

GEORGETOWN-SCOTT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Volume I Chapter Three

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

SCOTT COUNTY - GEORGETOWN - SADIEVILLE - STAMPING GROUND

2006

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY.....1

SECTION I - SUPPORTING INFORMATION3

 Introduction3

 Fundamental Principle3

 Key Terms And Definitions.....4

SECTION II - GROWTH PROJECTIONS12

 Projected Population Growth.....12

 Understanding Growth Factors12

 Historical And Projected Growth Rates13

 Growth Impacts.....14

 Transportation And Commuting Patterns14

 Housing And Land14

 Schools14

 Urban - Rural - Municipal15

SECTION III - GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND STANDARDS.....16

 Adequacy.....16

 Rural Roadway System Access23

 Land Use.....24

 Roadway Location26

 Air Service.....28

 Rail Facilities29

 Phasing And Coordination.....30

SECTION IV - PROJECT PRIORITIES32

 Evaluation Procedures And Criteria.....32

 Traffic Collision Statistical Summary.....33

 Priorities.....36

 Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan37

 Regional Transportation Committee.....38

 Scott County Priorities39

 Georgetown Priorities41

 Sadieville Priorities43

 Stamping Ground Priorities43

SECTION V - IMPLEMENTATION METHODS.....44

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

SUMMARY

The information contained within the Transportation Element of the Georgetown-Scott County Comprehensive Plan is intended to assist the Planning Commission, State and Local Government Officials, Developers, and Citizens in understanding the transportation system contained within Scott County and its municipalities. A broad understanding of the transportation network is essential with respect to making sound decisions regarding investments in and prioritization of transportation related construction and maintenance projects. These decisions affect virtually all of the residents of Scott County and should be made with all deliberation and the best information available.

The information in this chapter documents the structure, classification schemes, and levels of service for the existing transportation network within the county. It is intended to help the reader understand the complexities of the transportation network and the opportunities for improvement throughout the 10-year planning window envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE:

The guiding principle for decisions made regarding the transportation network within Scott County is that such decisions are made based on due-diligence and with an eye toward striking a proper balance between the needs of the public and the need to encourage and manage growth throughout the county. Decisions should result in a safe and modern transportation network that serves the needs of an increasingly mobile public, maintains and supports community commerce and integrity, and is sensitive to the historic and environmental aspects of Scott County.

Section I, Supporting Information, is designed to help the reader understand the remainder of the document. It provides context, and key terms and their definitions as used throughout the Transportation Element. A working knowledge of transportation element “language” will assist readers and decision-makers in their efforts to make viable and forward-thinking decisions regarding the transportation network in Scott County.

Section II, Growth Projections, presents information regarding the anticipated growth rates and patterns for the duration of the current planning window. Section II provides a statistical framework for decision-makers regarding projected growth in Scott County. It outlines the historical and projected population growth and suggests housing and residential land needs that are the foundation for the growth and land use management within Scott County. This section summarizes the many factors evaluated in the planning process, such as growth trends; capabilities to provide public infrastructure and services; foreseeable future events that could affect growth; and the desires and attitudes of Scott County citizens about growth. Section II provides projections for population growth, land needs and the transportation network that will be required to support those needs. The statistical bases for these projections are the 2000 and 2005 U.S. Census Reports, and the Scott County Socio-Economic Report produced by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission.

Section III, Transportation Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Standards, outlines the general goals, objectives, policies, and standards that have been developed and adopted by the Planning Commission and its staff to guide decision-makers. Function-specific goal statements are included for Transportation Adequacy, Roadway System Access, Land Use, Roadway Location, Air Service, Rail Facilities, and Phasing and Coordination.

Section IV, Project Priorities, describes the “on-the-ground” application of the goals, objectives, policies, and standards to current and future transportation network improvements. It provides a prioritized list of those improvement projects considered most important to enhancing the quality of life for Scott County Citizens. The Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan is the centerpiece for this section, and incorporates the bulk of the Scott County goals for construction. Municipal goals are also included for Georgetown, Sadieville, and Stamping Ground.

Section V, Implementation Method, outlines the principle methods for funding the planned transportation improvements.

The Planning Commission will keep on file all of the associated study and planning material related to the above sections. Future planning decisions that relate to the transportation network will be based on all available information.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
SECTION I
SUPPORTING INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

The Transportation Element of the Georgetown-Scott County Comprehensive Plan consists of “goals and objectives” as required by KRS 100.193, and the transportation plan for the future as required by KRS 100.187. The Transportation Element is based on an analysis of the adequacy of existing and proposed transportation facilities needed to accommodate existing and projected development within the Georgetown and Scott County community as required by KRS 100.191.

The Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element is intended to: (1) guide public and private land development decisions; (2) serve as a basis for the dedication of public rights-of-way when land is subdivided, rezonings are sought for more intense uses, conditional use permits are requested, or other activities involve the creation or significant expansion of use; and (3) guide the establishment and prioritization of local and state transportation improvement programs and projects.

The overall purpose of the county comprehensive plan will be realized as the goals and objectives of this and other chapters are adopted and supported by the various local legislative bodies within Scott County. The Georgetown-Scott County Joint Planning Commission will adopt and promote the goals, objectives, policies, and standards governing functional classification figures and future transportation plan statistics. It should be noted that standards as contained within this plan are advisory only and will not necessarily be adopted or approved by the Planning Commission as part of the Transportation Element.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE:

The guiding principle for decisions made regarding the transportation network within Scott County is that such decisions are made based on due-diligence and with an eye toward striking a proper balance between the needs of the public and the need to encourage and manage growth throughout the county. Decisions should result in a safe and modern transportation network that serves the needs of an increasingly mobile public, maintains and supports community commerce and integrity, and is sensitive to the historic and environmental aspects of Scott County.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

This section of the plan contains definitions for terms relevant to the Transportation Element of the Georgetown-Scott County Comprehensive Plan.

Acronyms:

ADT – Average Daily Traffic
BASE – Base Level of Service Standard
FHA – Federal Highway Administration
KRS – Kentucky Revised Statutes
LOS – Level of Service
USB – Urban Service Boundary
V/C – Volume-To-Capacity Ratio

Adequacy Analyses:

Adequacy Analysis data deals with the adequacy of the existing roadway network within Georgetown and Scott County. It generally focuses on arterial and collector roadway systems and addresses three categories of concern; functional, geometric, and structural.

Capacity:

Capacity is defined as the maximum hourly rate at which persons or vehicles can traverse a point or uniform section of a lane or roadway during a specified time period. It is evaluated and expressed in terms of the ratio of average arrival flow rate (demand) to capacity (V/C ratio).

Capacity – Reserve:

Reserve Capacity is the reserve, or unused, capacity in traffic movement at a given intersection or traffic lane.

Constrained Roadways:

Constrained roadways fall into two categories, physical and policy. Physically constrained roadways are those where needed improvements are made uneconomical due to the acquisition of structures or the adverse impact on historic structures. Policy constrained roadways are those that a policy-making body has determined cannot or should not be improved. Constrained roadways are designated by resolution of the appropriate local legislative body with land use control authority.

Development - Final Approval:

Final Development Approval is the recording of a subdivision plat or the approval of an occupancy permit for a development plan. The level of commitment required of a developer becomes more definitive and stringent as the development approaches occupancy.

Developments -- Large:

- Large Residential - Those in excess of 45 dwelling units.
- Large Retail Or Office - Those in excess of 30,000 square feet of building space.
- Large Industrial - Those in excess of 100 employees or 150,000 square feet of building space.
- Large Institutional Or Public Use - Those generating in excess of 300 trips during the street peak hour.

Development – Urban:

Urban development is concentrated land use. The term “urban development” includes industrial and commercial development of all kinds and residential development on lots consistent with the residential classifications under the zoning ordinance. Urban development in the context of this discussion does not include residential development on five-acre tracts.

Federal-Aid System:

The Federal-Aid System was established to assist in funding eligible road construction and maintenance projects. It is a reimbursement program that provides the majority of funding for construction and maintenance of roadways throughout Scott County. Projects that benefit the federal Interstate Highway System may be funded at up to 90 percent of costs. Most projects on arterial and collector roadways are supported by this funding program which provides up to 75 percent of the cost of a given project. The remaining 25 percent is the responsibility of state and local governments. The Commonwealth of Kentucky provides matching funds for Federal-Aid Highway projects through its State Administrative System. Highway projects not on a federal or state system must be implemented and maintained through local funding mechanisms.

Functional Roadway Classifications:

Based on Federal Highway Administration Guidelines three functional classifications are used to differentiate roadways – Arterials, Collectors, and Locals. These three classifications are assigned according to a given roadways proportion of service to “mobility” versus “land access,” i.e., the proportion of roadway use that serves to provide for vehicular mobility or access to land parcels. Variations within the three primary classifications are addressed by attaching “major” and “minor” subclassification descriptors. The broad functional classifications are defined as follows: (See Figure 1-1 for additional detail)

- 1) *Arterials* – Serve to move people between major destinations, favoring mobility over access. They are designed to provide a higher degree of mobility over longer trips. Arterials offer high operating speeds, optimal levels of service, and feature access controls.
- 2) *Collectors* – Place equal emphasis on mobility and land access, providing access to arterials and minor destinations. Collectors serve a dual role in that they not only provide access to arterials, they provide for short trip travel. They provide acceptable levels of mobility as well as access to abutting property; therefore intermediate design speed and open access are required.
- 3) *Locals* – Primarily serve abutting properties and provide a route to collectors. Mobility and high speeds are not required.

FIGURE 1-1

HIGHWAY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION - PROPORTION OF SERVICE -		
ARTERIALS (Mobility over Access)	Access	←—————→ Mobility
COLLECTORS (Balanced Mobility and Access)	Access →————→	←————→ Mobility
LOCALS (Access over Mobility)	Access →————→	Mobility

Goal – Transportation:

For the purposes of this plan Transportation Goals are written as statements of fact (i.e., true/false) so as to promote measurement as to whether the reality is consistent with the intent. If a given goal statement is held to be true, according to the reality on the ground, then the goal has been achieved. Goals are intended to be “end statements” that are the culmination of their associated objectives.

