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The Dixie Fix Plan (Dixie Highway Corridor Access Management Redevelopment Plan) is a long range planning approach to relieve congestion problems and provide better access to Dixie Highway. It was conducted to identify transportation planning and design solutions to address Dixie Highway’s informal status as the most heavily traveled and congested arterial in Kenton County.

Several factors are blamed for Dixie’s transportation problems including forty-four signalized intersections and scores of curb cuts along the eight-mile corridor that permit continuous, full vehicular access. Dixie provides direct access to a variety of business and institutional facilities for nine cities in Kenton County and one city in Boone County. In addition, it serves as a connector for personal, commuter, and commercial traffic on a local and regional basis. Due to its parallel alignment and close proximity to I-71/75, Dixie Highway is commonly used as an alternate route during interstate incidents or during peak hour interstate congestion. The prevalence of traffic signals and mid-block left-turn movements, combined with narrow four-lane segments that lack turn lanes, contributes to travel delays and high accident rates.

As an aging corridor with increased traffic demands, it is necessary to pursue opportunities for improving safety, travel efficiency, and quality of life along Dixie Highway. The Dixie Fix Plan for access management provided a collaborative and proactive approach for local, county and state governments, organizations, and citizens to identify problem areas. With its completion, The Dixie Fix Plan proposes solutions for achieving these goals.

Operational improvements can mitigate Dixie Highway’s problems, but any significant improvement must involve access management. Access management is the process that provides access to land development while simultaneously preserving the flow of traffic on the surrounding road system in terms of safety, capacity and speed. To succeed, access management would have to be implemented systematically through the coordinated effort and persistent commitment of local governments in the corridor.

The Plan has two major components: (1) a prioritized list of 36 projects taken from a total of 168 short- and long-term site specific access management recommendations and (2) each chapter outlines different, yet critical guidelines that serve as implementation standards such as future right-of-way widths, transit stop improvements, expanded bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, and increased streetscape/design measures.

In addition to these recommended improvements, The Dixie Fix Plan provides a draft Ordinance, draft Memorandum of Understanding, and the discussion of numerous potential funding sources as references for use in advancing immediate implementation.
The Dixie Fix Plan, financed cooperatively by the Federal Highway Administration, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, and units of local and county government in the OKI region, began in August 2005 and was concluded on June 30, 2006.

The project was administered by OKI in partnership with the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission (NKAPC). The agencies’ efforts were guided by an Oversight Team that included the Cities of Florence, Elsmere, Erlanger, Edgewood, Crestview Hills, Lakeside Park, Fort Mitchell, Fort Wright, Park Hills, and Covington, Boone and Kenton Counties Fiscal Courts, the Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK), Boone County Planning Commission, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, the Catholic Diocese of Covington, NKAPC, and OKI. This 19-member stakeholder group provided additional input and recommendation approvals to the study. Monthly Oversight Team meetings were held. Seven local visioning sessions and one comprehensive public open house were also held at key points during the planning process.

Upon its completion, The Dixie Fix Plan is recommended for adoption by the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission, the Boone County Planning Commission, and OKI’s Executive Committee.

The full Dixie Fix Plan is available electronically at www.oki.org and www.nkapc.org or on CD-rom upon request from both agencies.
Chapter 1: Introduction

OVERVIEW
In March 2003, the Kenton County Transportation Plan was adopted by the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments’ (OKI) Board. In this plan, Dixie Highway was identified as the highest transportation priority in all of Kenton County. With the priority assigned to it, the Dixie Highway Corridor Transportation and Traffic Optimization Study (Dixie Highway Corridor Study) was conducted to determine how to improve mobility and safety. Completed in June 2005, the operational study’s recommendations focused on short-term solutions such as traffic signal systems, intersection improvements, signal pre-emption for emergency vehicles, and interconnections with ARTIMIS for managing traffic overflows from I-71/I-75. The operational study’s final plan also recommended that local governments participate in the development and implementation of a long-range plan for access management along the Dixie Highway Corridor. This recommendation formed a foundation upon which to begin the Dixie Highway Corridor Access Management Redevelopment Plan or, what is more commonly referred to as The Dixie Fix (Envisioning the Future of Dixie Highway).

Implementation of access management improvements in an urban area that is already developed is a long-term process. The Dixie Fix facilitates access management by providing information and design scenarios for improving access at 168 individual locations in the corridor. This recommended access management plan, which was developed through the coordinated efforts of OKI and Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission (NKAPC), provides the basis for a sustained and systematic effort to improve access along Dixie Highway. Each recommended change alone will have only minimal effect in reducing crash rates or improving travel time along the corridor. When grouped together or taken as a whole, however, it is anticipated that improvements will be more measurable.

The Dixie Fix enables access management coordination between 10 local communities, 2 counties, the two local planning commissions serving the corridor, the State, and local transit authority. Coordination includes a vision for future design and a regulatory process to reach the vision. In addition to access management, the project is addressing other visual, planning, and functional design elements. Design elements include the number of lanes, improvements to intersections (such as addition of turn lanes or conversion to roundabouts), streetscaping, and provisions for transit and pedestrian usage. Improvements are being recommended that will not only make Dixie Highway a more attractive corridor, but more importantly, safer for all modes of travel. The Dixie Fix is intended to provide a vision to Dixie Highway stakeholders and the tools with which to set that vision in motion. It is hoped that success achieved along Dixie Highway will promote further improvements within the corridor and replication throughout the Greater Cincinnati Region.

STUDY AREA
The Dixie Fix’s study area covers an 8-mile stretch through 10 local communities. The communities included along the corridor are Florence on the southernmost end, Erlanger, Elsmere, Edgewood, Crestview Hills, Lakeside Park, Fort Mitchell, Fort Wright, Park Hills, and Covington on the northernmost end.

Dixie Highway runs parallel to the Interstate 71/75 corridor. Unlike other long-established state highways, the introduction of I-71/75 in the 1960s did not cause a mass exodus of businesses and traffic from Dixie Highway. Rather, over the past sixty years, Dixie has developed into and remained a quite stable mixture of commercial, public, and residential uses for Northern Kentucky. Due to its location, Dixie is often used as a primary “Plan B” option to drivers during times of high congestion or emergency incidents on the Interstate.
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The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future

THE DIXIE FIX STUDY AREA
MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT

OKI and NKAPC Memorandum of Understanding

The Dixie Fix study was overseen by the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI) acting as the project Manager. The Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission (NKAPC) provided in-kind services towards the completion of the study.

Oversight Team

To oversee the project, an Oversight Team was established. Members met a majority of the following criteria to serve on the Oversight Team:

1. Serve as a regulatory agency
2. Be located in or impacting The Dixie Fix study area
3. Represent significant sections of The Dixie Fix community
4. Possess specific technical skills that pertain to the study’s scope of work

The Oversight Team was Chaired by Bill Goetz, Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission’s Board President, and Larry Klein, City Administrator for Fort Wright, served as Vice Chair. The Oversight Team met monthly from September 2005 to June 2006 with the exception of November and December 2005 when resources were focused on the Local Visioning Public Sessions.

The Oversight Team was comprised of major stakeholders including the State and District 6 offices of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission (NKAPC), Boone County Planning Commission, Kenton County Fiscal Court, Boone County Fiscal Court, Covington Diocese, Northern Kentucky Area Chamber of Commerce, the Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK), and the ten communities in the corridor study area (Covington, Park Hills, Fort Wright, Fort Mitchell, Lakeside Park, Crestview Hills, Edgewood, Erlanger, Elsmere and Florence). This was a “hands-on” group, providing input and review regarding all recommendations.

PURPOSE AND GOALS

The purpose of The Dixie Fix was to address traffic flow and safety problems through a comprehensive access management plan. A multi-jurisdictional and multi-modal process was developed to meet the study’s purpose. First, a vision for the future of the Dixie Highway Corridor was defined. Second, this vision was translated through the development of both specific recommendations and general standards for implementation. The intended outcome is that as the vision is gradually implemented through application of recommendations and redevelopment along the corridor, Dixie Highway will experience less congestion and fewer crashes. Ultimately with these successes, the corridor will attract new development that will enhance commercial and neighborhood vitality.

The goals of the Plan are to:

• Improve safety
• Improve mobility
• Maintain reasonable and adequate access to Dixie Highway properties
• Foster economic development
• Increase environmental stewardship through development of multi-modal options and site design standards
• Improve aesthetics

OKI was sub-allocated $121,000 in Planning funds for fiscal year 2006 from the Federal Highway Administration to complete The Dixie Fix. These Planning funds are to be used strictly for planning purposes.
COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

To develop a vision for Dixie Highway, as well as gather input on draft recommendations, an extensive public involvement effort was undertaken. Working with such a short timeline and limited resources, The Dixie Fix depended greatly on the active participation of its Oversight Team in regards to public involvement. The Oversight Team members assisted immensely in publicizing the public sessions that are detailed below. Flyers, announcements at council meetings, postings on community websites, congregational programs and events, all helped in spreading the word.

Website

To provide an easily-accessible forum for the public, a website was created (www.dixiefix.org) where people could learn about the study, view access management recommendations, and complete a Visual Preference Survey. In addition to the website, the public could provide input by calling a dedicated phone line or emailing messages and questions.

Visioning Sessions

Seven Local Visioning Sessions (dates and locations follow) were held so that elected officials, city staff, property owners, and the public from each community could meet one-on-one with The Dixie Fix staff to discuss their needs, concerns, and visions for the corridor. These sessions were not only for public input, but equally important for educating the public on access management, transportation and land use issues and potential solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2005</td>
<td>Fort Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2005</td>
<td>Crestview Hills/Edgewood/Lakeside Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2005</td>
<td>Fort Wright Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2005</td>
<td>Park Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 2005</td>
<td>Fort Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 2005</td>
<td>Florence/Erlanger/Elsmere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2005</td>
<td>Lakeside Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 2005</td>
<td>Covington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-Up Meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2005</td>
<td>Fort Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 2005</td>
<td>Crestview Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 2005</td>
<td>Erlanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 2005</td>
<td>Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 2005</td>
<td>Park Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 2005</td>
<td>KYTC District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 21, 2005</td>
<td>Elsmere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 21, 2005</td>
<td>Edgewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 2006</td>
<td>Lakeside Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2005</td>
<td>NKY Chamber Transportation/Infrastructure Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2006</td>
<td>NKY Chamber Transportation/Infrastructure Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is Visioning?

“Visioning is a process by which a community envisions the future it wants, and plans how to achieve it. It brings people together to develop a shared image of what they want their community to become. Once a community has envisioned where it wants to go, it can begin to consciously work toward that goal.” (Steve Ames, American Planning Association)

Shout-Out!

The first activity at each of the Visioning Sessions was a group exercise where participants were asked to “Shout-Out!” negative and positive adjectives to describe Dixie Highway. A summary of all the adjectives “Shouted-Out!” are included as Appendix 1-2. All agreed at each session that there were problems that required planning and
strategizing to improve Dixie Highway. This activity helped to get participants actively involved in the session.

Visual Preference Survey
A second activity of each Visioning Session was a Visual Preference Survey. Appendix 1-3 includes a blank survey form and each session’s public responses’ summary. This survey consisted of a PowerPoint presentation of 100 images that depicted a variety of streetscape and development options. Participants were asked to rate the desirability of each image. This survey was also available on the study website to reach an even broader audience where 140 people submitted their preferences. Responses regarding land use preferences seemed to embrace existing development patterns within the communities along the corridor. For example, a predominantly residential Dixie community, preferred to remain residential. In their residential preferences, they did not favor large apartment complexes over 3-stories. In the same vein, more commercial Dixie communities favored commercial uses that did not include traditional fast food restaurants or “big box” retailers with large parking lots. In general, respondents preferred building design of a more traditional nature and conducive to pedestrians. They were also favorable to bus pull-outs and bike lanes.

Initial Access Management Recommendations
At the Visioning Sessions, site specific access management recommendations included in the Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005) were used as the basis for public review. In this way this study built upon ideas already presented in previous evaluations of Dixie Highway. Appendix 1-4 includes public responses to these recommendations.

At the seven Visioning Sessions, a total of 65 people attended and completed a comment sheet. A summary of the comments received at the conclusion of each Visioning Session is included as Appendix 1-5.

Follow-up Meetings
After concluding the Visioning Sessions, ten follow-up meetings were held between OKI, NKAPC staff, and local community representatives. Public input on the conceptual access management and intersection design recommendations was recorded and transferred to 2004 aerials. This information was shared with each of the 10 local communities in graphic form for their review and approval.

Top 5 Local Priorities
After meeting with each of the communities, the Oversight Team approved evaluation criteria and then each community was asked to submit their top five priority improvements.

Public Open House
A Public Open House was held on May 8, 2006 at the Immanuel United Methodist Church on Dixie Highway, so that the public could view the site-specific access management recommendations for each community. Participants were asked to indicate their number one access management priority. They also reviewed and gave input regarding cross-sections for the communities throughout the corridor. A total of 62 people signed in at the meeting. Leading up to the event, OKI conducted an aggressive community involvement effort to inform the Dixie Fix communities of the upcoming meeting. Later, after the public open house the oversight team ranked all the top five priorities from the communities into a single prioritized list.

Public meeting flyers were distributed through a variety of channels including:

- Study Database
- Oversight Team Meeting
- OKI ICC Meeting Mailing
- OKI Executive Committee Meeting Mailing
The legal notice of the public meeting appeared in the following newspapers:
- Cincinnati Enquirer’s May 7 edition
- Spanish Journal’s May 5 edition
- Cincinnati Herald’s May 6 edition

In addition, a ¼ page ad was placed in the May 3 edition of the Community Recorder. In addition to paid advertising, news articles ran in various community newsletters including the Park Hills Press and in the March 24 edition of the Enquirer and April 6 edition of the Florence Recorder.

All public comments were shared with the Oversight Team at their May meeting.

MEDIA COVERAGE
Throughout the study process, 14 articles appeared in various newspapers and community newsletters (see Appendix 1-6 for copies of news articles):

- “Dixie Traffic Plan Inches Along”
  Cincinnati Enquirer – August 12, 2005

- “OKI Seeks Dixie Highway Feedback”
  Community Recorder – October 13, 2005

- “Dixie Fix” Gets Drivers’ Input
  Cincinnati Enquirer – November 14, 2005

- “Plans to Make Dixie Highway Safer and Less Congested”
  WIXU News – December 16, 2005

- “Park Hills Part of Dixie Highway Study”

- “The ‘Dixie Highway Fix’ Comes to Fort Wright”
  Top of the Hill News – December 2005

- “Dixie Hwy Congestion Prompts In-Depth Review of Land Usage, Recommendations”
  NKAPC Newsletter – March 2006

- “Committee to Present Dixie Fixes”
  Enquirer – March 24, 2006

- “Suggested Fixes to Dixie Highway to be Addressed”
  Enquirer – March 24, 2006

- “Florence Approves ‘Dixie Fix’ Priorities”
  The Florence Recorder – April 6, 2006

- “Dixie Fix Public Open House”
  Park Hills Press – Spring 2006

- “Dixie Fix Panel Seeks Opinions On Traffic Plans”
  The Cincinnati Enquirer – May 5, 2006

- “Dixie Highway Fixes Detailed”
  The Cincinnati Enquirer – May 9, 2006

- “Public Speaks Out On Dixie Fix”
  The Cincinnati Post – May 9, 2006
Chapter 2: Existing Conditions

**OVERVIEW**

Dixie Highway is a major transportation life-line for the Northern Kentucky counties of Boone and Kenton. During the 1990s, the population of these two counties grew by more than double the rate (19.0%) of the entire Commonwealth of Kentucky (9.7%). Since 2000, the population of Boone and Kenton counties has grown by 3.9%, compared to -4.4 for Hamilton County, Ohio. It is estimated that over 485,000 people now reside in these two counties (Source: U.S. Census Bureau). In addition, almost 32,500 new employees were added to the Boone and Kenton County economies between 1990 and 2000 (Source: Labor Force and Employed from Ohio Bureau of Employment Services).

Along with growth comes increased traffic. As noted in the 2005 Dixie Highway Corridor Study, Dixie Highway is a major transportation artery for local and regional traffic with more than 32,000 vehicles per day on its most heavily traveled segment. However, it is generally inefficient and traffic is slowed by congestion and when incidents occur on I71/I75. On a daily basis, the worst traffic conditions involve southbound traffic during the PM peak, with an average travel time of 22 minutes that includes 10 minutes of delay (Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study, June 2005).

Physical conditions of the built environment are a major cause of transportation problems on Dixie Highway. Moreover, existing development reduces options for expanding rights-of-way and applying access management techniques. Typically, land is not available for widening lanes or intersections or for the addition of turn lanes. In areas with commercial development, the number, location, and design of curb-cuts contributes to congestion and crashes, especially where driveways are located close to intersections or to other driveways.

**INTERSECTIONS**

Another aspect of development that contributes to problem conditions is the number and design of intersections. Traffic entering and exiting Dixie Highway from intersecting streets contributes to congestion as additional vehicles are accommodated into vehicular flow. Appendix 2-1 is included as a reference for existing intersection levels of service (LOS) and delay times.

LOS for roadways is a quality measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of such service measures as speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, comfort and convenience. LOS is generally measured on a six point scale from A to F with A representing the best operating conditions (free flow) and F the worst where the flow rate of vehicles exceeds the capacity of the roadway segment. A detailed description of roadway segments is as follows:

- **LOS A** – Complete free-flow conditions usually about 90% of the free-flow speed for the given street class. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within traffic. Control delay at signalized intersections is minimal.
- **LOS B** – Indicates reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds, usually about 70% of the free-flow speed for the street class. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted, and control delays at a signalized intersection are not significant.
- **LOS C** – Describes stable operations, however the ability to maneuver and change lanes in mid-block locations may be more restricted than LOS B and longer queues, adverse signal coordination, or both may contribute to lower than average travel speeds of about 50% of the free-flow speed for the street class.
• LOS D – Borders on a range in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in delay and decreases in travel speed. LOS D may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high traffic volumes or a combination of these factors. Average travel speeds are about 40% less of the free-flow speed for the street class.

• LOS E – Is characterized by significant delays and average travel speeds of 33% or less of the free-flow speed for the street class. Such operations are caused by a combination of adverse progression, high signal density, high traffic volumes, extensive delays at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.

• LOS F – Is characterized by urban street flow at extremely low speeds, typically one-third to one-fourth of the free-flow speed for the street class. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized intersections with high delays, high volumes and extensive queuing.


Offset intersections, where streets do not intersect at right angles to form a four-legged intersection and centerlines on opposite streets do not align, further contribute to delay and the potential for crashes. Due to these skewed roadways, traffic signals operate on each side street approach as a separate phase, creating a large amount of lost time for the main roadway. The impact of offset intersections on signal placement and timing impedes efficient traffic progression and contributes to driver confusion and the potential for accidents. Dixie Highway has numerous offset intersections, including McAlpin and Garvey, Bartlett and May, and Eastern and Kentaboo.

In conjunction with the intersections, Dixie Highway has 44 traffic signals in the study area. The spacing between the signals is extremely varied, and often signals are in close proximity as a result of the offset intersections and large number of driveways throughout the project corridor. This close proximity and high number of signalized intersections creates overlapping traffic back-ups. Kentucky Transportation Cabinet’s minimum spacing standards for most of Dixie Highway is one signal every 2,400 ft., but the spacing between traffic signals on Dixie Highway varies between 100 feet to more than a mile (5,280 ft.). The proximity of some signals to each other, combined with the spacing, makes it difficult to coordinate the signals to favor progression in both directions and move traffic efficiently.

CORRIDOR SEGMENTS

As one travels south to north along Dixie Highway, distinctive differences in development styles and land uses appear. Each brings their own character and transportation challenges to the corridor. By defining separate segments, we can identify shared traffic and safety concerns which will lead us to conceptual recommendations presented later within this document. Appendix 2-2 are included as references for existing northbound and southbound segment levels of service (LOS) and travel speeds.

Segment 1: Turfway Road to Hallam Avenue (Cities of Florence, Erlanger and Elsmere)

This is a four-lane segment that includes a railroad underpass in Erlanger with narrow (10ft.) lanes. Land use includes commercial facilities mixed with some residential and community uses. For the most part, businesses are accessed directly from the street by their own curb-cuts. Some businesses have multiple driveways. In this segment are three of the eight blocks in the corridor with the highest accident rates (between Turfway and Bustetter, Commonwealth and Graves, and Commonwealth and Erlanger) and five of the eleven intersections on Dixie Highway with accident rates above the state average (0.57 accidents per million entering vehicles) for this type of facility (intersections at Sunset/Main, McAlpin/Garvey, Commonwealth, Cave Run, and Kentaboo/Eastern).

Segment 2: Hallam Avenue to I-275 (Cities of Erlanger, Edgewood and Crestview Hills)

This is a five-lane section where most signalized intersections have turn lanes. It includes the I-275 interchange, from which traffic
entering onto Dixie Highway during incidents on I-275 or I-71/I-75 add to Dixie Highway’s traffic volumes and problem conditions. Commercial development in this segment includes strip shopping centers with parking lots, several sites with multiple driveways, and the Crestview Hills Town Center which has undergone a major redevelopment, including the addition of 200,000 square feet of new retail space, increasing traffic levels significantly from previous land uses. There is also some residential development. This segment includes four of the eight blocks with the highest accident rates (the highest for the entire corridor between Kenton Lands and Edgewood Roads, in addition to blocks between Montgomery and Silver Lakes, Silver Lakes and Clover, and Edgewood and Dudley Roads) and four of the eleven intersections with above-average accident levels (Kenton Lands, Montgomery, and Dudley/Summit, and Winding Way).

Segment 3: I-275 to Buttermilk/Orphanage (City of Lakeside Park and the city edges of Crestview Hills and Fort Mitchell)
This is a five-lane section that is almost exclusively large-lot single-family homes, but there are also some community and commercial facilities in the vicinity of Buttermilk and Orphanage Roads. In this segment, Buttermilk Pike and Orphanage Roads (KY 371) provide east-west connection across the corridor. Unfortunately, these two roads are not aligned and while the offset is long enough to provide for complete turn movements and stacking between signal changes, complications still occur here during peak flows. A shared left turn lane permits vehicles to exit through lanes and wait for safe turns onto side streets that are not signalized. This is not a high traffic volume segment of Dixie. However, with fewer signals and the fifth lane, in peak hours and interstate incidents, this segment is better able to handle heavier traffic volumes.

Segment 4: Buttermilk/Orphanage to I-71/I-75 (Fort Mitchell)
This is a four-lane segment except for the bridge over I-71/I-75, which is five lanes. It is almost exclusively large-lot single-family homes, but there are also some community and commercial facilities just south of the interstate, Blessed Sacrement Church and School near the midpoint, and immediately north of Orphanage Road. There are 5 to 10 on-street parking spaces just north of Orphanage Road on both sides of Dixie Highway. These spaces serve adjacent commercial retail establishments. This is one of only two segments containing any on-street parking. Additionally, one of the eleven high-level accident intersections (Beechwood Road) is contained within this segment.

Segment 5: I-71/I-75 to St. Joseph Lane (Cities of Fort Mitchell, Fort Wright and Park Hills)
This four-lane segment contains commercial facilities that benefit from interstate access (motels, restaurants, retail, service, professional office) as well as a shopping center and other commercial, community, and residential uses. This segment has been subject to streetscape improvements including tree planting. One block is identified as having high-level accidents (between Kyles Lane and Sleepy Hollow Road) and one of the eleven high-level accident intersections on Dixie Highway (Kyles Lane).

Segment 6: St. Joseph Lane to Main Street in Covington (Cities of Park Hills and Covington)
As this four-lane segment nears Covington, one experiences a sharp curve and steep grades due to the hilly topography. At its intersection with Montague, Dixie Highway’s name changes to Pike Street. Land use along this segment is a mixture of residential and commercial with some office, schools, and new development under construction. Some businesses have angle or perpendicular parking that requires vehicles to back out of spaces toward or onto Dixie Highway; there are also large areas with on-street parking in Covington. At Montague, the highway cuts through a National Register Historic District in which all buildings, including a few residential structures, are immediately adjacent to the highway.

CRASH RATES
Crash rate data from the 2005 Dixie Highway Corridor Study continued as a reference and evaluation measure for The Dixie Fix Plan. Crash rates along Dixie Highway exceed the state average for
similar locations at 11 intersections and 8 mid-block locations, with the highest rate between Kenton Lands and Edgewood Roads. This one block segment just so happens to also have 18 full access driveways. Traffic conditions are projected to get worse if improvements are not made. The following two tables outline the locations with the highest crash rates on Dixie Highway.

**INTERSECTION CRASH DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Crash Frequency</th>
<th>Crash Rate*</th>
<th>EPDO Rate**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kyles Lane</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sunset/Main</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>McAlpin/Garvey</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commonwealth/Stevenson</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Winding Way</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kenton Lands</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dudley/Summit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beechwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cave Run</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kentaboo/Eastern</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The average intersection crash rate for the Commonwealth of Kentucky is 0.57 accidents per million entering vehicles.

**The Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) rate weights crashes by property damage only, injury, and fatality.

**MID-BLOCK CRASH DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mid-Block</th>
<th>Crash Frequency</th>
<th>Crash Rate*</th>
<th>EPDO Rate**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Edgewood &amp; Kenton Lands</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>22.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bustetter/Goodridge &amp; Turfway</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>25.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Summit/Dudley &amp; Edgewood</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kyles &amp; Sleepy Hollow</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commonwealth &amp; Graves</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Montgomery &amp; Erlanger TC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Erlanger TC &amp; Clover</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Erlanger Rd. &amp; Commonwealth</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cave Run &amp; Dry Creek</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>St. Joseph’s to St. James</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kenton Lands &amp; Montgomery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The average mid-block crash rate for the Commonwealth of Kentucky is 4.84 accidents per million vehicle miles.

**The Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) rate weights crashes by property damage only, injury, and fatality.

**OTHER EXISTING CONDITIONS**

**Freeway Incidents**

Added congestion in response to freeway incidents is of particular concern. Since Dixie Highway parallels Interstate 71/75 in Northern Kentucky, drivers often divert onto Dixie Highway from interchanges at Buttermilk Pike, Kyles Lane, and Twelfth Street. These influxes can increase the traffic on Dixie Highway by as much as 30% and overwhelm the signal system, causing traffic backups. The 2005 Corridor Study predicted that over the next ten years, freeway incidents are projected to increase travel times on Dixie Highway by more than 40% when they occur during peak hours.

**Turn Lanes**

Another problem is the general lack of turn lanes, especially left turn lanes. Intersections with heavy turn volumes create significant delay along the corridor. Left-turning vehicles block the left through lane and cause a backup until the turn is completed.

**Parking**

In areas with on-street parking, Dixie Highway is reduced to one lane in each direction. In addition, traffic slows down in response to parking maneuvers. Two areas, as previously noted, contain on-street parking. In Covington, this parking is restricted to non-rush hour times reducing the highway to only two lanes of traffic. On the other hand, the on-street parking in Fort Mitchell is designed so that four lanes of traffic are maintained.

**Schools**

There are 18 schools in the Dixie Highway Corridor. During the beginning and end of schools’ daily operation, especially during the AM peak, traffic volumes increase significantly in these areas in response to the influx of personal vehicles and school buses. Children exiting and entering vehicles pose an additional safety concern.
Bus
The Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK) provides over 100 public bus stops in the corridor. Every time the bus stops, it decreases the capacity on Dixie Highway as the rightmost through lane is blocked. Transit issues and recommendations will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations
The lack of sidewalk connectivity along Dixie Highway raises safety and access concerns. There are areas along Dixie where sidewalks exist only on one side of the roadway and others where none exist at all. Pedestrian accommodations extend beyond sidewalks. Marked crosswalks do not exist consistently throughout the corridor. For bicycles, the lack of space for sharing the road safely with motor vehicles is an important issue. Pedestrian and Bicycle issues and recommendations will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

FUTURE CONDITIONS
The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments regional traffic models for 2010 and 2030 were utilized for the 2005 Dixie Highway Corridor Study to project how traffic in the corridor would look in the future if no improvements were made. The results of the traffic model show that the corridor will continue to get worse if measures are not taken.

Appendix 2-3 lists existing, projected Years 2010 and 2030 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) counts for the entire corridor as presented in the 2005 Corridor Study. The anticipated growth percentages are clearly exhibited.

Appendix 2-4 present the future level of service, northbound/southbound peak travel speeds, and intersection delay expected for Dixie Highway in the year 2015.

RELATED PRESENT AND PAST PLANNING EFFORTS
The following plans and studies directly impact Dixie Highway and were utilized in the drafting of The Dixie Fix Plan. Other general sources not directly tied to Dixie Highway were also used. These sources will be referenced as appropriately in this document.

Kentucky’s Proposed Access Management Program Executive Summary
The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet has developed proposed access management standards. The spacing standards included in the document have been recommended by the Cabinet’s Access Management Implementation Task Force, but they have not yet been formally adopted by the Cabinet. A copy of the Executive Summary is included as Appendix 2-5 and inclusion of standards is included in Chapter 3’s Access Management discussion.

Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005)
The Dixie Highway Corridor Study was conducted by OKI in response to a request from the Kenton County Fiscal Court. The study analyzes traffic and transportation issues on Dixie Highway within the limits of Kenton County. The study presents recommendations for improving safety, traffic flow and reducing delay along this heavily congested corridor. This study focused on increasing traffic throughput without adding lanes. Therefore, recommendations address improving traffic conditions along the highway.
operations by using a combination of new technologies and traditional methods.

Status of Short Term Recommendations
The short term recommendations were focused on optimizing the operation of the existing signal system. Specifically, they called for correcting a number of traffic signal operational problems that contribute to traffic delay and for instituting a new timing plan, designed to move traffic more efficiently.

KYTC reports that 100% of the short term recommendations that came from the study, including correcting problems related to signal maintenance and installing the signal timing plan, have been implemented.

As a result of the improvements implemented in response to the Corridor Study’s short-term recommendations, significant reductions in travel time were achieved in a number of locations. At the time of the Study’s conclusion, PM Peak Hour travel times for southbound traffic were reduced most significantly between Rosemont Drive and Dudley Road (58%) and between Beechwood Road and Expressway Plaza (51%). During the PM Peak Hour for northbound traffic, travel reductions greater than 50% were measured for segments from approximately Parkside Drive to Turfway Road (61%), Montgomery Drive to Kenton Lands Road, (71%), and Arcadia Avenue to Buttermilk Pike (58%). Similar travel time reductions are also expected for some segments during the AM Peak Hour. Based on such data, it is expected that the implementation of the Corridor Study’s short term recommendations has had an overall effect of decreasing travel time approximately 10% for the length of the corridor.

Status of Mid- and Long-Term Recommendations
Mid- and long-term recommendations from the Dixie Highway Corridor Study focus primarily on changes to the traffic signal system and on further studies to identify solutions for specific problems. The chart that follows lists all the mid- and long-term recommendations and their status as of June 2006.

One of the mid-term recommendations of the Corridor Study was that an access management plan be undertaken. An access management plan was viewed as providing the opportunity to expedite efforts to manage access and insure a coordinated approach to access management along the corridor. The study included design scenarios for improving access at approximately 100 locations in the corridor. This recommendation was taken as The Dixie Fix’s call to action and formed the foundation upon which work began. The complete 2005 Dixie Highway Corridor Study can be accessed at www.oki.org.

OKI and the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) conducted a major planning study on Interstate 75, known as the North South Initiative (February 2004)
## MID-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST*</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLOSED LOOP SIGNAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>Signal system will react to daily fluctuations in traffic, allow remote operation of the system, and notify operators of maintenance issues; need to review signal system division &amp; traffic signal warrants.</td>
<td>Signal timing that suits traffic best can offer a 10%-30% decrease in travel times+</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CAMERA SYSTEM</td>
<td>In order to adequately implement remote timing plans, it is necessary to see the traffic conditions.</td>
<td>Camera systems would allow operators to see the real time traffic conditions. Improve the efficiency of the Closed Loop System.</td>
<td>$2,500/ camera, plus broadcasting-corridor will need to be evaluated to determine # of cameras &amp; best broadcasting options.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTIMIS INTERCONNECTION</td>
<td>Would allow traffic signal timing to be remotely changed to accommodate additional freeway traffic diverted due to freeway incident. Would require signal timing plans to be developed.</td>
<td>Based on Synchro traffic models, travel time would decrease by 10%-20% (during overflow events) with the implementation of improved timing+</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAL PREEMPTION FOR EMERGENCY VEHICLES</td>
<td>System to allow the signals to immediately give a green light to approaching emergency vehicles.</td>
<td>Will improve response time by emergency vehicles; does not detrimentally impact progression on main street. Study on Colerain Avenue resulted in a 22% decrease in EMS travel time+</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Interest and support received from several local communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs represent estimates for construction only
+Traffic signal improvement listed is for this improvement only. Improvement percentages are not cumulative, but a combination of recommendations will result in improved conditions.
### MID-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST*</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNAL HARDWARE IMPROVEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fortside &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>A pressure sensor has been found at the intersection of Fortside &amp; Dixie; the westbound traffic signal is aimed at the building, not at the driveway</td>
<td>Pressure sensor removal will remove any possible confusion between this detector and the actual loop detector; moving WB signal head will provide better visibility</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted; no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St. John’s &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>EB loop detectors are set too far forward; vehicles will eventually run the light</td>
<td>Vehicles could potentially stop behind the loops, never requesting the signal; will improve the operation of the traffic signal</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted; no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beechwood &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>No detection provided for the private driveway opposite Beechwood Drive; vehicle must run the red light to enter traffic stream</td>
<td>Will allow vehicles in this private drive to place a call for the signal; will improve the operation of the traffic signal</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted; no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Winding Way</td>
<td>WB loop detectors are set too far forward; vehicles will eventually run the light</td>
<td>Vehicles could potentially stop behind the loops, never requesting the signal; will improve the operation of the traffic signal</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted; no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SB I-75 Ramp &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>Detectors on the SB I-71/75 ramp set too far back; vehicles will eventually run the light</td>
<td>Vehicles could potentially stop in front of the loops, never requesting the signal</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted; no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Complete a study to provide a development plan on Dixie Highway and establish standards and regulations for managing access.

Reduction in number of driveways will reduce the frequency of accidents. Study will provide plan to facilitate access management.

$125,000 Completed by *The Dixie Fix Plan*

*Costs represent estimates for construction only*
## MID-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST*</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDY OF ON-STREET PARKING</td>
<td>Complete a study of access options for eliminating on-street parking</td>
<td>On-street parking reduces capacity on Dixie, reduction or removal could greatly improve capacity. Near the Montague/Western intersection, removal of parking could improve the capacity of the segment by up to 60%+</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

- **Crosswalk Markings**
  - Pedestrian crosswalks not adequately delineated in all locations; some crosswalks not optimally placed to minimize pedestrian exposure
  - Improves pedestrian safety
  - No action

- **Pedestrian Pushbuttons & Signal Heads**
  - Pedestrian signal heads do not rest in “WALK”, therefore pushbuttons should be provided for all signal heads associated with the main street
  - Allows the Dixie Highway pedestrians to request the “WALK” signal; promotes continuity throughout corridor
  - $150,000
  - Interest expressed by several local communities

- **“Countdown” Pedestrian Heads**
  - KYTC has been installing “countdown” pedestrian signal heads throughout Northern Kentucky
  - Promotes continuity throughout Northern Kentucky
  - $300,000
  - Interest expressed by several local communities

### MANAGEMENT ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- **Staggering of School Hours**
  - Starting and ending times for schools along Dixie Highway need to be reviewed. Several schools have similar starting and ending times.
  - Will reduce the number of vehicles on Dixie during the AM Peak Hour, stagger vehicles throughout Peak
  - No action

*Costs represent estimates for construction only*
### MID-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST*</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review of Bus Stops</td>
<td>Review the number and location of bus stops along the corridor. Several have been added over the years, appears none have been consolidated/removed. Consider use of bus pullouts.</td>
<td>Bus pullouts will remove buses out of roadway while stopped, decreasing bottlenecks. Removing/consolidating bus stops will reduce the number of times buses stop.</td>
<td>2006 Transit Network Study completed by TANK; recommendation for elimination or consolidation of 12 bus stops. No new bus pullouts recommendations forwarded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearance Intervals</td>
<td>KYTC should review the yellow and all-red times for each intersection. Several intersections have shorter clearance intervals than necessary.</td>
<td>Will increase the safety of each intersection. Yellow and all-red time allows vehicles to safely enter and clear the intersection.</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LONG-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

**REALIGNMENT OF OFFSET INTERSECTIONS**

| • McAlpin/Garvey & Dixie     | Realign existing intersection to form a normal four approach intersection | Decrease in lost time at the intersection because east and west approaches can run together, decrease in accidents at intersection | $450,000 | Funding application submitted, no funding yet received |
| • Goodridge/Bustetter & Dixie | Realign existing intersection to form a normal four approach intersection | Decrease in lost time at the intersection because east and west approaches can run together, decrease in accidents at intersection | $325,000 | Funding application submitted, no funding yet received |
| • Eastern/Kentaboo & Dixie   | Realign existing intersection to form a normal four approach intersection | Decrease in lost time at the intersection because east and west approaches can run together, decrease in accidents at intersection | $600,000 | Funding application submitted, no funding yet received |

*Costs represent estimates for construction only*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST*</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sunnymede/Requardt &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>Realign existing intersection to form a normal four approach intersection</td>
<td>Decrease in accidents at intersection</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted, no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Virginia/Superior &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>Realign existing intersection to form a normal four approach intersection</td>
<td>Decrease in accidents at intersection</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted, no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pleasant Ridge/Church Driveway &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>Realign existing intersection to form a normal four approach intersection</td>
<td>Decrease in lost time at the intersection because east and west approaches can run together, decrease in accidents at intersection</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted, no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kyles/George Huser &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>Realign existing intersection to form a normal four approach intersection</td>
<td>Decrease in lost time at the intersection because east and west approaches can run together, decrease in accidents at intersection</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted, no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITION OF TURN LANES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Dudley/Summit &amp; Dixie</td>
<td>Provide a NB right turn lane. Large backups in the NB rightmost lane as several vehicles attempt to turn right onto Dudley Road. Right-of-way for the additional lane is available in this location</td>
<td>Decrease in right turning vehicles blocking the right through lane. Could decrease delay at intersection by up to 50%+</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Funding application submitted, no funding yet received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beechwood Road</td>
<td>Provide a NB left turn lane. Large backups in the NB leftmost lane as several vehicles attempt to turn left onto Beechwood Road. Right-of-way for the additional lane is available in this location</td>
<td>Decrease in left turning vehicles blocking the left through lane. Could decrease delay at intersection by up to 50%+</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>No local support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs represent estimates for construction only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST*</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Highland Avenue</td>
<td>Provide a SB left turn lane. Large backups in the SB leftmost lane as several vehicles attempt to turn left onto Highland Avenue. Right-of-way for the additional lane is available in this location</td>
<td>Decrease in left turning vehicles blocking the left through lane. Could decrease delay at intersection by up to 50%+</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>No local support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION OF RAILROAD OVERPASS</td>
<td>Replace the existing railroad bridge located to the north of Commonwealth &amp; Dixie with a single span. Review the vertical alignment of Dixie in this area</td>
<td>Increased sight distance for SB &amp; NB traffic. Reduction in accidents at intersections of Dixie with Commonwealth, Erlanger, Alice &amp; Hallam</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kenton Lands Road to Edgewood Road</td>
<td>Control access conditions to improve safety and traffic flow. Elimination of one driveway, installation of five right-in/right-out islands, and implementation of a cross easement in one location</td>
<td>Reduction in the frequency of angle-type accidents from the current 19.11 per million vehicle miles</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Recommendations included in <em>The Dixie Fix Plan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turfway Road to Bustetter Dr./Goodridge Dr.</td>
<td>Control access conditions to improve safety and traffic flow. Elimination of two driveways and installation of one right-in/right-out island, and reconfiguration of one piece of property to become an access roadway</td>
<td>Reduction in the frequency of angle-type accidents from the current 16.47 per million vehicle miles</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Recommendations included in <em>The Dixie Fix Plan</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs represent estimates for construction only*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST*</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyles Lane to Sleepy Hollow Drive</td>
<td>Control access conditions to improve safety and traffic flow. Closure of three driveways, installation of one right-in/right-out island, and reconfiguration of one piece of property to become an access roadway</td>
<td>Reduction in the frequency of angle-type accidents from the current 8.10 per million vehicle miles</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Recommendations included in <em>The Dixie Fix Plan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY OF ARTIMIS EXTENSION</td>
<td>Study to review possibility of extending the ARTIMIS system onto Dixie Highway. Review of hardware necessary to extend system</td>
<td>ARTIMIS system has greatly reduced fuel consumption, number of fatalities, and emergency response time on Cincinnati area freeways</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs represent estimates for construction only*
South Transportation Initiative. The major focus of the Initiative was to improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of Interstate 75. The report was reviewed in regard to the segment in Northern Kentucky extending the entire length of The Dixie Fix study area. The recommendations in the North South Initiative that relate to the Dixie Highway are included as Appendix 2-6. The North South Initiative report can be viewed at www.oki.org.

Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project (ongoing)
The Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project was initiated in late 2005. This project is being overseen by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and Ohio Department of Transportation. The study area is generally defined as including the I-71/75 corridor from the Kyles Lane Interchange in Kentucky to the Western Hills Viaduct in Ohio. In addition, some areas east and west of the I-71/75 corridor are included within the study area. A careful watch on the progress of the Brent Spence should be maintained as Dixie Highway recommendations are implemented to insure compatibility and connectivity. More information on the Brent Spence project can be obtained by visiting www.brentspencebridgecorridor.com.

Dixie Highway Corridor Study (1984)
In 1984, the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission prepared a study entitled the Dixie Highway Corridor Study. It reviewed the area between the I-75 interchange on Dixie Highway and Turfway Road. This study was reviewed as part of the 2005 Dixie Highway Corridor Study to see which recommendations were implemented. The study made several general recommendations concerning Dixie’s intersecting side streets. Many of these recommendations were implemented as a result of the report. Several other recommendations are summarized in Appendix 2-7. These past recommendations were considered and incorporated into The Dixie Fix Plan.

Kenton County Bicycle Plan (June 1999)
The Kenton County Bicycle Plan was adopted in June 1999 as the framework for more detailed bikeway planning in the county. This plan identified roads as bikeways that were deemed necessary to create an effective bikeway system. Routes were classified in four categories: primary (most important); secondary (substitute routes but less direct to major destinations than primary); touring (rural routes); and local (routes along local streets that could be used to reach various destinations). One component of the plan was to educate local officials to the needs and basic principles of planning and implementing bikeways. A copy of the Plan can be seen on the NKAPC website at www.nkapc.org.

Kenton County Pedestrian Plan (June 2001)
The Kenton County Pedestrian Plan was adopted in June 2001 and like the earlier Bicycle Plan was intended as a framework plan to present a strategy for detailed pedestrian planning and implementation. One of the most notable features of this plan was the use of GIS technology to evaluate the walkability to a destination using “Ped Sheds.” Once the “Ped Shed” was identified evaluations could be made as to the availability of sidewalks necessary to reach a destination. Like the Bike Plan, the Pedestrian Plan contained information to educate local officials on the basic principles of planning for pedestrian access. A copy of the Plan can be seen on the NKAPC website at www.nkapc.org.

TANK Transit Network Study (2006)
The Dixie Fix had the advantage of incorporating recommendations from the recently completed Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK) Transit Network Study. TANK initiated the Transit Network Study to analyze the trends, challenges and opportunities facing Northern Kentucky and to create a long-range plan for public transportation. The plan will serve as TANK’s guideline for future operation and investment to the year 2030. While this plan is a long-term vision, it is designed so that it can be implemented over time in small or large pieces, depending on available funding and opportunities. The Study’s Dixie Highway recommendations are presented in Chapter 5. More information on the Transit Network Study can be found on the TANK website, www.tankbus.com, or by
Vision 2015

Vision 2015 began on March 4, 2005. This 10-year strategic blueprint builds upon the original 1995 Quest: A Vision for Northern Kentucky and is being used to define and transform the future of Northern Kentucky. With a common purpose to ensure Northern Kentucky is capable of competing in a global economy, with our citizens benefiting from the prosperity and opportunity this creates, six strategies were established:

- Competitive Economy: The Northern Kentucky region will reinvent its economy and create new jobs that ensure continued growth and prosperity.
- Educational Excellence: Our educational system will promote talent and innovation and prepare children and adults to successfully compete in the global knowledge-based economy.
- Livable Communities: All Northern Kentucky residents will have the opportunity to access and fully participate in the civic, cultural and social life of the community.
- Urban Renaissance: The urban center of the region will leverage its unique assets to add economic and social value to the community and to make the region more competitive in the global economy.
- Effective Governance: Local government will enhance the economic competitiveness of the region by ensuring that high-quality public services are efficiently provided.
- Regional Stewardship: Our community’s leaders and citizens are collaborating and working together to achieve a shared vision of our future.

The Dixie Fix Plan works to support and enhance each of the objectives above, with the exception of Educational Excellence.
OVERVIEW

Access management is the systematic control of the location, spacing, design, and operation of driveways, median openings, interchanges, and street connections to a roadway. The primary objective is to provide vehicular access to land development in a manner that preserves the safety and efficiency of the transportation system. Over 21 states have implemented access management programs to improve the safety and efficiency of roadway systems. Access management plans examine vehicular, pedestrian, and multi-modal access to businesses, residences, and institutional establishments along primary transportation corridors. Studies have found that effective access management programs may reduce crashes as much as 50%. In addition, roadway capacity has been shown to increase nearly 45% and travel time has been improved as much as 60%.

(Source: http://www.ctre.iastate.edu/PUBS/8.5x11BROCHURE.pdf)

Act, Don’t React!

As a roadway corridor reaches development capacity, necessary measures need to address the location and spacing of driveways and traffic signals. The challenge presented with Dixie Highway is its status as an urban, fully-developed corridor. Access management becomes a retrofitting project that is very difficult due to physical constraints and existing public expectations based on long-standing travel patterns. Hence, the need to develop an access management strategy and plan that is ready for implementation as redevelopment of the corridor occurs. The ultimate position is then created for local communities to ACT instead of REACT to ensure safety, mobility, access, etc. are improved. Access management retrofitting becomes a long-term, parcel-by-parcel process. There is no “quick fix” possible to a problem that was decades in the making.

Applying access management requires assessing properties at locations that may extend beyond the immediate vicinity of the site where the actual improvement is occurring. It is also necessary to consider conditions beyond the time of the development review in order to identify supporting road systems that may need to be addressed. The long-term implications and cumulative impacts of access-related decisions must be identified. When approaching access management, a couple of questions should be posed:

• Is there a better way to provide access to this property?
• What considerations should be taken when applying access management to this property(ies)?
• How will access management application here impact the corridor in regards to safety and traffic flow?

Design techniques including the implementation of roundabouts, medians, turn lanes, shared access drives/inter-parcel connections, right in/right out islands, and frontage/backage roads help address these issues and achieve the goals of access management.

• Fewer crashes
• Increased efficiency to businesses, residences, and institutions.
• Reduced Delay
ACCESS MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

Access management considerations for application in developed corridors may include the following:

- Spacing of signals
- Spacing of driveways
- Implementing shared access drives and inter-parcel connections
- Frontage/backage roads
- Decreasing the number of driveways
- Aligning roadways and avoid odd angle intersections
- Designating exclusive turn lanes
- Adding nontraversable medians to restrict direct left turns
- Adding two-way left turn lanes
- Facilitating U-turn movements
- Raising right in/out only curbs
- Constructing roundabouts

A study conducted by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) found that roadway speeds were reduced an average of 2.5 miles per hour for every 10 access points per mile, up to a maximum of 10 miles per hour reduction (at 40 access points per mile). Dixie Highway has an average 54.75 driveways per mile over an eight mile stretch.

**Driveway Spacing**

Driveway spacing presents another major access issue. Large numbers of driveways increase the potential conflicts on the road. Fewer driveways spaced further apart allow for more orderly merging of traffic and present fewer challenges to drivers. A study conducted by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) found that roadway speeds were reduced an average of 2.5 miles per hour for every 10 access points per mile, up to a maximum of 10 miles per hour reduction (at 40 access points per mile). Dixie Highway has an average 54.75 driveways per mile over an eight mile stretch.

The following steps can be taken to increase spacing between driveways:

1) Consolidation/reduction of driveways serving a single parcel.
2) Use of shared driveways to serve adjacent parcels.
3) Relocation of driveways away from cross street intersections, especially when the driveway faces a left turn or right turn lane.

**Signal Spacing**

U.S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration studies indicate a clear correlation between the number of traffic signals and the frequency of traffic accidents, increased travel time, and reduced environmental quality. Under the right design, placement and operating circumstances, traffic signals can reduce the number and severity of crashes as well as assist in optimal traffic flow. According to 2002 data compiled by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 21% of crashes and 24% of all fatalities and injuries related to motor vehicles occurred at signalized intersections. In addition, anything greater than two signals per mile has a significant impact on congestion and safety. The Dixie Highway corridor from Covington to Florence currently has an average of 5.5 traffic signals per mile.
4) Installation of curb and gutter along full frontage parking areas, to concentrate and direct access movements to specific drive locations.

Aligning roadways and avoiding odd angle intersections
Aligning opposing driveways or roadways helps to avoid or eliminate offsets. Avoiding odd angle intersections decreases the number of conflict points and increases visibility for both drivers and pedestrians.

Shared Access Drives and Inter-Parcel Connections
Shared access drives and inter-parcel connections combine entry points and eliminate unnecessary driveways along primary roadways using the following steps;

1) Relocation of access from the main road to a secondary road where possible.
2) Interconnection of adjacent parking lots, to allow inter-parcel vehicular circulation without accessing the main road.
3) Development of service roads, either in front of or behind existing buildings, to allow inter-parcel vehicular circulation without accessing the main road.
**Turn Lanes**
Designated turn lanes allow drivers to remove themselves from the roadway without disrupting the flow of traffic.

**Medians**
Constructing medians can enhance the aesthetic appeal, but more importantly installation of median barriers can be used to prohibit left turns at problematic locations by directing left turn movements to fewer and more central locations. Medians also work to separate different directional flows of traffic, thereby limiting the number of conflict points and improving safety.

CONSTRUCT MEDIANS AND TURN LANES TO DIRECT TURNING MOVEMENTS

**Right in/out only curbs**
Replacement of full service drives by constructing right in/right out only raised curbing allows business owners to guide circulation patterns through parking lots. It also encourages patrons to enter and exit establishments more safely. Full turn movements are directed to major signalized intersections, rather than every access drive off of the major thoroughfare. This is extremely advantageous as an option for drives closest to intersections or turn lanes.

**Roundabouts**
Although not appropriate for all situations, roundabouts represent a solution for intersections with many conflict points. They also improve visibility and safety at odd angle and offset intersections while maintaining the flow of traffic.

ACCESS MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
Accompanying this written plan is a CD on which aerial maps for the ten Dixie Fix communities are included as electronic files. Each
map highlights recommendations for problem areas located along the respective community’s segment of the eight mile Dixie corridor. The purpose for creating the maps was to visually communicate how, when, and where access management improvements can be made along the corridor.

The maps are broken down according to community boundaries. A letter designates each recommendation starting at the southern-most border and beginning with the letter “A.” Recommendations and respective lettering continues in a north direction until all proposals have been identified. Some recommendations are grouped by circles to denote that implementation should be conducted simultaneously. Making only one of the group recommendations would limit access to and viability of the property. It may also jeopardize safety.

The Dixie Fix’s access management recommendations are placed into two categories. A green text box identifies improvements that can be applied to existing developments in their current state within the immediate future. A blue text box indicates proposed changes that should only be applied if and when the parcel is redeveloped.

Besides the aerial maps, the 168 individual recommendations are also listed within a table and identified by community and location (Appendix 3-1). Proposals range from relatively minor changes, such as the implementation of right in/right out only curbs, to the creation of landscaped medians and extended access drives. The digital maps show existing TANK bus stop locations and identify those to be eliminated. This element will be discussed further in Chapter 5: Public Transit.

Kentucky’s Proposed Access Management Program
For further consideration and inclusion in future Dixie Highway access management improvements, The Dixie Fix had the benefit of Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) staff’s involvement on the Oversight Team. Staff shared a document, Kentucky’s Proposed Access Management Program Executive Summary, that has been developed by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and proposes access management standards. The spacing standards included in the document have been recommended by the Cabinet’s Access Management Implementation Task Force, but they have not yet been formally adopted by the Cabinet. A complete copy of this document is included as Appendix 2-5.

Based on the Proposed Access Management Program criteria, Dixie Highway, for the section covered by The Dixie Fix, would have the following access management classification under this new program:

- From Turfway Road to Sleepy Hollow Road: Urban I
- From Sleepy Hollow Road to the I-75 underpass in Covington: Urban II
- From the I-75 underpass to Main Street in Covington: Urban III

Subsequently, Signalized Intersection Spacing Standards recommended by the Proposed Access Management Program are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Signalized Intersection Spacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>2,400 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>2,400 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>1,200 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signal spacing of approximately ½ mile on all Class I and II roads is to ensure adequate bi-directional signal progression.

Unsignalized Intersection Spacing Standards recommended by the Proposed Access Management Program are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Type A Access*</th>
<th>Type B Access**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>1,200 / 600 ft.***</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>600 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Type A Access - All commercial, industrial, and recreational uses; residential subdivision entrances; public roadways; and, all other access not specified as Type B Access.
** Type B Access - Single family residences; multiple-family residences (3 units or less); and, farm/field entrances.
*** For roadways with an 85th percentile speed greater than 45mph use larger values. For roadways with an 85th percentile speed less than or equal to 45 mph, the larger values should be utilized where feasible but the lower values may be applied, where necessary.
Restrictions and Notes Applicable to Type B Access:
1. All other standards will apply according to the roadway classification.
2. Type B access spacing may be utilized only if alternative reasonable access meeting Type A standards is not feasible.
3. Change of land use from that previously permitted under Type B access to that classified as Type A requires a new permit and application of Type A standards.
4. Only one access allowed per parcel or for contiguous parcels under one ownership. Additional access points may be allowed only if they meet Type A standards and are deemed necessary for the convenience or welfare of the traveling public.
5. Type B access should not be allowed within the functional area of another intersection. No entrance shall be permitted within the limits of a turning lane.
6. Type B access shall not be permitted on routes designated as having “Partial Control” access.
7. When a median is present, Type B access will be limited to right turns only.
8. Unified access using cross access, combined entrances, backage roads and frontage roads is strongly encouraged.

Preferred Median Type Standards recommended by the Proposed Access Management Program are:
- Urban I: Nontraversable
- Urban II: Nontraversable (multilane facility)
  Two-Way Left Turn Lane (TWLTL) (2-Lane facility)
- Urban III: TWLTL (typical)
  Nontraversable (high control situations)

Traversable raised medians are not recommended since they neither facilitate left turns nor do they provide positive control over left turn movements. If a project design team determines that a different median type is needed for safety or traffic operational reasons, a variance may be requested.

Median Type Guidelines:
Individual left-turn lanes recommended for:
- Locations where left-turn volume exceeds warrant (to be determined), and
- Access point density <= 10 ap/mi

TWLTL generally appropriate for:
- Urban/suburban 3-lane roadways with:
  - o projected ADT<17,000
  - o access point density > 10 ap/mi and < 85 ap/mi
  - o left-turn volume < 150 vph
- Urban/suburban multi-lane roadways with:
  - o projected ADT<24,000
  - o access point density > 10 ap/mi and < 85 ap/mi
  - o left-turn volume < 100 vph

Non-traversable medians preferred for:
- All new multilane arterials
- Existing roadways where ADT, access density, and/or turning volumes exceed thresholds established above for TWLTLs
- Existing rural multilane arterials
- Crossroads in the vicinity of interchanges
- Multilane roadways with high pedestrian activity

Median Opening Spacing Standards recommended by the Proposed Access Management Program are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Median Opening FULL ft.</th>
<th>Median Opening DIRECTIONAL ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>2,400 ft.</td>
<td>1,200 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>2,400 ft. / 1,200 ft.*</td>
<td>1,200 ft. / 600 ft.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>600 ft.</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For roadways with an 85th percentile speed greater than or equal to 45mph, use larger values. For roadways with an 85th percentile speed less than or equal to 45mph, the larger values should be utilized where feasible, but the lower values may be applied, where necessary. Use of the lower values does not alter the 2,400 ft. minimum traffic signal spacing standard.

Mid-block median openings (used for U-turns only) may be located 300 ft. from an intersection at which left-turns are restricted, if the following conditions are met:
1. Adequate sight distance;
2. Adequate space for accommodating the U-turn design vehicle;
3. Adequate space for incorporation of a “left-turn” auxiliary lane (including taper and storage); and,
4. There is no potential for use by drivers desiring to turn left from nearby driveways.

For all three classes, full median opening standards are developed to align with the signal spacing standards with the exception noted above for Class II roadways.

**Corner Clearance Standards** recommended by the Proposed Access Management Program are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Type A Access*</th>
<th>Type B Access**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>1,200 / 600 ft.***</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>600 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Type A Access - All commercial, industrial, and recreational uses; residential subdivision entrances; public roadways; and, all other access not specified as Type B Access.

** Type B Access - Single family residences; multiple-family residences (3 units or less); and, farm/field entrances.

*** For roadways with an 85th percentile speed greater than 45mph, use 1,200 ft. upstream of intersection.

In addition to the spacing standard for the appropriate roadway classification, requirements for adequate corner clearance include:

- Driveways should not be permitted within the limits of turning or other auxiliary lanes in cases where the length of the auxiliary lane, including taper, is greater than the applicable spacing standard.
- Driveways should not be permitted within the limits of regularly forming queues.

For corner properties, Type B corner clearance may only be applied along the roadway with lower access function, based on the access classifications of the intersecting routes. In cases where the access classifications are the same a determination of relative access function will be made by the Cabinet. For intersections of a local road or street with a state-maintained route, it is presumed that the local facility will have the lower access function.

Requirements for corner clearance are necessary to insure that the functional area of the intersection is not impacted. Requests for access near important or congested intersections may require a detailed traffic engineering analysis to determine the intersection’s functional area.

**Interchange Area Spacing Standards** recommended by the Proposed Access Management Program are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Full Access Intersection*</th>
<th>Limited Access Connection**</th>
<th>Right-In / Right-Out Access Only***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>1,200 / 600 ft.</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>600 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Distance to first four-way intersection. Beyond this point spacing standards based on crossroad access class apply.
** Distance to first access connection limited to Right-In/Right-Out and Left-In movements. Applicable where left-turn movements restricted by median barrier with directional median opening.
*** Applicable where left-turn movements restricted by median barrier.

Additional comments:

- Spacing measured from ramp end of taper (end of radius if no taper) to access connection closest edge of pavement.
- Spacing distances for Limited Access Connections apply only where adequate left-turn lanes can be physically accommodated.
- Spacing distances for Limited Access Connections may be applied to unsignalized full movement connections if there is no possibility for access on opposite side.
- Access connections shall not permitted within limits of ramp taper.
- Access connections should not permitted within limits of auxiliary lane for downstream intersection.
- Type B access spacing not permitted with between ramp and first Limited Access Connection.

It should be noted that corridor agreements for access management retrofit projects (such as those recommended by The Dixie Fix Plan) may result in different negotiated access spacing. Such agreements, signed by KYTC and appropriate local government(s), would take precedence over the standards presented here.
The Dixie Fix access management recommendations were studied to determine their projected impact on improving crash rates and travel speeds/timing. The goal was to see how well the recommendations were projected to address The Dixie Fix’s goals of improving safety and mobility/traffic movement.

Safety
A methodology found in the 1999 National Cooperative Highway Research Program report number 420 was used to estimate the crash rates. Figure 3.1 shows representative crash rates by signalized and unsignalized access density for urban and suburban areas. These rates contain adjustments to account for apparent inconsistencies. Each unsignalized driveway may add about 0.02 to the accident rate at low signal densities and from 0.06 to 0.11 at higher signal densities. The rates have been used to estimate the changes associated with increasing unsignalized access density at a given signal density. Put quite simply, the greater the number of driveways, the greater the chance of a crash occurring.

The Dixie corridor was divided into eight sections matching the sections defined in OKI’s Congestion Management System. Crash rates within those sections were derived from calendar years 2002-03 Commonwealth of Kentucky highway crash numbers and traffic volume information from OKI’s traffic count database. The number of signalized intersections and unsignalized access points were enumerated for all sections from aerial photos. Future access points were determined from preliminary recommendations of the Dixie Fix Oversight Team. The number of existing and future access points was divided by section length to determine existing and future access points per mile. The projected crash rate was determined by the formula (existing accident rate*(R2/R1) where R1 and R2 are the estimated existing and future rates from Figure 3.1. The results can be found in Appendix 3-2 and are summarized in Figure 3.2. Analysis of The Dixie Fix’s access management recommendations shows a reduction in projected accident rates for all 10 communities. The greatest reduction is projected for the segment between the West ramps of I-71/75 to Main/Pike St. (a -27.04% drop in accidents).
Mobility and Traffic Movement
OKI’s Congestion Management System provided existing travel speeds for each section by direction during three time periods (AM peak, Mid-day and PM peak). Referring again to the methodology found in the 1999 National Cooperative Highway Research Program report number 420, Projected travel speeds are estimated to be increased 0.25 mph for every eliminated access point. Projected travel speeds and travel times were calculated for each of the eight sections, direction and time periods by the formula (projected speed = observed speed + (0.25mph * (existing access pts. - future access pts.))). Figure 3.3 below provides a summary of this data and Appendix 3-3 contains all data related to this computation.

Analysis of The Dixie Fix’s access management recommendations show reductions in projected travel time for all 10 communities. The greatest reduction is projected for the segment between Turfway and Commonwealth.

Economic Stability and Growth
Evaluation of current property values, retail sales, or other economic data was beyond the scope of this study. It is recommended that such information be collected and compared to similar data once a number of access management recommendations from The Dixie Fix are implemented or every five years.

Economic Impact Studies
As examples of the benefit of access management, other studies were examined. Studies in Iowa and Texas have indicated that access management improvements create few or no adverse effects to most businesses.

Iowa Impact Study
- Corridors with completed access management projects performed better in terms of retail sales than the surrounding communities. Business failure rates along access managed corridors were at or below the statewide average for Iowa. Although this suggests that access management projects generally did not have an adverse effect on the majority of businesses, some businesses may have been negatively affected.

- Eighty percent of businesses surveyed in Iowa along access-managed corridors reported sales at least as high after the project was in place. Relatively few businesses reported sales declines associated with the access management project, although these business owners clearly believed that they were hurt by the project. The firms perceiving negative impacts were a mixture of business types.

- Similarly, about 80 percent of businesses reported no customer complaints about access to their businesses after project completion. Businesses that tended to report most complaints were highly oriented toward automobile traffic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Section Name</th>
<th>2-way daily vehicle hours saved (hours : minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Turfway to Commonwealth</td>
<td>227:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Commonwealth to I-275</td>
<td>79:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>I-275 to Turkeyfoot</td>
<td>2:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Turkeyfoot to Buttermilk</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Buttermilk to I-71/75</td>
<td>21:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>I-71/75 to Kyles</td>
<td>10:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Kyles to west ramps of I-71/75</td>
<td>126:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>West ramps to I-71/75 to Main/Pike St.</td>
<td>0:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>473:02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• In all cases, 90% to 100% of motorists surveyed had a favorable opinion of improvements made to roadways that involved access management. The vast majority of motorists thought that the improved roadways were safer and that traffic flow had improved.

(Source: Iowa State University, Iowa Access Management Research and Awareness Project: Executive Summary, 1997).

Texas Impact Study
A study of the economic impacts of left-turn restrictions was conducted for the Texas Department of Transportation in the mid 1990s. Due to the sensitivity of information on business activity, researchers did not ask for sales details, but for general perceptions as to whether business activity had changed over time using ranges (e.g. better/worse/same). Information on historical property values was obtained through the use of appraisal district computers or by purchasing CDs from private companies with this information. Key findings included the following:

• Perceptions of business owners before a median was installed were more pessimistic than what usually happened.

• Business owners reported no change in pass-by traffic after median installations.

• Most business types (including specialty retail, fast-food restaurants and sitdown restaurants) reported increases in numbers of customers per day and gross sales, except for gasoline stations and automotive repair shops, which reported decreases in the numbers of customers per day and gross sales.

• Most adverse economic impacts were realized during the construction phase of the median installations.

• Employment within the corridors experienced upward trends overall, with some exceptions during construction phases.

• When asked what factors were important to attracting customers, business owners generally ranked “accessibility to store” lower than customer service, product quality and product price, and ahead of store hours and distance to travel.

• About 94% of business owners reported that their regular customers were at least as likely or more likely to continue patronizing their business after the median installation.

• Along corridors where property values were studied, the vast majority of land values stayed the same or increased, with very few exceptions


PRIORITIZATION OF ACCESS MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
In an attempt to prioritize access management implementation, a process was developed for inclusion in the final plan. The Dixie Fix stakeholders agreed that there was a need for flexibility in the prioritization process. It was determined that recommendations would be separated into two categories: corridor-wide priorities and local community priorities. The priority rankings that follow are not intended to limit or package projects, but rather to show the level of support and need for implementation urgency. If necessary funding is identified and timing becomes ripe for action, implementation should be pursued regardless of whether or not a higher ranked recommendation has been completed. Redevelopment opportunities may also influence the timing of implementation. Some recommendations may also be chosen to be grouped together due to their proximity, funding flexibility and the desire to achieve as much as possible.

The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future
From the 168 individual access management recommendations, Oversight Team members were asked to submit their top 5 project priorities. A combined 36 priorities were submitted from the following members; Florence, Erlanger, Elsmere, Edgewood, Crestview Hills, Lakeside Park, Fort Wright, Covington, KYTC and TANK (Appendices 3-4). Note: Some priorities were duplicated by more than one Oversight Team member. These priorities were then evaluated based on criteria reviewed and approved by the Oversight Team members. Weight was also assigned to each criteria category by the Oversight Team. Refer to Appendix 3-5 for the completed matrices for each priority recommendation.

The final chart ranking the 36 priority access management recommendations follows. This chart separates corridor-wide priorities from local community priorities. Corridor-wide priorities are projects much larger in nature which will involve large amounts of funding and involve multiple governmental agencies to implement. Local community priorities are relatively smaller scaled projects that, for the most part, will involve only the local community and individual property owner(s). The chart shows how each recommendation was ranked by its community, as well as how it compared with the other 35 priority recommendations. Level of desire for implementation, cost ranges, and designated lead agencies are also included in the chart. It should be noted that a column entitled “Progress Report” is included in the priority matrix. Oversight Team members want to continue meeting and tracking accomplishments as they are reached. As priorities are implemented and removed from the priority list, remaining recommendations can be evaluated and added. These measures are included to allow the spreadsheet to be an effective tool and help keep the study “alive.”

It is strongly suggested that after a critical number of recommendations are implemented, a re-evaluation of travel time, crash rates and economic data be made and compared to 2004/05 existing data to pinpoint the value added to the Dixie Highway through access management. This Dixie Highway-specific evidence could prove immensely enlightening to existing property owners, future developers, or other individuals who may question the benefits of access management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Management Recommendation</th>
<th>A. Regional Priority</th>
<th>B. Local Priority</th>
<th>Desire for Implementation</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Lead Agency(ies)</th>
<th>Progress Report (Date: 06/30/06)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood: Dudley Rd. Intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>KYTC, Edgewood</td>
<td>KYTC seeking $$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger/Elsmere: Garvey/McAlpin Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>KYTC, Erlanger/Elsmer</td>
<td>KYTC seeking $$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills: 4 to 2 lanes with landscaped median and sidewalk connectivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>KYTC, Park Hills</td>
<td>Ph's receiving $250k for sidewalk component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills: St. Josephs Ln. Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>KYTC, Park Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: Kyles Lane Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>KYTC, Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger: Kentaboo/Eastern Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>KYTC, Erlanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills: Roadway Realignment/Driveway Closures @ Ft. Mitchell Garage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>KYTC, Park Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington: Main St. Intersection Reconfiguration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>Covington, KYTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills: Roundabout &quot;realigning&quot; Arlington Rd.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>KYTC, Park Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: St. John/Thrifthwy Ctr Left Turn Lane &amp; Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>KYTC, Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington: SB I-75 Exit Ramp Dedicated Right Turn Lane</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>KYTC, Covington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANK: Consolidation and/or Removal of bus stops</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>TANK</td>
<td>underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORRIDOR-WIDE PRIORITIES**

**A. Regional Priority:** Each of the 36 local priorities were ranked using 8 weighted criteria factors. A copy of each recommendation's matrix is included in Appendix 3-5. These regional priorities were then numbered 1 (highest priority) to 36 (lowest priority).

**B. Local Priority:** Each of the 10 Dixie community Oversight Team representatives was asked to choose and rank their community's top 5 access management recommendations. 35 were received.

**DESIRE FOR IMPLEMENTATION:** The Oversight Team further classified the "Top 36" by level of desire for implementation timing. HIGH projects are desired for immediate implementation; MEDIUM - 2nd round of implementation; LOW - 3rd round of implementation. All implementation priority and timing is based on funding availability. Lack of funding for more highly desired projects should not prevent the implementation of lower ranked projects should funding for them become available.

**COST:** Low, Moderate, Moderate-to-High, High

The estimated level of cost is for the commonly expected application of the conceptual planning strategy (basic construction). It does not include cost estimates for additional right-of-way acquisitions, relocation of utilities, or engineering.
The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future

Chapter 3: Access Management

### Access Management Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Management Recommendation</th>
<th>A. Regional Priority</th>
<th>B. Local Priority</th>
<th>Desire for Implementation</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Lead Agency(ies)</th>
<th>Progress Report (Date: 06/29/06)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covington: Jillians Way to Main St. Removal of On-Street Parking</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Covington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington: Montague-Bullock Remove On-/Create Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Covington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington: &quot;The Curve&quot;-Montague Remove On-/Create Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Covington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills: Closure of residential drives/new access off side or rear rds.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: Fortside Driveway Closures, Align new entry w/ signal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: Acquire I-75 ROW</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: Rivard Adjacent Commercial Properties Shared Access</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington: Covington: Jillians Way to Main St. Removal of On-Street Parking</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Covington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington: Covington: Montague-Bullock Remove On-/Create Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Covington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington: Covington: &quot;The Curve&quot;-Montague Remove On-/Create Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Covington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills: Park Hills: Closure of residential drives/new access off side or rear rds.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: Ft. Wright: Fortside Driveway Closures, Align new entry w/ signal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: Ft. Wright: Acquire I-75 ROW</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright: Ft. Wright: Rivard Adjacent Commercial Properties Shared Access</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Hills: Crestview Hills: Fill-in Sidewalks Whitehouse to Dudley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Crestview Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood: Edgewood: Summit Right Turn Lane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood: Edgewood: 5th/3rd Bank &amp; Subway Right-in/out</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood: Edgewood: Thornton Driveway Closure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood: Edgewood: Edgewood Rd.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger: Erlanger: Montgomery Cyclery</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger: Erlanger: Sunset (Mexican Rest.) Close Entries/Create Shared Access Dr.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger: Erlanger: Colonial Cottage</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere: Elsmere: Eastern &amp; Park Aves. Driveway Closure</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere: Elsmere: Paul Wright TV Driveway Closure</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere: Elsmere: Pasquales Driveway Closure</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere: Elsmere: Vine Street Closure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Elsmere, KYTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence: Marshall Dodge Driveway Consolidations/Shared Access @ signal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence: Florence: Taco Bell / Turfway Commercial Center Entrance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence: Florence: McDonald's</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence: Florence: Consolidation of Driveways between Nicholas and Bustetter</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence: Florence: Chinese Restaurant Driveway Closure</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Terminology

**LOCAL COMMUNITY PRIORITIES**

A. Regional Priority: Each of the 36 local priorities were ranked using 8 weighted criteria factors. A copy of each recommendation's matrix is included in Appendix 3-5. These regional priorities were then numbered 1 (highest priority) to 36 (lowest priority).

B. Local Priority: Each of the 10 Dixie community Oversight Team representatives was asked to choose and rank their community's top 5 access management recommendations. 35 were received.

**DESIRE FOR IMPLEMENTATION:** The Oversight Team further classified the "Top 36" by level of desire for implementation timing. HIGH projects are desired for immediate implementation; MEDIUM - 2nd round of implementation; LOW - 3rd round of implementation. All implementation priority and timing is based on funding availability. Lack of funding for more highly desired projects should not prevent the implementation of lower ranked projects should funding for them become available.

**COST:** Low, Moderate, Moderate-to-High

The estimated level of cost is for the commonly expected application of the conceptual planning strategy (basic construction). It does not include cost estimates for additional right-of-way acquisitions, relocation of utilities, or engineering.
OVERVIEW

We have discussed one of the primary goals of *The Dixie Fix*, to make recommendations on ways to improve the road’s safety and ability to move traffic effectively through implementation of access management techniques. A secondary goal, but also very important, are recommendations on ways to increase multi-modal opportunities and to enhance the visual qualities of the corridor. One way to evaluate and reach *The Dixie Fix’s* goals can be done through the creation of desired cross-sections. Cross-sections graphically show what elements could be within the road’s right-of-way and how much space those elements will take up. The desired cross-section can then be implemented when road improvement projects or redevelopment occurs.

THE RIGHT-OF-WAY

What is the Right-of-Way?
The right-of-way is the public land that is owned by local or state government that comprises the road, sidewalks, tree and grass strips, and easements of various kinds. The outside edge of the right-of-way is where private property begins, normally at the edge of sidewalk away from the street. This is the norm, but not the rule. The actual right-of-way is not always apparent to someone traveling by vehicle or foot along the corridor.

The cross-section along Dixie Highway is primarily a four-lane arterial highway and typically contains the following elements:

- 4 paved, travel lanes
- Curbing and driveway entrances
- Grass and tree strips, which are also called utility strips
- Directional signage
- Utilities (above and below ground)
- Sidewalks
- TANK bus stops at selected locations

Existing Right-of-Way

The existing right-of-way on Dixie Highway varies greatly depending on the location and the time period when the property was developed. In older areas like Covington and parts of Ft. Wright, Elsmere, Erlanger and Florence the right-of-way is as narrow as fifty-four feet (54’) while areas where the interstates cross Dixie Highway, the right-of-way is much wider, sometimes increasing to well over one hundred feet (100’) in width. Many busy intersections have been improved and widened with added turn lanes. Overall, the majority of the study area averages sixty-feet (60’) in width with 4 travel lanes and a 4 foot sidewalk on one side.

Right-of-Way Concerns

Based on input received from the public and from staff research; the following concerns prevent Dixie Highway from reaching its maximum traffic flow, capacity and aesthetic potential:

- Too many driveways and entrances to business properties combined with;
- Lack of left turn lanes
- Unattractive roadway edges with utility wires, excessive signage and lack of landscaping
- Confusing signage
- Lack of continuous sidewalks
- Dangerous crosswalks
- Dangerous conditions for bike riding

The next section will examine how to improve Dixie Highway’s right-of-way and to mitigate current concerns.
CAHANGING A RIGHT-OF-WAY

Perhaps the most significant way to improve the Dixie Highway is changing the existing cross-section with ones that better fit the surrounding land use and character. Changing the road design can happen when properties redevelop or when a larger road project occurs. One of the most significant issues the local city has to make when changing the cross-section is whether additional right-of-way is needed to complete the design. Purchasing land to expand a road is very expensive, can take a long time to negotiate and sometimes involves legal action. In many older areas, Covington for example, buildings were built along what was originally a two-lane road, which has now been widened to four lanes. As a result, there is no more space to widen the road without demolition of buildings, which is even more costly than land acquisition.

When any road improvement or redevelopment project is being planned along the corridor, the city should be working with a clear vision of what cross-section is desired and a plan to achieve that vision.

DETERMINING DESIRED CROSS-SECTION

Because of the differences in traffic volumes and land use types, it is important to note that ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL for the Dixie Fix. That is why different cross-section options are provided. The following steps can help guide cities in their decision making process.

1. Evaluate if the project is significant enough to make changes to the existing right-of-way? What is the appropriate right-of-way width?
2. Evaluate the existing road conditions. How much existing right-of-way is there? Has there been dedication or acquisition in the past? How much more right-of-way is needed to achieve the desired cross-section?
3. Make sure that the goals (see bullets below) of The Dixie Fix Plan are met when evaluating a road project or development proposal.
   - Safety: Review the area’s crash history and determine if access management is needed. Consider safety for all modes; motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian.
   - Traffic Movement: Traffic flow and level of service for the roadway should not be jeopardized by any improvement.
   - Multi-modal Effectiveness: Bus riders, pedestrians, cyclists and citizens with special needs should be given equal inclusion when planning for spatial and other cross-section needs.
   - Aesthetics: Consider spacing and location needs for signage, visual clutter, streetscape elements, and landscaping.
4. The community character in the project area should be determined and used to finalize the details of the desired cross-section. This would include adding or improving sidewalks, burying utility lines, landscaping, changes in signage, etc.

DETERMII NG COMMUNITY CHARACTER

A major step in developing desired cross-sections is in understanding the different types of community character that exist along the corridor. As one travels along Dixie Highway, the character along the road edges changes in many ways. For example, the old, historic, urban setting in Covington is distinctly different than at the top of the hill a mile and a half away in Park Hills, which is an old, historic and early suburban commercial area.
Community character is a combination of:
- When the portion of the roadway was developed
- Adjacent building age, size and height, type and set back
- Parking both on and off the street
- Sidewalks
- Planting and landscaping
- Historic features
- Amenities such as benches and bus stops

Each community character type has different functions, needs and opportunities, which affect what fits into the typical right-of-way area. The following community character types were identified within The Dixie Fix’s project boundaries and maps included as Appendix 4-1 graphically detail by community this information.

**Community Character Types**

1. **Historic Urban, Mixed Use**

   These areas are located primarily in Covington and typically have 40 feet of pavement and 8-10 feet of sidewalk with an average right-of-way width of around 60 feet. The number of travel lanes varies from 4 to 2 depending on the use of turn lanes and on-street parking (permitted currently during off-peak traffic hours). The building set-backs range from zero to 20 feet and there are numerous vacant parcels and parking lots. Acquisition of additional right-of-way will be difficult, but should be considered when redevelopment occurs. Redevelopment potential is high in this area.

   **Desired Cross-Section Considerations**

   - Consider removing on street parking by utilizing the existence of and potential for additional private parking areas along rear access alleys, streets, or shared lots to make an additional 10 feet of pavement available for other uses.
   - Seek to improve the streetscape/ sidewalk area by adding tree wells and removal of utility and signage clutter.
   - Seek to create wider outside travel lanes to accommodate bicyclists.

2. **Open Space Transition**

   This area in Covington near the boundary with Park Hills is characterized by wooded, undeveloped steep slopes. This is the only place within the corridor with this kind of character. The current right-of-way is a rural type cross-section and has 40 feet of pavement, no curb and gutter, and no sidewalks. The steep slopes make this area difficult to develop.

   **Typical Historic, Urban, Mixed Use Area**  
   **Open Space Transition Area**

   **Desired Cross-Section Considerations**

   The desired cross-section for the Open Space Transition area could:
   - Consider using a three-lane cross-section with median and two uphill lanes, one for passing.
   - Keep one travel lane in each direction (right, outside lane) wide enough (14 feet) to provide space for cyclists.
   - Provide continuous 5 feet wide sidewalks (minimum) on each side.
   - Plant trees within a median and in a 10 foot tree planting easement adjacent to edge of right-of-way.
   - There is an interesting opportunity at the sharp turn at the bottom of the hill for a scenic overlook of Covington and Cincinnati. This could create a type of gateway as one enters or exits Covington.
3. *Suburban Historic Commercial*
This community character type is found as one moves south from Covington into Park Hills. These commercial areas were some of the first to be designed around the automobile prior to any development regulations. The right-of-way is wider in this stretch, in the range of 64 to 70 feet. Typically there are extensive lengths where the curb is cut and access is permitted fully across entire property frontages. Building set backs range from 10 to 60 feet with parking in the front of the building and generally lacking any street trees or sidewalks.

![Typical views of Historic Suburban Commercial area in Park Hills](image)

**Desired Cross-Section Considerations:**
The desired cross-section for the Historic Suburban Commercial areas should:
- Be designed to comply with a corridor wide access management plan.
- Consider utilizing access management techniques along a modified 3-lane section with a median and left turn lanes. This will create space for sidewalks and landscaping.
- Have continuous sidewalks (minimum of five feet wide) on both sides.
- Redefine streetscape elements as redevelopment occurs.
- Consider roundabouts at Dixie/Arlington and Dixie/St. James intersections.
- Require that additional right-of-way (70 feet desired cross-section, 35 feet half section) is dedicated when major redevelopment occurs.

4. *Suburban Commercial*
This community character type is a significant one for the Dixie Highway, especially in Ft. Wright, portions of Ft. Mitchell, and the majority of Elsmere, Erlanger and Florence. Many properties in these commercial areas have never expanded or redeveloped and hence have narrow rights of way with little or no access management in place, leaving wide open access and numerous uncoordinated driveways. When redevelopment occurs, additional rights-of-way should be dedicated to create a half section of 35 feet. These areas are suburban in character and have parking in front and building set backs varying between 30 and 70 feet. Many redevelopment opportunities exist in these areas.

![Typical views of Suburban Commercial Character in Ft. Wright (left) and Erlanger/Elsmere (right)](image)

The desired cross-section for the Suburban Commercial community character type should:
- Be designed to comply with a corridor wide access management plan.
- Increase the right-of-way width to 70’ (35’ half section) when redevelopment occurs. In some cases, additional right-of-way may need to be acquired prior to redevelopment for improvements.
• Have continuous sidewalks on both sides with a minimum width of eight feet (8’).
• Be under the regulations of a unified, corridor wide landscape and streetscape plan, modeled after the Erlanger and Elsmere Renaissance Overlay Zone.

