Alternative. Once the preferences were shared, there was a consensus among the PDT for the Off-Alignment Alternative, with eight members in favor, four in favor of the On-Alignment alternative and one member with no preference. It was agreed through a general consensus of the PDT that the Off-Alignment Alternative was the recommended alternative and that this would be communicated to the public at the open house and via the website."

3) Page 5, fifth paragraph: Mr. Ramler shared that where it says that he was glad about the multi-use path being included but was concerned that there wasn't a visualization of the path, that wasn't what he was concerned about. His concern was that there was still one option being presented without a multi-use path. Mr. Ramler recommended that the following text be removed "it will be presented with no visualization of what the path looks like" and replaced with the following italicized text "there was still one alternative option being presented without a multi-use path."

4) Page 6, fifth paragraph: Mr. Ramler clarified that he said the evaluation matrix's colors were misleading, not distracting, because the multi-use path option had only marginally higher impacts over the shoulder option but the color changed from yellow to red. Mr. Ramler recommended that the following text be removed "were distracting" and replaced with the following italicized text "could be misleading because the multi-use path option had only marginally higher impacts over the wide-shoulder option, but the color changed from yellow to red."
MEMBERS
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OKI STAFF
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Ms. Bancroft called the meeting to order at 10:10 AM.

Judge/Executive Knochelmann asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Judge/Executive Knochelmann asked if there were any corrections or amendments to the KY 536 PDT meeting minutes from July 31, 2015. Mr. Gordon moved to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Callan-Ramler seconded the motion, motion carried.

Overview of Refined Two Alternatives

Mr. Brannon provided an overview of the two refined alternatives that are currently under consideration for the KY536 Scoping Study. He stated once again to the group that the Study Team has advanced throughout the entire study process with a commitment to listening to the community and making sure that voices are heard. The team heard many ideas and three major themes came through feedback received from the public and PDT members:

1) The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet has reservations with constructing new roadway that would create additional road miles to maintain in the future and as such, is interested in using the existing road as much as possible

2) For many rural property owners, house impacts is sometimes more preferable than land impacts. Houses can be rebuilt whereas land is harder to replace.

3) Move traffic away from White’s Tower Elementary School.

Mr. Brannon stated that both the On- and Off-Alignment Alternatives are the same from KY 17 to a half-mile west of Staffordsburg Road Connector at which point the two alternatives branch off on different alignments until they reach the new connection to the Visalia Bridge. He also said that the existing roadway at Visalia Hill should be closed and removed under both alternatives. Ms. Callan-Ramler further explained that when roads or portions of state roads are relocated, the counties and/or cities in which the roads are relocated have to decide whether or not to take over management of the vacated portions of the road and thereby also accept maintenance responsibilities. This can be an expensive draw on the counties’ already limited budgets. Therefore, it is being assumed for now that the existing portion of KY 536 at Visalia Hill will be closed and removed if KY 536 is relocated onto an alternative alignment.

On-Alignment Alternative: Mr. Brannon said this approach proposes to modify and improve the existing roadway and use the existing corridor as much as possible although small sections would be briefly rerouted. This option would follow KY 536 east from KY 17 and shifts north onto a new segment as it approaches KY 16 (redirecting traffic north of White’s Tower Elementary School) to realign with KY 536 near Maverick Road. It would continue until about one half mile west of Klein Road, then turn north onto a new alignment that connects directly with the Visalia Bridge. This alternative is planned as a three-lane road (a single lane traveling in either direction with a lane in the middle to assist with left turns). To accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel, this alternative provides two, eight foot multi-use paths on both sides of the roadway between KY 17 and KY 16. East of KY 16, this alternative’s
cross section includes both a 12 foot, paved shoulder and a 10 foot multi-use path. Mr. Brannon said that while small portions of the On-Alignment Alternative would be redirected onto a new route, the majority of the alternative maximizes use of the existing KY 536 corridor.

Mayor Bell asked if the Study Team had identified which portions of the On Alignment Alternative would require deep cuts into the hillside and how that would affect properties and homes. Mr. Brannon and Ms. Callan-Ramler replied saying that the proposed alternatives have not yet been developed to that level of detail, however Mr. Brannon also said that the roadway elevation adjacent to properties and homes would change, though how many and to what degree has not yet been determined.

Mr. Maxey mentioned that if KY 536 is going to be rerouted to the north of Visalia Hill, care must be taken to maintain the integrity of the hill. Ms. Callan-Ramler said that the cut in the hill will be made on a diagonal (similar to what was done at KY 17 and KY 1486) and that geotechnical studies would be completed to determine how best to stabilize the hill. Under the On-Alignment Alternative, Mann Road will be improved at the intersection of Mann and KY 536. Under the Off-Alternative, Mann Road will be improved between the intersection of Mann and the new KY 536 and the intersection of Mann and Visalia Road. When asked if money could be saved by just improving the intersections and not the roadway in between, Ms. Callan-Ramler said that by the time the intersection work is completed, only a small portion of road between them would remain untouched. Therefore, if the Off-Alignment Alternative were to be recommended, it would be prudent to go ahead and complete improvements along the entire length of the roadway stretching between to the two intersections.