Level of Service – Base Standard (BASE):

The BASE LOS expresses the minimum level of acceptable service for a given intersection or roadway segment. See Table 1-1 below for specific standards information.

TABLE 1-1

BASE LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS			
Rural Principal and Minor Arterials		Rural Major and Minor Collectors and Local Roads	
Signalized Intersections	V/C Ratio of 0.90 and Delay LOS “C”	Signalized Intersections	V/C Ratio of 0.80 and Delay LOS “C”
Unsignalized Intersections including approaches from Side Roads	Delay LOS “C”	Unsignalized Intersections including approaches from Side Roads	Delay LOS “C”
Roadway segment between intersections	V/C Ratio below 0.6 or LOS “D”	Roadway segment between intersections	V/C Ratio below 0.6 or LOS “D”

Level of Service – Delay (Urban):

Level of Service (LOS) refers to the average stopped delay per vehicle for the different movements within an intersection. It is a measure of adequacy associated with signalized intersections, usually within urban areas. Levels of Service range from A to F and are defined as qualitative measures that describe the operational conditions within a traffic stream as well as their perception by motorists and/or passengers. They generally describe conditions in such terms as speed and travel time, freedom of maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety.

Level of Service – Unsignalized Intersections:

LOS ratings at unsignalized intersections range from A to F and are based on the reserve or unused capacity of the traffic movement land in question. The analysis method takes into consideration gaps in conflicting traffic movements. See Table 1-2 for specific LOS descriptions.

TABLE 1-2

LEVEL OF SERVICE DESCRIPTIONS FOR UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Reserve Capacity (vehicular capacity during peak hour)	Level Of Service	Expected Delay to Minor Street Traffic
> 400	A	Little or no delay
300 – 399	B	Short traffic delays
200 – 299	C	Average traffic delays
100 – 199	D	Long traffic delays
0 – 99	E	Very long traffic delays
(a)	F	Very long traffic delays
(a) When demand volume exceeds capacity, extreme delays will be encountered with “queuing” which may cause severe congestion and affect other traffic movements in the intersection.		

Level of Service – Rural Two-Lane Roadways:

LOS ratings for rural two-lane roadways are expressed in terms of the percentage of passing sight distance which is the primary factor influencing the capacity of the roadway. Pavement and shoulder width are considered secondary factors.

Maintenance Responsibilities:

State and local jurisdictions are responsible for maintaining roadways. The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Department of Highways maintains roadways designated as Interstate Highways, U.S. Highways, and State Highways. All other roads, both urban and rural, are maintained locally.

Objectives – Transportation:

For the purposes of this plan, Transportation Objectives are written as statements of fact (i.e, true/false) so as to be measurable. If a given objective statement is held to be true as written, according to the reality on the ground, then it can be considered to have been achieved. Objectives are intended to be conditional statements that when completed and combined, result in a given goal being reached. They can be viewed as “sub-goals”.

Peak Hour(s):

The timeframe during which the highest measured count included in the Average Daily Traffic count is recorded. This number can also be expressed as the low and high extremes as measured during a given day. AM and PM peak numbers can also be expressed individually.

Phase Categories:

- D = Design
- R = Right-Of-Way Acquisition
- U = Utility Relocation
- C = Construction

Planning Window:

The timeframe addressed by the Comprehensive Plan. This version of the Georgetown-Scott County Comprehensive Plan addresses a 5-year update window.

Policy – Transportation:

Policy statements are intended to be “directives” that establish the rules guiding implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Programmed For Construction:

Programmed for Construction means the transportation facility will be under construction within three years for local roads, and within six years for state roads.

Project Funding Codes and Categories:

APD – Federal Appalachian Development Highways
BRA – Federal Bridge Acceleration Funds (Demo)
BRO – Federal Bridge Replacement - On System
BRX – Federal Bridge Replacement - On/Off System
BRZ – Federal Bridge Replacement - Off System
CM – Federal Congestion Mitigation Funds
FH – Federal Forest Highway Funds
GAR – Garvee Bond Debt Service FD53
HES – Safety-Hazard Elimination
HPP – High Priority Projects
IM – Federal Interstate Maintenance Funds
JM1 – Garvee Bonds I-65 Rehabilitation
JM2 – Garvee Bonds I-75 Rehabilitation
JM3 – Garvee Bonds I-64 Rehabilitation
KYD – Federal Demonstration Funds Allocated To Kentucky
NH – Federal National Highway System Funds
RRP – Safety-Railroad Protection
RRS – Safety-Railroad Separation
SAF – Federal Safety Funds
SHN – Federal STP Funds Dedicated To Henderson
SLO – Federal STP Funds Dedicated To Louisville
SLX – Federal STP Funds Dedicated To Lexington
SNK – Federal STP Funds Dedicated To Northern Kentucky
SP – State Construction Fund
STP – Federal Statewide Transportation Program Funds
TE – Federal Transportation Enhancement Program Funds

Rural Area:

For the purposes of the Georgetown-Scott County Comprehensive Plan, Rural Areas are defined as those areas located in unincorporated areas of Scott County or outside of designated Urban Service Boundaries.

Rights-of-Way (Dedicated and Reserved):

A right-of-way is a certain minimum distance as measured from the established centerline of the existing/proposed road that is reserved or dedicated to the appropriate governing body on all minor and major subdivision plats in accordance with prevailing standards required for the functional classification of the road. These rights-of-way are typically used for required and/or anticipated roadway, bikeway, walkway, and utility and maintenance purposes.

Roadway Adequacy:

The ability of a given roadway to carry traffic is determined by analysis of its capacity and its level of service. The type of adequacy analysis required varies between urban and rural areas. In urban areas intersections provide the primary control of traffic flow. In rural areas the percent of passing site distance is the primary control of traffic flow. Both of these factors are affected by features unique to each intersection or roadway segment.

Roadway Classification Categories:

Roadways are classified by type, funding level, maintenance, and their ability to carry traffic.

- *Access Roadways:* Access roadways exist to provide access from a given local location to larger more controlled access roadways, such as arterials and collectors.
- *Rural Roadways:* Rural Roadways occur outside the corporate or accepted limits of a given metropolitan area.
- *Rural Local Roads:* Rural Local Roads provide access to and movement from individual sites. Typically, they include roads within subdivisions, small towns, industrial parks, and back roads found throughout the rural area. They often are narrow and have no lane designation, and may consist of graveled surfaces.
- *Rural Major Collectors:* Rural Major Collectors serve principal and minor arterials and distribute traffic to minor collectors. They serve a collectors dual role by supporting trips of short length and providing indirect access to abutting properties.
- *Rural Minor Arterials:* Rural Minor Arterials are typically two-lane highways that provide links between communities and connections between collectors and principal arterials. These roadways sometimes parallel rural principal arterials and serve traffic traveling between smaller urban areas.
- *Rural Minor Collectors:* Rural Minor Collectors provide linkages between the many farms, subdivisions, and rural communities to the major collectors that provide direct routes to the arterials and the urban communities. As such, they serve the collectors dual purpose function of providing access to abutting properties and trips of typically short duration.
- *Rural Principal Arterials:* Rural Principal Arterials are interstate highways, expressways, and limited four-lane highways traversing the unincorporated countryside. They are generally used for high-speed trips between major destinations.

Significant Deterioration:

An increase in average daily trips using a given facility of greater than 5 percent when a constrained facility has reached a volume-to-capacity ratio of 1.00 or an LOS “E”, OR when proposed development is anticipated to result in a reduction of the pre-existing LOS by 1 or more levels.

Standards – Transportation:

For the purposes of this plan, Standards are written as statements of measure or quality. They are intended to provide the guidance used to gauge whether compliance or conditions of quality have been successfully achieved.

Truck Route Designations:

Class AAA – This is the primary classification for truck highways and allows for a gross load limit of up to 80,000 pounds.

Class AA – Allows for a gross load limit of up to 62,000 pounds.

Class A – Allows for a gross load limit of up to 44,000 pounds.

Traffic Congestion Areas:

Areas in which existing roads routinely operated below minimum service level requirements.

Traffic Impact Study:

Traffic Impact Studies define and describe the expected impact of traffic on a given development.

Traffic Management Plan:

Traffic Management Plans describe how the impacts on a development as described in a given Traffic Impact Study will be handled/remediated.

National Network System:

The Surface Transportation Act of 1982 designated highways included within this system as truck routes for larger vehicles.

Urban Area:

For the purposes of this plan, urban areas are defined as those areas located within incorporated municipalities and/or within approved Urban Service Boundaries.

Urban Collector Streets:

Urban Collector Streets carry traffic to the arterials from residential and commercial areas. They provide a secondary connecting link between the local streets and the nearest major streets and highways, and are typically used for trips of shorter length.

Urban Local Streets:

Urban Local Streets provide for direct access to residential, commercial, industrial, or other abutting land uses, and for local traffic movements. They provide routes through subdivisions and residential areas and connect to collectors and arterials. Typically, Urban Local Streets are the most numerous in the urban classification category.

Urban Minor Arterial Streets:

Urban Minor Arterial Streets are roads that provide direct access to the principal arteries. They feature restricted speeds and generally are used to support shorter trips, typically being used to get somewhere directly within the community they serve or to gain access to an urban principal arterial.

Urban Principal Arteries:

Urban Principal Arteries are used for “express”, high-speed travel from point to point within an urban area. Examples include: bypasses, interstate highways, and limited access four-lane expressways. These roadways provide for the expeditious movement of high volumes of traffic between areas and/or across, around, or through the city or urban area.