5. Suburban Residential

Areas designated as having a Suburban Residential community character typically have been established for at least 50 years and have had to resist pressure from commercial growth and from the effects of widening Dixie Highway over the years. The width of the right-of-way varies considerably between these areas.

RECOMMENDED CROSS-SECTIONS FOR RIGHT-OF-WAYS

The following series of cross-section recommendations are made after evaluating all the comments from area citizens and city officials, and field observations. One of the key factors in making these recommendations is existing width of the right-of-way. Many areas along the Dixie Highway have adequate right-of-way width to construct the desired cross-sections. However, many older areas do not and present the need to acquire additional land for the improved right-of-way. The purchase or dedication of additional right-of-way, while legal, poses other significant problems such as:

• High cost of land, survey, title work
• Length of time required to negotiate purchase
• Potential purchase and/or demolition of structures
• Potential loss of parking and landscaping
• Possible litigation

One possible way to solve these right-of-way acquisition problems is through the use of easements as a way to create the space necessary to build the improved cross-sections. Creating easements for utility strips, sidewalks, landscaping and screening would require negotiation and time but could offer a method to resolve property owner concerns through variances, waivers or agreements.


**Covington Cross-Section Recommendations for Historic Urban Area**

- Reduce travel lanes from 4 to 3
- Remove on-street parking
- Middle lane can function as a turn lane or peak hour travel lane
- Plant street trees in 4’ tree wells within 10’ sidewalk area

**Covington Cross-Section Recommendations for Natural Area (“the Hill”)**

- Construct 3 lane section with center median
- Provide 2 lanes for the uphill direction using a passing lanes for slow vehicles
- Utilize easements outside the existing right-of-way for sidewalks and for additional tree plantings
- The outside lane needs to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic (share the road)
Park Hills Cross-section Recommendations
- Expand the right-of-way to 70’ from the current average of 66’
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic (share the road)
- Sidewalks should be on both sides and be a minimum of 5’ wide

Ft. Wright Cross-Section Recommendations
For areas where the existing Right-of-way is less than 60’
- Construct 4 lane (with median) roadway and use easements for sidewalks and trees
- Landscape and screening easements can be negotiated with commercial property owners
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
For areas where existing Right-of-way is greater than 60’

- Expand the right-of-way to 70’ for 4 travel lanes
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane (can vary from 8-10’ wide)
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic

Ft. Mitchell Cross-Section Recommendations

For areas where the existing Right-of-way is less than 60’ (north of I-71/75)

- Construct 4 lane (with median) roadway and use easements for sidewalks and trees
- Landscape and screening easements can be negotiated with commercial property owners
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
For areas where existing Right-of-way is greater than 60’

- Expand the right-of-way to 70’ for 4 travel lanes
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane (can vary from 8-10’ wide)
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
- Maintain the existing landscaped areas (old trolley line) south of I-71/75

Lakeside Park Cross-Section Recommendations

For areas where the existing Right-of-way is less than 60’ (north of I-71/75)

- Construct 4 lane (with median) roadway and use easements for sidewalks and trees
- Landscape and screening easements can be negotiated with commercial property owners
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
For areas where existing Right-of-way is greater than 60’

- Expand the right-of-way to 70’ for 4 travel lanes
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane (can vary from 8-10’ wide)
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
- Maintain the existing landscaped areas (old trolley line) south of I-71/75

Crestview Hills Cross-Section Recommendations

The entire length of the Dixie Highway through Crestview Hills has an existing Right-of-way over 70 feet, in fact most is over 100 feet wide due to the improvements made to the overpass of I-275. The existing design for Crestview Hills is adequate except for the following recommendations:

- Add 5 foot minimum sidewalks on both sides
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane (can vary from 8-10’ wide)
- Develop a landscape and tree planting scheme for the area under and around the I-275 overpass
- The outside travel lanes need to be striped wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
Edgewood Cross-Section Recommendations

For areas where the existing Right-of-way is less than 60’
- Construct 4 lane (with median) roadway and use easements for sidewalks and trees
- Landscape and screening easements can be negotiated with commercial property owners
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic

For areas where existing Right-of-way is greater than 60’
- Expand the right-of-way to 70’ for 4 travel lanes
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane (can vary from 8-10’ wide)
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
- Maintain the existing landscaped areas (old trolley line) south of I-71/75
Erlanger Cross-Section Recommendations

For areas where the existing Right-of-way is less than 60’

- Construct 4 lane (with median) roadway and use easements for sidewalks and trees
- Landscape and screening easements can be negotiated with commercial property owners
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic

For areas where existing Right-of-way is greater than 60’

- Expand the right-of-way to 70’ for 4 travel lanes
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane (can vary from 8-10’ wide)
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
- Maintain the existing landscaped areas (old trolley line) south of I-71/75
Elsmere Cross-Section Recommendations

For areas where the existing Right-of-way is less than 60’

- Construct 4 lane (with median) roadway and use easements for sidewalks and trees
- Landscape and screening easements can be negotiated with commercial property owners
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic

For areas where existing Right-of-way is greater than 60’

- Expand the right-of-way to 70’ for 4 travel lanes
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane (can vary from 8-10’ wide)
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic
- Maintain the existing landscaped areas (old trolley line) south of I-71/75
Florence Cross-Section Recommendations

For areas where the existing Right-of-way is less than 60’

- Construct 4 lane (with median) roadway and use easements for sidewalks and trees
- Landscape and screening easements can be negotiated with commercial property owners
- Manage access through a landscaped median or turn lane
- The outside travel lanes need to be wide enough to accommodate bicycle traffic

Corridor-Wide Cross-Section Recommendations

Aside from cross-section recommendations that are based on community character and other considerations, there are also basic recommendations that should apply on a corridor-wide basis. The following are all desired characteristics:

- Continuous sidewalks on both sides of Dixie Highway with a minimum width of 5 feet in residential areas and 8 feet wide in commercial areas.
- A unified thematic program using logo and signage should be developed for the entire corridor.
- Every opportunity to combine a desired cross-section improvement with a road project, redevelopment, or new development along Dixie Highway should be made. A cross-section improvement may be more cost effective if combined with another project.
- A corridor-wide landscape plan should be developed that brings beauty, needed shade and character to Dixie Highway sidewalks.
- The outside vehicular lanes should be striped approximately 14’ to the edge of the curb to accommodate bicycles in a “share the road” scenario. “Share the road” signage should be installed along with this improvement.
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OVERVIEW

The importance of public transit to Dixie Highway is evidenced in the level of ridership on The Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK) Route 1. Route 1 which runs the entire length of The Dixie Fix’s study area is TANK’s top route in terms of volume. Any time of the day, it is possible to drive Dixie and see someone waiting to catch the bus. TANK is an important asset to Dixie Highway. The Dixie Fix took into account opportunities to make riding the bus a safer option and considered improvements that would increase ridership. One recent improvement is TANK’s addition of bike racks on every bus for easy on-easy off multi-modal transport. Increased bus ridership translates into decreased traffic volumes, travel times, improved safety and mobility for all Dixie Highway travelers.

TANK TRANSIT NETWORK STUDY

The Dixie Fix had the advantage of incorporating recommendations from The Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky’s (TANK) recently completed Transit Network Study. TANK initiated the Transit Network Study to analyze the trends, challenges and opportunities facing Northern Kentucky and to create a long-range plan for public transportation. The plan will serve as TANK’s guideline for future operation and investment to the year 2030.

TANK’s long-range vision for transit in Northern Kentucky includes the elimination of 14 of the over 100 existing bus stops located in The Dixie Fix’s 8-mile study area. It appears that bus stops have been added over the years, but none have been eliminated. In many locations, buses stop at nearly every block. Every time the bus stops, it decreases the capacity on Dixie Highway as the bus blocks the rightmost through lane. The combined impact of these relatively small, but numerous incidences add up. The elimination of bus stops will both increase public safety on Dixie Highway and improve traffic flow.

Figures 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 present the problems TANK found while conducting the Transit Network Study. Each numbered stop or group of stops are then referenced with TANK’s improvement recommendations and local community input in the chart that follows. The reader is reminded that existing and recommended eliminations are also visually presented in each of the 10 communities’ access management aerials located in on enclosed CD.

Figure 5.1
TANK Recommendations

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Eliminate outbound stop at Rosebud</td>
<td>Erlanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Eliminate one inbound stop at Short Hill or Clover</td>
<td>Erlanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Eliminate outbound stop located between Kenton Lands and Roberts</td>
<td>Erlanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Eliminate outbound stop at either Geisen or 225 ft. north of Geisen</td>
<td>Lakeside Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Eliminate outbound stop at Locust</td>
<td>Lakeside Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>No change (grocery patrons use stop after shopping)</td>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Eliminate one set of inbound/outbound stops between Requardt and Pleasant Ridge</td>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Eliminate inbound stop at Leathers</td>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Eliminate outbound stop at W. Maple</td>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Eliminate one set of inbound/outbound stops at either St. Johns or W. Orchard</td>
<td>Ft. Mitchell/Ft. Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Eliminate both stops at Barrington</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Eliminate outbound stop at Vidot</td>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale in support of TANK’s recommendations from the local communities included the following responses:

- By eliminating the stop, the flow of traffic on Dixie Highway is less impeded by TANK buses stopping for passengers.

- Public safety is improved since a bus stopped at this location is not sufficiently visible to other southbound/northbound traffic behind it.

- Public safety is improved since this bus stop is very close to, and in between the two full access curb cuts which present multiple turning movements and conflicts all within a very short distance.

- City staff report few or no riders at this location.

- There are currently no amenities for riders at this TANK bus stop location such as benches, shelters, or trash cans.

- If the southbound/northbound bus stop is eliminated, it is logical to also eliminate the corresponding bus stop on the opposite side of Dixie Highway.

- There is a sufficient number of other TANK bus stops on Dixie Highway near this location and at a consistent spacing distance between each, so that no riders are unreasonably inconvenienced.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The topic of bus pull-outs was raised during an Oversight Team discussion. TANK reserves bus pull-outs for locations with high boarding or alighting of riders. These serve a dual role as potential lay-over areas for buses should they be running ahead of schedule. Oftentimes, it is difficult for the driver to get the bus back out into the lane of traffic due to heavy traffic volumes and/or lack of consideration on the part of other drivers. TANK does believe that existing bus pull-outs along the Dixie corridor fulfill public transit needs adequately.

For these purposes, TANK recommended that no new pull-outs be introduced to the Dixie Highway.

Bus shelters were mentioned by a few members of the public during local Visioning Sessions and the Public Open House, as mentioned previously. TANK has interest in providing additional shelters and seating where they do not exist currently, as well as possibly introducing a new shelter design unique to Dixie Highway. Bus route information could also be displayed at these shelters. This topic was not part of The Dixie Fix’s scope nor discussed amongst the Oversight Team. However, should interest and funding be directed to such a project, The Dixie Fix provides a few recommendations for future consideration. The following information was collected during other research activities for the study and is intended solely as a reference.
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The basic rectangular, modern shelter can be easily enhanced visually with the use of different colored metal material and artistic cut-outs as shown in the inset detail.

Both of these designs reflect more traditional, historic architectural features which may be found on older buildings along the corridor. Features include a barrel vault roof, diamond pattern grillwork with deep blue powder coat finish and a translucent gable roof with grill work and finials, split mullions and Victorian Bench all with a green powder coat finish.

Local artists, NKU design students, school children, or citizens could through a community contest or organized effort, introduce murals to enhance existing shelters. This would involve the community and result in a much more creative and unique visual element for the corridor. Special funding sources may also be available for such a community arts and public transportation project.
OVERVIEW

Walking is a travel mode option for short trips which is well suited to the Dixie Highway corridor due to the high mix of residential and commercial uses. The number of schools and faith communities along Dixie have the potential of encouraging additional pedestrian usage. An added bonus, pedestrian facilities also increase users’ quality of life through greater physical activity. However, several existing conditions are preventing what optimal level of pedestrian usage can be realized for Dixie Highway.

Existing conditions include the failure of vehicular traffic to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks. In addition, marked crosswalks do not exist consistently throughout the corridor. Where they do exist, many crosswalks need to be maintained to become more visible. Numerous comments were received that said pedestrian crosswalk signal timing is inadequate and requires longer timing. Pedestrian safety applies to both passages across Dixie Highway and its local side streets. There are commercial and residential Dixie segments that have sidewalks on only one side of the roadway. Meanwhile, others, most notably ‘The Hill’ leading to and from Covington and the I-275 interchange in Crestview Hills, that have large gaps with no sidewalks on either side of the roadway. The poor maintenance of sidewalks or the lack of their existence altogether often forces pedestrians to walk in the roadway. The Erlanger Safe Routes to School Application (Northern Kentucky Health District, March 2006) quotes Commonwealth of Kentucky statistics that state ‘walking in roadway’ as “the most frequent action resulting in pedestrian collisions among adults (age 20 and over).” Finally, there is also a huge concern regarding excessive motor vehicle speeds.

Many of these existing problems can be addressed immediately given the availability of funding and interest. Two recommendations received much support throughout The Dixie Fix:

1. Complete sidewalk connectivity on both sides of the entire corridor.

2. Introduce a minimum width of 5 feet for all residential sidewalks and 8 feet widths in commercial areas, so that two people to walk side-by-side or pass.

PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATIONS

In addition to the recommendations above, The Dixie Fix shares the following considerations for improving pedestrian safety and choice as a modal option along the corridor.
**Improve Safety at Intersections:**

1. Mark crosswalks at all signalized intersections.

2. Provide median refuge islands for streets wider than 5 lanes.

3. Insure adequate signal timing to accommodate pedestrians. This should include the introduction of countdown pedestrian crosswalk signals to assist pedestrians in knowing when a safe crossing is still permissible.

4. Enforce traffic laws especially for speeding motor vehicles and drivers who fail to yeild to pedestrians in crosswalks.

5. Apply “traffic Calming techniques to reduce traffic speeds in areas of high pedestrian travel or crash frequency such as curb bulb-outs, street trees, raised crosswalks, and roundabouts. These techniques can greatly increase the visibility of pedestrians to drivers, as well as separate pedestrians from moving traffic. Another traffic calming device for consideration is a flashing green light when the traffic signal is activated by a pedestrian. The flashing light would notify drivers that a pedestrian is in the side street crosswalk and to take extra caution as turning onto or off of a neighborhood side street.

**Improve Safety at Mid-Blocks**

1. Provide a sense of security from adjacent moving traffic for the walking environment by separating pedestrian from traffic with the use of:
   - Landscaping (grass, trees, planters, etc.) as screening for pedestrian safety and comfort.
   - Hardscape buffer or divider strip between curb and sidewalk using bricks, colored concrete, etc.
   - Benches, trash receptacles, drinking fountains, etc.
   - On-street parking.
   - Consider pedestrian access during redevelopment of adjacent properties improves pedestrian safety along the street by limiting driveway crossings.
   - Apply access management techniques to create shared access to properties and increase connections between properties.

2. Extend sidewalks and/or combine with parking lot refuge medians to increase the safety of walking from the sidewalk to building entrances.

Large intersections should be well marked to increase visibility and to accommodate vehicular and pedestrian movements.

Plant and landscape materials can be used for visual appeal along the roadway. Changes in pavement and construction materials can serve as a subtle warning to drivers as they near areas of increased activity.
3. Mark crosswalks at unsignalized intersections and where mid-block crossings are warranted with striping or different materials. Give a particular emphasis to marked crosswalks within school zones.

**Improve Safety for Special Populations**

1. All new construction and reconstruction of street facilities must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG).
   - Curb ramps with tactile warning surfaces.
   - Traffic signal timing should allow adequate time for pedestrian crossing at rates of 3-4 feet per second.
   - Grades should not exceed 8% (although existing grades along streets may be used).

**BICYCLE ACCOMMODATIONS**

Dixie Highway is designated a Primary Bike Route in the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission’s Bike Plan for Kenton County. As with other vehicular safety concerns, existing Dixie conditions make the introduction of conventional bicycle improvements difficult.

Due to these existing conditions, it is necessary to utilize opportunities for improvements as they arise through redevelopment. As redevelopment opportunities occur along Dixie Highway, it is recommended that the following two bicycle accommodations should be made:

- Widen right/curb lanes to a minimum of 14 feet
- Introduce striped 5 feet bike lanes

There was much support throughout *The Dixie Fix* study to make bike-lane accommodations.

**Generic Bicycle Considerations For Corridor Planning**

In addition to the recommendation of bike lanes, *The Dixie Fix* shares the following considerations for improving bicycle safety and usage along the corridor.

1. Construct appropriate bicycle facilities when existing roads are upgraded and when new road improvements are made by:
   a) Creating **shared roads** that include signed bike routes to specific destinations
   b) Providing secure bicycle parking facilities for customers and employees.
   c) Increasing or introducing street lighting where needed to improve visibility.

2. Apply access management practices to reduce the number of driveway intersections as potential conflict points.
3. Manage access to adjacent properties by constructing access roads.

4. Encourage bicycle use for utilitarian trips (i.e.: work, shopping, school, and social destinations).

5. Increase motorists’ awareness of cyclists with “Share the Road” signs and education at the local level.

6. Increase cyclists’ awareness of the traffic laws through education.

7. Enforce traffic laws for motorists and cyclists consistently.
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OVERVIEW
During the public input phase of The Dixie Fix, the area of streetscape generated much interest. While safety and traffic flow are primary objectives of the study, the aesthetics along the corridor should not be ignored when implementing improvements or when redevelopment occurs. In fact, what one sees plays an important role in safety and in moving traffic. The current visual clutter created by overhead utilities and confusing signage (both private and public) make it difficult to find your desired destination and visually distract the driver pulling attention away from the primary task of driving.

Community are urged to consider aesthetics when development regulations are revised and as property along Dixie Highway develops or redevelops. While it is understood that physical improvements to the roadway and access itself should take priority and that funding just for those improvements will be challenging; aesthetics should not be overlooked. Funds are available for streetscaping and much can be done through the development/redevelopment process when appropriate regulations are in place. Many communities find that insisting on high quality development/redevelopment creates a more pleasing setting and a more successful and sustainable business climate.

STREETSCAPE REGULATION MODELS
Streetscape and design elements are a broad subject. This narrative will provide an overview of two streetscape plans that can be used as the basis for streetscape standards. The first plan considered is known as “The Dixie,” a joint streetscape and design effort of the Cities of Elsmere and Erlanger (please refer to http://www.thedixie.com for the complete document). The second plan presented for consideration is the Kentucky Streetscape Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Districts.

“The Dixie”
“The Dixie” is a good local model to consider for the entire corridor. This design guideline program uses the following overall goal; “to improve the economic viability of this portion of the Dixie Corridor while enhancing the visual quality of life on and near The Dixie.” Example streetscaping design goals for the Dixie Highway corridor based on “The Dixie” include:

1. Establishing a new image for Dixie Highway
2. Creating a sense of excitement and energy for the area
3. Having a positive effect on businesses (both revenue and property values)
4. Encouraging redevelopment and new development opportunities
5. Promoting a compatible mix of businesses
6. Improving the quality of life for all community members.
7. Preserving the integrity of historic architectural building features.
8. Minimizing alterations and new construction that weaken architectural historic integrity.
9. Encouraging new development that respects and enhances the visual character of the area.
10. Enhancing the retail and service business focus of the area.
Both Elsmere and Erlanger implement and enforce their design guidelines through a zoning overlay district (please refer to http://ara/nkapc/zoningpdf/elsmere/elsrp.pdf for Elsmere and http://ara/nkapc/zoning_pdf/erlanger/erlrp.pdf for Erlanger’s Renaissance Protection Overlay Zone). The overlay district has specific boundaries, which are part of Elsmere and Erlanger’s zoning maps. The guidelines are referenced in the Zoning Ordinance and any new development in the designated area needs to comply with them.

One of the major features of the plan is a breakdown of guidelines into three specific types of design criteria: (A) public, (B) private and (C) historic. The public portion of the plan includes intersections, bus stops, public parking lots and sidewalks. These improvements are funded when public funds become available. The private guidelines are suggested, not mandatory, and are paid by the private property owner. The historic guidelines are used when federal, state and/or local funding is being provided for the rehabilitation or maintenance of historic features.

A. Public Design Guidelines (within the right-of-way)

1. Screen Walls: Are used at selective locations to act as gateway features and include a corridor “nameplate.” Screen walls are also used to block parking areas from view.

2. Sidewalks: “The Dixie” calls for brick sidewalks where redevelopment occurs. Careful consideration should be given to using brick due to safety and maintenance. Embossed concrete might be a more practical and safe choice.

3. Crosswalk: Specially colored and stamped crosswalks should be used at intersections.

4. Pedestrian Lighting: Calls for a specific type and height of street lighting are recommended.

5. Landscaping: The emphasis for landscaping is on minimizing maintenance. No hanging baskets or planters are allowed.

Acceptable trees and shrubs come from an approved list. Many good examples of landscaping exist along the Dixie corridor, such as:

- Little Red School House
- Richie’s Car Wash
- Fort Mitchell City Building/Fire House

6. Signage: The location of signage using the phrase “The Dixie” and the specific font and size are made.

7. Street Furniture: Specific street furniture, benches and trash receptacles are recommended along with where they should be placed.

8. Overhead Utilities: “The Dixie” recommends placing all the overhead utilities on one side of the street on high poles whenever possible.

Overhead utility lines are one of the most dominating visual forces along the corridor. Throughout the entire Dixie Fix study, there was discussion and interest in addressing the unsightliness of overhead wires, the visual distraction they pose to drivers, and the fact that in many instances the poles are only a foot from the curb and roadway. Both options of burial and relocation of utilities to the rear of the property are very high price improvements. However, overwhelming support was voiced for consideration of such improvements, especially if and when situations arise that would entail relocation of utilities due to expanded right-of-way acquisition, sidewalk installation, etc.

In lieu of a coordinated program to consolidate and clean-up the existing overhead utilities, other general options for utilities may exist. Following is a list presented in the Beechmont Corridor Vision Plan prepared in 2005 for Anderson Township:

- Introducing a metal surround, collar or banding around the utility poles
- Option to hang selected streetscape elements from existing utility poles such as banners, planters, decorative lighting, etc.
• Replacement of unsightly or damaged utility poles with new ones.

B. Private Design Guidelines (outside the public right-of-way)

1. Street Furniture: Specific street furniture, benches and trash receptacles are recommended along with where they should be placed.

2. Landscaping: Private businesses are allowed to have planters (terra cotta) in front of their businesses. Screening of private parking areas from Dixie Highway is encouraged. Tree plantings are also encouraged.

3. Pedestrian Lighting: Lighting similar to the public type is encouraged.

4. Awnings: Are a desired element of all three sectors of “The Dixie.” A number of specific recommendations regarding color, type, and heights are made.

5. Wall Signs: One wall sign per business is permitted.

6. Free Standing Signs: Specifications are given for free standing signs, which, in some cases, differ from the Zoning Ordinance regulations. According to the RP (Renaissance Protection) Overlay Ordinance, the design guidelines prevail over the underlying zone.

7. Temporary Signs: Size and duration are listed.

8. Parking: The goal of this section is to limit the visual impact of parking lots along the corridor through screening. Rear parking that is linked to adjacent lots is strongly encouraged with a 50% reduction. On-street parking is discouraged. This was echoed by The Dixie Fix Oversight Team and majority of public opinion. Another huge issue for Dixie Highway is the existence of frontage parking that requires drivers to back out into the flow of traffic. The Dixie Fix’s site specific access management recommendations have worked to address these particular locations.

9. Buildings: Reuse of existing building stock is encouraged. A list of suggested materials and colors for new construction is made as well as a height limitation of 2 ½ stories. This was well supported by responses from the Visual Preference Survey. The age of buildings along Dixie span from the 1800s to present day, creating a wide variety of building sizes, materials, set-backs, etc. New construction that blends with the existing is most preferred.

C. Historic Design Guidelines

These criteria are followed only if federal, state or local funding is used. The design guidelines are quite lengthy and are similar to those used by the Secretary of the Interior for Historic Buildings on the National Register.
Kentucky Streetscape Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Districts

The second plan used as a reference for developing streetscape and design regulations for Dixie Highway may be the Kentucky Streetscape Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Districts, which was published by the Kentucky Heritage Council in 2002. The guiding principles of Kentucky Streetscape Design Guidelines can be summarized as follows:

1. Design for People
   - Look for opportunities to enhance or create gathering places
   - Provide alternative transportation modes
   - Improvements and new development need to avoid all types of congestion and look for ways to improve safety

2. Correct Infrastructure Pathologies
   - Drainage
   - Utility Lines and facilities
   - Pedestrian Routes
   - Parking
   - Service Areas

3. Maintain or Improve Mass and Space Relationships
   - Where appropriate, seek to fill “gaps” in building “mass,” avoid excessive parking in the front of buildings
   - Maintain average building set backs

4. Enhance Pedestrian Experience
   - Screen parking lots
   - Remove visual “clutter” and obstacles
   - Plan improvements and redevelopment with pedestrian routes in mind

5. Coordinate Public and Private Improvements
   - Monitor public and private improvements and look for ways to incorporate streetscape improvements when feasible (improve sidewalks, signage for example)
   - Look to create limited design coordination between the public and private elements

6. Enhance Individuality
   - Maintain historic fabric (where appropriate)
   - Use high quality contemporary design for new projects

Both “The Dixie” Design Guidelines and the Kentucky Streetscape Design Guidelines have qualities and features that could be utilized in other areas of the Dixie corridor. The Kentucky Streetscape Guidelines have very solid overall goals while “The Dixie” Design Guidelines are an existing program that has been implemented. It is also worthwhile to keep the overall project goals of improving the economic viability, while enhancing the visual quality of life on and near the Dixie corridor in mind as determining the choice of streetscape plan.

ADDRESSING VISUAL CLUTTER THROUGH WAYFINDING

Building upon the potential for local communities along Dixie to adopt streetscape design regulations, it may serve very beneficial to conduct
a wayfinding study and create a plan for the entire corridor.

The term “wayfinding” was first used in 1960 by architect Kevin Lynch in The Image of the City, where he referred to maps, street numbers, directional signs and other elements as “way-finding” devices. Even though signage plays an important role in wayfinding, the process does not rely exclusively on signs.

Visitors to Dixie Highway are not always familiar with the corridor and need to know where they actually are and the location of their destination in order to travel safely and efficiently. An organized wayfinding system could have a positive effect on increasing safety and travel time, as well as the overall attractiveness of Dixie Highway as a travel destination.

Effective physical wayfinding clues allow people to quickly grasp the environment whether they are traveling by vehicle, foot, bicycle or bus. Wayfinding can take many different forms such as signs, color coding, maps, banners, brochures and even websites. Wayfinding tools provide orientation, direction, identification and regulatory information to the Dixie traveler. To achieve effective communication, wayfinding tools should:

- Clearly identify arrival points.
- Use easily understood “plain” language.
- Code areas by using color and memorable graphics.
- Size messages and signs appropriately for viewing distances.
- Select letterforms and color combinations that comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accessibility Guidelines
- Use established pictographs with words to facilitate comprehension of written messages.
- Establish consistency in sign placements and graphics layouts.
- Provide convenient parking and accessible walkways located adjacent to building entries.
- Provide standardized “you are here” maps for pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders.
- Use consistent lighting, roadway and sidewalk materials along the corridor
- Situate memorable landmarks along the corridor and at key decision points such as major intersections.
- Distinguish local communities with signs, plantings, etc.

A future wayfinding study for Dixie Highway should include all stakeholders and be multi-modal in its approach. The study should inventory and analyze existing conditions including:

- Interstate signage
- City street signage
- Street infrastructure
- Bike/Pedestrian routes
- Community/neighborhood identity
- TANK transit

It should be noted that a sign inventory was conducted during the Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005) and could provide a starting point for collecting wayfinding data.

A potential Dixie Highway wayfinding plan should make formal recommendations in regards to the design, materials, and location of wayfinding elements. Estimated costs and a phasing strategy for implementation would enable funding applications to closely follow conclusion of a wayfinding study.

Chapter 8: Implementation

OVERVIEW

Access and other improvements identified in this plan will only be as effective as the implementation process. It is important to note that implementation will be dependent on a variety of factors. The length of the corridor, scope of improvements, and intergovernmental cooperation will all play a role in the success of this planning effort. Some improvements may be immediate as cities or the state initiate the smaller less costly or less complicated recommendations. Other improvements will be slower to materialize, as they will likely occur as land along the corridor develops or redevelops. Still others, more likely those improvements requiring greater amounts of funding, will involve the coordination and cooperation of various funding agencies. This chapter will identify a few of the most apparent and logical methods for implementation.

STEP 1: ADOPTION OF THE PLAN

The first step of the implementation process should be the adoption of this plan (The Dixie Fix Plan: Envisioning the Future of Dixie Highway or, more formally named, Dixie Highway Corridor Access Management Redevelopment Plan) by the respective planning commissions in Kenton and Boone counties. Through this adoption process the Plan should become part of the comprehensive plan and/or as an addendum to each county’s transportation plan. Since land development/redevelopment is a key to implementation, it is best if adoption is part of the comprehensive plan. Land development decisions are more directly based on comprehensive plans than on transportation plans.

Upon adoption by the respective Planning Commission, The Dixie Fix Plan should be submitted to each city along the corridor for adoption by city council. Adoption can be by resolution or ordinance, but it is recommended that an ordinance be used. Appendix 8-1 contains a sample ordinance that may be used for this purpose.

To further aid implementation, it is recommended that the adoption process by each city include a request to the planning commission that zoning ordinances be developed to incorporate the plan. In Kenton County, the NKAPC and the Kenton County Planning Commission are currently conducting a major review of the model zoning ordinance. This process would readily allow for research and potential inclusion of a new overlay zone or other methodology for implementing The Dixie Fix Plan.

STEP 2: THE DIXIE FIX OVERSIGHT TEAM

Continuing The Dixie Fix Oversight Team meetings is seen as another effective way of to encourage and coordinate implementation. As noted previously, one likely issue tied to effective implementation is the need for cooperation between the many cities along the corridor. Quarterly or semi-annual meetings are likely sufficient to allow all the cities and other agencies involved the opportunity to share experiences, track progress, and discuss new ideas or action steps. It is recommended that these meetings be coordinated by NKAPC with the assistance, as appropriate, from OKI.

STEP 3: SAMPLE ORDINANCE AND MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

As previously mentioned, the adoption of an ordinance is one option. The advantage of adopting an ordinance and/or a revised zoning district as described previously is the strength that an ordinance would give to implementing The Dixie Fix Plan. In adopting an ordinance, care should be taken to ensure that the flexibility necessary to work through potential adjustments to the adopted Plan is available. For example, some access management recommendations in the Plan will only work if other changes are made to the adjoining property or
properties. It is likely that changes to such neighboring properties will not occur simultaneously. In this event, cities must have the capability to work with the owners and/or developers to phase implementation of the recommended improvements.

Another method that can be used either in conjunction with an ordinance or as a “stand alone” agreement is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between all agencies with a role in land use and access management decisions. These agencies include the ten local communities, NKAPC, Boone County Planning Commission, and KYTC. Such an agreement helps assure that all decisions by the various permitting agencies are coordinated with The Dixie Fix Plan. It is recommended that KYTC be a party to each MOU. The sample MOU (Appendix 8-2) is designed to be a single document between all the cities and the agencies. It would be possible for an MOU to be made individually, however, the document would be more administratively efficient and, thus more likely accepted as a single document.

The attached sample documents have not been approved or reviewed for legal content or conformity with state or local rules and regulations for such documents. Before these can be used, they must be reviewed and approved by legal counsel.

STEP 4: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

It was beyond the scope of The Dixie Fix study to examine a number of other factors that have the opportunity to impact safety, mobility, economic development, multi-modal options, and aesthetics. It is recommended that the following studies or actions occur to assist the communities in achieving their true, desired vision for Dixie Highway.

• Identification of Unwarranted Signalized Intersections
  Traffic counts for intersecting, signalized streets with Dixie Highway should be compiled from any data that exists or new counts collected. These counts should then be examined to verify the warrant status of each signalized intersection along the Dixie corridor. The potential elimination of signalized intersections, although controversial particularly to those who have come to depend and expect these facilities, could improve traffic flow, levels of service, and travel times. Other recommendations for creating new service roads or other means of shared access to link side streets to warranted signalized intersections would be appropriate for inclusion in such a study.

• Establishment of an Economic Conditions Baseline
  Current property values, retail sales, or other economic data should be compiled to create a baseline on which to establish Dixie Highway’s existing economic status. In the future, as a significant number of improvements are made to the corridor, a second collection of economic data should be compiled and compared with initial numbers. This data will identify the degree of impact The Dixie Fix improvements have had on spurring economic growth and development. It is anticipated that improved safety, travel times, traffic flow and access will encourage an increase in economic activity along the corridor. This review will determine the validity of this expectation. A positive change in economic conditions would also serve to educate and potentially stimulate more property owners and developers to embrace access management related improvements. It may also prove to further substantiate the quality and worth of The Dixie Fix’s recommendations and assist in securing new or additional funding.

• Creation of a Corridor-wide Streetscaping Plan
  To achieve many of the general recommendations detailed in Chapter 7’s Streetscape & Design Elements discussion, a corridor-wide streetscaping plan is called for implementation. The text that follows is a draft list of what steps should be followed to pursue this objective:
  o Create a Dixie corridor streetscape steering committee to develop the overall streetscape plan.
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- Determine where the streetscape overlay zone will be and create a boundary map.
- Decide what streetscape elements will be controlled.
- Consider whether to use design standards or guidelines. Standards are more specific, and generally not negotiable but easier to enforce. Guidelines offer more design choices and require a committee to approve streetscape applications.
- Determine what level of development/permit activity will require streetscape improvements.
- Decide who is responsible for funding and constructing the streetscape elements.
- Create timeline and work plan for the overlay zoning process.

Before embarking on the process of developing and implementing a corridor-wide streetscape design overlay, some questions need to be raised. As a streetscape plan is created and implemented, the following questions should be considered by each community both individually and collectively as a group.

- Should design guidelines be applied to other areas of Dixie Highway? If yes, where should they be applied?
- Should there be separate guidelines for commercial and residential areas?
- How far should design guidelines go in regulating what can be built?
- Who will pay for and maintain the improvements?
- Will the guidelines be enforced? If yes, then by whom?

- **Creation of a Public Transit Facility Improvement Plan**

With TANK as a driving force, there is interest in improving transit facilities for bus riders along the Dixie corridor. In Chapter 5’s Public Transit discussion, several examples of bus shelters were presented for consideration. In order to achieve implementation, this effort requires coordination and collaboration. Such improvements could dovetail into corridor-wide streetscaping efforts or be a stand-alone project given appropriate interest and support.

- **Creation of a Wayfinding Plan**

In Chapter 7’s Streetscaping & Design Element discussion, a multi-modal wayfinding study involving all stakeholders was recommended as a means of orientating the traveler and assisting in improving safety and travel time, as well as the overall attractiveness of Dixie Highway as a travel destination.

When conducted, the study should inventory and analyze existing conditions including, but not limited to:

- Interstate signage
- City street signage
- Street infrastructure
- Bike/Pedestrian routes
- Community/neighborhood identity
- TANK transit

The completed plan should make formal recommendations in regards to the design, materials, and location of wayfinding elements. Estimated costs and a phasing strategy for implementation should also be included in the final plan.

**STEP 5: POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES**

As stated in a Federal Transit Administration memorandum dated February 6, 2006, flexible funding was one of the hallmarks of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) that was continued under the 1998 Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and under the 2005 SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users). These flexible funding provisions enable State and local governments, transit operators, and metropolitan planning...
organizations to more effectively meet their unique needs, and facilitate a multimodal approach to meeting transportation needs at both the statewide and metropolitan levels. The flexibility provisions of these transportation acts include:

1. Broad highway/transit eligibility within selected categories of major highway and transit programs;
2. Transfer of funds within the Federal-aid highway program to other programs with broader highway/transit eligibility; and,
3. Transfer of funds from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Authority (FTA) and vice versa.

Appendix 8-3 includes a summary of these flexibility provisions and table of eligible highway and transit projects under the various FHWA and FTA programs as a reference tool. A summary of a few of the more promising potential funding sources for implementation of The Dixie Fix Plan follows.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ)**
The primary purpose of CMAQ funds is to fund projects in non-attainment and maintenance areas that will work to reduce transportation related emissions. Projects must demonstrate an air quality benefit.

OKI serves as a clearinghouse for the CMAQ program which is administered by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC). There is a keen competition for CMAQ funds due to the limited amount of funding that is available on a statewide basis. OKI will process submitted applications, estimate emission benefits, prioritize the projects and forward to KYTC. Projects are prioritized based on estimated reductions in ozone precursor and fine particulate emissions. Estimated reductions are based on projected reductions in vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled or vehicle emissions. Appendix 8-4 is provided as a sample CMAQ application used by OKI for previous fiscal year funding cycles.

Examples of projects that have received past approval include additional turn lanes at congested intersections, park-and-ride lots, projects that increase use of bicycles and walking as alternative modes of travel, and new express bus service. For a complete explanation of eligible CMAQ projects please visit the KYTC website: [http://transportation.ky.gov/Multimodal/Air_Quality.asp](http://transportation.ky.gov/Multimodal/Air_Quality.asp)

**Surface Transportation Program for Northern Kentucky (SNK)**
SNK are Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds dedicated to Northern Kentucky. KYTC believes SNK and CMAQ to be the best funds for use in implementing The Dixie Fix’s recommendations. The primary purpose of SNK funds is to construct, reconstruct, rehabilitate, resurface, restore, and provide operational improvements for highways and bridges including improvements to accommodate other transportation modes. Eligible projects include highway and transit projects as well as planning studies. A 20% non-federal match is required for funding.

OKI is sub-allocated approximately $4 million in Surface Transportation Program funds for Northern Kentucky (SNK funds) every fiscal year for transportation projects in Boone, Campbell and Kenton counties. OKI is responsible for determining which projects to fund through a competitive prioritization process. A funding application and instructions have been included as Appendix 8-5.

**Transportation Enhancement Grants (TE)**
The federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 introduced the Transportation Enhancement Program. The establishment of this program offered broad opportunities and federal dollars to undertake unique and creative actions to integrate transportation into our communities and environment. In 1998, the tradition of this program was continued by the enactment of the Transportation Equity Act (TEA-21.)

The primary purpose of TE funds are included in 12 eligible categories included in the definition of Transportation Enhancement Activities in
Transportation enhancement activities must fall into one or more of the following 12 categories as defined by federal legislation:

1. Provision of facilities for bicycles and/or pedestrians
2. Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists
3. Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites
4. Scenic or historic highway programs
5. Landscaping and other scenic beautification
6. Historic preservation
7. Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities including historic railroad facilities and canals
8. Preservation of abandoned railway corridors including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian and bicycle trails
9. Control and removal of outdoor advertising
10. Archaeological planning and research
11. Environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff or reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity
12. Establishment of transportation museums

Although transit is not specifically mentioned in the list of twelve eligible TE activities, some of the eligible TE activities benefit transit. For example, streetscape improvements can include transit shelters. The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet awards TE funds to governmental jurisdictions.

Transportation enhancement activities can be a stand-alone project or implemented as part of an on-going larger transportation project. In either case, the project must relate to the intermodal surface transportation system in function, proximity or impact. For example, an independent bike path is a functional component of the intermodal transportation system. Removal of outdoor advertising in the view shed of a highway is justified in light of its proximity. Retrofitting an existing roadway by creating a wetland to filter runoff from the roadway would qualify based on the impact of the roadway in terms of water pollution.

In summary, TE activities are improvements which increase the value or worth of a project or make it more aesthetically pleasing. They should provide a “quality-of-life” benefit. Thus, a project is “enhanced” by doing something that is not a common practice.

**Increment Financing (TIF)**

TIF Districts are a potential source of funding that can generate local funds for important Dixie Highway projects. These funds could be used to match funds from other sources or cities can choose to construct projects wholly with TIF funds. Projects funded by TIF must be those of a public improvement nature such as: relocating utilities, plantings, sidewalk and streetscape improvements, and landscaping. Local governments generate funds from Tax Increment Financing by designating specific areas that need economic development funds and then diverting the increased taxes that come from redevelopment towards the desired improvements. Kentucky State Law allows this technique and many communities are using it to create an improved business climate (refer to Appendix 8-6). Up to 100% of the incremental property and payroll tax revenues which are generated by the area can be used to fund certain projects. The funded projects must be for a public purpose, in or related to the development area, and have a useful life of at least one year. The TIF area can keep its designation for up to 30 years.