Ms. Donohoue acknowledged the answer but also noted that a big creek runs alongside Mann Road and that needs to be considered. Mr. Maxey asked if the Study Team has heard back from any of the Mann Road landowners regarding the refined alternatives. Ms. Bancroft said to her knowledge that the Team had not yet heard from any Mann Road landowners directly. The alternatives were released just one week ago and she expects the team will hear more from landowners in the upcoming weeks. Ms. Bancroft also mentioned that feedback received from landowners during Phase Two showed that property owners felt that the intersection at the top of Visalia Hill is extremely dangerous and they were pleased to see improvements being planned.

Mayor Reinersman asked about the degree to which the Study Team is reaching out to property owners regarding the new alternatives. Mr. Clemons replied that the Team is not reaching out to specific property owners at this time beyond on-going community outreach efforts. Ms. Callan-Ramler said that property owners typically want answers to specific questions (such as how much of my property are you going to take? Will my septic tank be affected, etc.), that the Scoping Study has not reached that level of detail. Mr. Wallace added that there will be a lot more opportunity for outreach to specific property owners during the next, more detailed phases of project development.

Ms. Donohoue asked when the Study Team will know which properties will be affected. Ms. Callan-Ramler replied that that will be determined in further stages of project development, often at the 30 percent design phase. However, it may still not be known at that stage what the specific impacts will
The timing for developing detailed project designs is dependent upon the availability of funding and funding has not yet been secured. Until that happens and more information is known, property owners should continue on as they have in the past. If someone should want to sell their property, they can disclose that a study has been completed but will also need to say that specific details are not yet known.

Mr. Bridges asked how the “Addresses Safety Concerns” measurement for the On-Alignment Alternative advanced from red (low/poorly meets goal) to green (highly/strongly meets goal). Ms. Bancroft explained that in response to feedback received from the PDT at the June 30 meeting, changes, including changing red to yellow for this measurement, were incorporated into the Evaluation Matrix that was presented to the public during Phase Two of the Study. Mr. Brannon added that the previous alternative being referenced re-used the existing Visalia Hill that has a significant accident history. The new On-Alignment alternative removes Visalia Hill, improving the safety rating.

Off-Alignment Alternative: Mr. Brannon reported this alternative, just like the On-Alignment, follows the existing KY 536 east from KY 17 and shifts north onto a new segment as it approaches KY 16, redirecting traffic north of White’s Tower Elementary School, to realign with KY 536 near Maverick Road. The Off-Alignment then follows the existing roadway until about one half mile west of Staffordsburg Road, where it turns north onto a new alignment that connects directly with the existing Visalia Bridge. This alternative is planned as a three-lane road, a single lane traveling in either direction or a lane in the middle to assist with left turns, between KY 17 and Staffordsburg Road. From Staffordsburg Road to the Campbell County line where the road is proposed to off the current KY 536 alignment, the alternative would become a two-lane road with the exception of a climbing lane that would be constructed to assist trucks traveling westward from KY 177 to the top of Visalia Hill.

A portion of the discussion centered on impacts to streams: Mr. Brannon said that one of the negative aspects of a more northern roadway alignment is that the new road would have to cross more streams, which results in more impacts and increased cost. Mr. Clemons said that an advantage of the Off Alignment is that the road would run perpendicular to streams rather than parallel to them and noted that running parallel results in greater impacts to the stream. Ms. Callan-Ramler further explained that crossing streams at a 90 degree angle will minimize the need to “get into a stream,” whereas running a road parallel to streams can require cutting into hillsides which can threaten the stability of the hillside and streambed.

Mr. Bridges noted that the Off-Alignment crosses many streams and the On-Alignment impacts fewer streams. He also stated that he submitted a suggested alignment that was located further north of the proposed Off-Alignment Alternative and would impact only two streams. Mr. Clemons explained that though the alignment Mr. Bridges suggested would cross fewer streams, the alternative crossed more streams than Mr. Bridges had thought. He also said that Mr. Bridge’s alternative would require the road to run parallel to the streams rather than beside them, may require that portions of the streams to be relocated, and could result in more impacts and costs. Mr. Wallace said that issues such as these will be revisited and looked at in much more detail once the project advances into the federally-required environmental assessment phase of development.
Mr. Bridges mentioned that though he had submitted an alternate proposal for the Study Team’s consideration, but did not see some of his suggestions included in the Off-Alignment Alternative and asked why not. Mr. Clemons said that the Study Team did look at Mr. Bridges’ proposal, but when considered from an engineering standpoint which considered slopes, cuts required, streams and creeks, roadway widths and other details, the impacts were much greater than they appeared to be when drawn on paper. Ms. Bancroft shared with the group that the alternative that Mr. Bridges was referring to came from Ms. Donohoue’s request to the Study Team following the last PDT meeting on July 31, that a member of the Study Team join her and other PDT members including Mr. Bridges, Ms. Sewell and Mr. Hult, for a tour of the Study Area in order to assist these members in providing input on the Off-Alignment Alternative’s refinement.

Mayor Bell observed that the construction cost for the Off Alignment Alternative is more because of the amount of excavation required. Mr. Brannon said excavation and embankment is more costly and that this is a trade off with property acquisition and utility costs.

Mr. Brannon reminded the group that these alternatives are high-level conceptual alternatives and more specific information will be known once a recommended alternative is identified and the detailed design phase gets underway. He noted that as part of that process, the specific road alignment may shift somewhat. He also mentioned that, during the detailed design phase, costs can be reduced in many ways, such as narrowing the roadway shoulders. He also said that the impact limits depicted on the maps of the On- and Off-Alignment Alternatives are projected “worst case scenarios.”