Urban Roadways:

Urban Roadways occur within the corporate limits or the accepted limits of a given metropolitan area.

Volume-To-Capacity (V/C) Ratio (Signalized Intersections):

Volume-To-Capacity ratios represent the volume of vehicles on an intersection approach or designated group of lanes serving a particular movement, divided by the calculated capacity of the intersection approach or designated group of lanes. A ratio of 0.90 to 1.0 indicates that the intersection or designated group of lanes is approaching its capacity and that consideration should be given to the need for improvements. A ratio of 1.0 or greater indicates that an improvement is definitely needed. V/C ratios are usually applied to signalized intersections.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

SECTION II

SCOTT COUNTY GROWTH PROJECTIONS

PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH

All growth indicators show a positive and even accelerating growth rate across Scott County. Given this fact, a substantive understanding of the factors affecting growth in Scott County is fundamental for decision-makers regarding their planning and land use responsibilities, particularly as they apply to development of the county transportation network. Fundamental to good decision making is a grasp of factors such as raw and projected population and economic growth rates, timing, and location. These factors, along with the location of the new jobs, housing, business and education development activities that are inevitable for Scott County provide the context in which the guiding decisions about the county's transportation network must be made. Clearly, a safe and accessible transportation network will be needed to support future development, the phasing of public improvements necessary to match the pace of that development, and thus meet the needs of a growing community particularly as they relate to the movement of people, goods and services. This section of the Transportation Element is designed to help county and municipal officials form a viable statistical basis for such a decision-making process.

This Comprehensive Plan is based upon an extensive evaluation of all currently available information on Scott County's growth patterns, both historical and projected. Statistical estimates are based on both the 2000 and 2005 updates of the US Census Bureau data. These statistics reflect actual historical records and estimated growth projections from 1970 through 2030 and are presented based on calculated increments of 5-years. It should be noted that any growth rate estimate will be affected by the occurrence of subsequent events. The planning process has made every effort to foresee and assess the possible impacts of such events over the next 5-10 years, in order to make this information as useful and relevant as possible to the decision-making processes.

UNDERSTANDING GROWTH FACTORS

For future population projections through 2030, a range of growth possibilities was considered:

- Growth rate is the speed at which growth occurs, presented either as actual measured data or calculated estimates.
- Low growth rate assumes a slower growth than the calculated historical trend.
- Medium growth rate assumes a moderate annual rate that essentially tracks historical trends.
- High growth rate assumes a more rapid or accelerating rate of growth that generally exceeds historical trends. This rate would typically result from higher absorption of new workers due to strong economic growth and other growth-inducing factors.
- Cumulative growth is the difference between current population levels and population levels as measured over a given period of time, presented as raw statistical data.
- Projected growth is growth rate statistical data based on actual historical data extrapolated to predict levels of growth over time.
- Urban growth is growth within established Urban Service Boundaries.

- Rural growth is growth within unincorporated areas of Scott County and/or outside of defined Urban Service Boundaries
- Municipal growth is growth that occurs within the corporate limits of a given municipality.

HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED GROWTH RATES

Table 2-1

YEAR	ACTUAL POPULATION	LINEAR POPULATION ESTIMATES	GROWTH RATE (%)	GROWTH RATE (Raw)	GROWTH RATE (Cumulative)
1970	17948	17948	0	0	0
1975	19881	21010	10.8	1933	1933
1980	21813	24071	9.7	1932	3865
1985	22724	27133	4.2	911	4776
1990	23634	30195	4.0	910	5686
1995	27634	33257	16.9	4000	9686
2000	33380	36318	20.8	5746	15432
2005	39380	39380	18.0	6000	21432
2010		42442	7.8	3062	24494
2015		45503	7.2	3061	27555
2020		48565	6.7	3062	30617
2025		51627	6.3	3062	33679
2030		54689	5.9	3062	36741

Table 2-1 -- Analysis

- Accelerating actual growth rate since 1990
- Actual growth rate historically exceeds projected growth rate
- Average actual growth rate 1970-2005 = 10.6%
- Average projected growth rate 2010-2030 = 6.8%
- Average combined growth rate 1970-2005 = 9.1%
- Kentucky Tourism Cabinet projected growth rate for Scott County = 8.7%
- Statistical projections indicate a moderate growth rate countywide with an annual population increase of approximately 3062. However, it should be noted that the data indicates that, historically, actual growth exceeds projections by a significant margin. The combined growth rate of 9.1% is the recommended planning number.
- Assumptions – The statistics contained in Table 2-1 above are either raw numbers or linear (straightline) projections and assume no significant changes to the historical growth patterns. Events such as Toyota expansion, significant new industry influx, the World Equestrian Games, and economic stability in neighboring counties do have the potential to impact the rate and timing of growth within Scott County.

GROWTH IMPACTS: TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUTING PATTERNS

Growth trends indicate a steady march toward a more urban Scott County. The majority of the county's population now resides within the respective Urban Service Boundaries of the existing municipalities. Further, the projections indicate that these urban areas will experience a slightly higher growth rate than will the more rural areas of the county. Development of streets and roads that serve to provide access from development areas to collectors and arterials, and connectors between municipalities and employment centers may need to receive the higher priority, if choices have to be made in that regard.

Most Scott County residents work within Scott, Fayette, and Harrison counties. However, the county also draws its workforce from as many as 43 counties in the greater Bluegrass, Central, and Northern Kentucky areas. Scott County workers also travel to as many as 14 other counties in Central and Northern Kentucky for their employment. The majority (67%) of Scott County commuters enjoy a one-way commute time of less than 25 minutes. These commute times, for the most part, are considered reasonable but careful planning will be required to maintain these levels as the traveling population increases and county and city streets become more crowded more often and for longer periods of time. The continuing lack of transportation alternatives in the county results in 94% of all non-commercial travel being conducted in private vehicles – 82% of which contain two or fewer occupants.

GROWTH IMPACTS: URBAN – RURAL – MUNICIPAL

While growth will occur countywide, the most rapid growth will likely take place in urban areas, those areas within defined Urban Service Boundaries, and will most likely be centered in (expanded) existing and planned developments. All Scott County municipalities are expected to share in the increased population. Unincorporated areas of the county are expected to experience steady growth but at a rate slightly below (8.9%) the projected county average (9.1%). As of 2005, in terms of urban growth, the three incorporated municipalities within the county, Georgetown, Sadieville, and Stamping Ground, constitute approximately 64% of the total county population. Thus the countywide trend is toward urbanization of the general population.

2000 Census data indicate that the population of Georgetown was 18,080 in 2000 and is projected to be 21,230 by 2010. This amounts to approximately 56% of the total county population as projected at that time. The growth rate in Georgetown has significantly accelerated since 1990 when population statistics showed its population to be 11,414. If the current growth rate continues the population of Georgetown will have increased nearly 86% over the 20-year period between 1990 and 2010. The population increase is projected to continue through the 2030 statistical window to approximately 27,531 which indicates a more modest growth rate over the next 20 years. It is a safe assumption to accept that the bulk of the Scott County population will continue to be centered in the Georgetown area and that the county as a whole will continue to attract new residents from neighboring areas, particularly Fayette County, due to elevated housing and property costs there and the continued favorable commuting patterns between these two urban employment centers. It is also reasonable to project that the bulk of the rural growth will occur in the northern reaches of Scott County, due to the availability of land parcels and their favorable prices.

2005 records indicate the Sadieville population, within the existing city limits, to be approximately 300 people. The greater Sadieville planning area population is approximately triple that contained

within the city limits. These numbers are slightly higher than the 2000 projections, and in fact represent a sharp increase in growth rate since 1980. The growth rate in Sadieville is slightly higher at 9.7% than the projected county average and is expected to accelerate over the next five years due to expanded infrastructure availability, planned annexation and reclassification activities, and known development plans.

2000 census records indicate the Stamping Ground population, within the existing city limits, to be approximately 566 people. The average projected growth rate in Stamping Ground is 8.4% through 2030 or slightly lower than the 9.1% projected county average. However, steady growth is predicted for the greater Stamping Ground Urban Service Boundary area based on known development plans.

GROWTH IMPACTS: HOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL LAND

Based on 2000 statistical Census Bureau data, the average Scott County household size is 3.01 people. This level is expected to hold steady, averaging slightly more than three people per household, through 2030. In 2000, an estimated 12,743 residences existed in Scott County. Based on 2005 population levels and the current average household size, an estimated 15,752 residences are currently located within the county. Given linear projections on general population growth (9.1%) approximately 1,731 new housing units will be needed each year to meet the anticipated demand over the next 5-10 years countywide. Based on 2000 housing availability levels and projected growth rates, a total of 17,712 units will be required by 2020, and a total of 20,449 units need to be in place by 2030. Land requirements for commercial and light industrial concerns can also be expected to increase proportionately.

Based on a relatively low density of three units per gross acre countywide, approximately 577 acres of developable land will be needed each year to accommodate projected growth demands for residential housing through 2010.

GROWTH IMPACTS: SCHOOLS

The average Scott County resident in 2000 was 33 years old. Typically, this is the age group in the middle of their “family building” years and steady growth can be expected in the supply of school age children throughout the planning window. Less than 10% of the population is 65 years of age or older. The Scott County Public School System reports an actual historical student enrollment annual growth rate of 3.54%. However, this does not account for students who attend non-public school establishments. Most indications are that the number of students in these situations is increasing. It can safely be assumed that based on indicated growth rates in the general population, the number of students attending school in Scott County will exceed the recorded historical rates and require accelerated facility building and expansion projects. The highest percentage of the school age population will be the elementary and middle school age groups, ages 5-14, followed closely by students of high school age, 15-18.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
SECTION III
TRANSPORTATION GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND STANDARDS

TRANSPORTATION GOAL ON ADEQUACY

Efficient, safe, convenient and coordinated movement of people and goods within Scott County and between its communities, while minimizing adverse social, economic, and environmental impacts, and maintaining the historic, cultural, and environmental quality and characteristics valued by county residents.