In developing criteria, some questions need to be answered to help guide each community in making their decision:

1. What needs and projects could use TIF funding?
2. What is the estimated cost of those needs and projects?
3. What properties will benefit from the TIF funding?
4. What properties should be included in the TIF district?
5. Is the community able to accept a potential loss in tax revenues to the general fund for a period of time?
6. Should residential property be part of a proposed TIF District?

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions are made for Dixie Highway:
1. The greatest benefit and need appears to be in commercial areas.
2. The funds would need to be dedicated to specific projects and/or areas.
3. Public property or any other tax-exempt land would not be eligible to generate TIF income, but could benefit from expenditures on public improvements. It is recommended that tax-exempt properties be included within TIF district, so that funds can be spent in the area of these properties.

The following criteria are suggested as ways to help guide communities in forming potential TIF districts. Each community should consider their special circumstances and need for funding.

Of particular note is the circumstance of city boundaries that occur at Dixie Highway’s centerline, such as in Erlanger and Elsmere for example. In those cases, intergovernmental agreements would need to be executed so that improvements could be made as coordinated, contiguous projects.

General Criteria for TIF Districts:
1. The property is located directly adjacent to Dixie Highway’s right-of-way.
2. The property is adjacent to Dixie Highway properties and is commercially zoned. A few residential properties have been included that appear to have potential for redevelopment. There are likely other properties currently used for residential purposes that need to be added or deleted based on more careful review at the city level.
3. The property is accessed via an access easement, access road or parking lot, from a property, which has frontage along Dixie Highway.

4. The property has access management recommendation(s) identified in The Dixie Fix Plan.

Using these criteria, potential TIF districts maps have been drafted and included as Appendix 8-7. Note that some cities do not have TIF district maps proposed due to an existing lack of commercial property or, in the case of Crestview Hills, the frontage along Dixie Highway has been improved recently by the redevelopment of the Crestview Hills Town Center and new taxes to be generated would likely be minimal.

Also included as Appendix 8-8, is Fort Wright, Kentucky’s Ordinance to create a TIF district for the Madison Pike Corridor. Note that Exhibits A and B mentioned in the Ordinance are not included. These resources and further information can be obtained from the City of Fort Wright.

State Road Funds
State Road Funds are another potential funding source for most of The Dixie Fix’s recommendations. However, the availability of funds is extremely limited given the large demands. Road Funds are receipts from motor vehicle usage tax, vehicle and boat registration, motor vehicle operator’s licenses, motor fuels tax, tolls and interest. Road Funds are used for road construction, maintenance, operations, engineering, planning, research, and the majority administer functions within the Cabinet. This type of funding would be especially conducive to projects where there was some type of cooperative arrangement with a city and/or property owner also contributing funding.

Dixie Corridor Municipalities
Local communities are another source of funding. Cities can set-up a special assessment district along Dixie Highway with funds earmarked for public improvements. They can offer incentives as a catalyst to get property owners to participate pro-actively in implementation of The
Dixie Fix’s recommendations. Dixie communities could also explore the potential to place a special tax levy on the ballot for voter approval with all funds dedicated to physical improvements along Dixie Highway.

**Local Property Owners**

Local business and property owners can provide financial assistance towards assembling local matches and thereby leveraging their smaller investments to achieve big ticket Dixie improvements. They may also establish a low interest loan program through local banks and earmark funds specifically for *The Dixie Fix* property enhancements.

Kentucky offers a number of progressive incentives for businesses that would enable individual property owners to implement many of The Dixie Fix’s small scale access management improvements. Appendix 8-9 includes a general summary list of such incentives and is intended as a starting reference point for consideration by local communities, property owners and business associations.
### APPENDIX 1-1
**Visioning Sessions Shout-Out! Synopsis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TODAY</th>
<th>Community Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Corridor</td>
<td>Community Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested</td>
<td>Commonwealth Avenue past McApin doesn’t work. Problems. Staggered alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUDgesode</td>
<td>Bottle-neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested</td>
<td>Busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>Dangerous intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>Antiquated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worn-out</td>
<td>Bottleneck Arcadia to Orphanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenient</td>
<td>Expensive to expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous</td>
<td>Lots of businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Unfriendly</td>
<td>Must be alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Congested at Rush Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested</td>
<td>Hard to find stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous</td>
<td>Antiquated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluttered</td>
<td>Unstructured retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested</td>
<td>Lots of wrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loud</td>
<td>Requires concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Focused</td>
<td>Requires concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Unstructured retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly to bikers</td>
<td>Lots of wrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured retail</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lex-Turfway Roads</td>
<td>Requires concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Static—</td>
<td>Unstructured retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not responsive-adaptive</td>
<td>Lots of wrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenings—has similar problems (late)</td>
<td>Traffic Management Static—Not responsive-adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires concentration</td>
<td>Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot of new development</td>
<td>Requires concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>Requires concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>Requires concentration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-1
Visioning Sessions Shout-Out! Synopsis - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole Corridor</th>
<th>Community Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated</td>
<td>A Magnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>Managed Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>Good Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Less Clutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>Profitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Something to be Proud Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated to Local Uses</td>
<td>Better Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Community Friendly</td>
<td>More Green (landscaping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider</td>
<td>Streetscaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscaped</td>
<td>Safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer</td>
<td>Quicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quicker</td>
<td>Smoother Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td>Pedestrian Access Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieved of I-75 Overflow</td>
<td>Less Overhead Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Construction</td>
<td>Bus Pull Outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Access from Side Streets</td>
<td>Perfect!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating to all</td>
<td>Wider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greener</td>
<td>Free Flowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More turn lanes (4 lanes keep)</td>
<td>Attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business generator</td>
<td>Utilities Put Underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetically attractive</td>
<td>Weed Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined</td>
<td>Litter Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family friendly</td>
<td>Welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painted Rail Overpass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smooth Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update Feeder Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No New Development (Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entranceway at Curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Path/Shared-Bike/Bus/Moped Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Median</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1-2

#### Visual Preference Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide Number</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 1-2 continued

All Combined Local Visioning Sessions Visual Preference Survey Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners- Contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners- Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10’-15’ wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10’ wide w/decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10’+ wide w/opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10’ wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15’+ wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10’+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15’+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30’ Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>landscapes medians</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10’ setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-2 continued

#### All Combined Local Visioning Sessions Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 34 31 57 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 12 23 61 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 15 42 49 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 16 28 40 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 24 26 45 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 24 20 49 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 27 32 31 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 23 29 33 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 27 39 33 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 8 23 64 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 12 34 54 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 14 39 51 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 41 35 31 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 14 27 59 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 30 27 26 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 40 21 27 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 12 33 60 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 23 28 38 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 26 29 39 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 19 29 43 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4 28 68 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 8 25 53 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 14 29 37 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 42 39 19 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 27 41 35 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 12 30 54 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 8 33 55 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Large anchor retail with office above</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 20 28 47 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store adaptive reuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 19 49 32 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 18 32 47 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 21 27 42 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 32 23 52 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial, small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 39 40 30 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied rooftop</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 19 35 47 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>larger scale 3.5 story building consistent rooftop</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 32 30 34 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1-2 continued

### All Combined Local Visioning Sessions Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>large foot print retail accommodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>fast food (traditional - McDonalds)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback and smalle side set backs-2 story</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Large front setback 15' side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2 story smaller setback, 10' side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Driveway not in front, 2 story, small side and front setback</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>large setback, split level, garage in front</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2 story, driveway in front large setback</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Country estate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City style townhouse</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and proches</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>High density and larger scale building with surface parking</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>highrise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Large scale transit hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Covington Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners- Contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners- Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10'-15' wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10' wide w/decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10'+ wide w/opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10' wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15'+ wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10'+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15'+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30' Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>landscapes medians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10' setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-2 continued
Covington Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Large anchor retail with office above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store adaptive reuse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial, small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied roofline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>larger scale 3.5 story building consistent roofline</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 4 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>large foot print retail accommodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 6 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 6 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>fast food (traditional - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 4 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 2 5 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback and small side set backs-2 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 5 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Large front setback 15' side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2 story smaller setback, 10' side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Driveway not in front, 2 story, small side and front setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 5 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>large setback, split level, garage in front</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 4 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2 story, driveway in front large setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 4 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Country estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City style townhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 3 3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 3 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 5 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 4 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and proches</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Highdensity and larger scale building with surface paring</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 5 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>highrise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 4 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Large scale transit hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1-2 continued

### Park Hills Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners- Contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners- Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10'-15’ wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10’ wide w/decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10+ wide w/opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10’ wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15+ wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30’ Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>landscapes medians</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10’ setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Lage anchor retail with office above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store adaptive reuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied roofline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>larger scale 3.5 story building consistent roofline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-2 continued

**Park Hills Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>large foot print retail accommodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>fast food (traditional - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback and smaller side set backs-2 story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Large front setback 15' side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2 story smaller setback, 10' side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Driveway not in front, 2 story, small side and front setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>large setback, split level, garage in front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2 story, driveway in front large setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Country estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City style townhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and proches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Highdensity and larger scale building with surface paring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>highrise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Large scale transit hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slides Description</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners- Contemporary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners- Traditional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10'-15' wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10' wide w/decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10'+ wide w/opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10' wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15'+ wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10'+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15'+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30' Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>landscapes medians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10' setback</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-2 continued

Ft. Wright Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Indesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Large anchor retail with office above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial: small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied roofline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>larger scale 3.5 story building consistent roofline</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1-2 continued

### Ft. Wright Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Indesirable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Large footprint retail accommodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Large front setback and small side setbacks - 2 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback 15' side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Large front setback, 10' side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and porch</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>High density and larger scale building with surface paring</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>High rise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Large scale transit hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ft. Mitchell Local Visioning Session
**Visual Preference Survey Summary**

#### APPENDIX 1-2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Moderately Desirable</th>
<th>Neither Desirable or Undesirable</th>
<th>Moderately Undesirable</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners- Contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners- Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 5</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 5 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10’-15’ wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 3</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10’ wide w/decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10’+ wide w/opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10’ wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15’+ wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 8 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10’+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 5</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15’+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 5 4</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30’ Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 7 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>landscaping medians</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 3</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 4 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10’ setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 6 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 7</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 5</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 6</td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 7</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 6 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 8</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 5</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 4</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1-2

#### Ft. Mitchell Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td>2 6 3 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td>1 3 1 10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td>1 3 6 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td>1 4 3 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>3 2 7 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>2 1 4 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>3 1 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>3 1 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td>3 4 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td>1 1 2 10 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td>1 1 7 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td>2 8 3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td>3 1 3 7 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td>3 1 3 7 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td>7 1 5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td>8 3 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td>2 2 5 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td>5 4 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td>1 5 6 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td>3 7 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td>3 10 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td>1 1 2 8 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td>2 1 2 9 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td>6 7 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td>3 4 6 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td>2 2 10 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td>1 6 6 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Large anchor retail with office above</td>
<td>5 5 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store adaptive reuse</td>
<td>2 2 8 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>4 5 3 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td>5 4 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td>4 6 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial: small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td>3 6 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied roofline</td>
<td>1 3 6 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Larger scale 3.5 story building consistent roofline</td>
<td>7 2 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-2 continued

**Ft. Mitchell Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>large foot print retail accommodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>fast food (traditional - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback and smaller side set backs-2 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Large front setback 15’ side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2 story smaller setback, 10’ side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Driveway not in front, 2 story, small side and front setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>large setback, split level, garage in front</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2 story, driveway in front large setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Country estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City style townhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and proches</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>High density and larger scale building with surface poring</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>highrise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Large scale transit hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lakeside Park Local Visioning Session

### Visual Preference Survey Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Moderately Desirable</th>
<th>Neither Desirable or Undesirable</th>
<th>Moderately Undesirable</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners - Contemporary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners - Traditional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10'-15' wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10' wide w/ decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10'+ wide w/ opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10' wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15'+ wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10'+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15'+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30' Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Landscapes medians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10' setback</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/ lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Indesirable</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 1 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 7 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 6 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 5 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 5 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 6 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 5 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Large anchor retail with office above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial: small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied roofline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>larger scale 3.5 story building consistent roofline</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-2 continued

Lakeside Park Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Indesirable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Large foot print retail accomodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Fast food (traditional - McDonalds)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback and small side set backs-2 story</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Large front setback 15’ side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2 story smaller setback, 10’ side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Driveway not in front, 2 story, small side and front setback</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Large setback, split level, garage in front</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2 story, driveway in front large setback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Country estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City style townhouse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and proches</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Highdensity and larger scale building with surface paring</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Highrise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Large scale transit hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Crestview Hills Local Visioning Session

**Visual Preference Survey Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Desirable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Undesirable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderately Desirable</strong></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Neither Desirable or Undesirable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderately Undesirable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Undesirable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td>4  4  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td>1  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td>3  2  3  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners- Contemporary</td>
<td>3  1  4  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners- Traditional</td>
<td>1  1  1  5  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td>2  3  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles</td>
<td>4  2  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10’-15’ wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td>1  2  3  1  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10’ wide w/decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td>1  1  4  2  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10’+ wide w/opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td>1  1  3  4  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10’ wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td>3  5  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15’+ wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td>1  1  5  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10’+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td>2  6  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15’+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td>5  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td>1  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30’ Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td>4  4  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td>3  5  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td>2  4  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Landscapes medians</td>
<td>1  1  1  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td>9  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10’ setback</td>
<td>6  2  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td>4  1  3  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td>1  1  6  1  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td>1  2  5  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td>1  2  5  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td>1  3  1  3  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td>1  2  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>1  2  4  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td>6  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td>3  4  3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future

---

APPENDIX 1-2 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Large anchor retail with office above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store adaptive reuse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied rooftop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>larger scale 3.5 story building consistent rooftop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1-2 continued

**Crestview Hills Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>large foot print retail accommodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>fast food (traditional - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback and smalle side set backs-2 story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Large front setback 15’ side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2 story smaller setback, 10’ side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Driveway not in front, 2 story, small side and front setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>large setback, split level, garage in front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2 story, driveway in front large setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Country estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City style townhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and proches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Highdensity and larger scale building with surface paring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>highrise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Large scale transi hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Florence, Elsmere, Erlanger Local Visioning Session Visual Preference Survey Summary

### Slide Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Moderately Undesirable</th>
<th>Neither Desirable or Undesirable</th>
<th>Moderately Desirable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signage Traditional Design (Town/village feel)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signage Traditional (earth colors Town/village feel)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary/nontraditional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Banners- Contemporary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Banners- Traditional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs (grouped on one pole)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standard metal street signs separate poles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10'-15' wide w/ plantings and light posts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10' wide w/decorative bricks &amp; lighting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10' wide w/opportunity for benches &amp; street furniture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10' wide no landscaping &amp; standard lighting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15' wide - Trees, lights, planters &amp; room for tables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10'+ sidewalks regular trees, lights, and parallel on-street parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brick sidewalks 15'+ wide (interior landscaped areas &amp; Perpendicular parking)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Predominance of plantings to define street edge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30' Bumpouts for benches &amp; plantings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscape barrier between roads and sidewalk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in materials &amp; paving patterns to mark pedestrian &amp; vehicle movements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>landscapes medians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overhead utilities located at sidewalk edge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Overhead utilities crossing roadways w/ 10' setback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Underground Utilities (only see lights)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>traditional lighting (ornate city style)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Double cobra head lights on standard grey posts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single post no horizontal part</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Extensive furnishings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gazebos and benches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Open green median/mall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Park w/lake &amp; vistas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Possible sitting &amp; walking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suburban pocket park</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suburban/village pocket plazas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Large park w/open green and shade</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Traditional factorymade play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Play fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fountains/splash park</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Private retail oriented gathering spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Urban Park/plaza style</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sidewalk table</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Plazas</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Green median</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Angled parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Onstreet parallel parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Screened Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Underground parking with surface nodes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Above ground parking structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parking behind buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modern infill between two existing historic buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Retail and office on second floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>One floor, small, and on street parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Historic 1st level retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mixed use w/architectural accents</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Retail with residential setback above</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Lage anchor retail with office above</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Commercial: Grocery store adaptive reuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>High density residential w/retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Urban mixed use</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Commercial: small scale, 1 story building</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 story building with varied roofline</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>larger scale 3.5 story building consistent roofline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5 story mixed use courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Large Commercial/office setback w/parking lot in front</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>big box retail with parking in front (Home Depot)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>large foot print retail accomodating character of area (CVS - blending)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Large footprint retail with standard architecture features (CVS block bldg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>fast food (traditional - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fast Food fitting in with character of surrounding area (different materials - McDonalds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Common pallet of materials and roof lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Large expanse of glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Large front setback and smalle side set backs-2 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Duplex large setback Garage in front 1 story</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Large front setback 15’ side setback and 1 story no sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2 story smaller setback, 10’ side setback and wide sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Driveway not in front, 2 story, small side and front setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>large setback, split level, garage in front</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2 story, driveway in front large setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Country estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>City style townhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Suburban townhouse with prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 story townhouse prominent garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3 story townhouse garage on first floor and house above</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Single entry for multiple units</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Limited setback with common courtyard and private entry and proches</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Inward facing clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Suburban Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mixed use residential housing on top</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Residential larger scale building close to street</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Highdensity and larger scale building with surface paring</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 story apartment building complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 story apt bldg complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3 story residential brick apartment building</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>highrise apartment with parking beneath building</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Bus pull out areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Large scale transi hub / park &amp; ride</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1-3
Covington Local Visioning Session Access Management Recommendations
### Park Hills Local Visioning Session Access Management Recommendations

#### Site Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Approval Rating

| Number of Respondents | 2 | 10 | 7 | 4 |

| TOTAL RESPONDANTS (surveys returned) |

17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Approval Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>only 1 against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>majority in favor less than 1/2 respondents against recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>greater number of respondents against, however over 1/2 the total respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>more people against than in favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TOTAL RESPONDANTS (surveys returned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pie Chart

- 44%: More people against than in favor
- 30%: Greater number of respondents against, however over 1/2 the total respondents
- 17%: Majority in favor less than 1/2 respondents against the recommendation
- 9%: Only 1 against
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Creation of shared access road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Creation of shared access road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Creation of signalized intersection</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Multiple driveway closures</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Realignment of major roadway &amp; new signal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Closure of former roadway &amp; removal of signal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Creation of access road &amp; smaller Dixie drivew</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only; smaller Dixie driveway</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Exit only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Entrance only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Dotted left turn directional striping</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Creation of access road</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ft. Mitchell Local Visioning Session Access Management Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Create new access drive / reconfiguration of parking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Realignment of intersection w/ new access road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Create new access drive / reconfiguration of parking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Closure/removal of old roadway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Intersection/roadway alignment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Closure/removal of old roadway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Intersection/roadway alignment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Entrance only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Closure/removal of old driveway</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Realignment of intersection w/ new exit only road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Entrance only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>(1) one-way / utilization of intersection for left turn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 3/4 access point (no left turns permitted onto Dixie)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Exit only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Driveway closure, narrowing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Driveway closure, narrowing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Driveway closure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No “Disagree” votes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear majority in favor (55%+ support)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority in favor, but half or more of total respondents against</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority against</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESPONDANTS (surveys returned)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lakeside Park Local Visioning Session
### Access Management Recommendations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER Comments:**

- Dedicated turn lane from Lakeside to Arcadia: 1
- The improvement of the Turkeyfoot intersection has improved the safety tremendously!: 1
### Crestview Hills & Edgewood Local Visioning Session
#### Access Management Recommendations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1) Create access drive (right in/left out)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1) Driveway closure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Create access drive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Open median (to permit left turns or access to adjoining property)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Create 2nd right turn only lane (divide w/ narrow median strip)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Create an I-275 &quot;incident-only&quot; activated signal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Fill-in sidewalk gap</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Driveway closures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 1-3 continued
Crestview Hills and Edgewood Local Visioning Session Access Management
Recommendations Summary
### Florence, Elsmere, Erlanger Local Visioning Session Access Management

#### Recommendations Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Driveway closure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Realignment of roadway/intersection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1) Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2) Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Create new access drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1) Realignment of roadway/intersection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2) Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O New access drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P New access drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Right turn-in &amp; out only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Driveway closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 1) New access drive, separate parking &amp; landscaped medians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 2) New access drive, separate parking &amp; landscaped medians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Driveway closure and removal of parking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX 1-3 continued**

Florence, Elsmere, Erlanger Local Visioning Session Access Management

Recommendations Summary
APPENDIX 1-4
Visioning Session Comment Sheet Synopsis
October-December 2005

Visioning Session
Comment Sheet Synopsis
October-December 2005

At the 7 Visioning Sessions, a total of 65 attendees completed a comment sheet. Below is a summary of the comments received.

Please rate the Visioning Session (please circle one answer for each line)
Overview: Excellent 31 Average 25 Poor 1 No Opinion 2
Visual Preference Survey: Excellent 27 Average 24 Poor 8 No Opinion 1
Shout-It-Out: Excellent 23 Average 29 Poor 4 No Opinion 2
Presentation: Excellent 35 Average 21 Poor 3 No Opinion 0
Maps: Excellent 23 Average 29 Poor 5 No Opinion 1
Staff: Excellent 45 Average 13 Poor 0 No Opinion 1
Other: (movie) Excellent Average Poor 1 No Opinion 0

Overall, are you glad you attended tonight’s Visioning Session? 56 Yes 2 No 2 No Opinion

Was there anything you were expecting to learn, see, or hear that was NOT provided tonight?
○ No.
○ The City Administrator’s letter implied that we would be considering specific changes to our property.
○ Needs polishing. Run power lines at backs of properties instead of at street.
○ Yes. A real waste of time.
○ Discussion of specifics.
○ Didn’t know what to expect! Got you thinking. Great possibilities that can occur.
○ About Park Hills.
○ More design drawings to actual Dixie Highway sections, i.e. working drawings/construction timetable.
○ Actual recommendations of Dixie Fix wrong meeting!
○ Wanted to hear other suggestions and recommendations from other cities’ session.
○ No, it was very comprehensive.
○ No, the overview was what I expected.
○ Common sense driving.
○ Expected more planning, but like the process you are using.

Please share any other comments or suggestions you have regarding tonight’s Visioning Session.
○ The movie was too long.
○ My store does not have a direct access from Dixie. I am concerned that Ashwood does not restrict left hand turns as to and from. This is my customers’ only access.
○ Real case study would be helpful.
○ Like many, I’m concerned about the cost.
○ Excellent presentation. Kept meeting focused and on time.
○ The visual preference survey needs to be more structured. It was hard to keep track of the slides.
○ Too many slides.
○ Too many slides, lot of duplicates.
○ Please contact property owners for their views. Our driveway is not hurting anyone.
○ Presentation excellent, very informative, food for thought, glad to hear this is finally being thought out.
○ I recognize one must start somewhere, however it appears no imminent improvements to Dixie Highway are in the works. No funding from the state legislature was discussed. Also, accompanying music to access management film was very annoying and distracting.
○ Decrease curb cuts. Pedestrians on east side of Dixie Highway should be safer. Consider a shared residential access to several driveways. More greenspace on east side of Dixie, similar to west side of Dixie.
○ Address traffic flow issues to facilitate.
○ The visual preference survey should compare 5 visuals.
○ Mostly interested in improving traffic light responsiveness.
○ Too much at one time.
○ Bus (TANK) stops traffic flow. Turn lane would help. Traffic flow is a major concern!
○ Is there any one developer in charge of the different cities or is each city in charge of getting their own?
○ Is there the possibility of taking properties in order to increase the size of Dixie Highway?
○ Work on areas of transportation for vehicles except auto; like bicycles, mopeds, etc.
○ Think facilitator did better overview of “access” management than the video.
○ Very well done.
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Dixie traffic plan inches along
OKI board expected to add $450K study to regional proposal

By GREG HIGHTOWER
The Dixie Fix

FORT M 11/20, 1998

OKI board expected to give serious consideration to a plan to add $450,000 to the study of the Dixie Highway Regional Transportation Plan.

The Dixie Highway in southern Fort Mitchell is one of the most heavily traveled routes in the county. The OKI board is scheduled to meet on Dec. 15, and the study is expected to be discussed.

The study will be conducted by the Regional Transportation Planning Council of Kentucky and will evaluate transportation needs in the region. The study is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year.

The study will look at the needs of the Dixie Highway, which is one of the most heavily traveled routes in the county. The study will be conducted by the Regional Transportation Planning Council of Kentucky and will evaluate transportation needs in the region. The study is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year.
APPENDIX 1-5 continued
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"Dixie Fix" gets drivers' input

By Mike Rollings
Lakota reporter

"Dixie Fix" is a new program on 91.7 WVXU that aims to improve traffic conditions in the region. The show features guests from various fields such as transportation and engineering. Listeners are encouraged to call in with their traffic concerns.

"Dixie Fix" is hosted by Steve Kline and airs every Monday at 5:00 PM. Listeners can also listen online at wvxu.org.

WVXU News

Want to make Dixie Highway safer and less congested?

Listen Online

You can hear 91.7 WVXU online any time, any where.

The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future
THE “DIXIE HIGHWAY FIX” COMES TO FORT WRIGHT!

As you may have read in past Top of the Hill newsletters, one of the Fort Wright Vision Committee’s future projects is “Dixie Highway Revitalization”. The concept of revitalizing Dixie Highway in Fort Wright was recently explored as part of a major Dixie Highway study that has been commissioned and is being performed by the OKI (Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments) and NKAPC (Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission). The study is titled the “Dixie Highway Fix, Envisioning the Future of Dixie Highway”, and includes Dixie Highway from Pike Street in Covington to Turfway Road in Florence. The Oversight Team for this study includes all cities along Dixie Highway, Boone and Kenton Counties, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, TANK, and the Chamber of Commerce. The Oversight Team is chaired by Mr. Bill Goetz, current chair of NKAPC, and former Mayor and retired City Administrator of Fort Mitchell, Kentucky, and Vice-Chair is Fort Wright City Administrator Larry Klein.

The goals of the Dixie Highway Fix are:

1) To define a vision of how the Dixie Highway Corridor should ultimately be developed or redeveloped.

2) To translate this “vision” into a development plan with standards for key design elements.

3) To develop regulations to implement the standards.

It is the further goal of the “Dixie Highway Fix” to achieve a safer and improved flow of traffic along Dixie Highway and access to businesses, as well as more aesthetically pleasing features such as underground utility lines and improved landscaping, benches, bus stops. Several “visioning” sessions have been held or are planned through December for the communities along Dixie Highway. Fort Wright’s “visioning” session was held on October 5th at the City building and was attended by property owners and businesses from Dixie Highway; the Fort Wright Vision Committee; City officials and City staff. At that “visioning” session a “Visual Preference Survey” was completed by each attendee in which 100 different slides were shown of various aesthetic, landscaping, curb cut and other access management concepts for Dixie Highway in Fort Wright. For more information on “The Dixie Fix”, and to complete and submit your own Visual Preference Survey as part of the “visioning” process, please visit the OKI website at www.dixiefix.org, or call 513-621-6300 extension 229 for more information. The “Dixie Highway Fix” will conclude in June 2006 with recommendations for standards on design, access, and aesthetics that will hopefully lead to the realization of a “Revitalized Dixie Highway” in Fort Wright!
The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future
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Committee to present Dixie fixes

In today's NKAPA, EXQUIERER staff writer
Suggested fixes to Dixie Highway to be addressed

By BRENNAN KELLY, ENQUIRER STATE WRITER

FLORENCE, Ky. (AP) — As political leaders weigh solutions for the state's troubled Dixie Highway, community leaders are urging state officials to consider not only improvements to the roadway's physical condition, but also to its image.

Improving the Dixie, which stretches from Florence to Paducah, Ky., has been a priority for local officials, who have been working with state and federal partners to improve safety and attract economic development.

Community leaders say they want to see a more modernized highway that better reflects Kentucky's cultural heritage and attracts tourists.

"We need to think about what the Dixie represents to our state," said John Doe, chair of the Dixie Highway Improvement Committee.

"It's not just a road, it's part of our history and our identity. We need to make sure it's reflecting that.

The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future
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Florence approves ‘Dixie Fix’ priorities

Redevelopment plans advance for Dixie

Drug force needs money to stay open

Florence Panel to consider new Dixie

Florence, Ky. — The Florence City Council on Tuesday approved a plan to improve the Dixie Highway, which runs through the city and connects to Paducah, Ky.

The council voted 4-1 to approve the plan, which includes improvements to the highway's design, lighting, and landscaping.

"This is a step in the right direction," said council member Jane Doe.

"We know the road needs improving, and this plan will help make that happen."
Local

News

Dixie Fix panel seeks opinions on traffic plans

By CINDY SCHROEDER | ENQUIRER STAFF WRITER

CRESTVIEW HILLS The Dixie Fix panel at CRESTVIEW HILLS proposed a series of transportation
solutions that could help alleviate traffic congestion. These solutions include the implementation
of a congestion pricing system, expansion of public transportation services, and
construction of additional roads. The Dixie Fix panel members believe that these changes
will not only improve traffic flow but also reduce overall transportation costs for residents.

VEHICLE LICENSES

For residents of CRESTVIEW HILLS, obtaining a vehicle license is a straightforward process. Residents can apply for a vehicle license by visiting the CRESTVIEW HILLS
Department of Motor Vehicles. The department offers convenient hours and is located
conveniently near the center of the city. Additionally, the department provides
extensive resources for obtaining a license, including information on fees and
requirements. The CRESTVIEW HILLS Department of Motor Vehicles aims to provide
excellent service to its residents, ensuring a smooth and efficient process for obtaining
vehicle licenses.

Animal Foes

In CRESTVIEW HILLS, the community is dedicated to the welfare and safety of its animals. The
CRESTVIEW HILLS Animal Control Department is responsible for ensuring the health and
well-being of all animals within the city. The department provides various services,
including animal rescue, spaying and neutering, and educational programs. Residents
are encouraged to take an active role in animal protection, whether it be through volunteering
or supporting local animal welfare organizations. CRESTVIEW HILLS continues to
promote a strong bond between the community and its animals, ensuring a harmonious
living environment for all.

The Dixie Fix panel seeks opinions on traffic plans

The Dixie Fix panel, consisting of local residents and experts, has presented a series of proposals
aimed at improving traffic conditions in CRESTVIEW HILLS. These proposals include
investing in public transportation, implementing a congestion pricing system, and
expanding road networks. The panel has solicited input from the public to ensure that the
community's needs are met. Residents are encouraged to provide their opinions and
suggestions on these proposals to help shape the future of transportation in the city.

The Dixie Fix panel is a collaborative effort, bringing together various perspectives to
address the growing traffic issues in CRESTVIEW HILLS. By engaging the community
in this process, the panel aims to foster a sense of ownership and collaboration in
solving the local transportation challenges.
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Local News
Dixie Highway fixes detailed
Projects could take years

By ANDREA REWE | ENQUIRER STAFF WRITER

The recent completion of the Dixie Highway bridge replacement project marks a significant milestone in the ongoing efforts to improve the comfort and safety of motorists along this major thoroughfare. The project, which involved the widening of the existing road and the construction of new bridges, has been a long-term endeavor that has required careful planning and coordination among various stakeholders.

In recent interviews, local residents have expressed their satisfaction with the outcome, noting that the increased capacity and reduced congestion have already led to improved travel times. However, the completion of this phase also signals the start of new challenges, as the focus shifts to the future expansion and modernization of the Dixie Highway system.

Public speaks out on Dixie Fix
or "un MASON | POST CONTRIBUTOR"

The community's input is critical in shaping the future trajectory of the Dixie Highway. As the project moves forward, feedback from residents and commuters will play a vital role in ensuring that the new infrastructure effectively meets the needs of the area. In the coming months, meetings and public forums will be held to discuss potential enhancements and to gather input from the local population.

The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future
## APPENDIX 2-1

### Existing Level of Service and Peak Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak LOS</th>
<th>AM Peak Delay (s)</th>
<th>PM Peak LOS</th>
<th>PM Peak Delay (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; Main St</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; I-71/75 NB Ramp</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; I-71/75 SB Ramp</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; Western/Montague</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>160.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Arlington Road</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3.8/7.1</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3.1/3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; St. Josephs Lane</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Covington Catholic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; St. James Ave/Hilton Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Sleepy Hollow Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Kyles Lane</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Ashwood Court</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Fortside Drive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; St Johns Rd/Ridge Rd</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Orchard Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-71/75 SB Ramp</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-71/75 NB Ramp</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Expressway Plaza</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Beechwood Road</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Highland Avenue</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Pleasant Ridge Ave</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Orphanage Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Buttermilk Pike/Huckleberry Ln</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Arcadia Ave</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Turkeyfoot Rd/Hudson Ave</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Carran Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Lookout Farm Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-275 WB Ramp (unsignalized)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-275 EB Ramp</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Winding Way</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Rosemont Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Summit Dr/Dudley Rd</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Edgewood Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Kenton Lands Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Montgomery Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Silver Lakes SC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Hallam Ave</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Commonwealth Ave</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Bartlett St/May St</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>2.8/6.5</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>1.7/3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; McAlpin Ave/Garvey Ave</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3.7/3.0</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>2.8/1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Sunset Ave/Main St</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Cave Run</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Kentaboo Ave/Eastern Ave</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Bustleters Dr/Goodridge Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Turfway Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>168.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2-2

**Existing Northbound and Southbound Segment Levels of Service (LOS) and Travel Speeds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Northbound AM Peak LOS</th>
<th>Northbound PM Peak LOS</th>
<th>Southbound AM Peak LOS</th>
<th>Southbound PM Peak LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turfway Rd/Main St/Rose Dr</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 16.9</td>
<td>E 12.5</td>
<td>F 6.0</td>
<td>I 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodridge Dr/Bustetter Dr</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 23.3</td>
<td>C 21.3</td>
<td>B 24.9</td>
<td>B 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ave/Bustetter Dr</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
<td>B 25.4</td>
<td>E 13.5</td>
<td>I 11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Run Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 27.8</td>
<td>B 24.5</td>
<td>D 17.9</td>
<td>F 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Dr/Main St</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 23.5</td>
<td>C 25.6</td>
<td>A 34.1</td>
<td>A 34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvey Ave</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 27.8</td>
<td>B 29.2</td>
<td>D 15.7</td>
<td>C 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpin Ave</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 17.8</td>
<td>C 19.3</td>
<td>B 27.8</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May St</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 14.9</td>
<td>C 19.3</td>
<td>C 19.7</td>
<td>D 17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett St</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 21</td>
<td>C 20.5</td>
<td>B 24.5</td>
<td>C 23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Ave/Stevenson Rd</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E 13.2</td>
<td>E 12.2</td>
<td>D 15.9</td>
<td>D 14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam Ave</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 17.5</td>
<td>C 22.8</td>
<td>F 6.0</td>
<td>F 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lakes Shopping Center</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 21.5</td>
<td>C 20.6</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
<td>B 24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 20.6</td>
<td>C 18.1</td>
<td>C 20.6</td>
<td>C 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton Lands Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 16.2</td>
<td>E 10.8</td>
<td>E 13.5</td>
<td>E 13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
<td>C 22.9</td>
<td>B 25.6</td>
<td>B 24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Rd/Summit Dr</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 16.9</td>
<td>E 10.9</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E 13.5</td>
<td>C 18.6</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding Way</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 19.1</td>
<td>E 13.9</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 EB On Ramp</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 32.2</td>
<td>C 22.9</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 WB On Ramp</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>A 33.2</td>
<td>A 32.5</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carran Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 28.3</td>
<td>B 27.2</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
<td>B 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeyfoot Rd/Hudson Rd</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 23.4</td>
<td>B 27.3</td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia Ave</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 24</td>
<td>B 28.4</td>
<td>B 28.4</td>
<td>B 28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttermilk Pike/Huckleberry Ln.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E 11</td>
<td>E 10.3</td>
<td>E 11</td>
<td>E 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage Rd</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>F 5.8</td>
<td>E 11.0</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
<td>A 32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge Ave</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
<td>B 29.0</td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
<td>B 29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Ave</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 19.9</td>
<td>B 26.7</td>
<td>C 19.9</td>
<td>B 26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechwood Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 15.8</td>
<td>B 26.8</td>
<td>D 15.8</td>
<td>B 26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway Plaza</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 20.9</td>
<td>C 23.8</td>
<td>C 20.9</td>
<td>C 23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7175 North On Ramp</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 24.3</td>
<td>B 24.6</td>
<td>B 24.3</td>
<td>B 24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7175 South Off Ramp</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 23.2</td>
<td>C 21.4</td>
<td>C 23.2</td>
<td>C 21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Ave</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 25.3</td>
<td>B 28.3</td>
<td>B 25.3</td>
<td>B 28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Rd/Ridge Rd</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 22.3</td>
<td>C 19.7</td>
<td>C 22.3</td>
<td>C 19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortside Drive</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 25.2</td>
<td>B 25.5</td>
<td>B 25.2</td>
<td>B 25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashwood Court</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 29.6</td>
<td>B 28.9</td>
<td>D 17.9</td>
<td>D 17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyles Lane</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D 10.6</td>
<td>E 12.7</td>
<td>D 10.6</td>
<td>E 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hollow Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 19.1</td>
<td>C 19.1</td>
<td>C 19.1</td>
<td>C 19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James Ave/Hilton Dr</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 26.7</td>
<td>C 23.5</td>
<td>B 26.7</td>
<td>C 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Catholic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 20.6</td>
<td>C 23.8</td>
<td>C 20.6</td>
<td>C 23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph Lane</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 22.2</td>
<td>C 18.4</td>
<td>C 22.2</td>
<td>C 18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Arlington Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>B 27.3</td>
<td>B 29.3</td>
<td>B 27.3</td>
<td>B 29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Arlington Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 19.5</td>
<td>C 18.2</td>
<td>C 19.5</td>
<td>C 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ave/Montague Rd</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 18.7</td>
<td>A 35.0</td>
<td>B 28.3</td>
<td>B 26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7175 SB Off Ramp</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 22.8</td>
<td>C 22.9</td>
<td>B 28.3</td>
<td>B 26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7175 NB Off Ramp</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E 11.9</td>
<td>C 19.2</td>
<td>B 24.1</td>
<td>B 29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C 22.8</td>
<td>B 24.1</td>
<td>E 11.9</td>
<td>C 19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1549.1</td>
<td>1399.8</td>
<td>1401.3</td>
<td>1711.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2-3

### Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Per Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADTs</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Exponential 2010-2030 (%)</th>
<th>Straight Line 2010-2030 (%)</th>
<th>Exponential 2010-2030 (%)</th>
<th>Straight Line 2010-2030 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-75 NB to I-75 SB</td>
<td>10600</td>
<td>13897</td>
<td>17975</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 SB to Montague</td>
<td>12200</td>
<td>7269</td>
<td>8910</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague to Arlington</td>
<td>12300</td>
<td>7003</td>
<td>10630</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington to St. Joes</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>7316</td>
<td>12508</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joes to Cov Cath</td>
<td>10600</td>
<td>8492</td>
<td>12508</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cov Cath to St. James</td>
<td>11400</td>
<td>8492</td>
<td>12508</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James to Sleepy Hollow</td>
<td>12200</td>
<td>8491</td>
<td>12510</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hollow to Kyles</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>13602</td>
<td>17827</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyles to Ashwood</td>
<td>15400</td>
<td>5365</td>
<td>8718</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashwood to Fortside</td>
<td>16300</td>
<td>5362</td>
<td>8718</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortside to St. Johns</td>
<td>15600</td>
<td>5481</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns to Orchard</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>5481</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard to I-75 SB</td>
<td>14300</td>
<td>5481</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 SB to I-75 NB</td>
<td>17600</td>
<td>18986</td>
<td>22443</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 NB to Expressway</td>
<td>20500</td>
<td>30828</td>
<td>37346</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway to Beechwood</td>
<td>19800</td>
<td>30828</td>
<td>37346</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechwood to Highland</td>
<td>18200</td>
<td>30584</td>
<td>37066</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland to Pleasant Ridge</td>
<td>18900</td>
<td>26034</td>
<td>32990</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge to Orphanage</td>
<td>19200</td>
<td>30730</td>
<td>38024</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage to Buttermilk</td>
<td>20100</td>
<td>30986</td>
<td>39010</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttermilk to Arcadia</td>
<td>21400</td>
<td>34211</td>
<td>41533</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia to Turkeyfoot</td>
<td>20900</td>
<td>36265</td>
<td>43641</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeyfoot to Carran</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>18261</td>
<td>25390</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carran to Lookout Farm</td>
<td>13400</td>
<td>18261</td>
<td>25390</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout Farm to I-275 EB</td>
<td>14600</td>
<td>18261</td>
<td>25390</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 EB to Winding Way</td>
<td>26700</td>
<td>325903</td>
<td>38435</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding Way to Rosemont</td>
<td>24700</td>
<td>32812</td>
<td>38818</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont to Dudley</td>
<td>26500</td>
<td>32812</td>
<td>38818</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley to Edgewood</td>
<td>31800</td>
<td>37432</td>
<td>43533</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood to Kenton Lands</td>
<td>28900</td>
<td>37433</td>
<td>43536</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton Lands to Montgomery</td>
<td>24500</td>
<td>33263</td>
<td>40418</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery to Silver Lakes</td>
<td>26700</td>
<td>32332</td>
<td>39822</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lakes to Hallam</td>
<td>23300</td>
<td>32332</td>
<td>39822</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam to Commonwealth</td>
<td>22500</td>
<td>32332</td>
<td>39822</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth to Bartlett</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>30512</td>
<td>35565</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett to May</td>
<td>21100</td>
<td>30512</td>
<td>35565</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May to McAlpin</td>
<td>20700</td>
<td>30512</td>
<td>35565</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpin to Sunset</td>
<td>19700</td>
<td>32018</td>
<td>37366</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset to Cave Run</td>
<td>20900</td>
<td>33257</td>
<td>37823</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Run to Kentaboo</td>
<td>20800</td>
<td>33257</td>
<td>37823</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentaboo to Bustetter</td>
<td>20700</td>
<td>33257</td>
<td>37823</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustetter to Turfway</td>
<td>20500</td>
<td>33210</td>
<td>38054</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 1.3% 1.6%
### APPENDIX 2-4
Future Level of Service, Northbound/Southbound Peak Travel Speeds and Intersection Delay Expected for Dixie Highway in the Year 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak LOS</th>
<th>AM Peak Delay (s)</th>
<th>PM Peak LOS</th>
<th>PM Peak Delay (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; Main St</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; I-71/75 NB Ramp</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; I-71/75 SB Ramp</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike St &amp; Western/Montague</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>241.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Arlington Road</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>4.0/7.3</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3.5/4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; St. Josephs Lane</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Covington Catholic</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; St. James Ave/Hilton Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Sleepy Hollow Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Kyles Lane</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Ashwood Court</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Fortside Drive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; St Johns Rd/Ridge Rd</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Orchard Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-71/75 SB Ramp</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-71/75 NB Ramp</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Expressway Plaza</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Beechwood Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Highland Avenue</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Pleasant Ridge Ave</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Orphanage Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Buttermilk Pike/Huckleberry Ln</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Arcadia Ave</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Turkeyfoot Rd/Hudson Ave</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Carran Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Lookout Farm Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-275 WB Ramp (unsignalized)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; I-275 EB Ramp</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Winding Way</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Rosemont Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Summit Dr/Dudley Rd</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Edgewood Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Kenton Lands Road</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Montgomery Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Silver Lakes SC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Hallam Ave</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Commonwealth Ave</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Bartlett St/May St*</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3.1/6.6</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>1.9/4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; McAlpin Ave/Garvey Ave*</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3.9/3.1</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>2.7/1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Sunset Ave/Main St</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Cave Run</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Kentaboo Ave/Eastern Ave</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Bustetter Dr/Goodridge Dr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Highway &amp; Turfway Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>193.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2-4 continued

Future Level of Service, Northbound/Southbound Peak Travel Speeds and Intersection Delay Expected for Dixie Highway in the Year 2015 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Street Class</th>
<th>Northbound AM Peak LOS</th>
<th>Northbound PM Peak LOS</th>
<th>Southbound AM Peak LOS</th>
<th>Southbound PM Peak LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Speed (mi/hr)</td>
<td>Speed (mi/hr)</td>
<td>Speed (mi/hr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turfway Rd/Main St/Rose Dr III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodridge Dr/Bustetter Dr III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ave/Bustetter Dr III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Run Drive III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Dr/Main St III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvey Ave III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpin Ave III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May St III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett St III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Ave/Stevenson Rd III</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam Ave III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lakes Shopping Center III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Road III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton Lands Road III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Rd III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Rd/Summit Dr III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont Drive III</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding Way III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 EB On Ramp III</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 WB On Ramp III</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carran Drive III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeyfoot Rd/Hudson Rd III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia Lane III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttermilk Pike/Huckleberry Ln. III</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage Road III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge Ave III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Ave III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechwood Road III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway Plaza III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71/75 South On Ramp III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71/75 South Off Ramp III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Ave III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s Rd/Ridge Rd III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortside Dr III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashwood Court III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyles Lane III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleepy Hollow Road III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Ave/Hilton Dr III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Catholic III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph Lane III</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Arlington Road III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ave/Montague Rd III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71/75 SB Off Ramp III</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71/75 NB Off Ramp III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travel Time (s)**

|                  | 1732.9 | 1465.9 |

**Main Street III**

**Northbound AM Peak LOS**

**Northbound PM Peak LOS**

**Southbound AM Peak LOS**

**Southbound PM Peak LOS**
APPENDIX 2-5

Kentucky’s Proposed Access Management Program Executive Summary

This proposed access management standards has been developed by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. The spacing standards included in the document have been recommended by the Cabinet's Access Management Implementation Task Force, but they have not yet been formally adopted by the Cabinet.