Ms. Donohoue requested that the Study Team share the community’s preferences once the project advances to the detailed design phase. She asked why the no build alternative (spot improvements only) was on the Evaluation Matrix, but not the Comment Form. Mr. Brannon mentioned that though the no build alternative is not directly addressed in the materials being developed, the alternative must be included in the alternatives analysis as a benchmark against which the impacts of other alternatives can be compared. Ms. Donohoue requested that a question be added to the Comment Form to evaluate the community’s opinions regarding priority for funding the project. Ms. Bancroft said the Study Team will consider including such a question on the Phase 3 Comment Form.

Mr. Ramler stated that he was glad that a multi-use path option was included with the alternatives but he was concerned it will be presented with no visualization of what the path looks like. When discussing whether or not to include a separate multi-use path as part of the off alignment alternative, Judge Knochelmann suggested that trends should be considered and in response to these trends, a separate multi-use path option should be included as part of the off alignment option.

Ms. Donohoue felt that including a separate multi-use path could transform the roadway from a rural corridor into a corridor that feels more suburban. She stated that more experienced bike riders could travel on the road’s shoulders. Mr. Ramler said that he would agree if this section of KY 536 were not planned to be connected to a larger, regional multi-use path system. He stated that his real concern is not a multi-use path separated from the road, it would be requiring pedestrians, bicyclists, runners,
etc. to travel on the roadway shoulders in the absence of a path. Further he stated that adding in separated multi-use paths after a roadway is complete costs tremendously more.

When asked about the configuration of the separated multi-use path, Ms. Bancroft explained that the path would run parallel to the road, but there would be space between the road and the path and the path would follow the natural topography of the land. She shared photocopies of a multi-use path example from Aero Parkway in Boone County which assisted the PDT members in picturing the proposal more clearly. The PDT recommended that photos be used to help convey information as clearly as possible to the public.

Mayor Carran suggested that inclusion of a multi-use path could create more opportunity for people to come and experience the rural character of the area. She also suggested that local farmers could also set up small markets to sell their produce to these visitors, which is something that is being done successfully in other areas. Mayor Carran noted that the public needs to understand that the money needed to build a multi-use path will not come directly out of people’s pockets, but instead will come from other public funding sources.

Judge Knochelmann asked the group why not include a multi-use path in the plan? Ms. Donohoue suggested that cost/expense, changes in the landscape, increased impact on homes and a change in the rural nature of the area were all issues to be considered. Mr. Bridges also suggested that multi-use paths may encourage unwanted interaction between the public and livestock. Ms. Donohoue requested that the Study Team ask the community through the comment form if they want a multi-use path. Ms. Bancroft and Mr. Brannon said they would provide the information and ask for the public’s input. Mr. Policinski emphasized that OKI will not be making the decision on whether or not to include a multi-use path as part of the final configuration. The public will make that decision. Judge Knochelmann said the PDT’s first focus is a recommendation on the road portion and once a decision has been made of On-Alignment or Off-Alignment today then go the public for feedback on both proposals and what they are wanting in their area.

Mr. Ramler was concerned about how information was presented in the Evaluation Matrix and said that the color-based notations indicating the degree to which each alternative met the study goals was subjective for some criteria. Specifically, he objected to the colors (red, green and yellow) used to define the measurements in the matrix as he felt they were distracting.

Ms. Bancroft suggested removing the colors from the chart. Mr. Knochelmann agreed, but felt that the information still needed to be presented.

Ms. Donohoue noted that the matrix addressed the On-Alignment with multi-use path, On-Alignment without multi-use path and Off-Alignment with multi-use path. She suggested amending the matrix to also present an off alignment without multi-use path. Ms. Callan-Ramler agreed that balancing the presentation of information would be a good idea. After group discussion, it was determined that the On-Alignment without paths would be removed from the Evaluation Matrix.
PDT Consensus on a Recommended Alternative

Judge Knochelmann asked the PDT members to consider which alternative they preferred. Mr. Maxey said that while this project is important to the residents of Kenton County, it is also important for Campbell County and others outside the study area. He commended the Study Team for the blend of On- and Off-Alignment Alternatives developed. He said that improving the bridge connection is most important. Mr. Bridges said he preferred the alternative he submitted. While he mentioned that he prefers the Off-Alignment, he still wants to hear what the public has to say. He requested a PDT meeting after the close of the public comment period to discuss further.

After the discussion, Judge Knochelmann asked group members to share their preferences.

Once the preferences were shared, it was agreed through general consensus that the Off-Alignment Alternative was determined to be the PDT’s recommended alternative and that this would be communicated to the public at the open house and via the website.

Next Steps

Ms. Bancroft thanked the group for their time and invaluable suggestions for improving the Study Team’s communication with the public regarding the two refined alternatives.

Ms. Bancroft announced that the final Public Open House will be held on Monday, October 5, 2015 from 4-7 PM at the City of Independence Senior and Community Center.

Ms. Bancroft said that today’s meeting is scheduled to be the last PDT meeting. However, after the 30-day public comment period concludes on November 5, she will report via email with the PDT on what the public responses are regarding the alternatives. If there is a clear indication that the public agrees with the PDT’s preference for the Off-Alignment Alternative, it is likely a follow up meeting will not be necessary. If the results indicate otherwise, Ms. Bancroft will consult the group to determine if they would like to meet one more time before a final recommendation is determined.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:05
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Call to Order/Welcome
Ms. Bancroft called the meeting to order at 2:35 PM.

