

Project Team Meeting Minutes

July 1, 2009

In Attendance:

Richard Breen, City of Glenview
Kathy Melvin, BIC
Aida Copic, Planning and Design Services
Mike Smiley, Environs, Inc.
Ted Grossardt, UK Trans. Ctr.
Ben Blandford, UK Trans. Ctr.

Dirk Gowin, Public Works
Dave French, River Fields
Lisa Hite, Metro Parks
Jon Henney, GSP
John Ripy, UK Trans. Ctr.

Distributed: Project Team meeting agenda; June 3 and June 17 Project Team meeting minutes, revised Project Schedule, and revised On-Line Survey Questions draft.

The meeting began with introductions of the University of Kentucky Transportation Center staff. Ben Blandford then walked the group through a PowerPoint summary of the results of the survey conducted at the June public meeting. The results were classified into three broad categories for the summary—raw data, by modal usage, and by zones of residence (see PowerPoint).

Raw Data summary

All 5 intrinsic qualities that were surveyed were considered valued (score of 5 or higher). Natural resources and scenic views were ranked highest of the intrinsic qualities while archaeological and cultural resources were ranked lowest. When it came to roadway functionality, Ben noted that performance consistently was rated higher than importance. Ben went on to state that overall respondents felt that the road functioned well for automobiles but not so well for bicycles or pedestrians. Mike stated that the questions relating to roadway convenience were confusing for those that lived on the corridor and didn't have any choice whether to use the road or not.

Ben then summarized the questions relating to safety, noting that travel speed and volume were identified as having the most impact on safety, though neither was given a significantly high score. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities were viewed as the most likely to improve safety on the corridor.

Results by Modal Use

Ben stated that in evaluating this data they counted someone as a particular modal user if they responded that they used that mode either on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis. He stated that when evaluating responses to questions about the qualities of the roadway that there was no significant variation from one modal user group to the next.

Richard asked if the raw data was available for the Project Team to review. John Ripy stated that the data is contained in a spreadsheet with several imbedded macros but they would be happy to provide the group with a copy. Aida asked about how the data was being interpreted, saying she thought it was showing that the road performed well for pedestrians. Ben responded that those who identified themselves as walkers (walked on a monthly, weekly, daily basis) rated the corridor as performing reasonably well for automobile travel. Lisa asked about the number of responders and said that the interpretation of the data should reflect those numbers (i.e., the fact there were only 2 people who identified themselves as transit users). John Ripy said that there were 128 respondents at the beginning of the survey and there were 110 respondents to the origin/destination questions.

Results by Zones of Residence

Ben presented the results of the survey questions dealing with origins/destinations based on the zone of residence that responders identified themselves with. Richard asked about use of zip codes rather than the 10 zones used. Ted said that there were several methods for determining origins/destinations and the approach used was just one way to accomplish that objective.

Dirk noted that over half of those identifying themselves as cyclists started and ended their trips in Zone 1 (downtown Louisville area). It was also noted that bike commuters and recreational riders were coming from different locations and going to different locations. Lisa suggested that the color codes on the map be revised so it was easier to visually discriminate between them.

Richard said his biggest concern with the survey was that people had to assume a lot in order to answer several of the questions. He used the example of roadway performance and the assumption that the Harrods Creek Bridge was open and functioning. He also was concerned that the questions went too long and that people were tired by the last set of questions. Ted responded that the attendees were asked during the meeting whether or not they wanted to repeat the questions for a new proposed trip and the response was yes.

The Project Team asked to see the PowerPoint with the questions, the raw data, and the draft summary of the results for their next scheduled meeting (July 15th). Ted said that if he was provided with specifics about analysis we wanted to see in the final report in a timely manner that they could get it turned around by then. Jon said he would provide Ted with that direction in the next day or two. Dirk requested that all of the maps depicting the data analysis include the graphic bar scales showing the numerical ranges used for each.

Jon reviewed the proposed agenda for the July 13th public meeting. Discussion followed on the format of the meeting. Richard suggested that the breakout sessions be optional as time permitted and that the bulk of the meeting be devoted to public comment. He suggested that time limits be imposed to ensure that everyone wishing to talk had the opportunity and asked that written comment sheets be provided again for those not wishing to make a verbal comment.

The purpose of the breakout sessions and Dot map exercise was then discussed. Richard asked if these were really needed. Lisa and Aida both stated that these were useful tools that offered opportunities for individuals to comment that might not otherwise participate and that it help assure people that their comments were being heard and considered.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jon Henney