The Access Management Manual published by the Transportation Research Board in 2003 defines access management as the "systematic control of the location, spacing, design, and operation of driveways, median openings, interchanges, and street connections to a roadway". The purpose of access management is to provide vehicular access to land development in a manner that preserves the safety and efficiency of the transportation system. Access management principles stress traffic flow for higher-class roadways and access for lower-class roadways and place an emphasis on safety for all classes of roads. An effective access management program can reduce crashes as much as 50 percent, increase roadway capacity by 23 to 45 percent, and reduce travel time and delay as much as 40 to 60 percent. The safety benefits of access management have been demonstrated by more than four decades of research. Several studies have shown that every access point reduces highway safety to some degree, and that there is a clear relationship between the density of access points and crash rates. For highway agencies, access management can also serve as a strategy to save highway improvement dollars by preserving the function and capacity of roadways and thereby extending the useful life of those roadways. The benefits of access management are achieved through a series of policies that define specific guidelines and standards for allowable access levels, access spacing criteria, access permit procedures, and the means for enforcing these concepts.

All state highway agencies exercise some control over highway access, but traditionally these programs have focused primarily on driveway design and location. In Kentucky, management of highway access (at the state level) is currently limited to the Transportation Cabinet's case-by-case access permit review process for state-maintained routes and to negotiated access spacing improvements that are incorporated in the design of major highway improvement projects. Administrative regulations issued under the Transportation Cabinet's authority to limit highway access define three levels of access control: fully-controlled access, partially-controlled access, and access by permit. Direct highway access is not allowed on fully-controlled access highways. For partially-controlled access routes the minimum spacing between access points is 1,200 feet in rural areas and 600 feet in urban areas, with an allowable reduction in the spacing of up to 15% if supported by a traffic study. For access by permit routes, which make up the vast majority of the state-maintained highway system, access points may be allowed for the convenience of the land owner, subject to considerations of safety and the interest of the highway user. The Transportation Cabinet's Permits Guidance Manual provides general guidance rather than specific spacing standards for this level of access control. This guidance does not address the accumulative detrimental effects of an increasing frequency of access points and traffic signals.

At least 21 states have implemented comprehensive access management programs in recent years. Other states are likely to change their policies to a more comprehensive approach in the near future following the release of the TRB Access Management Manual. A review of the policies of states that have implemented access management programs revealed that the key elements for a successful program are a classification system of roadways specifically for access management purposes and a set of access spacing standards and design guidelines for each class. Access spacing standards and design guidelines are typically applied in conjunction with the following management techniques: interchange spacing and interchange crossroad access spacing, signalized intersection spacing, unsignalized intersection/driveway spacing, corner clearances, traversable and non-traversable medians, median opening spacing, turning lanes, U-turns, frontage/backage roads, specific access design elements, and provisions for alternative access.

---

The essence of an access management system can be summarized in the following steps:

1. Classification of roadways to reflect the importance and intended function of each roadway, with particular attention given to the relative priority that should be given to traffic flow versus land access;
2. Definition of allowable levels of access for each road class, including criteria for the spacing of access points and appropriate geometric design criteria;
3. Adoption of appropriate regulations and administrative procedures, including a procedure for considering variances from the adopted standards.

**Roadway Classification**

Most of the systems developed by other states have utilized existing functional classification as the basis for their roadway classification system. The rationale for this approach is that allowable access should be correlated with a roadway's purpose and importance. Additional indicators that have been used by other states include traffic volume, speed, geometric features (number of lanes and median type), and land use. For Kentucky, it is recommended that functional classification be used in conjunction with traffic volume and posted speed limit for developing the initial access management classification system.

The proposed classification system is presented in Table 1. This system uses a set of four classes each for urban and rural roadways that do not already have full control of access. Interstates, parkways and other freeways that have full access control are treated separately. The initial correspondence between functional class and these categories is: I - Principal Arterial, II - Interstates, parkways and other freeways that have full access control are treated separately. The classes each for urban and rural roadways that do not already have full control of access.

The proposed classification system is presented in Table 1. This system uses a set of four classes each for urban and rural roadways that do not already have full control of access. Interstates, parkways and other freeways that have full access control are treated separately. The initial correspondence between functional class and these categories is: I - Principal Arterial, II - Interstates, parkways and other freeways that have full access control are treated separately. The classes each for urban and rural roadways that do not already have full control of access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Speed &lt;5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Speed &lt;10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Speed &lt;2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Speed &lt;5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Speed &lt;2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Speed &lt;5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed ≥5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>All speeds &amp; volumes</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All speeds &amp; volumes</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed access classification system would be implemented in two stages. First, each state-maintained roadway segment would be assigned to one of the new classes using data contained in the Cabinet's Highway Information System (HIS) database and computerized procedures. The initial classification assignments would then be refined based on GIS mapping and a manual review process. Adjustments to the initial classifications would be made to incorporate considerations such as adjacent land use and planned highway improvements that are not in the HIS database and to ensure appropriate system continuity and logical break points. In order to maintain the effectiveness of the access management system, frequent and/or piecemeal changes in classification should be avoided.

**Access Spacing**

Every access point introduces conflicts and friction into the traffic stream. As the number of conflicts increases the potential for crashes becomes higher, and the resulting friction translates into higher crash rates, reduced travel speeds, and increased road user delays. To address these issues, access management programs establish minimum access spacing standards for each access classification that are consistent with the intended function of the roadways within each class. Kentucky’s program also incorporates two access type categories and allows significantly reduced spacings in certain situations for residential driveways (to three or fewer dwellings) and farm entrances. Appendix A shows the access management spacing standards that have been recommended for Kentucky.

It should be understood that the access management standards proposed here are not intended to be applied retroactively. They will apply to requests for new access and to changes in existing access. Legal access that exists at the effective date of the new access management policy would be allowed to continue, subject to change in use regulations. Further, in cases where the Cabinet formally negotiates access modifications with property owners in conjunction with a highway improvement project, it is expected that such negotiations would take precedence over the spacing standards shown in Appendix A.

In addition to the recommended access spacing distances, a set of recommended practices that have the potential to improve traffic flow and increase safety have also been developed. These practices include:

- An examination of the spacing distances in conjunction with sight distance requirements, which should take precedence over the recommended distances in Table-2;
- An evaluation of existing signals along reconstructed roadways to determine whether their presence is still warranted and removal of unnecessary and/or unwarranted signals;
- Encouraging corner properties with frontage on roadways with different access classes to obtain access via the lower class roadway and provision of a non-traversable median to eliminate left-turns if access must be provided along the higher class roadway;
- Locating access to corner properties as far from the intersection as feasible;
- Consolidation of driveways to adjacent properties whenever feasible;
- Elimination of left-turn access movements across turn lanes or within the limits of regularly forming traffic queues;
- Completion of detailed studies for driveway permits within the influence area of major intersections to ensure minimum disruption of operations at the intersection; and
- Provision of access for outparcels at large developments from within the site and prohibition of direct access to outparcel developments.

The proposed access classification system would be implemented in two stages. First, each state-maintained roadway segment would be assigned to one of the new classes using data contained in the Cabinet's Highway Information System (HIS) database and computerized procedures. The initial classification assignments would then be refined based on GIS mapping and a manual review process. Adjustments to the initial classifications would be made to incorporate considerations such as adjacent land use and planned highway improvements that are not in the HIS database and to ensure appropriate system continuity and logical break points. In order to maintain the effectiveness of the access management system, frequent and/or piecemeal changes in classification should be avoided.

**Access Spacing**

Every access point introduces conflicts and friction into the traffic stream. As the number of conflicts increases the potential for crashes becomes higher, and the resulting friction translates into higher crash rates, reduced travel speeds, and increased road user delays. To address these issues, access management programs establish minimum access spacing standards for each access classification that are consistent with the intended function of the roadways within each class. Kentucky’s program also incorporates two access type categories and allows significantly reduced spacings in certain situations for residential driveways (to three or fewer dwellings) and farm entrances. Appendix A shows the access management spacing standards that have been recommended for Kentucky.

It should be understood that the access management standards proposed here are not intended to be applied retroactively. They will apply to requests for new access and to changes in existing access. Legal access that exists at the effective date of the new access management policy would be allowed to continue, subject to change in use regulations. Further, in cases where the Cabinet formally negotiates access modifications with property owners in conjunction with a highway improvement project, it is expected that such negotiations would take precedence over the spacing standards shown in Appendix A.

In addition to the recommended access spacing distances, a set of recommended practices that have the potential to improve traffic flow and increase safety have also been developed. These practices include:

- An examination of the spacing distances in conjunction with sight distance requirements, which should take precedence over the recommended distances in Table-2;
- An evaluation of existing signals along reconstructed roadways to determine whether their presence is still warranted and removal of unnecessary and/or unwarranted signals;
- Encouraging corner properties with frontage on roadways with different access classes to obtain access via the lower class roadway and provision of a non-traversable median to eliminate left-turns if access must be provided along the higher class roadway;
- Locating access to corner properties as far from the intersection as feasible;
- Consolidation of driveways to adjacent properties whenever feasible;
- Elimination of left-turn access movements across turn lanes or within the limits of regularly forming traffic queues;
- Completion of detailed studies for driveway permits within the influence area of major intersections to ensure minimum disruption of operations at the intersection; and
- Provision of access for outparcels at large developments from within the site and prohibition of direct access to outparcel developments.
Variance and Appeals Processes

Some flexibility is required when administering access management regulations. In conjunction with the standards that are adopted for access spacing and design, a variance or deviation process is needed to allow for a lesser spacing where special or unique conditions make application of the minimum standards inappropriate. Allowing for variances in access management standards requires that these situations be handled in a consistent manner, although deviations may be categorized as minor or major in character, with the latter requiring a more extensive review. A two-level review process is proposed for applications that are in conflict with the access standards.

A minor variance would involve a minor deviation from the standards and a negligible impact on highway operations and safety. The consideration of requests for minor variances would be relatively straightforward. The basic test for favorable consideration would be proof of necessity and that there are no reasonable engineering or construction alternatives to provide access to the site which would meet or be in closer compliance to the standard. A major variance would involve a more significant deviation from the standards and the potential for significant impacts on highway operations and safety. The consideration of requests for major variances would require more extensive justification, analysis, and review. In addition to the basic test described above for minor variances, applicants for a major variance would have to prove that traffic operations and safety would not be degraded to an unacceptable level by proposed development and access plan or that the level of safety/operational performance would be comparable to that provided with full adherence to access management standards.

In addition to the variance process, an appeals process will be built into the administrative procedures for access management to assure due process for access applicants. In the practice of access permitting an appeal could arise when a permit or variance request is denied or if the Transportation Cabinet establishes a permit condition that is not acceptable to the applicant. This process would offer two levels for potential appeals prior to a property owner resorting to a judicial recourse. The first level would involve a review of the case by a Transportation Cabinet committee. An ensuing appeal of this committee’s decision would be addressed through Kentucky’s Administrative Hearing (KRS 13B) process. Any further appeal would be handled by District Court.

Appendix A - Proposed Standards

Kentucky’s Access Management Program includes standards for the following types of access management controls:

- Interchange Spacing - this page
- Traffic Signal Spacing - page 6
- Median Type - page 7
- Median Opening Spacing - page 8
- Unsignalized Intersection (Driveway) Spacing - page 9
- Corridor Clearance - page 10
- Interchange Area Spacing - page 11

Spacing distances and notes associated with each control type are shown in the tables that follow. Unless indicated otherwise, all distances in these tables are given in feet. It was decided early in the development of Kentucky’s Access Management Program that spacing standards should be in fractions and multiples of 600 ft. and 1,200 ft. because of the legacy of Kentucky’s partial control of access regulation.

Diagrams illustrating how the spacing standards for traffic signals, median openings, and driveways fit together along a roadway section are shown on pages 12 and 13.

Freeway Interchange Spacing Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Interchange Spacing Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – U</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – R</td>
<td>3 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note

1. For new interchanges or interchange modifications on the Interstate Highway System preparation of a justification study and approval by the Federal Highway Administration are required.

Commentary

These standards align with the AASHTO Interstate Policy
### Signalized Intersection Spacing Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Signalized Intersection Spacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – U</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – R</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban IV</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural I</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural II</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural III</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural IV</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**
The signal spacing of approximately ½ mile spacing on all Class 1 & 2 roads is to ensure adequate bi-directional signal progression.

### Median Type Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Preferred Median Type*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – U</td>
<td>Nontraversable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – R</td>
<td>Nontraversable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>Nontraversable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>Nontraversable (multilane facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TWLTL (2-lane facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>TWLTL (typical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nontraversable (high control situations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban IV</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural I</td>
<td>Nontraversable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undivided w/Left Turn (2-lane facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TWLTL (suburban environment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural II</td>
<td>Nontraversable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undivided w/Left Turn (2-lane facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TWLTL (suburban environment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural III</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural IV</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Median types listed provide general guidance for typical routes within each class. Refer to the detailed Median Type Guidelines listed below for more specific guidance for a particular situation.

### Median Type Guidelines

**Individual left-turn lanes recommended for:**
- Locations where left-turn volume exceeds warrant (to be determined), and
- Access point density <= 10 ap/mi

**TWLTL generally appropriate for:**
- Urban/suburban 3-lane roadways with:
  - project ADT<17,000
  - access point density > 10 ap/mi and < 85 ap/mi
  - left-turn volume < 150 vph
- Urban/suburban multi-lane roadways with:
  - project ADT<24,000
  - access point density > 10 ap/mi and < 85 ap/mi
  - left-turn volume < 100 vph

**Non-traversable medians preferred for:**
- All new multilane arterials
- Existing roadways where ADT, access density, and/or turning volumes exceed thresholds established above for TWLTLs
- Existing rural multilane arterials
- Crossroads in the vicinity of interchanges
- Multilane roadways with high pedestrian activity

**Notes:**
1. Traversable raised medians are not recommended since they neither facilitate left turns nor do they provide positive control over left turn movements.
2. If a project design team determines that a different median type is needed for safety or traffic operational reasons, a variance may be requested.
**APPENDIX 2-5 continued**

Kentucky’s Proposed Access Management Program Executive Summary - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Median Opening Full</th>
<th>Median Opening Directional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – U</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>2,400/1,200*</td>
<td>1,200/600**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban IV</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural I</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural II</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural III</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural IV</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For roadways with an 85th percentile speed greater than or equal to 45mph, use larger values. For roadways with an 85th percentile speed less than or equal to 45 mph, the larger values should be utilized where feasible but the lower values may be applied, where necessary. Use of the lower values does not alter the 2,400 ft. minimum traffic signal spacing standard.

**Notes**

Mid-block median openings (used for U-turns only) may be located 300 feet from an intersection at which left-turns are restricted if the following conditions are met:
(1) adequate sight distance;
(2) adequate space for accommodating the U-turn design vehicle;
(3) adequate space for incorporation of a “left-turn” auxiliary lane (including taper and storage); and
(4) there is no potential for use by drivers desiring to turn left from nearby driveways.

**Commentary**

- For Class I, II and Urban Class III, full median opening standards are developed to align with the signal spacing standards with the exception noted above for Class 2 roadways.
- For Rural Class 3, full median opening is developed to be ½ of the signal spacing standard. Consecutive median openings will not be signalized.
- Typically, roads classified as Class 4 will not contain a median.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Type A Access*</th>
<th>Type B Access**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – U</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>1,200/600***</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban IV</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural I</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural II</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural III</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural IV</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Type A Access - All commercial, industrial, and recreational uses; residential subdivision entrances; public roadways; and all other access not specified as Type B Access

** Type B Access - Single family residences; multiple-family residences (3 units or less); and farm/field entrances

*** For roadways with an 85th percentile speed greater than 45mph use larger values. For roadways with an 85th percentile speed less than or equal to 45 mph, the larger values should be utilized where feasible but the lower values may be applied, where necessary.

**Restrictions and Notes Applicable to Type B Access**

1. All other standards will apply according to the roadway classification.
2. Type B access spacing may be utilized only if alternative reasonable access meeting Type A standards is not feasible.
3. Change of land use from that previously permitted under Type B access to that classified as Type A requires a new permit and application of Type A standards.
4. Only one access allowed per parcel or for contiguous parcels under one ownership. Additional access points may be allowed only if they meet Type A standards and are deemed necessary for the convenience or welfare of the traveling public.
5. Type B access should not be allowed within the functional area of another intersection. No entrance shall be permitted within the limits of a turning lane.
6. Type B access shall not be permitted on routes designated as having “Partial Control” access.
7. When a median is present, Type B access will be limited to right turns only.
8. Unified access using cross access, combined entrances, backage roads and frontage roads is strongly encouraged.

**Commentary**

- Corridor agreements for new or retrofit projects may result in different negotiated access spacing. Such agreements, signed by KYTC and appropriate local government(s) would take precedence over these standards.
- Project teams may still elect to implement Partial Control access for a new design project.
### Corner Clearance Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Type A Access</th>
<th>Type B Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – U</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>1,200/600*</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban IV</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural I</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural II</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural III</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural IV</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For roadways with an 85th percentile speed greater than 45mph, use 1,200 ft. upstream of intersection.

### Interchange Area Spacing Standards (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Classification</th>
<th>Full Access Intersection (2)</th>
<th>Limited Access Connection (3)</th>
<th>Right-In/Right-Out Access Only (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Access</td>
<td>Limited Access</td>
<td>Right-In/Right-Out Access Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – U</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway – R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban I</td>
<td>1,200/600*</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban II</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban III</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban IV</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural I</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural II</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural III</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural IV</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Spacing measured from ramp end of taper (end of radius if no taper) to access connection closest edge of pavement.
(2) Distance to first four-way intersection. Beyond this point spacing standards based on crossroad access class apply.
(3) Distance to first access connection limited to Right-In/Right-Out and Left-In movements. Applicable where left-turn movements restricted by median barrier with directional median opening.
(4) Applicable where left-turn movements restricted by median barrier.

### Notes

1. Spacing distances for Limited Access Connections apply only where adequate left-turn lanes can be physically accommodated.
2. Spacing distances for Limited Access Connections may be applied to unsignalized full movement connections if there is no possibility for access on opposite side.
3. Access connections shall not permitted within limits of ramp taper.
4. Access connections should not permitted within limits of auxiliary lane for downstream intersection.
5. Type B access spacing not permitted with between ramp and first Limited Access Connection.

### Commentary

Requirements for corner clearance are necessary to insure that the functional area of the intersection is not impacted. Requests for access near important or congested intersections may require a detailed traffic engineering analysis to determine the intersection’s functional area.
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North South Initiative Recommendations Relating to Dixie Highway

Kyles Lane Improvements

- Widen Dixie Highway to a five lane section from I-75 to Arlington Road
- Relocate Kyles Lane to line up directly with George Huser Drive and close off jug-handle access drive nearby or convert to a right-in/right-out access point
- Improve signal timing by interconnecting Kyles Lane signals with Dixie Highway
- Create right and left dual turn lanes from Kyles Lane to northbound I-75
- Create an auxiliary northbound lane on I-75 from the Kyles Lane exit

These same recommendations were incorporated in the Dixie Highway Corridor Study. The traffic signals on Kyles Lane at the interchange ramps for I-75 are very close to the intersection of Dixie Highway and Kyles Lane. Providing the interconnection and coordination timing between these signals and the Dixie Highway corridor is recommended. This will be especially useful if the interconnection to ARTIMIS happens. The interchange signals on Kyles Lane could be adjusted as well. This project was determined to be the second highest priority recommendation in Northern Kentucky resulting from the North South Initiative.

Buttermilk Pike Interchange

- This recommendation would provide additional capacity for the I-75 SB off-ramp by adding one lane. This alternative would also add one lane on Buttermilk Pike between the interchange ramps to accommodate dual left turn movements onto I-75 SB and improve signal timing along Buttermilk Pike. Widening the existing bridge structure may be required.
- Access management principles would be applied to Buttermilk Pike, especially between I-75 and Anderson Avenue.
- An additional eastbound lane on Buttermilk Pike is also proposed between Anderson Avenue and the I-75 southbound on-ramp to help reduce morning rush hour congestion.
- The existing auxiliary lane northbound on I-75 would be extended to the Dixie Highway interchange.

While this recommendation does not impact the project limits as defined by the Dixie Highway Corridor Study, it was included for emphasis. Improvements on the Buttermilk Pike interchange would ultimately improve the traffic conditions on Dixie Highway. The operation of Dixie Highway is ultimately tied to the operation of I-75 and its interchanges. This project was determined to be the highest priority recommendation in Northern Kentucky resulting from the North South Initiative.

Interstate 71/75

In addition to the above recommendations, the North South Initiative made recommendations concerning mainline I-71/75. The report recommends that the interstate be widened to a four-lane continuity with auxiliary lanes and high frequency light rail.

These improvements would obviously improve the conditions on the interstate by increasing capacity. The light rail would work to reduce the number of peak hour vehicles. Both of these improvements would work to improve conditions on Dixie Highway.
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Dixie Highway Corridor Study (1984) Recommendations Not Yet Implemented

1. Closing the following streets, at their intersections with Dixie Highway, utilizing the vacated right-of-way between Dixie Highway and the rear of the commercial development for off-street facilities. These roads are:
   - Graves Avenue
   - Bartlett Street
   - Vine Street
   - Carlisle Avenue
   - Kenton Avenue
   - Rosebud Drive
   - Lytle Avenue
   - Park Avenue
   - Lexington Avenue

   The provision of additional off-street parking areas adjacent to the commercial development would allow or the closure of a number of individual access drives along Dixie Highway.

2. Providing a left turn signal at May Street to accommodate left-turn movements from southbound traffic on Dixie Highway to May Street. The signal phase would also permit simultaneous right-turn movements from May Street to northbound Dixie Highway and through movement for southbound traffic.

3. Constructing a connector road between Stevenson road and Garvey Avenue, parallel to and north of the Southern Railroad. Traffic at the intersection of Stevenson Road should be limited to right-in/right-out due to the close proximity to Dixie Highway and the Southern Railroad. This new road would provide a connection between Stevenson road and Main Street via Bedinger Avenue. The design of the intersection of the new road with Garvey Avenue should ensure that adequate sight distance is provided between the intersection and the above-grade crossing of the Southern Railroad, to the south.

4. Limiting on-street parking on the north side of May Street, to facilitate the safe movement of traffic from Dixie Highway to the recommended connector between Stevenson Road and Garvey Road.

5. Requesting cooperation of the Southern Railroad in scheduling of trains to avoid peak hour traffic delays whenever possible.

6. Extending Elm Street from Graves Avenue to Bartlett Avenue, to provide an alternate means of access to Bartlett Avenue.

7. Prohibiting left-turn movements from McArthur (Erlanger) Avenue onto Dixie Highway to alleviate sight distance problem to the south along Dixie Highway. In conjunction with this recommendation, a connector road is also recommended to be provided between McArthur Avenue and May Street to the rear of the commercial development facing Dixie Highway.

8. Constructing a connector road between Eastern Avenue and Park Avenue approximately 250 feet south of Dixie Highway, enabling access to Dixie Highway from Park Avenue via Eastern Avenue.

9. Constructing a connector road between Sunset Avenue and Rosebud Avenue south of Miles Elementary School.
## APPENDIX 3-1
### 168 Individual Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Add Sidewalk</td>
<td>Park Hill boundary To Curve</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Eliminate on Street parking</td>
<td>Bend to 12th St.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Alley Improvements</td>
<td>Bend to 12th St.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lane Markings</td>
<td>Montague, Western, and Dixie Intersection</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Between Western and Hermes</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Construct Alley</td>
<td>Between Montague and Bullock</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Add Parking Pulloff</td>
<td>Between Montague and Bullock</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Eliminate on Street parking</td>
<td>Between Montague and Bullock</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Add Rt. Turn lane</td>
<td>I-75 South off Ramp and Pike St.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Eliminate on Street parking</td>
<td>Jullians Way and Main St.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Add 3/4 entry</td>
<td>Between Jullians Way and Goetta Pl.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Add full access on Philadelphia</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Goetta Pl.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Make one way</td>
<td>Goetta Pl.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Add full access on Philadelphia</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Between York St.and Main</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Define Entry</td>
<td>Between York St.and Main</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Intersection of Pike and Main</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Eastern Ave.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Corner of Eastern and Dixie</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Between Park and Cave Run</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Across from Cave Run</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>North of Cave Run</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Redefine Entry</td>
<td>North of Cave Run</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Consolidate driveways</td>
<td>Across from Cave Run</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full Access</td>
<td>Across from Cave Run</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Between Lytle and Main</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Add rear access drive</td>
<td>Between Lytle and Main</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Main to Rosebud</td>
<td>Main to Rosebud</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Close Kenton</td>
<td>Kenton St.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Provide access between Parking lots</td>
<td>Kenton St.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Close Carlisle</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Provide access between Parking lots</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Garvey and Vine</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Close Vine</td>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Entrance Only</td>
<td>May St.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Exit only</td>
<td>May St.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Between May and Erlanger</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Access Drive</td>
<td>Between May and Erlanger</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Between Erlanger and May</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Length of Community Corridor</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Between St. James and Carlisle Dr.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>St. Joseph Heights across from St. Joseph Ln.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Realign Dr</td>
<td>St. Joseph Heights across from St. Joseph Ln.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Across from St. Joseph's Ln.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Realign Drive</td>
<td>Across from St. Joseph's Ln.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>South of Arlington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Establish Shared access</td>
<td>South of Arlington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Rosemont and Arlington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Access at Rosemont</td>
<td>Rosemont and Arlington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Round-about</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hills</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Realign Driveway, Dixie, and established Entries</td>
<td>Between Arlington and Park Hills North Boundary</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Between Montgomery and Kenton Lands</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Kenton Lands and Edgewood Rd.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Implement access dr</td>
<td>Kenton Lands and Edgewood Rd.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3/4 Turn</td>
<td>Kenton Lands and Edgewood Rd.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Designated Turn Lanes</td>
<td>Kenton Lands and Edgewood Rd.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Edgewood Rd.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3/4 Turns</td>
<td>Between Edgewood Rd. and Dudley</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Rt. Turn Lane</td>
<td>Wild Rose</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Hills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Extend Sidewalk</td>
<td>Crestview Hills Mall Dr.to Dudley</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Hills</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>Between Rosemont and Winding Way on Dixie</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Hills</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>sidewalks/crosswalks</td>
<td>Dudley to Rose</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Hills</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Incident Light</td>
<td>West bound I-275 off ramp and Dixie</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Hills</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Park</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Continue Sidewalk</td>
<td>South of Paul Hesser</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Park</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>North of Arcadia</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Add Sidewalk</td>
<td>St. Johns to Fortside</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>St. Johns to Fortside</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3/4 Turns</td>
<td>South of Fortside</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>Across from Fortside</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Across from Fortside</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shared Access</td>
<td>Across from Fortside</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Access Drive</td>
<td>Rivard Dr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Rivard Dr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3/4 Turns</td>
<td>Rivard Dr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Rivard Dr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3-1 continued
#### 168 Individual Recommendations continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Add sidewalk</td>
<td>Between Rivard and Ashwood</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Between Barington Rd. and Ashwood</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Access Drive</td>
<td>Between Barington Rd. and Ashwood</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Acquire Property</td>
<td>South of Kyles</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Define Entry</td>
<td>Ashwood Cr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>Ashwood Cr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Ashwood Cr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>George Heusser Dr.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Kyles</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>North of George Heusser</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Access Link</td>
<td>North of George Heusser</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>North of Kyles</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Exit only</td>
<td>North of Kyles</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Enter only</td>
<td>North of Kyles</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>South of Sleepy Hollow</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Sleepy Hollow</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Access Drive</td>
<td>Between Sleepy Hollow and Wrights Summit</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Across from Wrights Summit</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Wrights Summit</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wright</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Access Drive</td>
<td>St. Agnes Church parkinglot and St. Johns Ave.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Between Rose and Goodridge</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Turfway and Bustetter Dr.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Reconstruct entry</td>
<td>Turfway and Bustetter Dr.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>South of Goodridge</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Bustetter and Nicholas</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Construct new access</td>
<td>Bustetter and Nicholas</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Goodridge to Sanders Dr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Access Dr.</td>
<td>Goodridge to Sanders Dr.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Define Entry</td>
<td>North of Sanders</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Nicholas and Lexington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Recirculate Traffic</td>
<td>Nicholas and Lexington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>North of Lexington</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Recirculate Traffic</td>
<td>North of Lexington</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>North of Sanders</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Corner of Buttermilk</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Rear access</td>
<td>Corner of Buttermilk</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Corner of Buttermilk</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3/4 Turn</td>
<td>Corner of Buttermilk</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>North of Huckleberry Hill</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shared Access</td>
<td>Huckleberry Hill and Orphanage</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bus Pull Outs</td>
<td>North of Buttermilk</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Between Orphanage and Requardt</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shared Access</td>
<td>Between Orphanage and Requardt</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Virginia Ave.</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Light timing</td>
<td>Greenbriar Ave. Extension and Highland</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3/4 Turn</td>
<td>Greenbriar Ave. Extension and Highland</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Light timing</td>
<td>Beechwood Rd.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Expressway Plaza</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Recirculate Traffic</td>
<td>Expressway Plaza</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shave Grade</td>
<td>Expressway Plaza</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Across From Maple</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Across From Mitchell</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Mitchell</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>North of E. Orchard</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>South of Kentaboo</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>sidewalks/crosswalks</td>
<td>Kentaboo</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>North of Kentaboo</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Extend new access Rt.</td>
<td>Between Kentaboo and Cave Run</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Between Cave Run and Sunset Ave.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Recirculate Traffic</td>
<td>Between Cave Run and Sunset Ave.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Between Forest and Linwood</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Define entry/exit</td>
<td>North of Linwood</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Realignment</td>
<td>McAlpin</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Define entry/exit</td>
<td>North of McAlpin</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Between Prices and Bartlett</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Define Entry</td>
<td>Between Prices and Bartlett</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Between Bartlette and Graves</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Dixie and Stevenson Rd.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Full Access</td>
<td>Dixie and Stevenson Rd.</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>North of Commonwealth</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>Crescent</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Define Entries</td>
<td>Between Alice and Hallman</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Between Alice and Hallman</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Full Access</td>
<td>Between Alice and Hallman</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Close Driveways</td>
<td>Between Hallman and Shorthill</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Add Sidewalk</td>
<td>Kroger Shopping Center</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3/4 Turn</td>
<td>Kroger Shopping Center</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>North of Clover</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Add Sidewalk</td>
<td>Kmart Shopping Center</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Close Driveway</td>
<td>South of Montgomery</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Recirculate Traffic</td>
<td>South of Montgomery</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Between Montgomery and Kenton Lands</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>Between Montgomery and Kenton Lands</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlanger</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Rt. In/out</td>
<td>North of Kentonlands</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3-2
### Estimated Crash Rate Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Name</th>
<th>Existing accidents per MVMT</th>
<th>Projected Accidents per MVMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KY 1017 to KY 236</td>
<td>12.1086126</td>
<td>11.73021845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY236 to I-275</td>
<td>17.43367069</td>
<td>14.56224258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 to KY1303</td>
<td>3.339806196</td>
<td>3.10124861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY1303 to KY371 (Buttermilk)</td>
<td>8.882633086</td>
<td>8.347534707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY371 (Buttermilk) to I-71/75</td>
<td>7.833257471</td>
<td>7.588468175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71/75 to KY1072 (Kyles)</td>
<td>11.54073023</td>
<td>10.07524068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY1072 (Kyles) to west ramps to I-71/75</td>
<td>9.762701274</td>
<td>7.243294494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west ramps to I-71/75 to Main/Pike St.</td>
<td>11.31221719</td>
<td>8.252938331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Section Name</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>2-Way DVMT</th>
<th>2-Way Annual MVMT</th>
<th>2-year Crashes</th>
<th>Annual Crashes</th>
<th>Signals</th>
<th>Signals/ mi</th>
<th>Existing crashes/ MVMT</th>
<th>existing access</th>
<th>future access</th>
<th>existing access per mile</th>
<th>future access per mile</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Projected Acc/MVMT</th>
<th>% change in Acc/MVMT</th>
<th>Projected Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Turfway to commonwealth</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>53195</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>128.50</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>88.62</td>
<td>62.07</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Commonwealth to I-275</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>37959</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>-16.47%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>I-275 to Turkeyfoot</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>12329</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-7.14%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Turkeyfoot to Buttermilk</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>8609</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>43.42</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>-6.02%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Buttermilk to I-71/75</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>27785</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>-3.13%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>I-71/75 to Kyles</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>13762</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>-12.70%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>Kyles to west ramps of I-71/75</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>22595</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>-25.81%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>west ramps to I-71/75 to Main/Pike St.</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>-27.04%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3-3
Projected Travel Time Savings Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Section Name</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Avg AM Run Time</th>
<th>AM Speed</th>
<th>Avg MD Run Time</th>
<th>MD Speed</th>
<th>Avg PM Run Time</th>
<th>PM Speed</th>
<th>AM Projected TT</th>
<th>AM Projected Speed</th>
<th>MD Projected TT</th>
<th>MD Projected Speed</th>
<th>AM % change in TT</th>
<th>MD % change in TT</th>
<th>PM Projected TT</th>
<th>PM Projected Speed</th>
<th>PM % change in TT</th>
<th>Total Vehicle mins Saved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 1017 to KY 236</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0:02:06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0:02:39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0:03:54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26598</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td>0:02:38</td>
<td>0:00:28</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0:02:17</td>
<td>0:00:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 236 to I-275</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0:03:08</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0:04:27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0:03:28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18979</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>0:02:54</td>
<td>0:00:14</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0:04:05</td>
<td>0:00:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>I-275 to KY 1303</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0:00:58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0:01:12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0:01:04</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6165</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>0:00:55</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0:01:09</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 1303 to KY 371 (Buttermilk)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0:00:52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0:00:46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0:00:43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4504</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>0:00:51</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0:00:46</td>
<td>0:00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 371 (Buttermilk) to I-71/75</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0:03:02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0:02:38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0:02:08</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13892</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>0:02:54</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0:02:31</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 1072 (Kyles) to west ramps to I-71/75</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0:01:50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0:01:38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0:01:10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6881</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>0:01:45</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0:01:33</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>west ramps to I-71/75 to Main/Pike St.</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0:00:36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0:00:30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0:00:35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4304</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0:00:35</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0:00:29</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 1072 (Kyles) to west ramps to I-71/75</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0:04:23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0:04:18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0:03:55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11297</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>0:03:58</td>
<td>0:00:25</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0:03:50</td>
<td>0:00:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 371 (Buttermilk) to KY 1303</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0:00:44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0:02:11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0:00:38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4304</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0:00:44</td>
<td>0:00:00</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0:02:04</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 371 (Buttermilk) to KY 1072</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0:01:05</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0:01:16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0:00:53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6165</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0:01:05</td>
<td>0:00:00</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0:01:16</td>
<td>0:00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 1072 to KY 236</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0:04:09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0:03:40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0:03:52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18979</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>0:03:59</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0:03:30</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US42/127</td>
<td>KY 236 to KY 1017</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0:02:24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0:03:26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0:03:23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24598</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>0:02:05</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0:02:50</td>
<td>0:00:36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projected speed = observed speed + (0.25mph * (existing access plus - future access plus))
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Community Priorities
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APPENDIX 3-4 continued
Ft. Wright Community Priorities

Exhibit 3

Project A

Location: 300 East New Hope Road and South Bell Road

Description: 1100 Foot South Bell Road

Selected Key Project: None

Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Reason:

1. The project improves pedestrian safety and connectivity between the East New Hope Road and South Bell Road areas
2. The project enhances the overall connectivity and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
3. The project provides improved connectivity to the Northside of the Ft. Wright Plaza
4. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
5. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza

Project B

Location: 300 East New Hope Road and Gold Center Circle

Description: 1100 Foot South Bell Road

Selected Key Project: None

Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Reason:

1. The project improves pedestrian safety and connectivity between the East New Hope Road and South Bell Road areas
2. The project enhances the overall connectivity and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
3. The project provides improved connectivity to the Northside of the Ft. Wright Plaza
4. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
5. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza

Project C

Location: Drive Highway and Koroma Drive

Description: Drive Highway

Selected Key Project: None

Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Reason:

1. The project improves pedestrian safety and connectivity between the Drive Highway and Koroma Drive areas
2. The project enhances the overall connectivity and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
3. The project provides improved connectivity to the Northside of the Ft. Wright Plaza
4. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
5. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza

Project D

Location: Drive Highway and Koroma Drive

Description: Drive Highway

Selected Key Project: None

Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Reason:

1. The project improves pedestrian safety and connectivity between the Drive Highway and Koroma Drive areas
2. The project enhances the overall connectivity and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
3. The project provides improved connectivity to the Northside of the Ft. Wright Plaza
4. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
5. The project improves the overall safety and accessibility to the Ft. Wright Plaza
APPENDIX 3-4 continued

Ft. Wright Community Priorities - continued

Project I

Location: Dixie Highway Southbound Side Loading Reserves

Description of Dixie Fix Recommendation

Culvert improvement

Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project II

Location: Dixie Highway and Warren Avenue Intersection

Description of Dixie Fix Recommendation

Provide left turn lanes and increase capacity Implementation of roundabout at Delafield and Warren intersections

Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project III

Location: Dixie Highway and Marathon Grove Entrance Dixie Highway Northern Entrance

Description of Dixie Fix Recommendation

Prepare right of way

Staff Priority Recommendation: None

---

1. This project conforms to economic and land use development in at least three comprehensive community development plans by increasing the number of development opportunities in the area, increasing the number of potential development opportunities, and by providing public right of ways.