Judge/Executive Knochelmann asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Judge/Executive Knochelmann asked if there were any corrections to e-mail amendments received for the KY 536 PDT meeting minutes from September 25, 2015. Mayor Bell moved to approve the minutes with noted amendments. Mr. Bridges seconded the motion, motion carried.

Public Comment Summary
Ms. Bancroft provided a brief overview of the 184 public comment forms received from the October 5th Public Open House and website during the 30-day public comment period. She noted that a complete summary of all responses was included in the PDT Constant Contact notice for this meeting.

Question number three asked which alternative should be advanced. Sixty-two percent of respondents stated that they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that the Off-Alignment should be advanced. This is in comparison to the 69 percent who stated that they “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” that the On-alignment should be advanced. Ms. Bancroft stated that the public’s responses confirmed the PDT’s recommendation made at the September 25th meeting that the Off-Alignment Alternative be advanced.

Question number four asked about the speed limit for the section of KY 536 east of KY 16. Respondents were almost equally split on this question. Forty percent “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that 55mph should be the posted speed limit for this section. Meanwhile, 43 percent “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” that 55mph should be the posted speed. Another 17 percent of the respondents answered “Not Sure.” Ms. Bancroft stated that the Study Team’s suggestion is that the Final Report include a recommendation that KYTC revisit the topic of posted speed limit(s) for the corridor during the future Design Phase of the project. Mr. Brannon suggested maybe KYTC break the speed limit up into different segments based on rural versus urban designed roadway sections.

Question number four also asked for the public’s opinion regarding non-motorized travel such as bicycling and walking for the section east of KY 16. Ms. Bancroft stated that the public’s responses once again reflect those expressed by the majority of PDT members at the September 25th meeting. Sixty-six percent of respondents said that they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that a separate, 10-foot multi-use path should be provided on one side of the road. In comparison, 66 percent “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” that the 12-foot paved shoulders should be used to accommodate bike/ped travel. Ms. Bancroft said that the Study Team suggests that the Final Report include the recommendation for a separate Multi-Use Path based on strong PDT and public support and due to the corridor’s role serving as part of a regional multi-modal network. Mr. Hans said that in a typically rural area, KYTC would look at including 12-foot shoulders, however a 10-foot multi-use corridor is usually what is recommended.
Ms. Donohoue still was curious as to why the width of roadway for rural section had to be used; since Harris Pike has two bike paths recommended with a smaller shoulder. Can the 12-foot shoulder recommendation be reduced to same as the Harris Pike? Mr. Hans said that what Ms. Donohoue was asking for will be included as part of the design process and it is way too early to determine the specific design criteria. Ms. Donohoue said she does not see a need for two 12-foot shoulders. Ms. Callan-Ramler said this is still very early and no precise measurements and conclusions can be made until the detailed design phase is conducted. She stated that at this point, the current scoping study is still too far out to get down to the detail that Ms. Donohoue wants addressed. Ms. Callan-Ramler said there are too many variables at this time and suggested that Mr. Brannon include writing “minimize width as much as possible” in the final report.

Mr. Bridges asked if a broad range for roadway width could be used in the Final Report rather than a set range? Mr. Brannon said that many factors contribute to determining the roadway’s width. He stated that certain design elements such as storm water management controls could necessitate fluctuations in roadway widths due to topography, soil and other factors. He said an urban roadway section with curb and gutter does not require as much width in comparison to a rural section where water is designed to run-off into natural swales or ditches alongside the roadway. Ms. Bancroft said that the PDT and public shared very early in the study how important it was to minimize impact to properties, homes, and farms and that the Study Team has been committed to this goal throughout the study process. She reaffirmed this commitment. Mr. Policinski asked that Mr. Bridges’ question be answered regarding a possible roadway width range. Ms. Callan-Ramler stated that the roadway width provided in this scoping study is done so at a conceptual planning level and is not set in stone. She repeated that in the next phase of Design, all data will be examined parcel-by-parcel in order to minimize roadway width as much as possible. Ms. Callan-Ramler stated that only the needed and necessary amount of land will be acquired to accommodate the roadway due to management of project costs and use of taxpayer money. Ms. Donohoue asked about buying extra right of way for future needs. Mr. Hans said sewer work and right of way acquisitions are handled by the utilities much later in the project development process. Ms. Donohoue asked again for clarity to understand why a rural roadway segment requires 96-feet in width and an urban section only 62-feet. She asked whether the extra footage is only to accommodate farm vehicles? Ms. Callan-Ramler said ample travel space and turning movement clear zones for farm equipment are issues, but in addition, as Mr. Brannon explained, water without the aid of curbs and gutters has to have a means to drain off and be removed from the roadway. Judge Executive Knochelmann said on a section of Bromley Crescent Springs Road that is being reconstructed, Kenton County is dealing with this same issue and that curb and gutter specifics evolve during the Design Phase with water regulations that effect the final design.

Mayor Reinersman moved to recommend approval of the Off-Alignment Alternative and that it be moved forward in the Final Report with the separate multi-use path included and a request that KYTC review posted speed limits for the corridor during the Design Phase. The motion was seconded by Mayor Bell with one no vote, motion carried.