<u>Supporting Objectives:</u>	<u>Implementing Policies:</u>	<u>Operating Standards:</u>
<p><i>Adequacy:</i> All new developments and changes in use are supported by streets, roadways, and trails adequate to handle both vehicular and non-vehicular traffic generated by the new development or use change in question.</p>	<p>Roadway design and construction shall be sufficient to safely handle the existing and anticipated mix and volume of traffic.</p> <p>Georgetown and Scott County shall develop and maintain formalized procedures by which developers shall contribute their proportional share of improvement costs for transportation facilities necessary to accommodate the anticipated impact of any proposed development.</p> <p>The public may contribute to the cost of transportation improvements required for developments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. When the transportation improvement or the development contributes to a community-wide objective such as the improvement of a transportation facility to serve substantial through-traffic movement above that generated by the development; b. To provide an inducement to developers of low and moderate cost housing; or, 	<p>In addition to the standards listed herein, all standards recognized and accepted by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission as being associated with transportation facilities adequacy are applicable to requirements of this plan whether incorporated directly or by reference.</p>

<i>(Supporting Objectives cont.)</i>	<i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i>	<i>(Operating Standards cont.)</i>
<p>Level of Service: All non-constrained streets within Scott County operate at a LOS “C” or better by 2011.</p>	<p>c. To provide financial incentives for the redevelopment or rehabilitation of older areas of the community.</p> <p>Traffic impact studies are required for “large” developments or “traffic congestion areas” to determine the magnitude of roadway improvements required to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development while maintaining the Base Level of Service Standards. Such studies shall consider existing traffic volumes during the highest street peak hour, traffic generated by developments having received final development approval, programmed roadway improvements of adopted roadway improvement programs, traffic generated by the proposed developments and normal traffic growth. The Planning Commission may optionally require the inclusion of traffic generated by preliminary approved developments which will proceed to the final development approval stage with reasonable certainty.</p> <p>Prior to development approval, developers are required to verify/establish the correct Level of Service (LOS) for the area in which the development will take place. Once the correct LOS has been determined developers must maintain or enhance the LOS for the subject development as defined by the accepted and applicable standards in place at the time development begins.</p>	<p>Minimum Level of Service –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The minimum acceptable peak hour operating Level of Service standards for non-constrained streets within Urban Service Areas shall be Level of Service “D” for all arterial streets and “C” for all collectors. 2) The minimum acceptable peak hour operating Level of Service standards for non-constrained streets outside of Urban Service Areas shall be LOS “D”.

<i>(Supporting Objectives cont.)</i>	<i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i>	<i>(Operating Standards cont.)</i>
	<p>The Base Level of Service Standards (BASE) as defined herein shall apply to all activities pertaining to street and roadway improvement, programming, and design unless variances are specified under other policies contained within this Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Roadways that are physically or environmentally constrained or legislatively prohibited from expansion due to their historic, environmental, or cultural character will operate at a Volume-to-Capacity ratio of 1.00 or an LOS “E”. However, no development permit shall be issued that would cause significant deterioration of the traffic carrying capacity of constrained roadway segments or that would violate generally accepted traffic engineering practices concerning safety.</p> <p>Road or street intersections or segments may operate at a volume-to-capacity ratio or LOS lower than the BASE standard (but not lower than a volume-to-capacity ratio of 1.00 or LOS “E”) unless the developer has made a contractual agreement to make the necessary improvements required to bring the intersection or segment to the minimum BASE standard.</p> <p>All developments with record plat approvals or issued building permit before final adoption of the updated Comprehensive Plan by the jurisdiction in which the development lies shall be exempted from meeting the LOS standards set forth in the applicable policies.</p>	<p>3) BASE Level of Service –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Urban Principal and Minor Arterials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Signalized intersections – volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.90 and delay -- LOS “D”. ii) Unsignalized intersections, including approaches on side streets -- LOS “D”. iii) Roadway segment between intersections -- LOS “D”. b) Urban Collector and Local Streets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Signalized intersections – volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.80 and delay -- LOS “C”. ii) Unsignalized intersections, including approaches on side streets -- LOS “C”. iii) Roadway segment between intersections -- LOS “C”. c) Rural Principal and Minor Arterials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Signalized intersections – volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.90 and delay -- LOS “C”. ii) Unsignalized intersections, including approaches on side streets -- LOS “C”. iii) Roadway segment between intersections -- LOS “C”, or a volume-to-capacity ratio below 0.6. d) Rural Major and Minor Collectors and Local Roads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Signalized intersections – volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.80 and delay -- LOS “C”.

<i>(Supporting Objectives cont.)</i>	<i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i>	<i>(Operating Standards cont.)</i>
Capacity: The capacity and safety of existing roadways is preserved through proper intersection spacing, driveway location, and adequate sight distances and off-street parking.	<p>In addition to the dedication of rights-of-way, developers shall be responsible for improvements to roadways passing through, adjoining, or providing access to their development to the extent improvements are needed to meet the minimum BASE LOS Standard.</p> <p>Safety concerns always override traffic carrying capacity concerns because the former involves life issues and the latter merely convenience issues.</p> <p>The community shall maximize existing roadway capacity and safety and reduce peak hour congestion by implementing traffic operational improvements to the extent feasible.</p> <p>Provision for adequate off-street parking shall be included in all development proposals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) Unsignalized intersections, including approaches on side streets -- LOS "C". iii) Roadway segment between intersections -- LOS "C", or a volume-to-capacity ratio below 0.6. <p>Adequate storage and turning bays, as described in the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Design Manual, should be provided for all developments generating more than fifty (50) trips per day on arterials and collectors.</p>
Right-Of-Ways: Adequate right-of-ways are provided to accommodate both required and anticipated roadway, walkway, bikeway, and utility and maintenance improvements.	<p>Developers shall dedicate adequate rights-of-way for streets and roadways running through and abutting to their various developments.</p> <p>The community shall provide for safe bicycle and pedestrian use in planning its transportation facilities, and shall promote safe bicycle and pedestrian movement in its development proposals.</p>	<p>The amount of a given right-of-way is based on roadway functional class and abutting zoning, and may be implemented through the subdivision regulations.</p>

<p align="center"><i>(Supporting Objectives cont.)</i></p> <p>Design And Construction: Roadway, walkway, and bikeway systems are designed and constructed based on pre-defined and approved standards.</p>	<p align="center"><i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i></p> <p>Horizontal and vertical alignment shall ensure safe movement of traffic through use of adequate sight distances around curves and on hills given the anticipated speeds and traffic volumes.</p> <p>Access to roadway systems is limited to properly designed and safe entrances.</p> <p>The community shall implement low cost improvements to improve safety on rural roads including shoulder stabilization, minor widening when resurfacing, signing, guardrail replacement, minor realignments on tight curves, reducing hills to improve sight distances, extending culverts and improving drainage ditches farther from the edge of pavement, and adding centerline and roadway edge markings on heavier traveled roads.</p> <p>Developers shall share access points to existing arterial and rural collector roadways to the extent practicable.</p> <p>Adequate access shall be provided for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Street patterns for “local streets” shall discourage through traffic and high speeds.</p> <p>Design standards on vertical and horizontal curves, pavement widths, curbs, sidewalks, and bikeways shall be set forth in the subdivision regulations.</p>	<p align="center"><i>(Operating Standards cont.)</i></p> <p>Roadway Entrances: To be deemed adequate, required sight distance for entrances to roadway systems within Urban Service Boundaries must be based on future functional class, speeds, and traffic volumes, include a thirty-five (35) foot sight triangle at the property line for all streets, and a twenty-five (25) foot triangle for all driveways. Greater site triangle distances may also be required on rural roads due to higher speeds.</p> <p>Intersection Spacing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intersections along a principle arterial (rural major or minor collector) must be located a minimum of 1,600 feet from any other intersection along that principal arterial (rural minor arterial, or rural major or minor collector). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Single-family residential lots and apartment complexes are prohibited from direct access to a principal arterial or a rural minor arterial, except by service roads. b. Service roads in nonresidential development observe the intersection spacing of the principal arterial. 2. Intersections along an urban minor arterial must be located a minimum of 1,000 feet from any other intersection along that minor arterial. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Single-family residential lots are prohibited from direct access to an urban arterial, except by service roads.
---	---	---

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i></p> <p>Developers shall be fully responsible for the construction of all roadways contained within the interior of their development area.</p> <p>Movement of pedestrians or bicyclists shall be given due consideration in every instance.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Operating Standards cont.)</i></p> <p>b. Service roads, apartment complexes, and nonresidential development shall observe the intersection spacing of the minor arterial.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Intersections along an urban collector must be located a minimum of 1,000 feet from any intersecting arterial and 800 feet from any intersecting collector. Driveways shall be located not less than fifty (50) feet from an intersection for single-family lots. 4. The spacing between intersections on local streets shall be 250 feet from centerline to centerline. Nonresidential development shall generally not have access to local streets. 5. The adequacy of the number and size of entrances shall be based on the proposed use and adequacy of the street system. 6. Single-family subdivisions of 200 dwelling units or more shall have at least two entrances or a divided median entrance. 7. Divided median entrances should be at least 500 feet in length, or of such length needed to reach the first cross-street intersection. <p>Parking:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Building expansions requiring Planning Commission approval shall provide adequate off-street parking based on current standards. b. Consideration and implementation of cross-parking agreements in meeting joint parking requirements is permitted.
--	---	---

		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Operating Standards cont.)</i></p> <p>c. Parking locations shall be within 500 feet of the primary use and must not require the patron to cross an urban arterial or a rural collector except in B-3 zoning areas.</p> <p>d. Appropriate signage detailing on-street “No Parking” zones shall be provided.</p>
<p><u>Rationale:</u> Streets and roads should have adequate capacity such that new development does not cause or compound traffic congestion. As development occurs roadway improvements may be required to maintain a reasonable Level-Of-Service and take into consideration changes caused by the proposed development, development that may already be underway, or development that is under consideration in the immediate future. The use of pre-defined standards as contained in this Comprehensive Plan and other referenced federal, state, county, and local regulatory documents guide and govern the functional class of a given transportation facility, abutting zoning, adjacent use, existing and anticipated traffic volumes, and the composition of traffic. Adherence to such standards enhances the planning and design process, improves budgeting and prioritization efforts, and ensures that the desired results will be achieved.</p>		

TRANSPORTATION GOAL ON RURAL ROADWAY SYSTEM ACCESS

A rural road system is available that provides access between and among rural areas, to the regional (urban and rural) transportation system, and safe, economical mobility and accessibility for citizens and goods.