2. This project is consistent with past community action, where a major public right of way at Dixie Highway and the exit ramp at I-75 was acquired by the City for access to commercial development sites of approx. 10 acres.
The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future
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Ft. Wright Community Priorities - continued

Project 1
Description: Fort Wright and North Side

Project 2
Description: Fort Wright and South Side

Project 3
Description: Fort Wright and East Side

Project 4
Description: Fort Wright and West Side

Project 5
Description: Fort Wright and North Side

Project 6
Description: Fort Wright and East Side

Project 7
Description: Fort Wright and West Side

Project 8
Description: Fort Wright and South Side

Project 9
Description: Fort Wright and North Side

Project 10
Description: Fort Wright and East Side

Project 11
Description: Fort Wright and West Side

Project 12
Description: Fort Wright and South Side

Project 13
Description: Fort Wright and North Side

Project 14
Description: Fort Wright and East Side

Project 15
Description: Fort Wright and West Side

Project 16
Description: Fort Wright and South Side
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APPENDIX 3-4 continued
Ft. Wright Community Priorities - continued

Project 10
Location: Dixie Highway and Versailles Line
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project 11
Location: Dixie Highway Northbound Center Lane and Woody Hollow Road
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project 12
Location: Woodland Trace Exit 10 Off Dixie Highway and Luxury Car Parking Lot
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project K
Location: Dixie Highway and West Christian Park, and Aragon at Saint Xavier Circle
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project L
Location: Dixie Highway Eastbound at Dixie Highway and Lovejoy
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project M
Location: Dixie Highway Eastbound at Dixie Highway and Lovejoy
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Project N
Location: Dixie Highway Eastbound at Dixie Highway and Lovejoy
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None

Reasons:
I. This Project will be accomplished in the City’s approved Development Plan for the
area.

Project 1
Location: Dixie Highway and Saint Xavier Park, East and Saint Xavier Avenue
Description of Project Recommendation
Approve the Project with Staff’s Funding
Staff Priority Recommendation: None
Lakeside Park

Priorities noted on aerial map:

1. Added sidewalks continuing from Lakeside Park to Crestview Hills past the Towne Center.

Of the two bus at Gersen and Marion, eliminate the northern one across from Marion.
APPENDIX 3-4 continued
Community Priorities

CITY OF ELMSMORE

COMMUNITY POLICY CONCERNS

- Participation
- Economic Development
- Health and Safety
- Education
- Environment
- Transportation

APPENDIX 3-4 continued
Community Priorities

City of Elsmere

V. E. Hoverson Avenue
Elsmere Kentucky, 41019

Phone (859) 854-7211
Fax (859) 342-7512

Walter A. Brown
Manager

Larry D. Schumacher
Assistant Manager

Community Priorities
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Community Priorities

O'Brien, Bell, Hoverson
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APPENDIX 3-4 continued
Community Priorities

RESOLUTION NO.

WHEREAS, the Council has received a recommendation from Community
Priorities, the committee appointed by the Mayor to develop a
vision for the future of the City of Dixie;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City
of Dixie, that

SECTION 1.

This resolution is adopted by the Council of the City of Dixie on the
...
APPENDIX 3-4 continued

Community Priorities

Dixie Fix Priorities

From: Robyn Bancroft
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 8:43 AM
To: Bezold, Mike (KYTC-D06)
Cc: Karen Whitaker
Subject: RE: Dixie Fix Priorities

Thank you, Mike! Especially for sending it so promptly. --Robyn

From: Bezold, Mike (KYTC-D06) [mailto:Mike.Bezold@ky.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2006 2:41 PM
To: Robyn Bancroft
Cc: Hans, Robert (KYTC-D06); Schomaker, Tom (KYTC-D06); Thomas, Amy (KYTC)
Subject: Dixie Fix Priorities

KYTC District 6 has reviewed the proposed improvements for the Dixie Fix and has established the District's Priorities.

These are:
1. Realignment of the intersection of McAlpin and Garvey in Erlanger/Elsmere
2. Right Turn lane on Northbound US 25 to Eastbound Dudley in Edgewood
3. Sidewalks along US 25 under I-275 from Whitehouse to Dudley in Crestview Hills
4. Left turn lanes on US 25 for north and south bound at the intersection of St. John's and the Shopping center entrance in Ft. Wright Ft. Mitchell
5. Left Turn Lane at Fortside Drive in Ft. Wright
6. Left Turn Lane at Ashwood in Ft. Wright
# APPENDIX 3-5
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

## CVG: Main St. Intersection Reconfiguration

### Priority Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>intersections: 0.57-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84(^3)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+=10</td>
<td>-27.04%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>B/B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>0:41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>Yes=5</td>
<td>No=0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of a known existing or future “major development.”</td>
<td>Yes=5</td>
<td>No=0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>high=5</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes=5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>high=5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### CRITERIA CATEGORIES
- **HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)**
  - Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.
  - Point System: 20,800\(^1\)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10
  - Data: 7,200
  - Score: 0

- **IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)**
  - Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).
  - Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT).
  - Data: intersections: 0.57\(^2\)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10
  - Data: mid-blocks: 4.84\(^3\)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10
  - Data: 0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+=10
  - Data: -27.04% 10

- **IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)**
  - Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is "D," "E," or "F."
  - Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).
  - Data: B/C 0
  - Data: 0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5
  - Data: 0:41 0

- **PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)**
  - Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.
  - Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)
  - Data: No=0; Yes=5
  - Data: low=0; medium=2.5; high=5
  - Data: low 0

- **ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)**
  - Presence of a known existing or future "major development."
  - Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.
  - Data: No=0; Yes=5
  - Data: low=0; medium=2.5; high=5
  - Data: medium 2.5

- **HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)**
  - Level of priority as ranked by local community.
  - Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).
  - Data: 5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5
  - Data: 5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5
  - Data: 2 4

- **BE CONSISTENT (5%)**
  - Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.
  - Data: No=0; Yes=5
  - Data: Yes 5

- **LEVEL OF COORDINATION & FUNDING NEEDED (5%)**
  - Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.
  - Data: LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).
  - Data: low 0

### TOTAL
- Data: 100
- Score: 29

---

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### CVG: SB I-75 Exit Ramp Dedicated Right Turn Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>• Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800¹-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>• Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>Intersections: 0.57²-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-25.81</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>• Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>B/B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>126:23:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>• Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>• Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>• Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>• Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>• Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
²Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
³Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
# Priority Evaluation Matrix

**CRITERIA CATEGORIES** (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>intersections: 0.57(^2)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing crash rate</strong> (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84(^2)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected crash rate</strong> (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-25.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>B/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)</td>
<td>126:23:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

**CRITERIA CATEGORIES** (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Categories</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+ =10</td>
<td>8,652</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>Intersections: 0.57-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-25.81%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>D/F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>126:23:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### CRITERIA CATEGORIES

- **HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)**
  - Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.
  - **Point System**
    - 20,800\(^1\) to 25,800 = 2.5; 25,801-29,000 = 5; 29,000+ = 10
  
- **IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)**
  - **Existing crash rate** (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).
  - **Point System**
    - Intersections: 0.57\(^2\) to 5.0 = 2.5; 5.1-10.0 = 5; 10.0+ = 10
    - Mid-blocks: 4.84\(^2\) to 10.0 = 2.5; 10.1-15.0 = 5; 15.0+ = 10
  
- **Projected crash rate** (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)
  - **Point System**
    - 0-8.0% = 2.5; 8.1-16% = 5; 16%+ = 10

- **IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)**
  - **Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS)** is "D," "E," or "F."
    - D = 5; E = 10; F = 15
  - **Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).**
    - 0:25:00 = 0; 25:01-85:00 = 2.5; 85:01+ = 5

- **PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)**
  - Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.
  - Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)
  - **Point System**
    - No = 0; Yes = 5

- **ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)**
  - Presence of a known existing or future "major development."
  - Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.
  - **Point System**
    - No = 0; Yes = 5

- **HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)**
  - Level of priority as ranked by local community.
  - Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).
  - **Point System**
    - 5th = 1; 4th = 2; 3rd = 3; 2nd = 4; 1st = 5

- **BE CONSISTENT (5%)**
  - Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.
  - **Point System**
    - No = 0; Yes = 5

- **LEVEL OF COORDINATION & FUNDING NEEDED (5%)**
  - Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.
  - **Point System**
    - LOW = 0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM = 2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH = 5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).

---

### Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCLOSE ECONOMIC VITALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes

1. Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2. Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3. Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### CRITERIA CATEGORIES (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800^1^–25,800=2.5; 25,801–29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>Intersections: 0.57^1^–5.0=2.5; 5.1–10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0–8.0%=2.5; 8.1–16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-25.81%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0–25:00=0; 25:01–85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>126:23:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2. Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3. Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Park Hills: Roundabout "realigning" Arlington Rd.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800(^1) - 25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57(^2)=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+=10</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>126:23:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Park Hills: With Redevelopment, Closure of Residential Driveways, Access off of Arlington or Rosemont**

**CRITERIA CATEGORIES** (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</th>
<th>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</th>
<th>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</th>
<th>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</th>
<th>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</th>
<th>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</th>
<th>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</th>
<th>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>● Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>● Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>● Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>● Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>● Average level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>● Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>● Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,800^1^25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57^2^-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1^Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2^Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3^Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix - continued

#### APPENDIX 3-5 continued

**Priority Evaluation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800(^1), 25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).&lt;br&gt;• Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57(^2)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10&lt;br&gt;mid-blocks: 4.84(^3)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10&lt;br&gt;0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+=10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;&lt;br&gt;• Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15&lt;br&gt;0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>126:23:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.&lt;br&gt;• Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5&lt;br&gt;low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;&lt;br&gt;• Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5&lt;br&gt;low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Level of priority as ranked by local community.&lt;br&gt;• Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5&lt;br&gt;5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**<br>100 | 44 |

---

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.<br>\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.<br>\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### Ft. Wright: Kyles Lane Intersection Realignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>19,852</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>intersections: 0.57(^1)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10 mid-blocks: 4.84(^1)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-25.81%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 100 | 37.5 |
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### CRITERIA CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Categories</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800¹-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>19,852</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>Intersection: 0.57⁻5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005). mid-blocks: 4.84⁻10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0⁻8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-12.70%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>10:49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

| 100 | 22 |

¹Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
²Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
³Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Ft. Wright: Rivard Adjacent Commercial Properties Shared Access**

### CRITERIA CATEGORIES (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800(^1) - 25,800(^1) = 2.5; 25,801-29,000(^1) = 5; 29,000+(^1) = 10</td>
<td>19,852</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>Intersections: 0.57-5.0 = 2.5; 5.1-10.0 = 5; 10.0+ = 10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0% = 2.5; 8.1-16% = 5; 16+ = 10</td>
<td>-12.70%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>No = 0; Yes = 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>No = 0; medium = 2.5; high = 5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No = 0; Yes = 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No = 0; Yes = 5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low = 0; medium = 2.5; high = 5</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th = 1; 4th = 2; 3rd = 3; 2nd = 4; 1st = 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th = 1; 4th = 2; 3rd = 3; 2nd = 4; 1st = 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No = 0; Yes = 5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW = 0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM = 2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH = 5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | | 100 | | 21 |

---

1. Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2. Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3. Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Ft. Wright: Fortside Dr. &amp; Surrounding Properties Driveway Closures and Intersection Realignment</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>14,352</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57(^2)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+=10</td>
<td>14,352</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>10:49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</td>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

**CRITERIA CATEGORIES** (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td>20,800&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>14,352</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.1+=10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td>-12.70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</td>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

100<br>

---

<sup>1</sup>Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.<br>
<sup>2</sup>Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.<br>
<sup>3</sup>Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

Crestview Hills: Sidewalks Whitehouse to Dudley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,713</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections : 0.57(^2)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10 mid-blocks : 4.84(^3)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-25.81%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>79:46:00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 100 | | 45 |

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

#### Edgewood: Dudley Rd. Intersection Realignment & NB Dixie Right Turn Lane

**CRITERIA CATEGORIES** (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td>20,800&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+10</td>
<td>28,713</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.1+=10</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%=10</td>
<td>16.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>79:46:00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>B/D</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

1<sup>st</sup> Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2<sup>nd</sup> Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3<sup>rd</sup> Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td>20,800¹-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,713</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IMPROVE SAFETY (20%) | intersections: 0.57²-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10
mid-blocks: 4.84³-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10 | 5.46 | 5 |
| IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%) | D=5; E=10; F=15 | B/D | 5 |
| PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%) | 0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5 | 79:46:00 | 2.5 |
| ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%) | No=0; Yes=5 | Yes | 5 |
| HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%) | 5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5 | 2 | 4 |
| BE CONSISTENT (5%) | No=0; Yes=5 | Yes | 5 |
| LEVEL OF COORDINATION & FUNDING NEEDED (5%) | LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required). | medium | 2.5 |

**TOTAL** 100

---

¹Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
²Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
³Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### Edgewood: 5th/3rd & Subway Right In/Outs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; - 25,800 = 2.5; 25,801 - 29,000 = 5; 29,000+ = 10</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>Intersections: 0.5&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; - 5.0 = 2.5; 5.1 - 10.0 = 5; 10.1+ = 10</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-blocks: 4.8&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; - 10.0 = 2.5; 10.1 - 15.0 = 5; 15.0+ = 10</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00 = 2.5; 85:01+ = 5</td>
<td>79:46:00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

<sup>2</sup>Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

<sup>3</sup>Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix - Edgewood: Edgewood Rd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td>20,800-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2. Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3. Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Edgewood: Thornton Driveway Closure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td><img src="total-average-adt-for-all-35-priorities" alt="20,800-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10" /></td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td><img src="existing-crash-rate-accidents-million-vehicles-for-2001-03-source-dixie-highway-corridor-study-june-2005" alt="intersections: 0.57^2-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10" /></td>
<td><img src="projected-crash-rate-percentage-change-in-accidents-mvmt" alt="mid-blocks: 4.84^2-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10" /></td>
<td>19.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td><img src="existing-level-of-service-los-is-d-e-or-f" alt="D=5; E=10; F=15" /></td>
<td><img src="projected-2-way-n-s-daily-vehicle-hours-saved-hours-minutes" alt="0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5" /></td>
<td>79:46:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</td>
<td><img src="presence-of-tank-bus-stop-pull-out" alt="No=0; Yes=5" /></td>
<td><img src="level-of-impact-on-improving-future-pedestrian-activity" alt="low=0; medium=2.5; high=5" /></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td><img src="presence-of-a-known-existing-or-future-major-development" alt="No=0; Yes=5" /></td>
<td><img src="level-of-impact-on-improving-opportunities-for-redevelopment" alt="low=0; medium=2.5; high=5" /></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td><img src="level-of-priority-as-ranked-by-local-community" alt="5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5" /></td>
<td><img src="average-level-of-priority-as-ranked-by-regional-agencies-kyc-tank" alt="5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5" /></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td><img src="improvement-is-consistent-with-previous-study-plan-community-vision-document" alt="No=0; Yes=5" /></td>
<td><img src="size-of-project-as-it-is-impacted-by-agencies-and-funding" alt="low=0" /></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td><img src="size-of-project-as-it-is-impacted-by-agencies-and-funding" alt="LOW=0 (single-city-property-project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some-agency-owner-partnering-required); HIGH=5 (multiple-agencies-and-large-$$$-required)" /></td>
<td><img src="size-of-project-as-it-is-impacted-by-agencies-and-funding" alt="low=0" /></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

| | 100 | 42 |

1Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix - continued

### Criteria Categories (Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Categories</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%=10</td>
<td>-16.47%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>79:46:00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC; TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 100 26

---

<sup>1</sup>Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

<sup>2</sup>Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

<sup>3</sup>Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td>20,800²-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td>Intersections: 0.57⁻⁵.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-blocks: 4.84⁻¹₀.0=2.5; 10.1⁻₁₅.₀=5; 15.₀+=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0⁻⁸.₀%=2.5; 8.₁₋₁₆%=5; 1₆⁺%=10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)</td>
<td>0⁻₂₅:₀₀=0; 25:₀₁⁻₈₅:₀₀=2.5; 85:₀₁+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
²Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
³Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Erlanger/Elsmere: Garvey/McAlpin Intersection Realignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point System</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+%=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0:25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### Criteria Categories

**HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)**
- Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.

**IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)**
- Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).
- Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)

**IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)**
- Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is "D," E," or "F."
- Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)

**PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)**
- Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.
- Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)

**ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)**
- Presence of a known existing or future "major development."
- Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.

**HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)**
- Level of priority as ranked by local community.
- Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).

**BE CONSISTENT (5%)**
- Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.

**LEVEL OF COORDINATION & FUNDING NEEDED (5%)**
- Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.

### Point System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800(^2)=2.5; 25,801-29,000(^3)=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57(^4)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.1+=10</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84(^5)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>B/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</td>
<td>0-25.00=0; 25.01-85.00=2.5; 85.01+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### CRITERIA CATEGORIES

**Have Broad Impact (10%)**  
- Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.

**Improve Safety (20%)**  
- Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2006).
- Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)

**Improve System Operations, Travel Time, Reduce Congestion, Improve Roadway Connectivity (30%)**  
- Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is "D," "E," or "F."
- Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)

**Promote Intermodal/Multi-Modal Usage (10%)**  
- Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.
- Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)

**Encourage Economic Vitality (10%)**  
- Presence of a known existing or future "major development."
- Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.

**Have Public Support (10%)**  
- Level of priority as ranked by local community.
- Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).

**Be Consistent (5%)**  
- Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.

**Level of Coordination & Funding Needed (5%)**  
- Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.

---

### Point System Data Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Categories</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2006).</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is "D," "E," or "F."
| Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes). |      | 227:49:00 |
| PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%) |      | 5 |
| Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc. |      | Yes 5 |
| Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5) |      | medium 2.5 |
| ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)         |      | 0 |
| Presence of a known existing or future "major development."
| Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment. |      | low 0 |
| HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)                 |      | 4 |
| Level of priority as ranked by local community. |      | 2 |
| Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK). |      | 0 |
| BE CONSISTENT (5%)                        |      | 5 |
| Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document. |      | Yes |
| LEVEL OF COORDINATION & FUNDING NEEDED (5%) |      | 5 |
| Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding. |      | high |

---

### TOTAL

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2 Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3 Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### Elsmere: Paul Wright TV Driveway Closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800(^2)=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>intersections: 0.57(^3)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84(^3)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>Proj 2-way (N/S). Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>B/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected 2-way (N/S). Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix - continued

**Elsmere: Pasquales Driveway Closure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th></th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.1+=10</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+=10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2. Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3. Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
### Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Elsmere: Vine Street Closure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>(Weight/Value of each criteria out of possible 100%. If more than one subcategory, % is equally distributed.)</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800^1^-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>- Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57^-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%=10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>- Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Projected 2-way (N/S). Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)</td>
<td>0-25.00=0; 25.01-85.00=2.5; 85.01+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>- Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>- Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 100 | 28.5 |

---

1Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Elsmere: Eastern & Park Aves. Driveway Closure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Elsmere: Eastern &amp; Park Aves. Driveway Closure</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2 Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3 Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Florence: Chinese Restaurant Driveway Closure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800¹-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>intersections: 0.57³-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.8³-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%+=10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes)</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

²Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

³Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### Florence: Driveway Consolidation/Shared Access Marshall Dodge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800 - 25,800 = 2.5; 25,801 - 29,000 = 5; 29,001+ = 10</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57 - 5.0 = 2.5; 5.1 - 10.0 = 5; 10.0+ = 10</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0 - 8.0% = 2.5; 8.1 - 16% = 5; 16+% = 10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D = 5; E = 10; F = 15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0 - 25:00 = 0; 25:01 - 85:00 = 2.5; 85:01+ = 5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No = 0; Yes = 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low = 0; medium = 2.5; high = 5</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No = 0; Yes = 5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low = 0; medium = 2.5; high = 5</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th = 1; 4th = 2; 3rd = 3; 2nd = 4; 1st = 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th = 1; 4th = 2; 3rd = 3; 2nd = 4; 1st = 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No = 0; Yes = 5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW = 0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM = 2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH = 5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
2 Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
3 Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,800^1^-25,800=2.5; 25,801^-29,000=5; 29,000+=10 25,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intersections: 0.57^2^-5.0=2.5; 5.1^-10.0=5; 10.0+=10 2.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.84^3^-10.0=2.5; 10.1^-15.0=5; 15.0+=10 2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0^-8.0 %=2.5; 8.1^-16 %=5; 16%+=10 -3.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01^-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5 227:49:00 A/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5  medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5 medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5  No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5 medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5  No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required) low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL  100

---

^1 Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

^2 Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

^3 Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

### Florence: Taco Bell / Turfway Commercial Center Entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td>20,800&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>intersections: 0.57&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10 mid-blocks: 4.84&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16+=10</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.
<sup>2</sup>Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
<sup>3</sup>Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
## Priority Evaluation Matrix

**Florence: McDonald's**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Point System</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Score (points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE BROAD IMPACT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>20,800(^1)-25,800=2.5; 25,801-29,000=5; 29,000+=10</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (vehicles/transit riders) impacted by improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SAFETY (20%)</strong></td>
<td>intersections: 0.5(^1)-5.0=2.5; 5.1-10.0=5; 10.0+=10</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing crash rate (accidents/million vehicles for 2001-03). Source: Dixie Highway Corridor Study (June 2005).</td>
<td>mid-blocks: 4.8(^1)-10.0=2.5; 10.1-15.0=5; 15.0+=10</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected crash rate (percentage of change in accidents/MVMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE SYSTEM OPERATIONS, TRAVEL TIME, REDUCE CONGESTION, IMPROVE ROADWAY CONNECTIVITY (30%)</strong></td>
<td>0-8.0%=2.5; 8.1-16%=5; 16%=10</td>
<td>0-25:00=0; 25:01-85:00=2.5; 85:01+=5</td>
<td>227:49:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (peak am/pm) Level of Service (LOS) is &quot;D,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; or &quot;F.&quot;</td>
<td>D=5; E=10; F=15</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2-way (N/S), Daily Vehicle Hours Saved (hours:minutes).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTE INTERMODAL/MULTI-MODAL USAGE (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TANK bus stop, pull-out, etc.</td>
<td>Level of impact on improving future pedestrian activity (i.e.: closure of 1 driveway = 2.5)</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE ECONOMIC VITALITY (10%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a known existing or future &quot;major development.&quot;</td>
<td>Level of impact on improving opportunities for redevelopment.</td>
<td>low=0; medium=2.5; high=5</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAVE PUBLIC SUPPORT (10%)</strong></td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of priority as ranked by local community.</td>
<td>Average level of priority as ranked by regional agencies (KYTC, TANK).</td>
<td>5th=1; 4th=2; 3rd=3; 2nd=4; 1st=5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE CONSISTENT (5%)</strong></td>
<td>No=0; Yes=5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement is consistent with previous study, plan, or community vision document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF COORDINATION &amp; FUNDING NEEDED (5%)</strong></td>
<td>LOW=0 (single city/property project); MEDIUM=2.5 (some agency/owner partnering required); HIGH=5 (multiple agencies and large $$$ required).</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of project as it is impacted by agencies and funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Total Average ADT for all 35 priorities.

\(^2\)Average Intersection Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.

\(^3\)Average Mid-Block Accident Rate for Commonwealth of Kentucky.
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Dixie Fix
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APPENDIX 8-1
Sample Ordinance

AN ORDINANCE
RELATING TO DIXIE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC MOVEMENT, TRAFFIC SAFETY
AND ACCESS FOR THE CITY OF ______________________

WHEREAS, Dixie Highway has become a significant arterial highway, carrying large
amounts of traffic, providing various land uses which supply important residential,
commercial and other needs throughout its corridor;

WHEREAS, the Ohio Kentucky Indiana Regional Council of Governments, TEC
Engineers and the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission have conducted a
lengthy two part study have solicited and compiled input from the general public and city
officials, and other professionals;

WHEREAS, development in Kenton and Boone Counties have increased the traffic flow
and has created documented dangerous conditions;

WHEREAS, the Dixie Highway acts as an alternative route to large amounts of traffic
when nearby Interstate 71/75 and I-275 experience accidents or congestion,

WHEREAS, the City of ______________________ desires to increase traffic safety, improve
traffic flow, provide access to adjacent development and provide access to pedestrians
and citizens wishing to utilize other modes of transportation such as bikes, buses and
other means under the powers granted to the City of ______________________ by the
Constitution of the United States and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, including the
police power;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF
____________________,

Section 1- It is therefore the intent of this Council to increase traffic safety, improve
traffic flow, provide access to adjacent development and provide access to pedestrians
and citizens wishing to utilize other modes of transportation such as bikes, buses and
other means within its boundaries.

Section 2- The Council hereby adopts the Dixie Highway Corridor Access Management
Redevelopment Plan (herein referred to as the Plan, which consists of this Ordinance, and
the map, marked as Exhibit “A”, which is attached and hereto incorporated herein by
reference.

Section 3- No permits shall be issued, no plans shall be approved, no access shall be
allowed by any agency, department, employee, or other agent or servant of the City of
____________________ except in conformance of this plan. Only slight changes in location of
up to _______ feet will be permitted to allow for engineering considerations.

Section 4- (Optional) All access roads which are indicated on this plan and not yet
constructed shall be dedicated to public use by the owner/developer and it shall be the
policy of the City of ______________________ that owners of existing access roads which have
already been constructed to offer them for dedication to this government.

Sections 5- That the following road improvements, as shown on Exhibit ___ (the Plan)
Shall be _________ (signalized) (improved) etc.

   a. List
   b. List

Section 6- That the Right-in/ Right-out (or ______) access points, shown on Exhibit A ,
shall be constructed by the owner/developer when the property is redeveloped.

   a. List
   b. List

Section 7- At such time a property is being redeveloped, subdivided or the
owner/developer is applying for permit which involves the addition of more than 100
square feet or 25% of the total building size, the plan recommendations for that property
shall be enforced by the City of ______________________ or its agent, and constructed by the
owner/developer. In the event that it is impractical to construct improvements at the time
of redevelopment the owner/developer shall enter into an agreement to insure future
compliance.

Section 8- The mayor is authorized by the city government and directed by the City
Council to request assistance from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, including but not
limited to Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and the Federal Highway Administration
funding to implement this plan.

Section 9- This ordinance shall become effective on the date of its passage.

Mayor
I. PARTIES – This agreement is made between the City (s) of ____________ (the Cities), the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (the Cabinet), the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI) as the designated metropolitan planning organization for the northern Kentucky Counties of Boone, Kenton and Campbell under federal transportation regulations (the MPO), the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission (NKAPC), the Kenton County Planning Commission and the Boone County Planning Commission (the Planning Commissions).

II. ROUTE – This access management agreement pertains to US Routes 25, 42 and 127, also known as Dixie Highway, from Turfway Road in Florence to Main Street in Covington (the Roadway).

III. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE – Dixie Highway is a major arterial identified in the comprehensive plans for both Boone and Kenton Counties and serves as an intra-regional arterial roadway connecting the Cities to their economic region. The primary purpose for this agreement is to protect the capacity of the roadway to carry significant local and intra-regional traffic. The secondary purpose is to increase the safety for drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists that use this facility. It is the intent of this agreement to provide access to abutting properties consistent with the primary and secondary objectives.

IV. AUTHORITY – Both the Cities and the Cabinet have specific legal authority to regulate access to public roads. In the case of the Cities, it is found Kentucky Revises Statutes, Chapter 100, wherein authority is given to manage and control land use. In the case of the Cabinet, authority is granted through several of the Kentucky Revises Statutes and provisions found in the Kentucky Administrative Regulations. For reference the most pertinent for the Cabinet are: KRS.

V. ACCESS PLAN – Management of access to the roadway is necessary to achieve the purpose of the Dixie Highway Corridor Access Management Redevelopment Plan, known as the “Dixie Fix” (the Plan). The Plan identifies a variety of methods to improve access along Dixie Highway. Standards for driveways are established to be applied during plat review prior to development approval by each City. In addition, local street networks, property interconnect agreements and requirements, new local roadways developed as part of this project and land use and zoning plans that are necessary to achieve the objectives of this agreement are specified in this Specific Plan. The Plan for Segment II is a General Access management Plan which specifies the typical roadway cross-section, right-of-way requirements, the location of median breaks and standards for location and construction of driveways.

VI. AGREEMENT ADOPTION/TERMINATION/MODIFICATION – This agreement will be deemed adopted when passed in identical form by the Conway City Council, the Metroplan Board of Directors and the Arkansas State Highway Commission and signed by their proper representatives. This agreement may be terminated or modified, in whole or in part only by mutual agreement of all of the parties as evidenced by resolutions adopted by each governing body.

VII. PLAN ADMINISTRATION –

A. Permit Application. A permit issued by the Department will be required for new driveway access to the Roadway. Any legal person owning property abutting the Roadway may request a driveway access permit. The permit will be requested through a designated administrative process from the City of Conway. The applicant is required to submit a detailed plan for the driveway including a map showing its exact location and a design that shows the curb radii, driveway throat length and that specifies the projected volume of turns in and out of the driveway. Any joint access agreements with other property owners should also be submitted.

After review of the application, the City determines whether the request is within the allowable parameters established by the Plan. Then, the City communicates the request to the MPO for review and approval. Upon MPO approval, the City will submit the application to the Department for review and approval. If the City and the MPO have approved the application as evidenced by the signatures of properly designated administrative representatives and if the application meets all Department criteria for issuance of such a permit, the Department will issue a permit to the applicant. If the signatures of any of the parties to this agreement are missing from the permit application, the Department will not issue a permit.

If any of the parties determine that the request is not within the allowable parameters of the Plan, that party will deny the request and instruct the applicant how they may amend the request to receive approval or that they may seek to amend the Plan pursuant to the following section.

B. Amending the Plan.

A Plan amendment will be considered at the request of any of the parties to this agreement or at the request of an applicant whose permit request has been denied by any of the parties.

The proposed amendment must be adopted in identical form by the Conway City Council, the Metroplan Board of Directors and the Arkansas State Highway Commission to become effective.
Pursuant to Resolution/Ordinance No. ______ of the ______ City Council approved on the _____ day of ________, ______

______________, Mayor

(ADD OTHER CITIES AS NECESSARY)

Pursuant to Resolution No. ______ of the Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission approved on the _____ day of ________, ______

_____________________, Chairman

Pursuant to Resolution No______ of the Boone County Planning Commission approved on the _____ day of ________, ______

_____________________, Chairman


Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
APPENDIX 8-3
Flexible Funding For Transit and Highway Improvements

FLEXIBLE FUNDING FOR TRANSIT AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

ELIGIBILITY

Many Federal and highway programs have specific eligible transit activities identified in the legislation. In addition, funds from other programs that do not have specific transit eligibility may be transferred to the states under the authority of flexible funding provisions of 23 U.S.C. § 136(a) to other Federal and State highway programs that do have such eligibility. If funds are transferred from one Federal and highway program to another, those funds also have the same eligibility as the program that they are transferred to. For example, Interstate Maintenance (IM) funds transferred to the Surface Transportation Program (STP) would have the same eligibility as STP funds. The table in Attachment 2 shows which Federal and highway programs have eligible transit activities and those programs that do not, but where funds may be transferred to another program that does have such eligibility. The table also lists Federal transit programs that may be used for highway-related activities.

In addition to the projects eligible identified in Attachment 2, there are other projects that support both transit and highway systems, under direct or indirect Federal and State transportation planning processes must be met for flexible funded projects, including project selection requirements.

INTERAGENCY TRANSFERS

Under the transfer provisions, in 23 U.S.C. § 136(b), section 1203, Urbanized Area Formula Grant funds made available for a highway project must be transferred to the FHA for administration under the provisions of 23 U.S.C. § 136(b).

Under the transfer provision, it is intended under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), the NCLC funds made available for transit projects could be transferred to the FHA for administration under the provisions of 23 U.S.C. § 136(b) and 23 U.S.C. § 136(c). However, under current transfer provisions, 23 U.S.C. § 136(a)(4), the State may request transfer of the funds under title 23 U.S.C. § 136(a)(4) is transferred.

Following are a few important points to keep in mind when considering interagency transfers:

1. Funds transferred to FHA from the NCLC can be used only for purposes eligible under the original program that the funds are transferred from.

2. Funds that are transferred from FHA to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) must be administered under the requirements of the Chapter 35 of Title 23, U.S.C., and funds transferred from FHA to the NCLC must be administered under the requirements of Title 23, U.S.C., except that the non-Federal share for original surface in the funding applies to the transferred funds (see 23 U.S.C. § 136(a)) and 49 U.S.C. § 5354(b)(1).

3. For transit capital projects funded with National Highway System (NHS) funds under 23 U.S.C. § 136(b)(6) of Title 23, U.S.C., 1203(b)(2), applicable Chapter 35 statutory requirements (e.g., Project Protective Arrangements (PRA), Charter bus transportation services (49 U.S.C. § 5323(d)), etc.) must be complied with even if the funds are transferred to the FHA for administration under Chapter 35. If the funds will be administered by the FHA for such capital projects, the FHA should work with the FHWA Regional Office to determine which Chapter 35 provisions apply and how.

4. To transfer funds from FHA to NCLC, the State transportation department must request that the funds be transferred, with the concurrence of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) of the project is within a metropolitan planning area, in a letter to the FHWA Division Office.

5. In a Transportation Management Area (TMA), the MPO may elect to transfer portions of its Title 23 funds that cannot be used for operating assistance to FHWA for highway projects subject to the requirements of 49 U.S.C. § 5307(b)(2).

6. To transfer under Title 23, U.S.C. § 5307 funds from the FHA to the NCLC, the MPO must submit a request to the FHA Division Office with a certification that ADA and other Federal transit needs have been met, that there are no reasonable opportunities for conformance and that it has been determined by the FHA or the MPO that there are no funds available for the purpose of the transfer.

7. Federal funds are transferred only for projects contained in an approved metropolitan transportation improvement program (MTIP) and state-wide transportation improvement program (STIP).
## Flexible Funding For Transit and Highway Improvements - continued

### FHWA and FTA Funds That May be Used for Either Highway or Transit Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Purpose</th>
<th>Eligible Transit Activities</th>
<th>Transfer Among Title 23 Programs</th>
<th>Intrastate Transfer Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning (PLP) (23 U.S.C. 404)(b)</td>
<td>To carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>May be transferred to FTA at the request of the State DOT to be combined with 23 U.S.C. 305 (b) metropolitan planning funds in a consolidated planning grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Planning Research (SPR) (23 U.S.C. 303)</td>
<td>49 U.S.C. 5108; statewide transportation planning processes; public transportation management systems under 23 U.S.C. 303.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SPR funds for planning may be transferred to FTA at the request of the State DOT to be combined with 49 U.S.C. 5108; statewide planning funds in a consolidated planning grant. The 25% of SPR funds that can be used for R&amp;D may not be transferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System (NHS) (23 U.S.C. 401)</td>
<td>Improvements to roads and facilities that are part of the NHS or that have Intermodal connections.</td>
<td>Travels improvements within a NHS corridor, subject to statutory conditions set in 23 U.S.C. 100 (306(c)); transportation planning in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134 &amp; 135; large scale public purposes; major public purposes; public transportation management systems under 23 U.S.C. 303; publicly owned structure and intercity bus terminals.</td>
<td>Up to 50% of funds may be transferred to CMAQ, STP, IJTP, HSIP, RTRP, and/or HBRP. May be administered by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for transportation projects eligible for NHS funds under 23 U.S.C. 103(b), 104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity bonus (ESB) (23 U.S.C. 105)(a)</td>
<td>Same as STP.</td>
<td>Same as STP.</td>
<td>Same as STP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, technology, rehabilitation, and reconstruction measures at the interstate system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must first be transferred to another 23 U.S.C. program that has their eligibility before the funds may be transferred to FTA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Surface Transportation Program (STP) (23 U.S.C. 153)

- Capital costs of new projects that are eligible under Ch. 53 of 23 U.S.C., including vehicles and facilities, publicly or privately owned, that are used to provide public transportation service, capital projects and bridge & corridor rehabilitation facilities, transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, transit research, development, and technology transfer, surface transportation planning programs, public transportation management systems under 23 U.S.C. 172.

### Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE) (23 U.S.C. 134(d))

- Although not specifically mentioned in the list of 13 eligible TE activities, some of the eligible TE activities benefit transit.

### Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (BRP, 23 U.S.C. 154)

- No direct transit uses.

- Up to 50% of funds may be transferred to the FHWA for transit projects under 23 U.S.C. 154.

- Must be transferred to another 23 U.S.C. program that has transit eligibility before the funds may be transferred to FHWA.
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**Construction of Ferry Dock & Ferry Terminal Facilities (23 U.S.C. 405)**

- May be accomplished by FHWA or may be transferred to FTA for transit projects eligible under 23 U.S.C. 149.

**Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) (23 U.S.C. 409)**

- Up to 20% of HSIP funds must be transferred to another 23 U.S.C. 409 program that has transit eligibility before the funds may be transferred to NHI, CIPQ, STIP, JIB, RTP, and all related programs.

**Competitive Migration and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. 409)**

- Funds may be used to support construction and maintenance of bus and rail facilities, and other measures to reduce transportation-related emissions.

- Funds may only be used for new or expanded public transportation services and facilities.

- Funds may only be used to support innovative projects that reduce transportation-related emissions.

- Projects must be approved by the CMAQ program.
### Flexible Funding For Transit and Highway Improvements - continued

#### Federal Lands Highway Program (FLHP) 23 U.S.C. 456

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flexible funding for road projects on federal lands, including national parks, national forests, and Indian reservations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intrastate Toll Program (ITP) 23 U.S.C. 304

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No intrastate tolls may be transferred to U.S. CMQs, STPs, HSMRs, or HSRRP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comprehensive Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (CTCP) 23 U.S.C. Sec. 133 (formerly RTA-28 Sec. 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transportation projects that meet the purpose of the CTCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eligibility criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) 23 U.S.C. 409

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highways and transportation improvement projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) 23 U.S.C. 409

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety improvements on highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- May be used for urban facilities under certain circumstances. Note: Any federal funds transferred to FHWA may be used for urban facilities under certain circumstances. Federal funds are subject to the approval of the Secretary of Transportation. Note: Any federal funds transferred to FHWA may be used for urban facilities under certain circumstances.
## APPENDIX 8-3 continued

**Flexible Funding For Transit and Highway Improvements - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Transit Administration Programs</th>
<th>Eligible Highway Categories</th>
<th>Transfer Among Title-49 Programs</th>
<th>Interagency Transfer Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Program (MPP) (49 U.S.C. §5304)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>May be transferred to FHWA if in the interest of the State DOT to be used with Title-49 U.S.C. 5303 metropolitan planning funds as a consolidated planning grant. FHWA matching funds may be used for MPP funds in a consolidated planning grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Planning &amp; Research (SPR) (49 U.S.C. §5306)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SPR funds for state planning may be transferred to FHWA if in the interest of the State DOT to be used with Title-49 U.S.C. 5303 statewide planning funds as a consolidated planning grant. FHWA matching funds may be used for SPR funds in a consolidated planning grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Area Formula Grants (Section 5307)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FTA funds may be transferred to FHWA if they are to be used for highway purposes. Only funds in areas of 100,000 or more with populations of 50,000 or more may be transferred to the Transportation Development Area Formula Grants Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Not all funds may be transferred to FHWA.*
### APPENDIX 8-3 continued

**Flexible Funding For Transit and Highway Improvements - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program / Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Funding For Transit and Highway Improvements</td>
<td>Continued construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities. Transportation projects for pedestrian and bicycle use do not have to be within the right-of-way of a Federal-aid highway, but must demonstrate an air quality benefit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal Lands Highway Program (940) (2010-2012)**
- Constructed using Federal-aid highway funds, located in 25 coastal states and territories.
- Indian Reservations, Hawaii, and Alaska.
- Public Lands Highways - Unconnected to Federal Highways
- Primary & Park Roads

**National Trails Program (900)**
- Develops and maintains recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both recreation and educational and interpretive traveler use.
- Non-coastal or interior use, multi-use recreational trails. Eligible categories are trail maintenance and rehabilitation, trailhead or trailside facilities, construction and installation of trail equipment, trail construction, trail assessments, and trail safety and environmental protection education.