**Next Steps**

Ms. Bancroft said that the final report will be available December 31st on the OKI web. She also stated that the OKI Board will be asked for approval of the KY 536 Scoping Study at their January
14, 2016 meeting. Ms. Donohoue asked if the PDT will receive the Final Report. Ms. Bancroft stated that as soon as the Report was completed and available, she would notify the PDT members and alternatives via email, so they would be the first to know.

Judge Executive Knochelmann asked Mr. Brannon to discuss the Study Team’s recommendations for presenting the corridor in segments for future advancement. Mr. Bannon stated that in order to fund and move improvements forward, dividing the corridor into segments has proven to be very beneficial in other roadway projects. He suggested that the corridor be broken into the following sections; KY 17 to KY 16, KY 16 to the Staffordsburg Connector (the point where the new KY 536 would go onto a new alignment), and Staffordsburg Connector to Campbell County. Mr. Brannon stated that the most western sections are KYTC’s highest priorities. Mr. Bridges said if the western sections were improved first, more traffic would be directed to Visalia Hill. Mr. Brannon agreed that the Hill is an important issue to be addressed. Mr. Hans said beginning on the western end would really benefit traffic going west to the east and may decrease traffic on Visalia Hill. Judge Executive Knochelmann stated that he will be pushing to get this project addressed.

Judge Executive Knochelmann thanked the PDT for their valuable input, KYTC-D6 for listening, PB for all their hard work and OKI for facilitating for the study. Thank you.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 3:20
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Call to Order/Welcome
Ms. Bancroft called the meeting to order at 2:35 PM.

Judge/Executive Knochelmann asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Judge/Executive Knochelmann asked if there were any corrections to e-mail amendments received for the KY 536 PDT meeting minutes from September 25, 2015. Mayor Bell moved to approve the minutes with noted amendments. Mr. Bridges seconded the motion, motion carried.

Public Comment Summary
Ms. Bancroft provided a brief overview of the 184 public comment forms received from the October 5\textsuperscript{th} Public Open House and website during the 30-day public comment period. She noted that a complete summary of all responses was included in the PDT Constant Contact notice for this meeting.

Question number three asked which alternative should be advanced. Sixty-two percent of respondents stated that they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that the Off-Alignment should be advanced. This is in comparison to the 69 percent who stated that they “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” that the On-alignment should be advanced. Ms. Bancroft stated that the public’s responses confirmed the PDT’s recommendation made at the September 25\textsuperscript{th} meeting that the Off-Alignment Alternative be advanced.

Question number four asked about the speed limit for the section of KY 536 east of KY 16. Respondents were almost equally split on this question. Forty percent “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that 55mph should be the posted speed limit for this section. Meanwhile, 43 percent “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” that 55mph should be the posted speed. Another 17 percent of the respondents answered “Not Sure.” Ms. Bancroft stated that the Study Team’s suggestion is that the Final Report include a recommendation that KYTC revisit the topic of posted speed limit(s) for the corridor during the future Design Phase of the project. Mr. Brannon suggested maybe KYTC break the speed limit up into different segments based on rural versus urban designed roadway sections.

Question number four also asked for the public’s opinion regarding non-motorized travel such as bicycling and walking for the section east of KY 16. Ms. Bancroft stated that the public’s responses once again reflect those expressed by the majority of PDT members at the September 25\textsuperscript{th} meeting. Sixty-six percent of respondents said that they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that a separate, 10-foot multi-use path should be provided on one side of the road. In comparison, 66 percent “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” that the 12-foot paved shoulders should be used to accommodate bike/ped travel. Ms. Bancroft said that the Study Team suggests that the Final Report include the recommendation for a separate Multi-Use Path based on strong PDT and public support and due to the corridor’s role serving as part of a regional multi-modal network. Mr. Hans said that in a typically rural area, KYTC would look at including 12-foot shoulders, however a 10-foot multi-use corridor is usually what is recommended.
Ms. Donohoue still was curious as to why the width of roadway for rural section had to be used; since Harris Pike has two bike paths recommended with a smaller shoulder. Can the 12-foot shoulder recommendation be reduced to same as the Harris Pike? Mr. Hans said that what Ms. Donohoue was asking for will be included as part of the design process and it is too early to determine the specific design criteria. Ms. Donohoue said she does not see a need for two 12-foot shoulders. Ms. Callan-Ramler said this is still very early and no precise measurements and conclusions can be made until the detailed design phase is conducted. She stated that at this point, the current scoping study is still too far out to get down to the detail that Ms. Donohoue wants addressed. Ms. Callan-Ramler said there are too many variables at this time and suggested that Mr. Brannon include writing “minimize width as much as possible” in the final report.