<u>Supporting Objectives:</u>	<u>Implementing Policies:</u>	<u>Operating Standards:</u>
Initiate development of a highway capacity assessment to be used in reviewing and evaluating proposals for developments located in unincorporated areas of the county.	Implementing policies for this goal will be developed over time by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission, Transportation and other subcommittees as a subset of this Transportation Goal.	Operating Standards for this goal will be developed over time by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission, Transportation and other subcommittees as a subset of this Transportation Goal.
Encourage the adoption and application of a strong access management plan.		
Develop and implement an access management strategy aimed at managing growth and creating a safer and more efficient transportation system.		
Maintain the aesthetic character of rural roads.		
Encourage the designation of a regional system of equine/bike/walkways along identified open space corridors.		
Encourage the development and adoption of long-range capital improvement programs by local political jurisdictions consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.		
Develop a system that accurately assesses the true cost of proposed developments upon local government services within the county.		
<p><u>Rationale:</u> There is a continuing need for coordinated local, county, and state roadway capital improvement programs to exist that ensure the public has access to a safe and adequate transportation network. Because it is safe to assume that the amount of public funding available for construction and maintenance of such a network will always be limited, policies and procedures that encourage collaborative project development and prioritization will be needed. These policies and procedures need to provide for a fair, balanced, and deliberate approach to ensuring the continuing availability of an adequately functioning transportation network that meets the needs of the community.</p>		

TRANSPORTATION GOAL ON LAND USE

The arterial and collector street system provides access to high intensity development.

<u>Supporting Objectives:</u>	<u>Implementing Policies:</u>	<u>Operating Standards:</u>
<p>Locate large residential, commercial, and industrial developments on the arterial or collector street systems to mitigate the effects of large land uses on the transportation network.</p>	<p>Large residential, commercial (retail and office), industrial, and institutional or public use developments shall be located on urban or on rural arterial or collector roads only.</p>	<p>In addition to the standards listed herein, all standards recognized and accepted by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission as being associated with land use location as related to transportation facilities are applicable to requirements of this plan whether incorporated directly herein or by reference.</p> <p><u>Large Residential Developments:</u> are those in excess of 45 dwelling units.</p> <p><u>Large Retail Or Office Developments:</u> are those in excess of 30,000 square feet of building space. Those in excess of 100,000 square feet of building space shall be located on urban or rural arterials. Large retail or office developments in excess of 300,000 square feet of building space shall be located on urban or rural arterials within one-quarter mile of a freeway exchange.</p> <p><u>Large Industrial Developments:</u> are those in excess of 100 employees or 150,000 square feet of building space. Large industrial developments in excess of 300 employees or 450,000 square feet of building space shall be located on principal arterial streets, or rural minor arterial or major collector roads within one-quarter mile of a freeway exchange.</p>

<i>(Supporting Objectives cont.)</i>	<i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i>	<i>(Operating Standards cont.)</i>
Do not route traffic from non-residential uses through residential uses on local streets.	Access roads to arterial and collector roadways shall not be routed through lower intensity or residential use areas.	<p>Those in excess of 900 employees or 1,000,000 square feet of building space shall be located on urban principal arterial streets or a rural minor arterial or major collector road within one-quarter mile of a freeway interchange.</p> <p><u>Large Institutional Or Public Uses:</u> are those generating in excess of 300 trips during the street peak hour.</p>
Do not route traffic from higher intensity residential uses through lower intensity uses, except where the roads have sufficient capacity and appropriate design to accommodate the traffic.	<p>Access to arterial roads in Urban Service Boundaries shall be provided by frontage or service roads.</p> <p>Access from nonresidential, higher intensity development areas may pass through residential areas on local streets only if those streets are capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic in terms of both design and capacity, and are part of a unified development under the same initial ownership.</p>	The Urban Service Boundary rather than the limits of the incorporated area serves as the urban versus rural differentiator.
<p><u>Rationale:</u> This goal is aimed at addressing the cumulative effects of land uses on the transportation network and encouraging such uses to be placed where they can best be accommodated. The first priority regarding placement of development is to encourage it to be located where roadways are already adequate, followed by locations where public roadway improvements are already programmed, followed by other areas where improvements will be needed and for which developers will pay the costs.</p>		

TRANSPORTATION GOAL ON ROADWAY LOCATION

The final traffic circulation pattern for a given project area protects community and neighborhood integrity.

<u>Supporting Objectives:</u>	<u>Implementing Policies:</u>	<u>Operating Standards:</u>
<p>The intended character of neighborhoods is preserved and protected by preventing intrusion of through traffic on urban streets and discouraging through traffic on urban collector streets unless those streets have been planned and designed for such traffic.</p>	<p>Arterials shall be located and designed so as not to sever or fragment existing neighborhoods or land which could be developed for defined neighborhoods.</p> <p>Through traffic in neighborhoods shall be discouraged through the use of accepted traffic management techniques such as signage and landscape and roadway design.</p>	<p>All standards associated with the locational aspects of transportation facilities as recognized and accepted by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission are applicable to requirements of this plan whether incorporated directly herein or by reference.</p>
<p>Development of transportation systems that preserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas and historic landmarks and structures, and enhance community aesthetic values is assured by proper planning and project execution.</p>	<p>Trucks are prohibited on urban local and collector streets except for the purposes of local delivery.</p> <p>Upon completion of the Georgetown Bypass, only heavy trucks making local deliveries are permitted on streets inside the Bypass.</p> <p>All new and improved roadways shall be designed and constructed so as to be compatible with the surrounding development, complement adjacent development, and provide an aesthetically pleasing visual experience to the user and adjacent areas.</p> <p>Landscaping provided along roadways shall maintain or enhance the quality of the environment within the Urban Service Areas.</p>	

<p><i>(Supporting Objectives cont.)</i></p>	<p><i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i></p> <p>Transportation improvements that have the effect of encouraging development in environmentally sensitive areas as identified in the Comprehensive Plan are to be avoided to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>When no feasible alternative exists for the improvement or construction of roadways to or through historic or environmentally sensitive areas, design and construction methodology shall be used that minimizes adverse impacts to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>New roads shall be designed so as to prevent and control soil erosion, minimize the destructive secondary impacts of clearing, grubbing, and storm water run-off, and avoid unnecessary changes in drainage patterns.</p>	
<p>Proper functioning of streets, walkways, or bikeways, and for emergency vehicles, access to, from, and through all developments is accomplished by linking interior facilities with systems already built or planned in the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Due consideration will be given to the need to balance the desire of a given neighborhood to prohibit all through traffic and the desire of the community to be served by an adequately functioning transportation network.</p> <p>Adequate street stubs for future roadway connections shall be included in all subdivision developments.</p>	
<p><u>Rationale:</u></p> <p>In the final analysis, a successful roadway development project is defined by the absence of conflict between its intended purpose and its final use. The perception of success is largely a factor determined by the freedom of movement by the community using the roadway facility, and that is determined by functionality, does the roadway adequately serve its intended purpose, without an undue impact on the surrounding community. Introduction of traffic vehicles and volume in excess of available capacity and in contrast with the surrounding environment negates the other, more positive, quality-of-life aspects of a given community.</p>		

TRANSPORTATION GOAL ON AIR SERVICE

Adequate provision is made for adequate, safe, and convenient air transportation service for Scott County.

<u>Supporting Objectives:</u>	<u>Implementing Policies:</u>	<u>Operating Standards:</u>
A general aviation facility is maintained that meets the general air transportation needs of the residents and businesses in Scott County.	Runways and navigation systems in use are sufficient for the type and level of service/operations anticipated or proposed for a period of <u>twenty years</u> beyond the approval date of this Comprehensive Plan.	All standards associated with the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of Air Service transportation facilities as recognized and accepted by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission are applicable to requirements of this plan whether incorporated directly herein or by reference.
Adequate ground and parking facilities exist for all aviation facilities.	Direct access shall be provided for all arterials and rural major collectors from general aviation facilities.	
Expansion of general aviation facilities are located so as to minimize adverse impacts on the surrounding area, and include flight path options that minimizes adverse impact on sensitive areas and provides adequate clear and safety zones.		A formal “Small Area Development Plan” is recommended for completion for the airport and the area immediately surrounding it.
Allow only compatible agricultural land uses within the approach zones of a general aviation airport, with due consideration being given to future air traffic characteristics and requirements, (e.g. 65 Ldn noise contour for a 100 to 1 glide slope, 1000’ runway extension, etc.).	Only industrial and commercial uses are permitted on airport property. Subdivision of land for residential purposes in proximity to an airport, particularly with respect to airport approach paths, is prohibited.	
Maintain currency and compliance with all applicable federal and state guidance regarding airport design and operations.	FAA Design Standards, Part 77, and KRS requirements are adopted as guiding documents.	FAA Design Standards, Part 77; KRS Requirements

Rationale:

No statistics compiled to date indicate any decline in the need for an adequate air transportation facility in Scott County. In fact, the arrival of the World Equestrian Games to the county in 2010 indicate a suddenly critical need for review and enhancement of the existing facility and an action plan to bring it and the surrounding area into a position appropriate for welcoming the equestrian world to Scott County. This facility now constitutes a “hot spot” with respect to the county transportation network.