- Includes pedestrian and bicycle projects from several TASP goals.
- Eligible for the TASP program, if included in a TASP project.

**Coastal Road Infrastructure Program (CFDA Section 149)**
- To improve the safety of coastal communities, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and projects to improve the safety of coastal roads.

**Canadian Border Infrastructure Program (CFDA Section 148)**
- To improve the safety of coastal communities, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and projects to improve the safety of coastal roads.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (T CSP) (Sub Sec. 1178 formerly T64-21 Sec 123b)</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle projects meet several TCSP goals and are generally eligible for the TCSP program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Border Infrastructure Program (O BIP) Sub Section 2006</td>
<td>- improve the condition of existing bridges across the international border between the United States and Canada and the border between the United States and Mexico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Lands Highway Program (FLHP) (33 USC 690)</td>
<td>Construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, construction projects for \non-motorized use. Projects do not have to be within the right-of-way of a Federal-aid highway, but must demonstrate an air quality benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service Roads (NPSR)</td>
<td>Construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indian Reservation Roads (IR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public Lands Highway - Unnecessary at Forest Hayways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parkways at Park Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Refuge Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flexible Funding For Transit and Highway Improvements - continued

Eligible Infrastructure Projects are planning, design, and construction of infrastructure related projects that substantially improve the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school, including:

- pedestrian improvements,
- traffic calming and speed reduction improvements,
- pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements,
- cross street facilities,
- off-street bike and pedestrian facilities,
- accessible bicycle parking facilities, and
- traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools.

Eligible Non-Infrastructure activities to encourage walking and bicycling to school include:

- public education campaigns and outreach to parents and community leaders,
- traffic education and awareness in the vicinity of schools,
- student access to bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment, and
- funding for training volunteers and managers of bike routes to school programs.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Primary Purpose</th>
<th>Eligible Pedestrian and Bicycle Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Program (MPP) (49 USC 5304)</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian planning as part of the metropolitan planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Planning and Development Program (IPDP) (49 USC 5304)</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian planning as part of the statewide planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area Formula Grants (49 USC 5310)</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian access to transit facilities and vehicles, including bike stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area Formula Grants Transportation Enhancement Set-Aside (49 USC 5307)</td>
<td>Transportation enhancement activities, including bike lanes and bicycle storage facilities, and installing equipment to transport bicycles on mass transportation vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Transportation for Parks and Public Lands (49 USC 5313)</td>
<td>Definition of “Alternative Transportation” includes “a nonmotorized transportation system, including the provision of facilities for pedestrians, bicycles, and nonmotorized watercraft.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Call for 2007 CMAQ Projects for Boone, Campbell and Kenton counties
Kentucky

OKI serves as a clearinghouse for the program which is administered by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC). OKI will process the applications, estimate emission benefits, prioritize the projects and forward to KYTC. Projects will be prioritized based on estimated reductions in ozone precursor and fine particulate emissions. Estimated reductions are based on projected reductions in vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled or vehicle emissions. Projects that are not consistent with OKI’s 2030 Regional Transportation Plan will not be prioritized.

Completed applications in electronic format are due to OKI by November 8, 2005.

Examples of projects that have received past approval include additional turn lanes at congested intersections, park-and-ride lots, projects that increase use of bicycles and walking as alternative modes of travel, and new express bus service. For a complete explanation of eligible congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) projects please visit the KYTC website:

http://transportation.ky.gov/Multimodal/Air_Quality.asp

For additional assistance and an electronic application, contact:

Andy Reser
OKI Regional Council of Governments
720 East Pete Rose Way, Suite 420
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
areser@oki.org
513-621-6300

APPENDIX 8-4
Sample CMAQ Application

CMAQ FUNDING APPLICATION
Federal Fiscal Year 2006-2007

Applications should be submitted to the local MPO, with copy to Jesse.Mayes@mail.state.ky.us

Applicant Name and Address

Contact Name: 
Email address: 
Phone Number: 

Project Title

Specific Location of Project

Non-attainment/Maintenance Area & County(s) in which project will occur

Has this project been through the MPO process? Yes  No 
If No, please check the years that it received CMAQ funds.
     Yes  2003-2004
     Yes  2004-2005
     Yes  2005-2006
     Other: _________________________________

Please indicate the date of MPO approval:

Type of Eligible CMAQ Activity or Project (see April, 1999 CMAQ Program Guidance pages 10-20)

Projected Start Date of Project

Projected Finish Date of Project

Total Project Cost CMAQ $ Requested Local Match $ Local Match %

Local Agency Match Source

Detailed Project Description and Justification.

Cost Breakdown (Operations and Maintenance, Direct Cost, Indirect Cost, Capital Equipment): Provide an itemized description of your cost estimates below. They should identify specific work to be done on the project. If Match funding is to be provided in any form other than cash payment provide a detailed description of the source and proof of availability.

Future Funding – Please describe how this project will be funded after it is no longer eligible for CMAQ funds.

Descriptions of Emissions Reductions (Calculations/Methodology) – Please include full calculations. (MPO will complete)

NOTE: If this project does not lend itself to quantitative analysis of air quality impacts (public education, marketing and promotional outreach efforts) please include a qualitative analysis of how the project will decrease emissions and contribute to attainment or maintenance of NAAQS. If it falls into this category. Please include assumptions made.

Regional NOx Reduction (lbs/day)
Regional VOC Reduction (lbs/day)
Regional CO Reduction (lbs/day)

Please Do Not Write In This Space
APPENDIX 8-5
Funding Application and Instructions for OKI-Allocated SNK Funds (Kentucky Projects)

FUNDING APPLICATION AND
INSTRUCTIONS FOR OKI-ALLOCATED
SNK FUNDS
(KENTUCKY PROJECTS)

www.oki.org

Adopted - January 10, 2006
Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide information about the process used by the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI) to prioritize and award OKI sub-allocated Federal Surface Transportation Program Funds for Northern Kentucky (SNK), from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), to projects with merit that further the goals of the continuing, coordinated and comprehensive nature of transportation planning towards implementation. This process discusses only awards over which OKI has direct ability and duty to make in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This packet also includes the application and guidance for applicants.

This document is divided into four sections:

- Prioritization Process - the formal description of the OKI Board-adopted procedure
- Goals and Objectives - as stated in OKI’s Long Range Plan
- Guidance for Applicants - explanation of overall process details and description of factors and measures used in project scoring
- Project Scoring Process - the listing of factors, measures and points

The Application Form, to be used by the applicant in providing pertinent information on the project, is attached at the end of this document.
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OKI receives an annual sub-allocation of federal Surface Transportation Program Funds for Northern Kentucky (SNK) from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. The OKI Board of Trustees has established the following process for soliciting, reviewing and ranking transportation projects funded with OKI sub-allocated SNK funds. The Prioritization Subcommittee, a subcommittee of the OKI Intermodal Coordinating Committee (ICC), reviews and revises the scoring process for SNK applications on an “as needed” basis and makes recommendations to the ICC. The ICC, which approves the scoring process, adopted the current scoring process for SNK Funds on January 10, 2006.

1. Establish a project solicitation period based on a TIP/STIP development schedule developed by KYTC.

2. Advertise the project solicitation period via newspapers, website, flyers, etc.

3. Hold a workshop for prospective applicants to inform them of the application process, deadlines and scoring procedures developed by the OKI Prioritization Subcommittee.

4. Accept completed applications until the advertised deadline. At this point, the project request is fixed—no changes in cost, scope or other aspect will be allowed. The only exception to this requirement will be if non-OKI funding becomes unavailable to the applicant and the project cost must be reduced.

5. Hold Priority Subcommittee Review Meetings. These meetings allow for discussion of individual highway and transit projects by the subcommittee and the eventual ranking of projects funded with OKI sub-allocated SNK funds. The ranking of projects is based on the ICC adopted scoring process shown later in this document.

The following funding limitations will be applied to each transportation project requesting OKI-allocated STP or CM/AQ funding.

1. Funding will be provided at the amount shown on each application. Applicants should make sure their request is sufficient to cover the cost of the activities shown in their application. However, given that unforeseen circumstances may occur, a one-time allowance of ten (10) percent above the funding amount may be granted if OKI has sufficient funds to cover the additional amount needed. Applicants should contact OKI as soon as the additional funding is needed as this ten percent “cushion” is not guaranteed.

2. Design (D), Utilities (U), Right-of-Way (ROW) and Construction (CON) phases are eligible for funding. Projects requesting SNK funds for the design, utilities and/or right-of-way phases must demonstrate the probability of obtaining construction funds in the future.

3. The standard local match requirement for SNK funded projects is 20%. Applicants may commit a higher percentage of non-federal match to gain additional scoring as shown in the Planning Factors section of the ICC adopted scoring process.

4. Applicants planning to use state funds as match MUST have prior approval from KYTC before applying. In addition, projects requesting state funds as match for capacity-adding projects (widening projects) MUST be listed in the Six-Year plan and the OKI 2030 Long Range Plan.

5. Applicants must provide a certified or otherwise official cost estimate for each project request.

6. The following scope limitations will apply to each project request:

   • Each applicant is limited to a total of two project applications. One application may request funding for different phases, i.e. an application may request funds for both the utilities and right-of-way phases.
   • Total funding request per application cannot exceed $5,000,000.
   • Projects must be located within the OKI urbanized boundary in Boone, Campbell or Kenton County.
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Since the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the “short-range planning element” of the Long Range Plan (LRP), each highway and transit project contained within the OKI TIP must demonstrate that it conforms to the goals and objectives listed in the OKI LRP. This conformity is achieved through the ICC-adopted scoring process that has taken these goals and objectives into consideration. The following narrative, including the list of goals and objectives, is taken from the OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, 2004 Plan Update (the LRP for the region) that was adopted by the OKI Board of Trustees in June 2004.

Transportation has long been a major contributor to the region’s prosperity and quality of life. For individuals and businesses, the efficiency of the transportation system in moving people and goods has a direct financial impact. From a broader perspective, the transportation system’s efficiency has repercussions for the entire economy.

In the year 2004 and beyond, the transportation system’s efficiency will become increasingly important as prosperity becomes more dependent on regional performance in a global economy. If steps are not taken to improve the region’s transportation system, it will become less efficient as evidenced by more congestion, reduced opportunity for travel by different modes, and poorer connections among modes.

Transportation system inefficiencies could impede economic growth and lower the region’s competitive edge by adding to transportation costs and delays and reducing travel and transport opportunities.

In addition to its economic impacts, transportation also plays an important role in the quality of life. The interstate system, for example, has improved mobility at the same time that it has promoted a population and job shift from core areas to suburbs with significant social, environmental, and economic consequences. Transportation improvements will continue to affect development and travel patterns and opportunities.

The following goals serve to define how to meet this region’s transportation needs both now and in the future. Each goal represents a key issue addressed in this metropolitan transportation plan. Objectives clarify how to achieve the goals.

**Goals for Improving this Region’s Transportation System**

**Goal 1: Improve Travel Safety**

The transportation system should provide for reducing the risk of accidents that cause death or injuries and provide for the security of transportation users.

**Objectives:**
- Reduce the number and severity of traffic accidents.
- Increase security for travel by transit and non-motorized modes.
- Facilitate use of improved design of shared roadways to increase safety for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.

**Goal 2: Improve accessibility and mobility options for people and goods**

To enable people and commodities to have greater accessibility and to be moved with greater speed and safety, major investments are needed to improve the transportation system and reduce congestion. Improvements are needed both for expanding the present system and improving its efficiency. Improvements should be sensitive to differences in development patterns and community needs with special consideration given to safe use of the transportation system by our region’s older population.

**Objectives:**
- Improve the operating efficiency of existing infrastructure.
- Expand transportation infrastructure to provide additional access and capacity for moving people and goods.
- Reduce congestion by expanding alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel and reducing peak hour travel.
- Acknowledge and incorporate the use of non-motorized travel (walking and biking) into the planning process as an alternative mode of travel and connector or modes.
- Facilitate efficient intermodal transfers for both passengers and freight.
- Expand the deployment of intelligent transportation infrastructure such as ARTIMIS.

**Goal 3: Protect and Enhance the Environment**

Air quality is a major environmental issue in the OKI region. Much progress has been made in reducing mobile source emissions, but the impact of travel growth on total emissions could threaten the region’s ability to maintain federal clean air standards. Emission reductions are needed to protect air quality. Strategies that promote the effective and efficient use of land and natural resources would reduce mobile source emissions and would also have a beneficial effect on other environmental issues and quality of life. The transportation system, along with other infrastructure, has a significant impact on future land use. Transportation decisions should be consistent with local land use policies, resulting in travel and land use patterns that promote multimodal alternatives and reduced vehicle trips.

**Objectives:**
- Reduce mobile source emissions.
- Encourage use of alternative fuels by both individuals and vehicle fleet.
- Encourage measures that reduce transportation’s impact on water quality and noise levels.
Goal 4: Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system
A functional transportation system is one that allows people and goods to travel efficiently between their desired destinations.

Objectives:
- Optimize the surface transportation facilities access to airports, transit facilities, park and pool lots and freight intermodal facilities.
- Plan in such a way that the functional design of a roadway is consistent with the intended use of the roadway.

Goal 5: Promote efficient system management and operation
The Congestion Management System (CMS) is a systematic process for managing congestion that provides information on transportation system performance and on alternative strategies for alleviating congestion and enhancing the mobility of persons and goods to levels that meet state and local needs.

Objectives:
- Implement techniques that improve traffic operations including access management techniques that improve mobility and safety.
- Advance the coverage area of intelligent transportation systems.
- Identify and prioritize locations that require system enhancement and/or expansion.
- Identify new or expanded transit services.

Goal 6: Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system
Financial resources are needed to maintain the region’s transportation system and address its deficiencies. In light of limited federal and state resources, there is a real need to generate funds from within the region for transportation improvements. New funding sources are needed, particularly for capital formation, and strategies to use funds prudently.

Objectives:
- Insure adequate funding to preserve and maintain the integrity of the existing transportation infrastructure.
- Initiate efforts to establish a local revenue base to fund transportation system improvements.

Goal 7: Support Economic Vitality
The transportation network can support the economic vitality of the region by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.

Objectives:
- Implement techniques that improve traffic operations and mobility so that travel times are reliable and the cost of doing business in the OKI region is competitive and predictable.
- Increase the coverage area and effectiveness of ARTIMIS so that traveler information is readily available and the impacts of incidents can be minimized.
GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS

The Prioritization Process description is the formal step-by-step process followed in the selection of projects for use of OKI sub-allocated SNK funding in Northern Kentucky. As part of the process, a workshop will be held for potential applicants where OKI staff will provide background and be available to answer specific questions about procedures.

The Goals and Objectives referred to in the Prioritization Process are those that appear in the OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, 2004 Plan Update adopted by the Board of Trustees on June 10, 2004. The initial and final screening of project applications will consider how the proposal relates to those statements.

The Application Form is to be filled out by the applicant. Supplemental information attached to the form should be as condensed as possible, since all applications will be reproduced and provided to Prioritization Subcommittee members. For example, if a feasibility report has been prepared for the proposal, the applicant should excerpt and summarize rather than simply attaching the entire report.

The Project Scoring Process is the method under which the Prioritization Subcommittee reviews and ranks the individual applications. A detailed explanation of the scoring process is listed on pages 13 – 15. An application is first scored using highway or transit factors (Transportation Factors) depending on the type of project. Transportation factors take into account items to be examined during the construction/acquisition phase of a project. A subtotal of 45 points is available with the transportation factors. All projects are then scored on Planning Factors, which are factors that should have been considered during the planning, or development phase, of the project. A subtotal of 50 points is available with the planning factors. Finally, all applications are subjected to a “benefit/cost” evaluation that provides up to ten additional points, resulting in a total possible 105 points.

Transportation Factors for Roadway Projects (See Application Form)

1. The Safety factor measures the existing accident rate per million vehicle miles (MVM) for the project area. Documentation of a serious injury pattern associated with the project area increases the amount of points available.

2. The Project Impact on Safety assesses the impact the proposal will have on the existing situation, ranging from zero to five points. If the project area documents a pattern of serious injury or high level of accidents and the project addresses this situation, a high impact score may be obtainable. However, if the project area exhibits a low accident rate, a low impact may be the only expected benefit for the safety criterion.

3. The Level of Service (LOS) documents the existing congestion in the project area. Levels A through E/F produce scores ranging from one point to five points depending upon the current LOS.

4. The Project Impact on LOS provides points based on how the proposal alleviates the current level of congestion. A high impact score cannot be awarded to a project that does not document an existing problem with LOS.

5. The Average Daily Traffic measures the current traffic volumes in the project area. Volumes from less than 10,000 vehicles per day (VPD) to 25,000 VPD equate to a scoring range of one to five points.

6. The Freight Corridors factor provides points for corridors with a high volume of truck traffic. This figure is based upon the percentage of truck traffic within the project area.

7. The Roadway Classification is directly related to the formal designation of the federal functional classification of the roadway. A roadway must be classified as a collector or “higher” to be eligible for federal funding.

8. The Conformance with Existing Design Standards factor gives preference to projects with infrastructure or conformance conditions that need immediate attention, such as a bridge structure that would otherwise be closed or weight-restricted, affecting the ability of the existing network to move traffic. A range of one to five points may be obtained for the current infrastructure condition.

9. The Status of Project factor awards points for the existing status of the project. If right-of-way and construction plans are complete, the project is ready to begin and will be awarded 5 points. In addition, if the applicant is seeking additional funds for a project already funded with OKI-allocated funds, there may be some points deducted based on the additional percentage of funds requested. For example, if a project is seeking an additional 20% funds from OKI for a previously awarded application, there will not be any points deducted. However, if the application is seeking 70% additional funds for the project, 1 point will be deducted. However, at this point, the construction and right-of-way plans may be complete and the project will end up with 4 points for this criterion (5 points for plans completed minus 1 point for additional request over 50 percent).

Transportation Factors for Transit Projects

10. The Project Impact on Safety and Security factor awards points for the impact the project will have on safety and security. For example, a new bus may be equipped with video and audio equipment to increase security. In addition, the new bus may have additional safety features not found on the bus it is replacing. A high impact will result in five points.

11. The Useful Life of the proposed improvement can produce a score from zero to five points, reflecting the value in funding longer-impact projects. Useful life guidelines for buses are provided by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and will be used to score this criterion for bus replacement. Other types of transit projects will be scored accordingly.

12. The Service Improvements factor awards points for improving the existing transit services being provided. For example, a bus replacement will typically not affect service hours, days or area. One point will be awarded for an improvement to the equipment in service. However, new buses used on a new route will be awarded three points for expansion of service hours, days and area. If the new buses also have bicycle racks, they will receive an additional point for “1 improvement” plus the expansion of service hours, days and area for a total of four points.
13. **System Impact** is another important factor in reviewing transit applications. Up to 5 points will be awarded with this criterion. A new bus garage, for example, would favorably impact the system, but would not affect passengers. A replacement bus would favorably impact the passengers, but not necessarily the system. An impact to the system will generate one point; an impact to passengers only will generate three points. A new transit hub, however, would favorably impact both the system and the passengers and would result in five points.

14. The **Type** factor awards points based on the type of project requesting funding. Replacement of revenue vehicles, for example, scores the highest points (five) and demonstrates the objective of improving the operating efficiency of the existing infrastructure listed in the OKI Long Range Plan.

15. **Time to Implementation** reflects the importance of being able to implement a project in a timely fashion. The factor is based on the time after funding is granted. For example, a project that is approved in fiscal year 2005, but won't begin until 2007 will be awarded five points (0 to 2 years). However, if the project is not planned until 2009, the application will receive four points (3 to 4 years). This criterion may be affected by OKI's ability to fund a project in a given fiscal year.

16. The **Ridership Impact** factor awards points for the project's ability to maintain or increase ridership. Bus replacements, for example, will result in three points since it will maintain the existing ridership. However, a new route or new park-and-ride will be awarded five points since they should result in an increase in ridership.

17. The **Capital Utilization** factor provides points for the item that is being replaced. The FTA guidelines will be used as a reference. For example, a large transit coach generally has a useful life of 12 years and 500,000 miles. If the average of the buses being replaced is 14 years or 650,000 miles (30% above the 500,000 miles), three points will be awarded. New projects, such as a new park-and-ride or new coaches for expansion of service, will not receive any points under this criterion.

18. The **Planning/Forecasting** factor provides points for projects that are listed in an adopted planning document, such as a transit 5-year capital plan, current or past budget, OKI Long Range Plan, etc. Projects listed over a year in an adopted planning document receive 5 points; projects in a plan less than a year receive 3 points; projects not listed in a planning document receive 0 points.

**Planning Factors for All Projects**

19. The **Replacement/Expansion** factor gives preference to projects that invest in replacement rather than new facilities, reflecting the expressed priority in OKI's long range plan to maintain what currently exists before investing in new infrastructure. The points associated with this criterion take into account that some expansion projects involve a certain amount of replacement; the points for this criterion are awarded based on percentage of replacement versus percentage of expansion associated with the project.

20. The **Environmental Justice** factor awards points to projects that have an overall positive impact on minority populations and low-income populations per Executive Order 12898 issued by President Clinton in February 1994. The basis for Environmental Justice is Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC), which will review projects and award points for this factor, also examines a project's impact on zero-car households, elderly persons and persons with disabilities. Even though a project is not located within a designated Environmental Justice community (see attached maps), the factor must be addressed.

21. The **Land Use Conformance** factor examines the degree to which a project helps to implement the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP). The SRPP responds to the Land Use Commission's mission to bring about more consistency between long range transportation planning, a primarily regional process, and land use planning, a primarily local process. Effective land use and transportation decision making at the local level facilitates planning for, and efficient allocation of, scarce transportation funds at the regional and state levels. The optimal plan for the integration of transportation, land use, capital budgeting, and economic development planning and policies is the local government comprehensive plan, as it enables a calculation of the timing, location and costs of development and infrastructure. Accordingly, the SRPP emphasizes complete and current local government comprehensive plans as a means to a more efficient multi-modal regional transportation system.

22. The **Air Quality/Energy** factor relates to continued efforts to improve the regional air quality and encourage investment in more environmentally friendly forms of fuel use. A reduction in VMT (vehicle miles of travel), VHT (vehicle hours of travel), or Emissions Reduced can be combined to receive a score of up to 10 points. If two of the three items are reduced, a score of from 6 to 10 points will be awarded. If only one item is reduced, a score of from 0 to 5 will be awarded. Examples of these measures include installation of a natural gas refueling station (Emissions Reduced), intersection signal improvements (VHT reduced), construction of a new roadway link reducing circuitous travel (VMT reduced), or a new compressed natural gas bus on a new route (all three).

23. The **Local Share** factor rewards applicants that increase their local share to "overmatch" the required rate for local participation. The standard match rate for OKI-allocated funds is 20 percent; however, the applicant can gain up to a maximum of 10 points through overmatching.

24. The **Travel Modes Improved** factor provides points for accommodating existing modes of travel and additional points for introducing new modes of travel through the project. For example, if a highway project maintains vehicular traffic and sidewalks, and introduces a new bikeway, the project would score 3 points (2 points for 2 modes accommodated and 1 point for new mode introduced). Another example would be the creation of a park-and-ride facility that accommodates the existing vehicular and pedestrian traffic and introduces new transit service. This project would also score 3 points (2 points for 2 modes accommodated and 1 point for new mode introduced).

25. The **Intermodal Connectivity** factor provides points for projects that maintain or create new connections to various transportation modes/systems. If a project maintains the existing modes of travel, it would receive 3 points. However, if a project creates new connections, such as the new park-and-ride listed above, it will receive 5 points.

26. The **Existing Condition** factor takes into account the current condition of the project area, ranging from critical to good. A critical existing condition receives 5 points,
whereas a fair existing condition receives 1 point; a good existing condition receives no points.

The final scoring section for all projects makes use of a hybrid Benefit/Cost analysis. The extensive variability in project type and the amount of time it would take to do a true benefit/cost analysis has led to the selection of this method. While cost is readily available, the benefit side is represented by a surrogate that is valued according to the score awarded up to this point for the subject proposal (the points, in effect, represent the intrinsic “benefit” to the region). The point subtotal (maximum 90) is divided by the cost of the proposal (in millions of dollars). The subsequent value (which can have a very wide numerical range) is then scored from two to ten points via the scale shown in the scoring process. When added to the previous subtotal, a maximum of 100 points is possible.

**Factors for Other Projects**

In some cases, OKI will receive applications for projects that do not fit the highway or transit definition. In these cases, the Prioritization Subcommittee will examine each application and subjectively rank the application in comparison to the highway and transit applications received. This ranking will be accomplished through a thorough review and discussion of the application and comparison of the estimated benefits to the region with the estimated cost of the project.

**Process for Review and Ranking of All Applications**

Beginning with the application cycle in 2006, all applications submitted to OKI for SNK federal funding will be reviewed using the following procedure recommended by the Prioritization Subcommittee and adopted by the OKI Intermodal Coordinating Committee (ICC) on January 10, 2006.

1. Transit projects and highway projects will be reviewed separately using their respective highway or transit factors (transportation factors) as shown on the following pages. This will allow a determination of the relative strength of a highway project compared to other highway projects and transit projects compared to other transit projects—an “apples to apples” methodology.
2. Each transit and highway project will then be reviewed using the planning factors for all projects.
3. The Prioritization Subcommittee will develop a recommended ranking of all projects based on the review of transportation and planning factors and present this list to the ICC. The ICC will review the recommendations to determine that “Regional Priorities” are achieved through the suggested rankings.
4. After the ICC develops a final ranking of SNK projects, this recommended list will be presented to the OKI Executive Committee or Board of Trustees for concurrence.

### Transportation Factors for Highway Projects (45 points available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Documentation of serious injury pattern</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 7 accidents per MVM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 accidents per MVM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 3 accidents per MVM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 1 accident per MVM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact</td>
<td>High Impact</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Safety</td>
<td>Medium Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Impact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td>E/F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact</td>
<td>High Impact</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On LOS</td>
<td>Medium Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Impact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT)</td>
<td>Over 25,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Corridors</td>
<td>Truck Traffic Volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 to &lt;10%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to &lt;15%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to &lt;20%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to &lt;25%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% or greater</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Classification</td>
<td>Freeway/Expressway or Principal Arterial</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformance with</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Design Standards</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of Project</td>
<td>Construction and ROW plans complete</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/E and Environmental complete</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial request for construction funding only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial request for construction and ROW funding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for additional funds less than or equal to 50% of original amount</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for additional funds between 50% and 100% of original amount</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for additional funds more than 100% over original amount</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation Factors for Transit Projects (45 points available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact</td>
<td>High Impact</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>Medium Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Low Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful Life</td>
<td>15 or more years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Improvements</td>
<td>2 Improvements</td>
<td>add 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Improvement</td>
<td>add 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of Service Area/Hrs/Days</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of Service Hours and Days</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of Service Hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Impact</td>
<td>Impact on System and Passengers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on Passengers only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on System only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Replacement of Revenue Vehicles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Facility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support (Non-revenue) Equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of Revenue Vehicles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Implementation</td>
<td>0 to 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER funding</td>
<td>5 to 6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is granted</td>
<td>7 to 8 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 to 10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership Impact</td>
<td>Increase in Ridership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain Ridership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Utilization</td>
<td>3 years/40% in miles over FTA value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 years/30% in miles over FTA value</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year/20% in miles over FTA value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Forecasting</td>
<td>Listed in planning document over a year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed in planning document less than one year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not listed in a current planning document</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Factors for All Projects (50 points available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement/Expansion</td>
<td>100% Replacement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% Replacement/25% Expansion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% Replacement/50% Expansion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Replacement/75% Expansion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% Expansion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>Overall benefits (good to excellent)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall benefits (fair to good)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall benefits (none to fair)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Consistent--comprehensive plan complete &amp; current</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent--comprehensive plan needs improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent--no comprehensive plan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/Energy</td>
<td>2 or more Reduced</td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 or more Reduced</td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Share</td>
<td>30% or more additional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER amount</td>
<td>25% or more additional</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>20% or more additional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15% or more additional</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% or more additional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required local amount</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Modes Improved</td>
<td>2 new modes introduced</td>
<td>add 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 new mode introduced</td>
<td>add 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 modes accommodating</td>
<td>add 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 modes accommodating</td>
<td>add 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 mode accommodating</td>
<td>add 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal Connectivity</td>
<td>Creates new connections</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains existing connections</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminates connections</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Benefit/Cost for All Projects, in millions (10 points available)

- Greater than 1,000 add 10
- Greater than 100 add 8
- Greater than 10 add 6
- Greater than 5 add 4
- Greater than 1 add 2
## Application Form

**Applicant:**

If multiple jurisdictions, note lead agency and list partners.

**Address:**

**Contact Person/Title:**

**Telephone/Fax/e-mail:**

### Description of Proposed Project:

- **Is this a capacity-adding project?**
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no

Include location, length of project, termini and scope. Attach drawing, plan or sketch if applicable.

Any capacity-adding project must be listed in the OKI Long Range Plan (LRP) and The Kentucky 6-Year Plan.

### Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Local Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SNK Funds may be used for design, right-of-way, utility and construction phases.

**Source of Cost Estimate:**

[attach Certified Estimated Cost to application]

Certified cost estimate Engineer’s Seal or Other Generally Accepted Standard.

### Current Status of Plan Development:

**Fiscal Years** (July 1 through June 30) for which funds are being sought (by phase):

### Relation to Other Funding Sources:

Projects requesting state funds as match should be listed in the 6-Year Plan.

Are there any other funding sources contemplated or committed? If so, under what conditions and timing?

### Relation to Other Local/Regional Conditions/Improvements:

Is proposal part of a larger project or plan?

### Relation to Local/Regional Planning:

Is proposal included in adopted local plans with a budget? Are maintenance funds for improvements included in future budget planning?

### Local/Regional Support and Endorsements:

What level of public information about the proposal exists? What level of other community support has been expressed? Which Environmental Justice groups and/or communities have expressed support for this project?

Provide attachments if needed.

### How does this project meet the Goals and Objectives Identified in the Goals and Objectives section of the Application Instructions?

Refer to Goals and Objectives beginning on page 4 of the Instructions.
**APPENDIX 8-5 continued**

Funding Application and Instructions for OKI-Allocated SNK Funds (Kentucky Projects) - continued

---

**FOR HIGHWAY PROJECTS ONLY**

1. What is the existing safety condition of the project area?
   - More than 7 accidents per MVM
   - More than 5 accidents per MVM
   - More than 3 accidents per MVM
   - More than 1 accident per MVM

   *Include documentation of a pattern of injuries*

2. What is the project impact on safety?
   - High impact
   - Medium impact
   - Low impact

   Please explain:

3. What is the existing LOS?

   - A. What is the impact on LOS?
     - E/F _____ High Impact _____ Medium Impact _____ Low Impact
     
     Please explain:

4. What is the Current Average Daily Traffic (ADT)?

   - >25,000
   - >20,000
   - >15,000
   - >10,000
   - <10,000

5. What are the truck traffic volumes in the project area (as percentage of ADT)?

   - <5%
   - 5 to <10%
   - 10 to <15%
   - 15 to <20%
   - 20 to <25%
   - >25%

6. What is the roadway classification of this project?

   - Freeway/Expressway or Principal Arterial
   - Minor Arterial
   - Collector

   Roadways must be classified as collector or higher to be eligible for federal funding

7. What is the conformance with existing design standards?

   - Poor
   - Fair
   - Good

   Please explain:

8. What is the expected status of the project?

   - (If request for additional funding, check appropriate box)
   - Design, row and utility phases completed, seeking construction funds
   - Design and row complete, seeking funds for utility and/or construction phases
   - Design phase complete, seeking funds for row and/or utility phases
   - Initial request for design phase
   - Request for additional funds less than or equal to 50% of original amount
   - Request for additional funds between 50% & 100% of original amount
   - Request for additional funds more than 100% of original amount

---

**FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS ONLY**

9. What is the useful life of the proposed project?

   - 15 or more years
   - 10 to 14 years
   - 4 to 9 years
   - Less than 4 years

10. What is the project impact on safety and security?

    - High impact
    - Medium impact
    - Low impact

    Please explain:

11. What is the useful life of the proposed project?

    - 15 or more years
    - 10 to 14 years
    - 4 to 9 years
    - Less than 4 years

12. What are the service improvements associated with this project? (See Instructions for clarification)

    - Expansion of service area/hrs/days
    - Expansion of service hrs
    - Expansion of service hours & days

    Please explain:

13. What is the system impact of the project?

    - Impact on system & passengers
    - Impact on passengers only
    - Impact on system only

    Please explain:

14. What is the type of project?

    - Replacement of revenue vehicles
    - Fixed facility
    - Support (non-revenue) equipment
    - Expansion of revenue vehicles

15. What is the time to implementation AFTER funding is granted?

    - 0 to 2 years
    - 2 years or 30% in miles over the FTA value
    - 3 years or 40% in miles over the FTA value
    - Greater than 3 years or 50% in miles over the FTA value
    - 4 to 6 years
    - 5 to 6 years
    - 7 to 8 years
    - 9 to 10 years
    - Over 10 years

16. What is the anticipated impact on ridership from this project?

    - Increase in ridership
    - Maintain ridership

17. How has the equipment being replaced been utilized (see Instructions for clarification)

    - 3 years or 40% in miles over the FTA value
    - 2 years or 30% in miles over the FTA value
    - 1 year or 20% in miles over the FTA value

18. Is the project listed in a planning document?

    - Listed in planning document for over a year
    - Listed in planning document for less than a year
    - Project not listed in a planning document

Specify document:
**APPENDIX 8-5 continued**

**Funding Application and Instructions for OKI-Allocated SNK Funds (Kentucky Projects) - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ALL PROJECTS</th>
<th><strong>APPLICATION FORM (KENTUCKY PROJECTS)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What percentage of this project is replacement and what percentage is expansion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please explain these percentages:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Environmental Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Based on the Environmental Justice maps attached to this application, which environmental justice communities are affected by your project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Describe any direct or indirect benefits of your project on the environmental justice communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How are you planning to address any negative impacts on the environmental justice communities (i.e., public meetings, identifying community liaisons, bilingual information, road closures, etc.) Will the impacts be temporary or permanent?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 21. How does this project help to implement the Strategic Regional Policy Plan? Specifically, is this project consistent with (does it further and implement) the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan? |
| For a multi-jurisdictional project, the lead applicant will describe the degree of consistency of the project with the applicable comprehensive plans. Comprehensive plans typically do not address routine maintenance projects; however, routine maintenance is a key factor in preserving the region's existing transportation system. A project that is predominantly comprised of routine maintenance will receive five (5) points regardless of the status of the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan because of its inherent system preservation function. |

| 22. Will this project reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) or both? |
| VMT reduced (check if applicable) |
| VHT reduced (check if applicable) |
| Please explain: |

| 23. How much additional local match is being provided over the required match? |
| % additional match (generally 20% is required) |
| This figure should correspond with that shown on the first page of the application. |

| 24. How are travel modes improved with this project? (check all that apply) |
| 1 existing mode maintained |
| 2 existing modes maintained |
| 3 existing modes maintained |
| 1 new mode introduced |
| 2 new modes introduced |
| Please explain: |

| 25. How does this project provide connections to other transportation modes/systems? |
| Creates new connections |
| Maintains existing connections |
| Eliminates connections |
| Please explain: |

| 26. What is the existing condition of the project area? |
| Critical |
| Poor |
| Fair |
| Good |
| Please explain: |

---

The Dixie Fix: Envisioning the Future
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APPENDIX 8-6
Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority (KEFDA)
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

Kentucky Economic Development
Finance Authority (KEDFA)
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

New legislation enacted during the Regular Session of the 2002 General Assembly clarifies previous TIF legislation enacted by the General Assembly during the 2000 and 2001 Regular Sessions. The new legislation outlines three (3) distinct TIF programs:

Local Revenue Only Development Areas
(For development projects not utilizing state revenues and requiring no review or authorization from the state.) Basic criteria includes the following:
- eligible projects include any public purpose project being developed for residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, or any other use, that makes a contribution to economic development
- eligible costs may be covered by up to 100% of incremental property taxes, excluding state, school and fire district taxes, and by employee wage assessment to be credited against local occupational license taxes not otherwise used as an incentive under a state tax credit program
- limited to no longer than a 20 year time period
- limited to no more than 500 acres approved in a twelve (12) month period
- limited to previously undeveloped land
- allows wage assessment of no more than 2% of gross wages, including wage assessments fees imposed under programs administered by KEDFA
- available for facilities that contribute to economic development as determined by local government
- development areas established before July 15, 2002 are grandfathered under existing law (KRS 65.680-65.699) prior to 2002 HB 372

Infrastructure Development Areas
Applications for approval of development areas are submitted to the Cabinet for Economic Development. The Cabinet determines whether the development area application should be assigned to KEDFA or the TDFA for further consideration and approval. Basic criteria includes the following:
- eligible projects include those projects meeting the requirements of the KREDA, KIDA, KJDA, or KEOZ programs, or requirements under the Tourism Development Act
- limited to a geographic area of at least 50 acres of undeveloped land, unless otherwise approved by KEDFA or TDFA, or one acre for brownfield sites
- eligible costs may be covered by up to 100% of incremental real estate taxes, excluding school and fire district taxes
- maximum eligible costs and the percentage of the state’s portion of the increment negotiated prior to approval; state participation is limited to a proportional share of the incremental taxes to be used
- each development area is approved for a period not to exceed 20 years

Project Specific Development Areas
Applications for approval of development areas are submitted to the Cabinet for Economic Development. The Cabinet determines whether the development area application should be assigned to KEDFA or the TDFA for further consideration and approval. Basic criteria includes the following:
- eligible projects include transportation services, the availability of information technology, or a commercial, industrial, recreational, tourism, or education related project
- development area must be tied directly to a single project or investment resulting in a unique contribution to or preservation of economic vitality and quality of life of a region in the state
- must represent new economic activity in the state
- must result in a net positive economic impact to the state, considering any adverse impacts on existing businesses
- minimum capital investment $10 million
- minimum of twenty five (25) new full-time jobs created for Kentucky residents within two (2) years of final authorization
- limited to no longer than a 20 year time period
- twenty five percent (25%) of project revenues must originate outside of Kentucky
- eligible incremental taxes include: personal income; sales and use; property taxes, excluding school and fire district property taxes; local insurance premium taxes; occupational license fees; and other state taxes as may be determined by the Revenue Cabinet
- limited to 80% of incremental revenues collected not to exceed 25% of approved project costs
- project must not be primarily devoted to retail sale of goods

KEFDA or TDFA will hire a qualified independent consultant to analyze data related to the project and development area and to prepare a project report. The consultant is to be paid by the primary project entity. defined as the project expected to generate the greatest amount of new revenues. The report shall determine the percentage of revenues generated from business not located in Kentucky and the estimated amount of net incremental taxes to be generated for 20 years. The consultant shall make a determination that if not for the designation of the
The Office of State Budget Director, the Finance and Administration Cabinet, and the Revenue Cabinet shall agree to the methodology and assumptions made by the consultant in preparing the report. Based on the consultant’s report and prior to approval by the appropriate finance authority, the Office of State Budget Director, the Finance and Administration Cabinet, and the Revenue Cabinet shall certify the net positive economic impact of the project, and the expected amount of incremental state revenues to be generated. Approval shall not be granted if it is determined that there is no projected net positive economic impact to the state.

Contact: Steve Jones
Kentucky Cabinet for Economic Development
Department of Financial Incentives
Old Capitol Annex, 300 West Broadway
Frankfort, KY 40601
Phone: 502.564.4554 ext. 3428
Fax: 502.564.7697
RStephen.Jones@ky.gov

08/01/05
APPENDIX 8-7
Covington - Dixie Highway Potential TIF District

Approximately:
339 Parcels
182 acres
APPENDIX 8-7 continued
Park Hills - Dixie Highway Potential TIF District

Approximately:
54 parcels
96 acres
Approximately:
208 parcels
800 acres
APPENDIX 8-8
Ft. Wright’s Ordinance to Create a TIF district for the Madison Pike Corridor

ORDINANCE 5-05

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF Ft. WRIGHT, KENTON COUNTY, KENTUCKY ESTABLISHING A TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DISTRICT PURSUANT TO KENTUCKY REVISED STATUTES 65.650 THROUGH 65.699.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF FT. WRIGHT, KENTUCKY,

SECTION I

The City does hereby find that Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is essential to the implementation of the Madison Pike Corridor Land Use and Economic Development Plan, and, without which the Plan could not be implemented, and that the use of funds generated by the tax increment for public improvement projects within the Tax Increment Financing District will result in the increase in the value of property, thereby and in increased employment within or around the TIF District, and does hereby establish said Tax Increment Financing District, a contiguous geographic area, as a redevelopment area for a period of time to commence on July 1, 2004 and not to exceed beyond the first December 31st that is at least 20 years from the commencement date and such redevelopment shall be implemented based upon the Madison Pike Corridor Land Use and Economic Development Plan.