Mr. Bridges asked if a broad range for roadway width could be used in the Final Report rather than a set range? Mr. Brannon said that many factors contribute to determining the roadway’s width. He stated that certain design elements such as storm water management controls could necessitate fluctuations in roadway widths due to topography, soil and other factors. He said an urban roadway section with curb and gutter does not require as much width in comparison to a rural section where water is designed to run-off into natural swales or ditches alongside the roadway. Ms. Bancroft said that the PDT and public shared very early in the study how important it was to minimize impact to properties, homes, and farms and that the Study Team has been committed to this goal throughout the study process. She reaffirmed this commitment. Mr. Policinski asked that Mr. Bridges’ question be answered regarding a possible roadway width range. Ms. Callan-Ramler stated that the roadway width provided in this scoping study is done so at a conceptual planning level and is not set in stone. She repeated that in the next phase of Design, all data will be examined parcel-by-parcel in order to minimize roadway width as much as possible. Ms. Callan-Ramler stated that only the needed and necessary amount of land will be acquired to accommodate the roadway due to management of project costs and use of taxpayer money. Ms. Donohoue asked about buying extra right of way for future needs. Mr. Hans said sewer work and right of way acquisitions are handled by the utilities much later in the project development process. Ms. Donohoue asked again for clarity to understand why a rural roadway segment requires 96-feet in width and an urban section only 62-feet. She asked whether the extra footage is only to accommodate farm vehicles? Ms. Callan-Ramler said ample travel space and turning movement clear zones for farm equipment are issues, but in addition, as Mr. Brannon explained, water without the aid of curbs and gutters has to have a means to drain off and be removed from the roadway. Judge Executive Knochelmann said on a section of Bromley Crescent Springs Road that is being reconstructed, Kenton County is dealing with this same issue and that curb and gutter specifics evolve during the Design Phase with water regulations that effect the final design.

Mayor Reinersman moved to recommend approval of the Off-Alignment Alternative and that it be moved forward in the Final Report with the separate multi-use path included and a request that KYTC review posted speed limits for the corridor during the Design Phase. The motion was seconded by Mayor Bell with one no vote, motion carried.

**Next Steps**

Ms. Bancroft said that the final report will be available December 31st on the OKI web. She also stated that the OKI Board will be asked for approval of the KY 536 Scoping Study at their January
14, 2016 meeting. Ms. Donohoue asked if the PDT will receive the Final Report. Ms. Bancroft stated that as soon as the Report was completed and available, she would notify the PDT members and alternatives via email, so they would be the first to know.

Judge Executive Knochelmann asked Mr. Brannon to discuss the Study Team’s recommendations for presenting the corridor in segments for future advancement. Mr. Bannon stated that in order to fund and move improvements forward, dividing the corridor into segments has proven to be very beneficial in other roadway projects. He suggest that the corridor be broken into the following sections; KY 17 to KY 16, KY 16 to the Staffordsburg Connector (the point where the new KY 536 would go onto a new alignment), and Staffordsburg Connector to Campbell County. Mr. Brannon stated that the most western sections are KYTC’s highest priorities. Mr. Bridges said if the western sections were improved first, more traffic would be directed to Visalia Hill. Mr. Brannon agreed that the Hill is an important issue to be addressed. Mr. Hans said beginning on the western end would really benefit traffic going west to the east and may decrease traffic on Visalia Hill. Judge Executive Knochelmann stated that he will be pushing to get this project addressed.

Judge Executive Knochelmann thanked the PDT for their valuable input, KYTC-D6 for listening, PB for all their hard work and OKI for facilitating for the study. Thank you.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:20
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Appendix H. Phase One and Two Public Comment Summary Flyer
Phase One Public Comment Period Summary

Conclusions

Overall, the public recognizes that improvements are needed along KY 536 between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell county line. However, the rationale for why they feel improvements are needed and the extent to which they should occur varies:

- The majority expressed that improvements are needed to address a variety of safety issues
- Others shared that improving the flow of local and/or regional traffic was important

Roadway Improvement Concerns

Although, most people agreed that something needed to be done, the public shared several concerns for the Study Team to consider and minimize as roadway improvements were developed:

- potential loss of homes and/or property or portions thereof
- potential impacts to the natural environmental (vegetation, rivers, endangered species, etc.)
- potential impact of increased traffic volumes (to drivers as well as to residents living along KY 536)
- potential increase in truck traffic along the route and increases in noise
- roadway improvements could result in unwanted development
- an improved roadway could negatively impact and/or change the rural nature of the community
Public Consensus
According to the comments received during Phase Two, there were no clear “winners” in terms of the eight alternatives. However, the public did show clear consensus around some key elements, as evidenced through the majority of responses received and shown in the chart.

- One consensus point was the public’s overwhelming “dislike” for alternatives 1 and 2. The most frequent responses were that these alternatives did not do enough to address current problems with the existing roadway.
- A second consensus point was that although people disagreed on their support for Alternatives 5 through 8, they did agree on the importance of minimizing the impact to homes, properties and the rural character of the KY 536 area.
  - Alternatives 5, 6, 7, and 8 were “liked” most often with Alternative 5 “liked” the most (31%). People said they “liked” these alternatives because they would have lower or less impact to homes and properties.
  - While being the most favored, Alternatives 5, 6, 7, and 8 received almost the same percentage of “dislike” responses. People said they “disliked” these alternatives because of the potential negative impacts these same alternatives would have to homes, properties, farmland and open space.

Conclusion
While people agree that some level of improvement would be beneficial, the public differed considerably regarding the approach to which improvements should be made. Individuals generally fell into one of two groups:

- address current issues by improving the existing roadway (On-Alignment Alternative)
- move traffic away from the existing roadway onto a modern, new roadway (Off-Alignment Alternative)

This chart is included in the Public Comment Summary Report for Phase Two available on the “Phase 2: Draft Alternatives” page at www.oki.org/536.
Appendix I. October 5, 2015 Public Open House Comment Form
Transportation improvement alternatives for KY 536, between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell county line, have been developed in close coordination with local residents, property owners, businesses and local and regional community leaders. Options presented this summer to the community for consideration and feedback have been refined and narrowed down from eight to two: an ON ALIGNMENT Alternative and an OFF ALIGNMENT Alternative. The KY 536 Scoping Study Team invites you to use this form to submit your comments on the two refined alternatives. The Study Team will consider your input as it works to develop the Study’s final recommendation. Thank you for your time and input.