TRANSPORTATION GOAL ON RAIL FACILITIES

Development of rail facilities is compatible with their surrounding areas.

<u>Supporting Objectives:</u>	<u>Implementing Policies:</u>	<u>Operating Standards:</u>
New rail lines do not pass through or within a distance that causes adverse noise impact on residential areas.		All standards associated with the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of Rail transportation facilities as recognized and accepted by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission are applicable to requirements of this plan whether incorporated directly herein or by reference.
New rail facilities are treated as heavy industrial uses with respect to location and compatibility with surrounding areas.		
When a railroad is abandoned, due consideration is given to opportunities for public use before allowing the right-of-way to revert to abutting landowners.		

Rationale:

Railways retain both a historical and practical value with respect to their place in the Scott County transportation network. From a historical perspective, their continued presence and preservation of their historical role and remaining facilities present opportunities for adding context and flavor to communities throughout the county. Their current functionality needs to be protected so that they can remain an economically viable transportation alternative, particularly with respect to the movement of goods and support of the county’s major employers.

TRANSPORTATION GOAL ON PHASING AND COORDINATION

Transportation system capital improvements are coordinated with planned future land uses and other capital improvement programs, recognizing physical and fiscal constraints.

<u>Supporting Objectives:</u>	<u>Implementing Policies:</u>	<u>Operating Standards:</u>
<p>Effective and ongoing coordination efforts are established and maintained with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet to encourage and facilitate implementation of local Transportation Plans and their priorities.</p>	<p>The Comprehensive Plan shall be reviewed at least annually for consistency to the extent possible with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet’s Six-Year Highway Capital Improvement Program.</p> <p>Scott County and its incorporated areas will review their annual roadway improvement programs at least annually for consistency with one another and all components of the Comprehensive Plan and amended them as necessary to ensure consistency.</p> <p>Standard methodology and criteria shall be used to establish major roadway improvement and bridge replacement priorities. This methodology and criteria shall include but not necessarily be limited to consideration of such factors as safety and accident data, traffic volume statistics, existing deficiencies, and creation of an improved rural road network that connects Scott County’s cities, smaller towns, Interstate 75, the City of Lexington, and other major cities in bordering counties.</p>	<p>In addition to the standards listed herein, all standards associated with the phasing and coordination aspects of transportation facilities as recognized and accepted by the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission are applicable to requirements of this plan whether incorporated directly herein or by reference.</p> <p>Proposed and approved roadway improvement programs support and enable achievement of the growth goals for major areas as defined in the Comprehensive Plan and are reviewed annually for this purpose.</p>

<p align="center"><i>(Supporting Objectives cont.)</i></p> <p>Right-of-way and transportation corridor requirements are designated and reserved as necessary to support existing and future transportation needs.</p>	<p align="center"><i>(Implementing Policies, cont.)</i></p> <p>Rights-of-way shall be dedicated at appropriate locations in accordance with the Future Transportation Map using width standards as established within the Comprehensive Plan and applicable subdivision regulations for all developments requiring Planning Commission or Board of Adjustment approvals.</p> <p>Advanced land acquisition shall be used to acquire and reserve space needed for the ultimate cross-sections of roadways when the initial pavement construction is less than that anticipated for the final facility.</p>	
<p><u>Rationale:</u> This Comprehensive Plan recognizes the fiscal and physical constraints associated with developing and maintaining the Scott County transportation infrastructure. The fiscal realities of limited resources and increasing demand essentially mandate that transportation system capital improvements should be well coordinated with future land uses and other related capital improvement programs.</p>		

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
SECTION IV
PROJECT PRIORITIES

EVALUATION PROCEDURES:

In Kentucky, transportation projects are developed, evaluated, and prioritized at three levels. The first is at the local (county/municipality) level where projects are identified and prioritized based on need and projected resource availability. The second level of evaluation is at the regional or multi-county level. Every other year, the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee updates its “Unscheduled Projects List.” In this process, projects submitted by the various counties in a given development district are reviewed, evaluated, and prioritized based on county criteria and functionality aspects, including the scope of the community to be served by the roadway in question. Following this review, proposed projects are placed on the Unscheduled Project List which serves as the alternate plan to the Kentucky Highway Six-Year Plan. The third level of review and prioritization is at the State level or District Highway Office. The primary evaluation criteria at this level are funding availability. Following evaluation and review at this level, projects are placed in the Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan for scheduling and funding processes.

The Georgetown-Scott County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Subcommittee and elected officials within Scott County and its incorporated municipalities generated priorities and recommendations for the various transportation system improvements outlined within this plan. These improvements and recommendations were developed in consideration of, and in conjunction with, the most recent version of the Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan (Table 3-1). The basic information used to determine project priorities at the local (county/municipality) level included projected needs based on growth and adequacy of the existing roadways, including functional (capacity), structural adequacy (bridge sufficiency ratings), and geometrical adequacy (pavement width and horizontal and vertical curves). Note: Road improvement project priorities may be adjusted based on the projected impacts of new development, including phasing of the development and developer participation in funding.

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

The evaluation criteria for setting project priorities included:

- Safety and accident information (See Collision Statistics Table below);
- Traffic volumes;
- Existing problem areas (excluding improvements to serve new development);
- Creation of an improved rural network connecting cities and smaller towns to Interstate 75 and Lexington;
- System continuity; and,
- Compatibility with the Future Land Use Plan

TRAFFIC COLLISION STATISTICAL SUMMARY 2000 - 2005

The following table is a comparative analysis of traffic collision statistics for the top 10 collision sites each year between 2000 and 2005, inclusive, in the Georgetown metropolitan area. These statistics are based on Kentucky State Police records and were compiled and provided by the Georgetown Police Department. This information can be useful in determining priorities for transportation improvement projects and establishing and executing plans for further development of the Georgetown-Scott County Transportation Network.

INTERSECTION SITE/LOCATION	YEAR/NUMBER OCCURANCES	ANNUAL RANKING	TOTAL OCCURANCES 2000 - 2005	OVERALL RANKING 2000 - 2005
Cherry Blossom Way & Paris Pike	2000 = 18 2001 = 13 2002 = 14 2003 = 16 2004 = 16 2005 = 17	2000 = 2 2001 = 1 2002 = 2 2003 = 1 2004 = 1 2005 = 1	94	1
US-25 South & US- 460 Bypass	2000 = 18 2001 = 9 2002 = 9 2003 = 8 2004 = 9 2005 = 8	2000 = 1 2001 = 4 2002 = 7 2003 = 4 2004 = 6 2005 = 8	61	2
Cherry Blossom Way & I-75 at mile marker 126	2000 = 7 2001 = 7 2002 = 16 2003 = 7 2004 = 12 2005 = 11	2000 = 8 2001 = 6 2002 = 1 2003 = 6 2004 = 2 2005 = 4	60	3
Lemons Mill Road & US-460 Bypass	2000 = 17 2001 = 8 2002 = 9 2003 = 7 2004 = - 2005 = 9	2000 = 1 2001 = 8 2002 = 6 2003 = 5 2004 = - 2005 = 6	50	4
Connector Road & Oxford Drive	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = 13 2003 = 14 2004 = 10 2005 = 12	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = 3 2003 = 2 2004 = 5 2005 = 3	49	5

INTERSECTION SITE/LOCATION	YEAR/NUMBER OCCURANCES	ANNUAL RANKING	TOTAL OCCURANCES 2000 - 2005	OVERALL RANKING 2000 - 2005
Paris Pike & Connector Road	2000 = 10 2001 = - 2002 = 11 2003 = - 2004 = 11 2005 = 10	2000 = 6 2001 = - 2002 = 4 2003 = - 2004 = 3 2005 = 5	42	6
Paris Pike & Edwards Avenue	2000 = 11 2001 = 10 2002 = 10 2003 = - 2004 = - 2005 = -	2000 = 5 2001 = 3 2002 = 5 2003 = - 2004 = - 2005 = -	31	7
South Broadway & Showalter Drive	2000 = 8 2001 = 6 2002 = 8 2003 = - 2004 = 7 2005 = -	2000 = 7 2001 = 7 2002 = 8 2003 = - 2004 = 9 2005 = -	29	8
Main Street & Broadway	2000 = - 2001 = 5 2002 = 6 2003 = 9 2004 = - 2005 = 6	2000 = - 2001 = 8 2002 = 9 2003 = 3 2004 = - 2005 = 9	26	9
Cherry Blossom Way & Osbourne Way	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = 10 2005 = 15	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = 4 2005 = 2	25	10
US-460 Bypass & Southgate Drive	2000 = 12 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = 8 2005 = -	2000 = 2 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = 7 2005 = -	20	11
Cherry Blossom Way & Champion Way	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = 5 2003 = - 2004 = 7 2005 = 7	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = 10 2003 = - 2004 = 8 2005 = 8	19	12

INTERSECTION SITE/LOCATION	YEAR/NUMBER OCCURANCES	ANNUAL RANKING	TOTAL OCCURANCES 2000 - 2005	OVERALL RANKING 2000 - 2005
US 25 South & Southgate Drive	2000 = 13 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 6 2004 = - 2005 = -	2000 = 4 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 7 2004 = - 2005 = -	19	13
US 25 North & Colony Blvd.	2000 = 6 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 6 2004 = - 2005 = -	2000 = 9 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 8 2004 = - 2005 = -	12	14
South Broadway & Clayton Avenue	2000 = 5 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = 6 2005 = -	2000 = 9 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = 10 2005 = -	11	15
North Broadway & Payne Avenue	2000 = 5 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 4 2004 = - 2005 = -	2000 = 10 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 10 2004 = - 2005 = -	9	16
US-460 Bypass & Finley Drive	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = - 2005 = 6	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = - 2005 = 10	6	17
North Broadway & Washington Street	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 5 2004 = - 2005 = -	2000 = - 2001 = - 2002 = - 2003 = 9 2004 = - 2005 = -	5	18
West Main Street & Elizabeth Street	2000 = - 2001 = 4 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = - 2005 = -	2000 = - 2001 = 10 2002 = - 2003 = - 2004 = - 2005 = -	4	19

TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES (State, Regional, Local):

Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan – Scott County:

The Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan is a biennial construction program and a four-year planning document. Projects are included in the plan based on existing and projected roadway conditions, construction costs, traffic volumes, accident rates, geographic distribution of projects, and anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts associated with the proposed construction. The anticipated level of Federal and State funding for capital projects over a six-year period establishes a ceiling for the number of projects included. The Kentucky General Assembly approves the Six-Year Highway Plan which is updated biennially.

