ATTENDANCE:
Bobbie Baker – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area
Joe Baker – Crescent Springs City Attorney
Jim Collett – Mayor of Crescent Springs
Matthew Damon – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Villa Madonna Academy
Dawn Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident
Daniele Longo – Crescent Springs Resident
Louis Prabell – Crescent Springs Resident
George Ripberger – Crescent Springs City Employee
Mark Rogge – Crescent Springs Resident / KCPC Representative
Scott Santangelo – Crescent Springs City Council Member
Scott Siefke – Co-owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area
Greg Sketch – Crescent Springs Resident
Bill Toebben – Owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area
Tom Vergamini – Crescent Springs City Council Member
Edward Dietrich – NKAPC – Project Manager
Keith Logsdon – NKAPC – LRP Director

ABSENT:
Ben Bratton – Local Resident
Bobby Chipman – Crescent Springs Resident Residing Within Study Area
Barrie Creamer – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area
Andy Eisner – Crescent Springs Resident
Eric Haaser – Crescent Springs Resident
Matthew Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Covington Latin
Bob Mueller – Crescent Springs Resident
James Fausz – NKAPC – Assistant Project Manager

1. OPENING REMARKS
The meeting was called to order at 6:05 pm. Mr. Dietrich made an announcement that due to information from and discussion with Doug Harnish of Gem Public Sector Services the order of tasks events of the Task Force will be altered somewhat in the future. Instead of looking at case studies from other parts of the country and then working on scenarios for this particular site the Task Force will work on scenarios first and then look at case studies to fine tune the scenarios that are developed.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the first task force meeting (3/17/09) where approved unanimously with Mr. Ripburger making the first motion and Mr. Baker seconding. The minutes of the
second task force meeting (4/22/09) where also approved unanimously with Mr. Ripburger making the first motion and Mr. Baker seconding it.

3. EXISTING CONDITIONS
Mr. Dietrich presented the task force with the results of the existing conditions investigation. He presented information in the following categories:
Land use
Demographics
Community Facilities and Utilities
Green Infrastructure

Land use: Mr. Dietrich showed maps of the existing land use, the current zoning, and the future land use and pointed out the location of each land use and zone. He explained the Special Development Area land use which is a designation for a location thought to be good for entertainment or amusement type uses. They are close to interstates with a d

Demographics: Mr. Dietrich said the area is an affluent area with a larger percentage if its residents holding management and professional employment. Households have a higher income than the national, metro, and county average. The population is also aging.

Community Facilities/Utilities: The only community facility in the study area is the Church of Christ located on High Street. All utilities are provided in the study area and according to interviews with representatives of each agency all of utilities levels are adequate and no maintenance is scheduled for any of the utilities in the study area. There were comments about the stormwater drainage system shown on the map as not being accurate. Mr. Dietrich is going to review this discrepancy with George Ripburger and then talk with SD #1. There was also mention of problems with stormwater drainage down by Overhead Door. They experience a strong odor when the sewer system is pumped as well as, a large amount of stormwater collected from the Interstate is discharged into the natural drainage way extremely close to the company. These issues will also be raised with SD #1. There were also comments that during heavy rains the low area on the study area side of the railroad tracks fills with water which stands for long periods of time producing mosquitoes.

Green Infrastructure: Mr. Dietrich showed a map showing the amount of impervious surfaces amounting to 54% of the study area. He also revised the amount of tree canopy in the study area from 16.90% to 16.90%. The new number included the estimate of the tree canopy in the residential area along High Street. Mr. Dietrich stated that given the type of redevelopment that would probably take place in the study area, reducing the amount of impervious surfaces would be difficult. And, that the task force should think about how to reduce the amount of storm water run off directly entering the manmade and natural drainage system.

Adam Kirk presented his findings on the existing traffic situation. He explained how traffic counts where taken at the four major along Buttermilk Pike that affect the study area: Anderson Road, High Street/Buttermilk Crossing, Hazelwood Drive/Grandview
Ave, and I-75 SD Off-ramps. The counts identified average daily traffic volumes between 37,000 to 40,000 vehicles per day (VPD) between I-75 and Hazelwood, 32,000 VPD between High Street and Anderson Road and 25,000 VPD west of Anderson Road.

Approximately 70-75 percent of traffic entering and exiting the focus area at Hazelwood are from/to the east towards the interstate. Capacity analysis indicated that all intersections can operate at level of service (LOS) B/C with little delay, but queues from adjacent intersections block the through movement of traffic, degrading operations on the corridor. Access management issues on Buttermilk Pike and the side streets further prevent full capacity of the intersections being realized. However, the traffic analysis does not take into account the possible displacement due to the ongoing construction. Additional historical data will be gathered to see if a decrease has occurred due to the bridge construction.

There were comments made about traffic being a problem but also representing the popularity of the area and a positive sign to its economic viability. Also, the signals are usually synchronized but are not at this time due to the bridge construction. This may have an influence on the current traffic situation. Adam did state that additional technology in regards to traffic signals is usually a waste of money.

A question was asked if the KY transportation Cabinet would oppose removing a signal and/or restrict access at one of the intersections. Adams said that it would be in the interest of the cabinet to reduce congestion, and removing a signal would be in agreement with the current policies/guidelines of KYTC.

4. WRAP UP
Mr. Dietrich announced that the next market analysis meeting is on Monday, June 8th at 5:30 and that everyone should try and make the meeting.

The next task force meeting will be held at the NKAPC chambers on Wednesday, June 24th at 6:00. During the interim Mr. Dietrich will be sending out examples of vision statements and goals, along with the staffs’ initial draft of a vision statement and goals for the task force to respond to. It is hoped that a final version of the vision and goals be approved during the first half of the next task force meeting.