1. Please identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (Strongly Agree, Agree, Not Sure, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) about the ON ALIGNMENT Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The ON ALIGNMENT Alternative addresses local and regional needs for travel safety and reducing accident rates.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. The ON ALIGNMENT Alternative updates this section of KY 536 as part of a modern, continuous transportation corridor that connects to a regional, multi-county roadway system.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The ON ALIGNMENT Alternative supports multiple travel modes (car, truck, bus/transit, bike, farm equipment, foot).</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The ON ALIGNMENT Alternative provides infrastructure that can support economic prosperity in the region through efficient transportation connectivity.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The ON ALIGNMENT Alternative is consistent with current plans that address existing and future land use to efficiently accommodate growth in urban and suburban sections while maintaining the rural, agricultural character of the eastern portion of the study area.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The ON ALIGNMENT Alternative will maintain or enhance the quality of life for residents, business owners and other stakeholders located within the study area.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. The ON ALIGNMENT Alternative effectively preserves and/or protects natural resources and hillsides while providing for mobility needs.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Please identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (Strongly Agree, Agree, Not Sure, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) about the **OFF ALIGNMENT** Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative addresses local and regional needs for travel safety and reducing accident rates.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative updates this section of KY 536 as part of a modern, continuous transportation corridor that connects to a regional, multi-county roadway system.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative supports multiple travel modes (car, truck, bus/transit, bike, farm equipment, foot).</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative provides infrastructure that can support economic prosperity in the region through efficient transportation connectivity.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative is consistent with current plans that address existing and future land use to efficiently accommodate growth in urban and suburban sections while maintaining the rural, agricultural character of the eastern portion of the study area.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative will maintain or enhance the quality of life for residents, business owners and other stakeholders located within the study area.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative effectively preserves and/or protects natural resources and hillsides while providing for mobility needs.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. The <strong>OFF ALIGNMENT</strong> Alternative will maintain or improve air and water quality in the area while providing for mobility needs.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (Strongly Agree, Agree, Not Sure, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).
A. The **ON ALIGNMENT** Alternative should be advanced as the Recommended Alternative for improvements to be made along KY 536 between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell county line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. The **OFF ALIGNMENT** Alternative should be advanced as the Recommended Alternative for improvements to be made along KY 536 between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell county line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. KY 536 serves as a vital east/west transportation corridor for the Northern Kentucky region. In regards specifically to accommodating local and regional non-motorized travel such as bicycling, walking, running, horse-riding, etc. by people of all ages, the information below is provided for public comment and consideration.

For the section of KY 536 between KY 16 and the Kenton/Campbell county line (proposed speed limit 55 mph), two methods for accommodating non-motorized travel have been discussed:

**Method 1:** The roadway is planned to be constructed with 12-foot, paved shoulders on each side that pedestrians, bicyclists, runners, etc. could use for travel. This design option is consistent with current, minimum standards set by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet in their design policies for rural roadway sections.

**Method 2:** A separate 10-foot multi-use path on one side is planned to be constructed (in addition to the 12-foot shoulders) to follow the natural topography of the area. This path would provide a non-motorized travel option and connect with other existing and planned multi-use paths and trails across the Northern Kentucky region as documented in the Regional Trails Plan. The path would include a non-paved, grass buffer to separate motorized vehicles from bicycles and pedestrians.
Considering this information, please identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. For the section of KY 536 between KY 16 and the Kenton/Campbell county line, the posted speed limit should be 55 mph.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. For the section of KY 536 between KY 16 and the Kenton/Campbell county line, non-motorized travel such as bicycling and walking should be accommodated by 12-foot, paved shoulders on each side of the road (Method 1).</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For the section of KY 536 between KY 16 and the Kenton/Campbell county line, non-motorized travel such as bicycling and walking should be accommodated by a separate, 10-foot multi-use path on one side of the road (Method 2).</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In Phase 1 of this Study, the responses received from the public identified that the top five community concerns about the existing road were sharp, winding curves; lack of roadway shoulders; steep grades/hills; high accident rates; and poor sight distances.

Considering this information, please identify the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:

The KY 536 corridor is an important east/west connection and investing in the improvement of the corridor between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell county line is a high priority to me.

6. Please use the space below to share any additional comments you may have.
7. Please indicate which of the following BEST describes you (please check only ONE):

_____ I live within or near the KY 536 study area
_____ I own property within or near the KY 536 study area
_____ I own a business within or near the KY 536 study area
_____ I work in or near the KY 536 study area
_____ Though I don't live, own property, own a business or work within or near the KY 536 study area, I frequently travel through it
_____ Other (please explain):

8. In general, how frequently do you travel on KY 536 between KY 17 and the Campbell County line (check the option that BEST APPLIES to you)?

_____ Daily or almost daily
_____ Several times a week
_____ Once every few weeks
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every few months
_____ Other (please explain):

Thank you for your comments.
Please leave your completed form with a Study Team representative or drop in one of the collection boxes before you leave today.