The most significant means to implement the Future Transportation Plan for Scott County and its municipalities is to ensure the inclusion and subsequent progression toward funding and construction of roadway improvements on the Commonwealth's Six-Year Highway Plan.

Table 3-1 shows the FY 2006-2012 version of the Six-Year Plan as approved by the Kentucky General Assembly as part of its Budget development in early 2006. Project descriptions including funding codes and amounts are included. Total approvals for the Six-Year Plan for Scott County are \$125,378,200.

Table 3-2 is the most recent version of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee's Unscheduled Project List.

Tables 3-3 through 3-7 are the locally generated and prioritized transportation project lists.

**KENTUCKY TRANSPORTATION CABINET
SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY PLAN
FY 2006 – FY 2012**

TABLE 3-1

ITEM NO.	PARENT NO.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	SCHEDULING & FUNDING
06-72.20	06-72.20	I-75: Lexington – Covington; From South of Pokeberry Road To Grant County Line. (Section 3 – Garvee-JMO2 Component) 4.5 miles from Milepoints 138.7 to 143.239	JM2 - Phase C – 2006 - \$34,000,000 Total -- \$34,000,000
07-102.01	07-102.01	Georgetown Northwest Bypass From US 460 West to I-75 North; 6.3 miles	HPP - Phase D – 2006 -- \$2,400,000 Total – 2,400,000
07-102.03	07-102.03	Georgetown Northwest Bypass From US 460 West to I-75 North; 6.3 miles	KYD - Phase C – 2006 -- \$661,000 Total -- \$661,000
07-102.10	07-102.01	Georgetown Northwest Bypass – Priority Section; 2.8 miles from US 460 to KY 32	STP -- Phase R – 2007 -- \$2,250,000 STP -- Phase U – 2007 -- \$1,900,000 STP -- Phase C – 2008 -- \$6,000,000 Total -- \$10,150,000
07-102.11	07-102.10	Georgetown Northwest Bypass – Priority Section; 2.8 miles from US 460 to KY 32 (Additional Funding for Phase C)	STP – Phase C – 2009 -- \$6,000,000 Total -- \$6,000,000
07-102.50	07-102.01	Georgetown Northwest Bypass; 4.7 miles from KY 32 West to I-75	SP – Phase R – 2009 -- \$3,750,000 SP – Phase U – 2009 -- \$3,100,000 SP – Phase C – 2010 -- \$18,800,000 Total -- \$25,650,000
07-122.50	07-122.00	US 25; Lexington-Georgetown; Reconstruct and widen US-25 from 1400' south of Ironworks Road to Etter Lane in Georgetown; 2.7 miles from milepoints 0 to 1.904 and 21.415 to 22.286.	SP – Phase R – 2007 -- \$12,600,000 SP – Phase U – 2007 -- \$3,200,000 SP – Phase C – 2009 -- \$12,100,000 Total -- \$27,900,000
07-212.00	07-212.00	US 460; Reconstruct US 460 from KY 227 at Great Crossing to US 62 WCL of Georgetown; 1.6 miles from milepoints 7.055 to 8.583.	SP – Phase R – 2009 -- \$3,700,000 SP – Phase U – 2009 -- \$1,000,000 SP – Phase C – 2011 -- \$7,218,200 Total -- \$11,918,200
07-344.00	07-344.00	US 460; Reconstruct US 460 West of Georgetown to eliminate “S” curve 0.2 miles west of Cane Run Road; 0.5 miles from milepoints 6 to 6.5	SP – Phase R – 2009 -- \$400,000 SP – Phase U – 2009 -- \$400,000 SP – Phase C – 2011 -- \$3,300,000 Total -- \$4,100,000
07-1102.00	07-1102.00	KY 356; Replace Bridge & Approaches at NS (CNO&TP) System 2.3 miles East of US 25 ; 0.1 miles from milepoints 2.35 to 2.45	BRX – Phase U – 2006 -- \$295,000 BRX – Phase C – 2007 -- \$902,000 Total -- \$1,197,000
07-1105.00	07-1105.00	CR-1020; Replace Bridge & Approaches at NS (CNO&TP) System 0.2 miles North of CR5021; 0.1 miles from milepoints .804 to .904	BRZ – Phase R – 2006 -- \$150,000 BRZ – Phase U – 2006 -- \$100,000 BRZ – Phase C – 2008 -- \$495,000 Total -- \$745,000
07-1106.00	07-1106.00	Replace bridge of Lytle Creek at Josephine (B47) 1.4 miles west of Junction with KY 1636; 0.1 miles from milepoints 15.4 to 15.5	BRX – Phase C—2006 -- \$550,000 Total -- \$550,000
07-1107.00	07-1107.00	Replace bridge over North Rays Fork (B09) 0.6 miles south of the Grant/Scott County Line; 0.1 miles from milepoints 24.665 to 24.765	BRO – Phase C – 2006 -- \$297,000 Total -- \$297,000

**TABLE 3-2
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE UNSCHEDULED PROJECTS LIST – SCOTT COUNTY**

CONTROL NO.	AREA	DESCRIPTION	2006 LOCAL PRIORITY	2005 REGIONAL PRIORITY	2005 DISTRICT PRIORITY
07 105 A0075 1.00	I-75	Major widening for 2 additional lanes from Pokeberry Road to Grant County line. (4.5 miles)	High	High	High
07 105 B0025 126.00	US-25 Georgetown	Major widening from Jefferson Street north to Long Lick Road/Champion Way (KY 32). (1.9 miles)	Low	High	Medium
07 105 B0460 127.00	US-460 Georgetown	Reconstruction from East Main Street to Georgetown Bypass Near I-75. (0.6 miles)	Medium	High	Medium
07 105 B0460 128.00	US-460	Reconstruction from Soards Road to KY 227 at Great Crossing, Section 4-1995 Design Location Study. (3.00 miles)	High	High	High
07 105 B0460 129.00	US-460	Reconstruction from 0.2 miles east of Fisher Mill Road (KY 3378) to Soards Road, Section 3 – 1995 Design Location Study. (2.9 miles)	Medium	High	High
07 105 C0000 125.20	NEW	Georgetown Northwest Bypass From US 460 West to I-75 North. (6.3 miles)	High	High	Medium
07 105 D1963 1.00	KY-1963	Reconstruct Lisle Road From US 25 to KY 1962. (2.7 miles)	High	High	Medium
07 105 D1973 1.00	KY-1973	Reconstruct Ironworks Road from US 62 to US 460. (6.3 miles)	Medium	High	Medium
07 120 A0064 136.00	I-64	Major widening for 2 additional lanes from the Franklin County Line to I-64/I-75 Interchange northwest of Lexington. See December 2002 I-64 Corridor Planning Study. (15.3 miles)	Low	High	Low
07 105 D0032 118.10	KY-32	Reconstruct KY 32 from Old Long Lick Road to Suterville Road. (11.2miles)	Low	Medium	Low
07 105 D0032 120.00	KY-32	Replace Railroad Overpass Structure over KY 32 in Sadieville. (0.1 miles)	High	Medium	Low
07 105 D0620 121.00	KY-620	New Route – G,D,&S from a point 0.1 miles west of I-75 to US 25. (Toyota Access Road) (0.5 miles)	High	Medium	High
07 105 D1962 132.00	KY-1962 Georgetown	Improvements to Lemons Mill Road (KY 1962) from Military Street to Lisle Road at I-75 in Georgetown. (1.7 miles)	High	Medium	Medium
07 105 D2906 10.00	KY-2906 Georgetown	Georgetown Connector Road – Reconstruction and widening of KY 2906 from US 460 (Paris Pike) to US 62 (Cherry Blossom Way) in Georgetown. Project should include access management. (1.10 miles)	High	Medium	Medium
07 105 B0460 127.50	US-460 Georgetown	Reconstruction from Montgomery Avenue to US 62 in Georgetown. (0.60 miles)	Medium	Low	Medium
07 105 D0032 118.20	KY-32	Reconstruct KY 32 from Suterville Road to Coppage Road. (2.7 miles)	Low	Low	Low
07 105 D0032 119.00	KY-32	Reconstruct KY 32 from US 25 west of Sadieville east to Harrison County line. (6.5 miles)	Medium	Low	Low

SCOTT COUNTY PRIORITIES:

In addition to those projects identified in the most recent Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan (Reference Table 3-1), Scott County priority projects are as follows: (Reference Table 3-2)