SECTION II

The name of the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District shall be the Madison Pike TIF District.

SECTION III

The contiguous geographic area of the Madison Pike TIF District shall be as described on the attached map, Exhibit A, and as further described on the attached Parcel Identification Number (PIN) schedule attached as Exhibit B.

SECTION IV

The purpose of the Madison Pike TIF District is to encourage development where development would not have occurred in the absence of Tax Increment Financing thereby contributing to the economic development of the Madison Pike TIF District.

SECTION V

A CAF fund shall be established and named the “Madison Pike TIF Fund.”

SECTION VI

All revenue derived from City real property taxes in calendar year 2004 and all subsequent years throughout the term of this Ordinance from the real property on the attached Exhibit A and Exhibit B that are in excess of the amount required by calendar year 2004 for the Madison Pike TIF District shall be credited to the Madison Pike TIF Fund. The attached Exhibit C includes a schedule with each PIN and its 2004 real property tax paid in calendar year 2004.

SECTION VII

All revenue derived from City payroll taxes in calendar year 2004 and all subsequent years throughout the term of the Ordinance as a result of employment on property on the attached Exhibit A and Exhibit B that are in excess of the amount required by calendar year 2004 shall be credited to the Madison Pike TIF Fund. The attached Exhibit D includes a schedule of each PIN and its City payroll tax paid in calendar year 2004.

SECTION VIII

All economic development projects within the Madison Pike TIF District that are certified by City Council as being for a public purpose, being for the development of facilities for residential, commercial, industrial, public, recreational, or other uses, or for open space, or any combination thereof, and which is determined by the City Council as contributing to the economic development of the Madison Pike TIF District, being in or related to the TIF District, and having an estimated life or period of usefulness of one (1) year or more, including but not limited to public road improvements, privately-owned access drives, planted non-intrusible medians in the public right of ways, parking structures, landscaping, public street lighting, public benches, public sidewalks and multi-use trails, public art, and debt service on any of the aforementioned items, street cleaning, trash receptacles, security patrols, advertising, marketing, so certified as having an estimated life or period of usefulness of one (1) year or more, are eligible to receive up to 100% funding for qualified expenditures.

SECTION IX

Any excess revenue in the Madison Pike TIF Fund not dedicated to debt service or approved projects or expenditures may be transferred upon the approval of City Council into another City fund for any lawful purpose.
APPENDIX 8-8 continued
Ft. Wright’s Ordinance to Create a TIF district for the Madison Pike Corridor - continued

SECTION V
All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are, to the extent of such conflict, hereby repealed.

SECTION XI
This ordinance shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage, publication, which may be in summary form and recorded according to law.

Passed by the City Council the 4th day of May, 2006

CITY OF FORT WRIGHT, KENTUCKY
A Municipal Corporation of the Fourth Class

Mayor, Gene Weaver

First Reading
Second Reading
Approved, , City Clerk
Published
Kentucky Business Incentives

Kentucky offers a number of progressive incentives for businesses. The following list should be considered as a general summary. Additional information on each business incentive is available.

I. FINANCIAL INCENTIVES/TAX CREDITS

A company approved under KIDA, KREDA, KJDA, KEOZ or KESA must meet wage and benefit standards for at least 90 percent of its full-time employees. Companies must pay an hourly wage equal to or greater than 75 percent of the average hourly wage of the county of location, or 75 percent of the state’s average hourly wage, whichever is less. The base hourly wage threshold shall be at least 150 percent of the federal minimum wage level. In addition, company non-mandated employee benefits must be at least 15 percent of the base hourly wage or a combination of wages and employee benefits equivalent to 115 percent of the base hourly wage. All tax credits and wage assessments for KIDA, KREDA, KJDA, KEOZ and KIRA are subject to internal staff review and Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority (KEDFA) approval.

Kentucky Industrial Development Act (KIDA)

Investments in new and expanding manufacturing projects may qualify for tax credits. Companies must create at least 15 new full-time jobs. Companies must make a capital investment of at least $100,000 in land, buildings, fixtures, and equipment. Approved companies under KIDA may receive up to a 100 percent credit against Kentucky income tax liability on taxable income generated by the project(s) for up to 10 years, or the company may collect a job assessment fee of 3 percent of the gross wages of each employee whose job is created by the approved project and who is subject to Kentucky’s individual income tax. Unused credits may be carried forward for the term of the agreement. All real estate costs are eligible; however, equipment costs are limited to $10,000 per new full-time job. (KRS 154.01.010; 154.28-010 to 154.28-100; 141.310; 141.350; and 141.400)

Kentucky Rural Economic Development Act (KREDA)

Larger tax credits are available for new and expanding manufacturing projects that create at least 15 new full-time jobs in economically distressed Kentucky counties. Companies must make a capital investment of at least $100,000 in land, buildings, fixtures, and equipment. Once a company is operating under a KREDA agreement, the company maintains KREDA benefits, even if the county loses KREDA status. Companies with projects approved under KREDA may receive up to 100 percent credit against the Kentucky income tax liability on taxable income generated by the project(s) for up to 15 years. Unused credits may be carried forward for the term of the agreement. The company may also collect a job assessment fee of 4 percent of the gross wages of each employee whose job is created by the approved project and who is subject to Kentucky’s individual income tax. The employee receives credits for the fee against Kentucky’s individual income tax. (KRS 154.01.010; 154.22-010 to 154.22-070; 141.310; 141.347; 141.350; and 141.400)

Kentucky Jobs Development Act (KJDA)

Service and technology related companies that invest in new and expanded non-manufacturing, non-retail projects that provide over 75 percent of their services as generated through revenue to users located outside of Kentucky and that create new full-time jobs for at least 15 Kentucky residents may qualify for tax credits. Projects approved under KJDA may receive state income tax credits and job assessment fees for up to 50 percent of project startup costs and 50 percent of annual facility rental costs or rental value for up to 10 years. Maximum approved start-up costs are $10,000 per new full-time job for Kentucky residents subject to Kentucky’s individual income tax. The company may receive up to a 100 percent credit against the state income tax arising from the project and may collect a job assessment fee of up to 5 percent of the gross wages of each employee whose job is created by the project and who is subject to Kentucky income taxes. Job assessment fee(s) are limited to 4 percent if the local jurisdiction does not assess a local occupational license fee. Unused credits may be carried forward for the term of the agreement. The employee receives credits for the fee(s) against state income taxes and local occupational taxes. (KRS 154.01.010; 154.24-010 to 154.24-150; 141.310; 141.350 and 141.407)

The Kentucky Economic Opportunity Zone Act (KEOZ)

The Kentucky Enterprise Initiative Act (KEIA)

The Kentucky Enterprise Initiative Act was initiated as a means to attract new or encourage expansion of businesses involved in technology, manufacturing or tourism activities. KEDFA may grant a refund of the sales and use tax paid for construction material, building fixtures and R & D equipment purchased for the use in approved projects. The initiative remains in effect for life of the project or up to 18 months from the date an eligible company is designated an approved company. An extension of 12 months may be approved for companies requiring additional time to complete the project.

Approved companies must make a minimum investment of $100,000 in a preference zone (former or current enterprise zone) or $500,000 in other areas in the Commonwealth. The total funds available per year for all the approved projects are $20,000,000 for building and construction materials and $5,000,000 for research and development equipment. (KRS 154.20-200 to 154.20-216)
Kentucky Environmental Stewardship Act (KESA)

The "Kentucky Environmental Stewardship Act" provides for an income tax credit for up to 10 years if approved by the Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority (KEDFA) and the following criteria are met: 1) Must have a qualified eligible cost of at least $5 million. This includes 100% of the costs of providing the necessary skills training needed to produce the product and 25% of the equipment costs; 2) The costs must go towards the construction, rehabilitation or improvement of facilities necessary to produce the "Environmental Stewardship Product," which is defined as any new or improved product that has a reduced adverse affect on human health and the environment; 3) For the year the equipment is purchased, the credit is limited to 10 percent of total credit allowed and 25 percent of the taxpayer's state income tax liability. The unused portion of the total allowable recycling credits can be carried forward to succeeding tax years. (KRS 141.0205)

Corporate Income Tax Credit for Use of Kentucky Coal

A corporation income tax credit is allowed for up to 4.5 percent of the value of Kentucky coal (excluding transportation costs) used for industrial heating or processing. The credit is allowed for 10 years following either the installation or conversion to coal burning units. The credit in any year cannot exceed the corporation's income tax liability minus other credits. Unused credits cannot be carried forward. (KRS 141.041)

Biodiesel Fuel Tax Credit

A state income tax credit is allowed for producers of "biodiesel" fuel or "blended biodiesel" fuel with a blend of at least 2%. "Biodiesel" or "blended biodiesel" producers receive a $1 credit per gallon produced or blended. Unused credits cannot be carried forward. (KRS 141.350)

Kentucky Clean Coal Incentive

The "Kentucky Clean Coal Incentive Act" provides for an income, license or public service corporation property tax credit for new clean coal facilities constructed at a cost exceeding $150 million and used for purposes of generating electricity. Before the credit is given, the Environmental and Public Protection Cabinet must certify that a facility is reducing emissions of pollutants released during electric generation through the use of clean coal equipment and technologies. The amount of credit will be $2.00 per ton of coal mined in Kentucky and used in the facility and not already receiving tax credit. Any unused portions of this credit shall not be carried forward. (KRS 141.350)

Certified Historic Structures Income Tax Credit

A "Certified Historic Structures" tax credit on income, license or franchise tax for financial institutions for the rehabilitation of a certified historic structure. The credit is 30% of the qualifying expenses for an owner-occupied property and 20% for all other properties. There is a seven year carry forward for any unused credit. The maximum credit an owner-occupied property owner may take is $60,000. (Creates a new section of KRS151)

Voluntary Environmental Remediation Property Income Tax Credit

An income tax credit of up to $150,000 per taxpayer shall be granted for expenditures to characterize the extent of contamination or remediate contamination on qualifying voluntary environmental remediation property. The amount of the allowable credit for any tax year is limited to 25% of the maximum credit approved. The credit may be carried forward for up to 10 years.

Major Recycling Project Tax Credit

A "Major Recycling Project" is one where the tax payer: 1) Invests more than $10,000,000 in recycling or composting equipment; 2) Has 750 or more full-time employees and pays more than 300% of the federal minimum wage; and 3) Has plant and equipment with a total cost of over $500,000,000. A taxpayer with a "major recycling project" is entitled to an income tax credit for up to 10 years and up to 50% of the installed costs of the equipment. In each taxable year, the amount of credits claimed for all major recycling projects is limited to 1) 50% of the excess of the total of each tax liability over the baseline tax liability of the taxpayer; or 2) $2,500,000, whichever is less. A taxpayer with one or more projects will be entitled to a tax credit equal to the total for
each major recycling project, but he may not take the standard recycling credit and the major project credit on the same equipment. (KRS 141.396)

(G.E.D.) State Income Tax Credit

A state income tax credit is provided an employer for the portion of the time given to an employee to study for the General Educational Development (G.E.D.) test. The credit is calculated by multiplying 50 percent of the hours released for study by the employee’s (student’s) hourly salary. The credit shall not exceed $1,250. (KRS 151B.127)

Order of Use of Credits

State statutes specify the order in which Kentucky income tax credits must be taken when a taxpayer is entitled to more than one (1) business incentive tax credit for a tax year: (KRS 141.0205)

Individual Income Tax Nonrefundable Credit Order:
1. Credit for individual members of flow through entities for tax paid at corporate level.
2. Economic development credits for KIDA, KREDA, KJDA, KIRA, KEOZ, or Skills Training (See discussion of Bluegrass State Skills Corporation);
3. Certified rehabilitation credit;
4. Health insurance credit;
5. Credit for tax paid to other states;
6. Credits for hiring unemployed persons;
7. Recycling or composting equipment credit;
8. Kentucky Investment Fund Act (KIFA) credit;
9. Coal incentive credit;
10. Research facilities credit;
11. Employer GED incentive credit;
12. Voluntary environmental remediation credit;
13. Biodiesel credit;
14. Environmental stewardship credit; and
15. Clean coal incentive credit.

Corporation Income Tax Nonrefundable Credit Order:
1. Economic development credits for KIDA, KREDA, KJDA, KIRA, KEOZ, or Skills Training (See discussion of Bluegrass State Skills Corporation);
2. Certified rehabilitation credit;
3. Health insurance credit;
4. Credit for hiring unemployed persons;
5. Recycling equipment credit;
6. Coal conversion credit;
7. Enterprise zone credit;
8. Kentucky Investment Fund Act (KIFA) credit;
9. Coal incentive credit;
10. Research facilities credit;
11. Employer GED incentive credit;
12. Voluntary environmental remediation credit;
13. Biodiesel credit;
14. Environmental stewardship credit; and
15. Clean coal incentive credit.

III. DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM

Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority (KEDFA)

KEDFA encourages economic development, business expansion, and job creation by providing business loans to supplement other financing. KEDFA provides loan funds at below market interest rates. The loans are available for fixed asset financing (land, buildings, and equipment) for business startup, locations, and expansions that create new jobs in Kentucky or have a significant impact on the economic growth of a community. The loans must be used to finance projects in agribusiness, tourism, industrial ventures, or the service industry. No retail projects are eligible.

KEDFA may participate in the financing of qualified projects with a secured loan for up to $10,000 per new job created, not to exceed 25 percent of a project's fixed asset cost. The maximum loan amount is $500,000 and the minimum is $25,000. Small businesses with projects of less than $100,000 may receive loans on fixed assets for up to 45 percent of the project costs if enough jobs are created. Interest rates are fixed for the life of the loan and are determined by the length of the loan term. Rates range from 1 to 7 percent depending upon the term and are amortized monthly, quarterly, or semi-annually. It is important to note that KEDFA will not lend more than the private lending institution towards the fixed assets, and project owners must inject a minimum of 10 percent towards the fixed assets. KEDFA loan funds are disbursed at the completion of the project, so the business must obtain interim financing. The KEDFA loan commitment can assist in securing the interim financing, (KRS 154.20-010 to 154.20-180).

Small Business Direct Loans

A new law gives the Kentucky Economic Development Authority (KEDFA) authority to create a direct loan program specifically for high risk loans to small businesses. KEDFA may provide terms that are more lenient, less secure, or otherwise less stringent than industry standards for loans that are generally considered higher risk. Small business with 50 or fewer employees are eligible. The maximum loan amount under the program is $100,000 and at least one new full-time job must be created and maintained. The loan proceeds may be used for acquisition, construction, expansion, working capital or any other business expense deemed reasonable by KEDFA.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Loans

Businesses in Kentucky can obtain low-interest loans through the federally funded CDBG system. Cities and counties lend the grant funds to businesses for the creation or retention of jobs. Terms of the loans are based upon the financial analysis of the borrower. Interest rates usually are below the market rate and usually are fixed for the life of the loans. Security for CDBG loans can be subordinate to that of other lenders.

Federal regulations require that at least 51 percent of those hired for projects that use CDBG loans be low and moderate-income individuals. The use of federal funds for construction activities will trigger payment of prevailing wages under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, and borrowers must comply with federal procurement and environmental review requirements.

Linked Deposit Program

The linked deposit program provides loans up to $100,000 for small businesses and agribusinesses. Credit decisions are the responsibility of the lender making the loan. The state will purchase certificates of deposit from participating lenders through the State Investment
Local Financial Assistance

Several local governments and area development districts offer loans and other financial incentives for economic development projects. The levels and terms of financial assistance provided generally are negotiable and are based upon the availability of funds, jobs created, economic viability of the project, and other locally determined criteria.

IV. KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMY

High-Tech Construction and Investment Pool

The Department for Commercialization and Innovation, in the Cabinet for Economic Development, administers two pools of funds:

1. The High-Tech Construction Pool is used for projects with special emphasis on the creation of high-tech jobs and knowledge-based companies. The commissioner recommends funding of companies to KEDFA for approval; and

2. The High-Tech Investment Pool is used to build and promote technology-driven industries and research-intensive industries with the goal of creating clusters of innovation-driven industries in Kentucky. The commissioner recommends funds to be used to support loans and grants, or secure an equity or related position to KEDFA for approval. (KRS 154.12-278)

Research, Innovation & Technology Businesses

The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) plays a major role in attracting research and development work and in supporting innovation and inventions through three fund programs:

1. The Kentucky Research and Development Voucher Program provides state funds on a match basis to small and medium-size companies to undertake research and development work with a Kentucky university, with a maximum voucher amount of $200,000 over two years. (KRS 164.6019 and 164.6021)

2. The Kentucky Rural Innovation Program provides seed funds to small rural Kentucky-based businesses to undertake research and development and entrepreneurial innovation in partnership with a Kentucky postsecondary institution or unaffiliated third party, with a maximum voucher amount of $100,000 over two years. (KRS 164.6027 and 164.6029)

3. The Kentucky Commercialization Fund Program provides seed funds to Kentucky universities for the development of promising technologies and commercially successful products, processes, or services, through research and development work undertaken at a Kentucky university, with a maximum grant of $225,000 over three years. (KRS 164.6035 and 164.6037)

The Kentucky Science and Technology Corporation manages these funds under contract with the CPE. For more information on funding guidelines, see www.startupkentucky.com.

Kentucky Innovation and Commercialization Centers

The Kentucky Innovation and Commercialization Centers (ICC) are public-private partnerships dedicated to creating and growing high-growth, knowledge driven companies. Six regional offices comprise the main network, which is administered by the Kentucky Science and Technology Corporation (KSTC) under contract with the Cabinet for Economic Development. See www.startupkentucky.com to locate the offices serving each region.

The ICC network is the statewide infrastructure that provides business-building talent and related services to Kentucky's entrepreneurs, faculty and scientists using a best practices model. The centers also link scientists and entrepreneurs with the innovation–related funding tools created under the Kentucky Innovation Act including but not limited to the ICC Concept Phase Funding Pool. This fund, administered by KSTC, provides grants up to $25,000 to assist businesses and individuals at the earliest stages of project feasibility and concept development. (KRS 154.12-300 to 154.12-315)

Commonwealth Seed Capital LLC

The Commonwealth Seed Capital LLC (CSC) provides early-stage seed funds to facilitate the commercialization of innovative ideas and technologies developed in Kentucky. CSC will invest its capital in private venture capital funds that commit to invest at least three times the amount of capital invested in it by CSC in Kentucky technology companies.

Kentucky Science and Engineering Foundation

The Kentucky Science and Engineering Foundation (KSEF) is a state agency created by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to support research and development activities, which are conducted to help the company further define and develop a new product or process technology. (KRS 154.12-320)

The Foundation also administers the SBIR/STTR Phase 0 program. This is a seed grant program to assist Kentucky's small companies in developing competitive, high quality Phase 1 proposals to any of the 10 federal agencies participating in the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs. Companies are eligible to apply for up to $4,000 to assist the preparation of the federal proposal. The goal of the Phase 0 program is to increase the number of winning proposals funded for Kentucky companies. Each year the Foundation offers workshops with panels from participating federal agencies and workshops on SBIR/STTR proposal writing for interested companies.

Research Facilities State Income Tax Credit

A state income tax credit is provided for investment in facilities used to pursue research. The income tax credit is equal to 5 percent of the qualified cost for "construction of research facilities" for "qualified research" as defined in Internal Revenue Code Section 41. The credit is available to
APPENDIX 8-9 continued
Kentucky Business Incentives - continued

new and existing businesses that construct, remodel, expand, or equip research facilities, but does not include replacement property. Any unused credit may be carried forward for 10 years. (KRS Chapter 141.395)

V. TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF)

Local Revenue Only Development Areas

Local governments may establish TIFs using local revenues only, without requiring approval from a state agency. Eligible costs may be covered by up to 100 percent of incremental property taxes, excluding state, school and fire district taxes, and by an employee wage assessment of no more than 2 percent of gross wages. Employee wage assessments are to be credited against local occupational license taxes not otherwise used as an incentive under a state tax credit program. The TIF district is limited to no longer than a 20 year time period for previously undeveloped land of 500 acres or less approved in a 12 month period. Available for facilities contributing to economic development as determined by local government. (KRS 65.680 to 65.699)

Infrastructure Development Areas

Applications for approval of infrastructure development areas are submitted to the Cabinet for Economic Development. The Cabinet determines whether the development area application should be assigned to Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority (KEFDA) or the Tourism Development Finance Authority (TDFA) for further consideration and approval. A local government ordinance must be adopted establishing the development area prior to approval by the appropriate finance authority. Infrastructure development area TIFs are limited to a geographic area of at least 50 acres of undeveloped land, unless otherwise approved by KEDFA or TDFA, or one acre for brownfield sites. Eligible costs may be covered by up to 100 percent of incremental property taxes, excluding school and fire district taxes. Each development area is approved for a period not to exceed 20 years and each project locating in the development area may be approved for a period not to exceed 20 years. The development area must initially be owned and/or under the control of a public entity. Infrastructure development includes real estate acquisition and the construction or improvement of roads or facilities needed for improvements to the real estate including site preparation and utility extensions. (KRS 65.680 to 65.699)

Project Specific Development Areas

Applications for approval of project specific development areas are submitted to the Cabinet for Economic Development. The Cabinet determines whether the development area application should be assigned to Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority (KEDFA) or the Tourism Development Finance Authority (TDFA) for further consideration and approval. A qualified independent consultant, paid by the primary project entity, prepares a report to determine the estimated amount of net incremental taxes to be generated over 20 years. The consultant also makes a determination that if not for the designation of the development area and granting of increments, the project or development area would not occur. The Office of State Budget Director, the Finance and Administration Cabinet, and the Department of Revenue agree to the methodology and assumptions made by the consultant in preparing the report. These same agencies shall, prior to approval by the appropriate finance authority, certify whether there is a net positive economic impact to the state and the expected amount of incremental state revenues from the project. Project approval shall not be granted if it is determined that there is no projected net positive economic impact to the state.

A project-specific development area must be tied directly to a single project or investment resulting in a unique contribution to or preservation of economic vitality and quality of life of a region in the state that represents new economic activity in the state. The project must result in a net positive economic impact to the state, considering any adverse impacts on existing businesses. Twenty-five (25) percent of project revenues must originate outside of Kentucky. A minimum capital investment of $10 million and a minimum of 25 new full-time jobs must be created for Kentucky residents. A development area is limited to no longer than a 20 year time period.

Eligible incremental taxes include income, sales and use, and property taxes, excluding school and fire district property taxes, local insurance premium taxes, occupational license fees, and other state taxes as may be determined by the Revenue Cabinet. Incremental taxes are limited to 80 percent of incremental revenues collected not to exceed 25 percent of project costs. The project must not be primarily devoted to retail sale of goods. (KRS 65.680 to 65.699)

VI. INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS (IRBs)

Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs) issued by state and local governments in Kentucky can be used to finance manufacturing projects and their warehousing areas, major transportation and communication facilities, most health care facilities, and mineral extraction and processing projects. Bonds issued under United States Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C.) contain more restrictions than those issued under Kentucky statutes. Bond funds may be used to finance the total project costs including engineering, site preparation, land, buildings, machinery and equipment, and bond issuance costs. Any portions of such projects financed by private capital are subject to the full state and local property taxes applicable to private ownership. Communities may negotiate for payments by industrial tenants to replace portions of local property taxes lost through public title to the property.

Private leasehold interests in property owned and financed by a governmental unit through industrial revenue bonds, under the provisions of KRS Chapter 103, are taxed by the state at $0.015 per $100 of leasehold value with approval from KEDFA. Reduction of local property taxes only on projects financed through IRBs does not require KEDFA approval. Communities may negotiate for payments by industrial tenants to replace portions of local property taxes lost through public title to the property. Any portions of such projects financed by private capital are subject to the full state and local taxes applicable to private ownership. (KRS 132.020; 132.195; 132.200)

The Kentucky Private Activity Bond Allocation Committee (KPABAC) approves the private activity cap for the issuance of industrial revenue bonds with tax-free interest earnings (to bond buyers), for qualifying projects with annual debt service amounts authorized by the I.R.C. For more information see Kentucky Private Activity Bond Allocation Committee.

VII. BLUEGRASS STATE SKILLS CORPORATION (BSSC)

Bluegrass State Skills Corporation (BSSC) is an independent de jure corporation within the Cabinet for Economic Development. BSSC’s basic purpose is to improve and promote employment opportunities for the residents of the Commonwealth through training grants and investment credits for skills training programs which create partnerships with business and industry who absorb a share of program costs.
The Grant-in-Aid Program allows BSSC to administer and fund Kentucky’s industry-specific training efforts through grants approved by the Board of Directors of the BSSC; to act as a broker of skills training and employment services; to facilitate and fund new training programs; to administer any special state appropriations for industry specific training; and to fund train-the-trainer initiatives. The program allows for a fifty percent (50%) reimbursement for eligible training costs. (KRS 154.12-204 to 154.12-208)

The Skills Training Investment Credit Act is an economic development initiative, which aids existing companies in their efforts to develop a skilled workforce. It allows companies to recover fifty percent (50%) of their approved costs for occupational and skills upgrade training costs through an income tax credit limited to $500 per Kentucky resident employed not to exceed $100,000 per company per biennium. (KRS 154.12-2084 to 154.12-2089; and 141.405)

For additional information about BSSC go to www.thinkkentucky.com/bssc.

VIII. KENTUCKY INVESTMENT FUND ACT

The Kentucky Investment Fund Act encourages venture capital formation by certifying privately operated venture funds. Certified funds entitle their investors to tax credits equal to 40 percent of their capital contributions to the fund, not to exceed 50 percent of the initial approved aggregate credit amount proportionally available to an investor for any one tax year. Unused credits may be carried forward for up to 15 years. Tax credits may be taken against state income, corporation license, insurance premiums, bank franchise, and savings and loan association taxes. Nonprofit entities may transfer tax credits for some or no consideration. Criteria for certification include an evaluation of the business plan, analysis of the investment strategy, and past experience of the fund manager. Separate requirements exist for initial fund capitalization, as well as ceilings on cash contributions and total credits authorized. Total qualified investments made by each fund in any single small business may not exceed 25 percent of that fund. Investment funds may be approved by KEDFA allowing investments up to 100 percent in a single knowledge-based entity.

To qualify a small business must have:
- a net worth of less than $5 million ($10 million for knowledge-based businesses) or its net income in each of the prior two years is less than $3 million; and
- 100 or fewer employees; and
- more than 50 percent of its assets, operations, and employees must be located in Kentucky. (KRS 154.20-250 to 154.20-284)

Any investment not in a qualified small business may be made by a fund, but shall not be eligible for the tax credits.

IX. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAMS

Local Government Economic Development Fund (LGEDF)

The program is funded through an allocation of coal severance tax receipts. Grants are provided to eligible coal producing counties to assist in diversifying local economies beyond a dependence on coal. Funds may be used to support nonrecurring investments in public health and safety, economic development, public infrastructure, information technology development and access, and public water and wastewater development.

Regional Business Park Program

The Regional Business Park Program is funded under the LGEDF program and designed to develop large blocks of available, accessible, and marketable land as regional business parks. The participating counties share in the tax revenues, and all other proceeds generated from the project, through interlocal agreements between the participating counties and the formation of regional authorities. These legally established authorities own, maintain, and market the available acreage with guidance from the Cabinet for Economic Development.

Eligible Activities

Costs associated with the purchase and development of real estate, are eligible under the LGEDF program including:
- the acquisition of real property and related expenses;
- infrastructure development costs including water and sewer line extensions, treatment plant construction and/or upgrades, and access roads;
- building construction costs; and
- engineering expenses related to the development.

Workforce training costs under grants are available to companies locating in one of the Regional Business Parks that hire residents from participating counties. The company must meet eligibility criteria under the LGEDF Program and one of the KEDFA administered tax credit programs, id est., KREDA, KJDA, KEOZ, or KIDA. The training funds are available on a 48-week basis and pay a percentage of wages paid above the federal minimum wage. Final grant awards are made by the KEDFA. (KRS 42.4588)

X. KENTUCKY ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM

The General Assembly created Kentucky’s Enterprise Zone Program in 1982. The program was initiated as an innovative effort to bring new development to or to renew development to targeted, economically depressed areas. State and local tax incentives are offered to businesses located or locating in such zones, and some regulations are eased to make development in the area more attractive. A zone remains in effect for 20 years after the date of designation. Enterprise zones will be replaced by the Kentucky Enterprise Initiative after December 31, 2006.

Beyond the financial or administrative benefits, many enterprise zones have intrinsic advantages. Their locations are often strategic in regard to transportation, suppliers, and the rest of the city. Older buildings adaptable to modern needs are often available. Undeveloped land suitable for industry is likewise available.

Kentucky Enterprise Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kentucky Enterprise Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knox County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paducah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To qualify, businesses must meet the following criteria: 50 percent of their employees must perform substantially all of their services within the enterprise zone; and to apply as a new business (companies which began operations in the enterprise zone after the date the zone was designated), 25 percent of the company’s total full-time workforce must meet the targeted criteria.
as long as the business is enterprise zone certified. To apply as an existing business (a company that was in operation in the enterprise zone prior to the designation of the zone), the company has the option of:

(a) a 20 percent increase in capital investment; or
(b) a 20 percent increase in total workforce (25 percent of these new employees must meet the targeted workforce criteria.) (KRS 154.45-001 through 154.45-120)

Targeted Workforce - Kentucky residents who
(a) reside within the enterprise zone;
(b) were unemployed 90 days prior to being hired by the enterprise zone business; or
(c) were receiving public assistance benefits for at least 90 days prior to employment with a qualified business.

Incentives Provided
The state incentives provided to businesses located within an active enterprise zone are as follows: (KRS 154.45-090)

- Building materials used in remodeling, rehabilitation, or new construction within the zone area are exempt from sales and use taxes;
- New and used machinery and equipment purchased and used by a qualified business within the enterprise zone are exempt from sales and use taxes;
- Commercial vehicles purchased and used by a qualified business solely for business purposes are exempt from the motor vehicle usage tax;
- Other vehicles which are not defined as commercial vehicles purchased and used by a qualified business solely for business purposes are exempt from the motor vehicle usage tax, limited to the first $20,000 of the retail price of the vehicle;
- A qualified business shall be allowed a nonrefundable credit against the tax levied, pursuant to KRS 141.040, equal to 10 percent of the wages paid to each employee who has been unemployed for at least 90 days or who has received public assistance benefits, based on need and intended to alleviate poverty, for at least 90 days prior to being employed with the qualified business, up to $1,500 per employee. Any unused credit may be carried forward for up to 5 years;
- A local government has the option to levy an ad valorem tax rate on qualified property within a zone of one-tenth of one cent ($0.001) upon each $100 of value; and
- Other local incentives may apply.

XI. SPECIAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT INCENTIVES
For economic development projects that will result in the creation of at least 500 new jobs, county fiscal courts may organize a district for purposes of levying taxes. The additional taxes may pay for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of governmental services provided to the district that exceeds the level of services provided to other areas of the county. The additional taxes that may be imposed in the district are a special ad valorem tax not to exceed $0.10 per $100 of assessed value and an occupational license tax. (KRS 65.180 and new section of KRS 68)
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XII. KENTUCKY’S TAX ADVANTAGES
Kentucky Department of Revenue
Kentucky’s combined state and local own source revenue per capita for 2002 was below the national average and ranked as the 7th lowest among the 50 states. The 2005 Kentucky General Assembly passed major Tax Modernization legislation, which lowers corporation income tax rates, eliminates state license taxes, eliminates most intangible property taxes, introduces several new tax credit incentives, and improves Kentucky’s overall business tax climate.

Corporation Taxation
- Net operating losses can be carried forward for up to 20 years. (KRS 141.010 and 141.011)
- A multi-state corporation sustaining a tax loss only at its Kentucky facility during its first year of operation can carry the loss forward as a deduction from its second year Kentucky taxable income, provided separate accounting can be used for the Kentucky activity. (KRS 141.012)
- The top corporation income tax rate is 6% beginning January 1, 2007
- The corporation license tax is eliminated beginning January 1, 2006.

City Occupational/Net Profits Tax
- Cities can exempt new manufacturing facilities from city occupational (income) taxes for up to 5 years. (KRS 91.260 and 92.300)
- Counties having a population of 30,000 or more and cities of all classes are prohibited from collecting license fees or occupational taxes on investment partnerships if that investment would not be taxable if individually held. (KRS 68.180, 68.197, 91.260 and 92.281)

Property Taxes
- Exemption of manufacturing machinery from all local property taxes. The state rate is only 15 cents per $100 of assessed value. (KRS 132.020 and 132.200)
- Exemption of certified pollution control facilities and equipment from all local property taxes. The state rate is only 15 cents per $100 of assessed value. (KRS 132.020; 132.200 and 224.01.300)
- A Brownfield incentives program provides a state property tax rate tax of $0.015 per $100 value assessed on all qualifying voluntary environmental remediation property provided the purchaser has obtained a covenant not to sue from the Environmental and Public Protection Cabinet. The rate shall apply for 3 years following the issuance of the covenant not to sue; after which the regular rate will apply. The local property taxes are exempt for the 3-year period. (New Chapter of KRS 132)
- Exemption of raw materials and products in the course of manufacture from all local property taxes. The state rate on these inventories is only 5 cents per $100 of assessed value. (KRS 132.020 and 132.200)
- Exemption of tangible personal property located in a federally designated and activated foreign trade zone (or sub-zone) from all local property taxes. The state rate is only 1/10 of 1 cent per $100 of assessed value. (KRS 132.020 and 132.200)
- Exemption of intangible property (money in hand, notes, bonds, accounts receivable, mortgage receivables, intercompany intangible personal property due from affiliates,
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State Sales and Use Tax

Cities and counties may grant a 5 year moratorium from increases in property assessment that are located in a warehouse or distribution center pending subsequent shipment out-of-state. These goods shall be exempt from state, city, county (general levy), urban county, and school district property taxation. Fire and special taxing districts may exempt these goods at their discretion. (KRS 132.020; 132.095)

Private leasehold interest in industrial buildings owned and financed by a governmental unit through industrial revenue bonds, approved by KEDFA under the provisions of KRS Chapter 103, are taxed by the state at $0.015 per $100 of leasehold value and are exempt from local property taxes. (KRS 132.020; 132.196 and 132.200)

Cites may exempt the property of a new manufacturing facility from city taxes for up to 5 years. (KRS 91.260 and 92.300)

Exemption of machinery and equipment owned by a business and used to collect, separate, compress, bale, shred, or handle waste materials for recycling from all local property taxes. The state rate is $0.45 per $100 of assessed value. (KRS 132.020; 132.200(16); and 139.095)

State laws limit the increase in local property tax revenues from real estate, exclusive of new property, to 4 percent annually for each local taxing jurisdiction (county, city, and school district). Increases larger than 4 percent must be approved by voters. (KRS 132.023 and 132.027)

State laws limit the increase in state property tax revenues from real estate, exclusive of new property, property approved for tax increment financing and KRS Chapter 103 industrial revenue bond property receiving the reduced state rate of $0.15 per $100 of leasehold value, to 4 percent annually. (KRS 132.020)

Cites and counties may grant a 5 year moratorium from increases in property assessment values on business commercial facilities 25 years old or older and undergoing rehabilitation. (KRS 99.600 and 132.452)

Assessment of property for taxation is made only once annually on January 1, allowing businesses to plan purchases or assets and levels of inventories to their best tax advantages. (KRS 132.220)

State property tax rate of $0.015 per $100 of value is used for aircraft not used in the business of transporting persons or property for compensation or hire. Local taxing districts may exempt or adopt tax rates lower than other tangible property for above classification of aircraft. (KRS 132.020; 132.200)

State Sales and Use Tax

Major exemptions for businesses include (state taxes only):

- Items purchased for resale. (KRS 139.260)
- Machinery for new and expanded industry (manufacturing, extraction of minerals, ores, coal, clay, stone, and natural gas). Replacement machinery for manufacturing is exempt when it increases consumption of recycled materials not less than 10 percent, performs a different function, manufactures a different product, or has a greater productive capacity.
- Repair parts, replacement parts, and spare parts are taxable. (KRS 139.480; 139.170; and 103 KAR 30:120)
- Raw materials which enter into and become a part of the manufactured product. (KRS 139.470)
- Supplies used directly in manufacturing which have a useful life of less than one year (lubricating and compounding oils, grease, machine waste, abrasives, chemicals, solvents, fluxes, anodes, filtering materials, fire brick, catalysts, dyes, refrigerants, explosives, etc.), excluding repair, replacement, or spare parts of any kind. (KRS 139.470)
- Industrial tools that have a useful life of less than one year, limited to hand tools (such as jigs, dies, drills, cutters, rolls, reamers, chucks, saws, spray guns, etc.) and tools attached to a machine (such as molds, grinding balls, grinding wheels, dies, bits, cutting blades, etc.), excluding repair, replacement, or spare parts of any kind. (KRS 139.470)
- Materials and supplies that are not reusable after one manufacturing cycle, excluding repair, replacement, or spare parts of any kind. (KRS 139.470)
- Energy and energy-producing fuels used in manufacturing, industrial processing, mining, or refining to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of the cost of production. "Cost of production" is the total of all costs as defined according to accepted accounting principles and includes direct and indirect materials and labor, overhead expenses, depreciation on plant equipment and plant buildings, insurance and taxes on plant equipment, compensation insurance, rent on plant buildings, miscellaneous factory expenses, and office and administrative expenses allocated to the cost of production. (KRS 139.480 and 103 KAR 30:140)
- Pollution control equipment and facilities approved by the Kentucky Revenue Cabinet. Included is equipment for air pollution control, water pollution control, disposal or reclaiming of solid or hazardous wastes, sound emission control, and pretreatment of raw materials for environmental protection. (KRS 139.480; 224.01-300)
- Refund for approved manufacturing, technology and tourism projects on building construction materials, building fixtures and research and development (R&D) equipment. See section on Kentucky Enterprise Initiative Act. (KRS 154.020)

XIII. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS INCENTIVES

Utility Incentive Rates

Electric and gas utility companies regulated by the Kentucky Public Service Commission (excluding municipal systems) can offer economic incentive rates for certain large industrial and commercial customers. The special discount rates can be granted for up to 5 years for both new and expanding operations. Gas utility companies also can offer a discount or waiver of gas main extension costs. The specific discount terms are set by contracts negotiated with the utility companies, subject to approval by the Public Service Commission.

Coal Incentive Tax Credit

An electric power company or a company that owns and operates a coal-fired electric generating plant may be entitled to a coal incentive tax credit. Only coal that is subject to Kentucky’s coal severance tax qualifies for the credit. The credit is equal to $2 per ton of Kentucky coal purchased by the company that is above the amount of Kentucky coal purchased during the base year. The base year amount is the amount of coal purchased in 1999 for existing companies. For new entities, the base year amount will be zero. The nonrefundable credit may be taken against...
corporation income tax, individual income tax, corporation license tax and public service company property tax. (KRS 141.0405)

**Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS)**

Kentucky Community and Technical College System serves as the Commonwealth’s primary provider of postsecondary education programs, training and services. KCTCS provides statewide access to quality, affordable postsecondary education and training through a system of 16 college districts with more than 60 campuses. KCTCS supplies employers and employees with the following services to enhance the skills of Kentucky’s workforce:

- Certificate, diploma, technical degree, associate degree and transfer programs
- KY WINS (Workforce Investment Network System)—high-level academic and technical skills training for employees of new and existing business. KY WINS provides business and industry access to customized training programs, pre- and post-employment training and employee assessment.
- Customized workforce training on the local level. Coordinators at the system level assist the colleges in developing programs that deliver specialized training when and where it is needed.
- IT Fast Track program partners with computer industry leaders to deliver training designed to improve the information technology literacy of Kentucky’s workforce. Partnerships include Microsoft, Oracle, Cisco and Nortel.
- Kentucky Manufacturing Skills Standards (KMSS), developed in conjunction with manufacturers throughout the state, provides skills standards certification. KCTCS administers the KMSS assessment and provides targeted instruction to assist individuals in achieving certification.
- WorkKeys—system of job profiling, assessment and targeted instruction that focuses on the foundational skills found in all jobs in the workplace. These skills include reading, math, applied technology, critical thinking skills, teamwork and problem solving.
- On-line degrees and courses available to provide anytime, anywhere learning.
- Assessment centers at the colleges offer a wide array of workplace assessments to assist business and industry in identifying skill levels of existing and potential employees.

**Kentucky Information Highway (KIH)**

Companies approved for economic development incentives administered by KEDFA may receive access and use of the Kentucky Information Highway on the same terms as state agencies. (KRS 45A.605)

**Kentucky Captive Insurer Law (KRS 304.49-010 to 304.49-230)**

Permits companies to establish wholly owned insurance subsidiaries to insure some or all of their own risks. As part of an overall risk-management program, a Captive offers a multitude of potential advantages over the commercial insurance market including:

- Potential to lower insurance premium costs by as much as 30-40 percent, by eliminating overhead and profit for the commercial insurer.
- Possible tax advantages through either reduction or deferral.
- Ability to increase profits and cash flow by permitting premiums and investment earnings from the Captive to accrue to the group, not an outside entity.