You may also mail, fax or email your completed forms to:
Robyn Bancroft, OKI Project Manager
720 East Pete Rose Way, Suite 420
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(Fax) 513-621-9325
rbancroft@oki.org
AS YOU LOOK AT BOTH ALTERNATIVES...

BOTH ALTERNATIVES INCLUDE the following elements:

• The proposed posted speed limits are 45mph (between KY 17 and KY 16) and 55mph (east of KY 16 to the Kenton/Campbell county line).
• Both alternatives follow the existing KY 536 east from KY 17 and shift north onto a new segment as they approach KY 16 (redirecting traffic north of White’s Tower Elementary School) and realign with KY 536 near Maverick Road.
• Between KY 17 and the points east of KY 16 where they leave the existing KY 536 corridor, both are three-lane roads (a single lane traveling in either direction and a lane in the middle to assist with turns).
• Non-motorized travel such as bicycling and walking is accommodated by eight-foot multi-use paths on both sides of KY 536 from KY 17 to KY 16 and a 10-foot multi-use path on one side of the roadway east of KY 16.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN the two alternatives include:

• The locations where they depart from the existing KY 536 roadway east of KY 16:
  o The ON-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE departs the roadway at a point about one-half mile west of Klein Road (Visalia Road Connector).
  o The OFF-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE departs the roadway at a point about one-half mile west of Staffordsburg Road (Staffordsburg Road Connector).

• The ON-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE will stay a three-lane road once it leaves the existing KY 536 corridor at the Visalia Road Connector due to the short distance between that point and the 11-foot climbing lane that would be constructed to assist trucks traveling westward from KY 177 to the crest of the Visalia Hill west of Mann Road.

At the Staffordsburg Road Connector, the OFF-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE will become a two-lane road (with the exception of an 11-foot climbing lane that would be constructed to assist trucks traveling westward from KY 177 to the crest of the Visalia Hill west of Mann Road).
ON-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE

- The ON-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE follows the existing KY 536 east from KY 17 and shifts north onto a new segment as it approaches KY 16 (redirecting traffic north of White’s Tower Elementary School) to realign with KY 536 near Maverick Road.
- It continues along existing KY 536 until a half mile west of Klein Road (Visalia Road Connector), then turns north onto a new alignment that connects directly with the Visalia Bridge.
- Between KY 16 and the Visalia Road Connector, this alternative is planned as a three-lane road (a single lane traveling in either direction and a lane in the middle to assist with turns).
- From the Visalia Road Connector to the Campbell County line, this alternative will remain a three lane road due to the short distance between that point and the 11-foot climbing lane that would be constructed to assist trucks traveling westward from KY 177 to the crest of the Visalia Hill west of Mann Road.
- The proposed posted speed limits are 45mph (between KY 17 and KY 16) and 55mph (east of KY 16 to the Kenton/Campbell county line).
- To accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel, this alternative includes eight-foot multi-use paths on both sides of KY 536 from KY 17 to KY 16 and a 10-foot multi-use path on one side of the roadway east of KY 16.

OFF-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE

- The OFF-ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE follows the existing KY 536 east from KY 17 and shifts north onto a new segment as it approaches KY 16 (redirecting traffic north of White’s Tower Elementary School) to realign with KY 536 near Maverick Road.
- It follows the existing KY 536 until one-half mile west of Staffordsburg Road (Staffordsburg Road Connector), where it turns north onto a new alignment that connects directly with the existing Visalia Bridge.
- Between KY 17 and Staffordsburg Road Connector, this alternative is a three-lane road (a single lane traveling in either direction and a lane in the middle to assist with turns).
- From the Staffordsburg Road Connector to the Campbell County line, this alternative becomes a two lane road (with the exception of an 11-foot climbing lane that would be constructed to assist trucks traveling westward from KY 177 to the crest of the Visalia Hill west of Mann Road).
- The proposed posted speed limits are 45mph (between KY 17 and KY 16) and 55mph (east of KY 16 to the Kenton/Campbell county line).
- To accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel, this alternative includes eight-foot multi-use paths on both sides of KY 536 from KY 17 to KY 16 and a 10-foot multi-use path on one side of the roadway east of KY 16.
YOUR INPUT IS NEEDED!
Please COMPLETE A COMMENT FORM while you are here today or visit www.oki.org/536 to TAKE THE SURVEY online. We need your input on the two alternatives. Please share the website and information on the KY 536 Scoping Study with others who might be interested.

THANK YOU!
Robyn Bancroft, AICP
KY 536 Scoping Study, OKI Project Manager
rbancroft@oki.org
(513) 619-7662
Appendix K. Flyer Mailed to KY 536 Property Owners
Public Open House

Monday, October 5, 2015
4pm - 7pm
City of Independence Senior and Community Center
2001 Jackwoods Parkway
Independence, KY 41051

This public event is the final one in a series of three open house meetings held as part of the KY 536 Scoping Study. The purpose of the event is to share final alternative recommendations and gather public input.

In accordance with the American Disabilities Act, if anyone has a disability and requires assistance or, in accordance with the Limited English Proficiency Executive Order, requires translation services, please call Florence Parker at 513-619-7686 or 800-750-0750 (Ohio Relay Service).

ANY QUESTIONS PLEASE CONTACT REGINA BROCK AT R BROCK@OKI.ORG OR 513-619-7664
WWW.OKI.ORG/536