Rural Road Improvement Projects

TABLE 3-3

Project Name/Description	2006 Local Priority	2005 Regional Priority	On Six-Year Plan	Add To Six-Year Plan
I-75 Widening: Major widening for 2 additional lanes from Pokeberry Road to Grant County line. (4.5 miles)	High	High	Yes	
I-64 Widening: Major widening for 2 additional lanes from the Franklin County line to I-64/I-75 Interchange northwest of Lexington. See December 2002 I-64 Corridor Planning Study. (15.3 miles)	High	High		
Frankfort/ Stamping Ground Road Intersection: Realignment of Frankfort Road at Stamping Ground Road.	High		Yes	
Stamping Ground Road (KY 227) Improvements: Stamping Ground Road safety and realignment improvements – includes Galloway intersection.	High			Yes
Midway Road Improvements: Soards/Midway Road widening and realignment; widen bridge over South Elkhorn.	High			Yes
Cynthiana Road (US 62) Improvements: Cynthiana Road widening from Cherry Blossom Way east to Harrison County line.	High		Yes	
Georgetown Northwest Bypass (Phase III): Construction from U.S. 460 West to I-75.	High	High	Yes	
New Route (Toyota Access Road): G,D,&S from a point 0.1 miles west of I-75 to US 25. (0.5 miles)	High	Medium		
Lexington Road (US-25): Safety improvements from Bypass south to Fayette County line (turn lanes, sight distance etc.)	High		Yes	
Lisle Road Improvements: Widen Lisle Road from US 25 to Lemons Mill Road (KY 1962).	High	High		Yes
Frankfort Road (US 460) Improvements: Widen Frankfort Pike from Southwest Bypass to US 62 intersection.	High	High		Yes
Lemons Mill Road Improvements: Widen Lemons Mill Road from Military Street to the Southeast Bypass and Lisle Road.	High	Medium		Yes

Paris Pike Improvements: Widen, to the extent possible, US 460 east from I-75 to the Scott County line, and improve access at the entrance to the airport.	High			Yes
Newtown Pike Improvements: Widen, straighten, level, and add shoulders to KY 922 from US 460 to Ironworks Road.	High			Yes
Long Lick Road Improvements: Widen Long Lick Road (KY 32) from Scott County High School to Northwest Bypass.	High			
Ironworks Road Improvements: Widen Ironworks Pike from US 62 West to US 460 West.	Medium	High		Yes
Sadieville Bypass: KY 32 realignment south of existing route from US 25 east to Luke Road.	Medium			Yes
Georgetown Northeast Bypass: New route from US 62 east to Cherry Blossom Way, and to Paris Pike (US 460).	Medium			
Frankfort Road (US 460) Widening: Widen US 460 from Southwest Bypass to KY 227.	Medium		Yes	
Paris Pike (US 460 East) Widening: Widen US 460 to Bourbon County line.	Medium			
Luke Road Widening: Widen and add shoulders to Luke Road from KY 32 to Double Culvert Road.	Medium			
KY 32 Widening: Widen KY 32 East from Sadieville to Harrison County line.	Medium			
North Broadway Widening (Phase III): Champion Way to Delaplain Road (KY 620).	Medium			Yes
Burton Road (KY 620) Improvements: widening and safety improvements (Stamping Ground Connector).	Low			
Old Delaplain Road Upgrade: Frontage road upgrade along Cherry Blossom Way.	Low			
I-75/Rogers Gap Road Interchange: I-75 interchange north of Rogers Gap and connection to US-25.	Low			
Stamping Ground Connector: Stamping Ground to Delaplain Road.	Low			
Galloway Road Widening: from US 460 to KY 227.	Low			
Long Lick Road Improvements: Reconstruct KY 32 from Old Long Lick Road to Suterville Road. (11.2 miles)	Low	Medium		

Rural Bridge Improvement Projects

TABLE 3-4

Project Name/Description	2006 Local Priority	2005 Regional Priority	On Six-Year Plan	Add To Six-Year Plan
All Scott County maintained bridge structures with safe load capacities of 18 tons or less are certified to be in compliance with National Bridge Inspection Standards as of March 21, 2006.				

CITY OF GEORGETOWN PRIORITIES:

TABLE 3-5

Project Name/Description	2006 Local Priority	2005 Regional Priority	On Six-Year Plan	Add To Six-Year Plan
Carley Drive Extension: Extend Carley Drive to the Southwest Bypass;	High			
Lisle Road Improvements: Widen Lisle Road from US 25 to Lemons Mill Road (KY 1962).	High	High		Yes
Bourbon Street Connections: Improve Bourbon area connections to US 460; Main Avenue bridge; Eastside Drive; and explore improvements to Bourbon Street at railroad underpass and alternative connections to Washington Street.	High			
Old Oxford Road Traffic Study: Complete a detailed traffic study of upgrade possibilities and alternatives in the Old Oxford Road area.	High			
Georgetown Connector Road: Reconstruction and widening of KY 2906 from US 460 (Paris Pike) to US 62 (Cherry Blossom Way) in Georgetown. (1.10 miles) Project should include access management and development and analysis of alternatives for increasing capacity and safety of the area surrounding the Connector Road/Cherry Blossom Way intersection.	High	Medium		Yes
North Broadway Widening (Phase II): 3-laning from Jefferson Street to Champion Way	High	Medium		Yes
Northwest Bypass Phase III: Northwest from Frankfort Pike to US 25.	High		Yes	
East Main Extended Widening: Widen from Main Street (US 460) to Bypass.	High	High		Yes

Paris Pike (US 460) Widening: Phase I – 3-lane from railroad bridge to Elkhorn; Phase II – Widen railroad and Elkhorn bridges; Phase III - Widen US 460 from East Main Street to Bypass intersection.	High	High		Yes
Frankfort Pike (US 460) Widening: From Payne’s Depot Road (US 62) to KY-227.	High		Yes	
Frankfort Pike (US 460) Widening: Reconstruction from Montgomery Avenue to Payne’s Depot Road (US 62) in Georgetown. (0.60 miles)	Medium	Low		
Lemons Mill Connector: Extend Lemons Mill Road to Clayton Street - Bypass “S”curve	Medium			
Paynes Depot Road (US 62) Widening: Widen US 62 from US 460 to intersection with Southwest Bypass	Medium			
East Main/Paris Pike/Warrendale Intersection: Reconstruction	Medium			
Indian Hills Connection: Brookside Extension, Clinton Avenue to Hillside Avenue, or alternative depending on development pattern.	Low			
Eastside Drive Extension: From Paris Pike to Lemons Mill (Old Quarry Road)	Low			
Colony Boulevard Extension: To Long Like Pike (KY 32)	Low			
DeGaris Street Connection: Elkhorn Bridge and connection to Champion Way (US 62) (“Turkeyfoot Turnpike”)	Low			

Collector Roadway Improvement Projects

Table 3-6

Collectors Project Name/Description	2006 Local Priority	2005 Regional Priority	On Six- Year Plan	Add To Six- Year Plan
Georgetown Northwest Bypass: Construct Georgetown Northwest Bypass From US 460 to I-75 North. (6.3 miles)	High		Yes	
Oxford Drive Widening: Widen Connector Road (KY 2906) from Paris Pike (US 460) to Cherry Blossom Way (US 62).	High	Medium		Yes
Pleasant View Drive Connection: Pleasant View Drive connection to Lisle Road.	High			
Lisle Road Improvements: Widen Lisle Road from US 25 to Lemons Mill Road (KY 1962).	High	High		Yes
Airport Road Extension: Airport Road Extension to Southwest Bypass	Medium			

CITY OF SADIEVILLE PRIORITIES

Table 3-7

Project Name/Description	2006 Local Priority	2005 Regional Priority	On Six- Year Plan	Add To Six- Year Plan
The City of Sadieville has adopted and formally presented to the Georgetown-Scott County Planning Commission the following list of actions included below in order to effect needed improvements to the transportation network within the Sadieville Urban Service Boundary:				
US 32 Reclassification: Reclassify KY-32 east of US-25 to prohibit heavy truck traffic except for those making local deliveries inside of the Sadieville USB.	High			
Vine Street Improvements: Regrade and reconstruct Vine Street to improve safety, drainage, and parking.	High			
Sadieville Railroad Bridge: Develop a plan for modernization/replacement of the railroad bridge over KY-32 in downtown Sadieville and “straighten” the hairpin turn that exists there.	High	Medium		Yes
US 25/KY 32 Intersections: Install a caution light both intersections of KY-32 and US-25.	High			
KY-32 Improvements: Improve via resurfacing and widening KY 32 to the extent possible from US 25 east to the Harrison County line.	Medium	Low		
Sadieville Bypass: Restoration to the Kentucky Six-Year Highway Plan of that highway project known as the Sadieville Bypass (new KY 32).	Medium			Yes
US 25 Access: Access to any commercial or light industrial properties located along US 25 is available from US 25 only. With the exception of the fire station, property development east of US 25 is treated as residential for purposes of property access.	Medium			

CITY OF STAMPING GROUND PRIORITIES:

The City of Stamping Ground opted to include their transportation network priorities in their Element Update to be completed in 2007.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
SECTION V
IMPLEMENTATION METHODS

Three primary implementation methods exist for budgeting and implementing the Georgetown-Scott County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element. They are:

1. Local Government Capital Improvements Budgeting

Local government takes the lead in the determination of transportation improvement priorities and the implementation of transportation improvements according to those priorities. Local government's absence from this process in effect transfers the responsibility for the communities transportation needs to the developers and the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Neither of these two entities have the community's general transportation needs as their primary interest or area of responsibility. Numerous financing methods are available for local governments to utilize in implementing their respective transportation plans and they are in the best position to determine the most appropriate of these methods.

2. Private Construction or Financing of Transportation Improvements necessitated by Development

Development projects that create the need for transportation improvements should bear their proportional share of the costs for those improvements. This responsibility cannot be properly imposed without implementing local legislation that fairly provides for the design, scheduling, and cost assessments of needed transportation improvements. The Planning Commission should take the lead in developing such legislation and recommending it to the appropriate legislative bodies in Scott County for adoption.

3. The Kentucky Six-Year Highway Capital Improvement Program

Scott County's state representatives, local officials, Planning Commission and staff must develop and maintain good communication and constructive working relationships with the state government so that local needs are known and understood by the executive and legislative branches of the state government. An effective exchange of information will ensure that the Six-Year Highway Plan properly reflects the priorities for transportation improvements that will best serve the needs of Scott County.