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1.0 Introduction

The Freight Movement and Intermodal Access in Kentucky Study (SPR 98-189) is being conducted by the Kentucky Transportation Center on behalf of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC). There are two major objectives of the study: evaluation of the access for trucks between intermodal or other truck generating sites and the National Highway System (NHS); and furthering the understanding of freight commodity flows throughout the state. This report summarizes the access evaluation for a facility located in Hopkins County in the Pennyrile Area Development District (ADD) and KYTC Highway District #2. The location of the site is shown in Figure 1. Work on other sites as well as the freight commodity flow task is ongoing and is documented elsewhere.

The sites to be evaluated were selected from two existing databases (a truck facility survey from 1994 and the intermodal facility inventory) based on ADD and KYTC Highway District planner recommendations, geographic location, distance to the national highway system, and the number of trucks accessing the site. Consideration was also made for the freight type handled and transportation modes used. The Centennial Resources facility was recommended by KYTC District 2. The facility is located along US 62 in Hopkins County between Dawson Springs and Nortonville.

The site was visited several times for data collection and video recording. The original survey of site layout and facility identification was done on January 15, 1998. Photographs and video were taken on that day. Additional data collection was conducted on July 8, September 28, and November 5, 1998. This is a coal facility with the entrance signs noting permits for Centennial Resources, Inc. and B. Four, Inc. of Madisonville. The surrounding area is rural.

A phone survey with the facility manager was conducted as part of the study. The trucks per day using the facility is seasonal, based on demand and could range from 10 to 100. The coal is mostly hauled to the TVA Drakesboro plant. A 1998 KYTC volume count indicates a traffic volume of about 2,300 with slightly over 300 trucks per day along US 41. The percentage of heavy trucks was estimated as about 14 percent. The site trucks are generally semi tractor trailers with a maximum trailer length of 32 feet. The phone survey information can be found in Appendix A.

2.0 Trucks Routes in Use

There is currently only one primary route for trucks to reach the National Highway System. The coal trucks travel on US 62 from the facility to the Pennyrile Parkway. The distance is about 4.7 miles from the truck entrance at milepoint 11.0 to the Pennyrile Parkway at milepoint 15.7. US 62 is a two lane road with 10-foot lanes and a two-foot paved shoulder (Figure 2). It has a functional classification of a rural, major collector. It is in the AAA weight class indicating a maximum gross weight of 80,000 pounds but is on the extended weight system which increases maximum weights of coal trucks to 120,000 pounds. The general character of the route is rural except for the portion adjacent to the Pennyrile Parkway which goes through Nortonville where the speed limit is reduced to 35 mph. There is a four-way stop at the intersection of US 62 and
US 41 in Nortonville. Right of way at the Pennyrile Parkway is controlled by stop signs on the exit ramps.

**Figure 1: Location of Truck Generating Site**
3.0 Route Data Collection and Evaluation

The route features that were evaluated in this study are shown in Table 1 along with a brief description of the evaluation method. While some of these features require only subjective evaluation during site inspection, others required quantitative measurement to label the particular point or section as “preferred”, “adequate”, or “less than adequate” for truck access. The guidelines for labeling a point or section into one of these three descriptive categories are provided in both the interim and final reports for this project. In several cases measurements were only taken where subjective evaluation indicated a problem might exist.

3.1 Traffic Operations and Level of Service

No problem areas relating to traffic operations and level of service were identified by the phone survey. Therefore, there was no need for any detailed traffic counts or travel time surveys.

Table 1: Route Features and Method of Evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Team Consensus based on Committee Meeting and Draft Report Feedback</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offtracking</td>
<td>Lane Width with formula based on wheel and axle spacing</td>
<td>Evaluate where observation of trucks indicates possible offtracking - use HIS data and collect in field</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Safe Speed</td>
<td>Ball Bank Indicator Reading</td>
<td>Evaluate complete route due to ease of data collection</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Curve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Speed Reduction Tables with Percent Grade and Direct Observation</td>
<td>Evaluate where observation of trucks indicates speed reduction occurs using HIS data and collect in field as needed</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width</td>
<td>HIS data and field measurement</td>
<td>Review complete route due to ease of data collection</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Zone</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Subjective evaluation</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulders</td>
<td>HIS data and field measurement</td>
<td>Evaluate where HIS data is available and estimate based on observation elsewhere</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Subjective evaluation</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Stopping</td>
<td>Field measurements</td>
<td>Measure only when observation indicates possible problem</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Radii</td>
<td>Field measurements and observations of trucks</td>
<td>Measure only when observation indicates possible problem</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident History</td>
<td>Accident data files and KTC High Truck Accident Report</td>
<td>Do for entire route</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td>Traffic counts</td>
<td>Only where problems are indicated by facility managers</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route LOS</td>
<td>Traffic counts and travel time studies</td>
<td>Only where problems are indicated by managers</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Crossings</td>
<td>Field Observation</td>
<td>Evaluate all level crossings</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>KYTC Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>Evaluate all bridges</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Accident History
In 1997 the Kentucky Transportation Center studied all state-maintained roads throughout Kentucky and determined average truck accident rates for different types of road sections. A critical accident rate was then calculated using the average accident rate for a specific highway type along with an assumed level of statistical significance and exposure (vehicle miles traveled). Critical rate factors were calculated for one-mile sections having critical numbers of accidents. One section was identified along US 62 which had a critical rate. There were five accidents between milepoints 12.406 and 12.927 which resulted in a critical rate factor of 1.5. There was no pattern to these accidents.

Figure 3 shows the locations of accidents during the years 1995, 1996 and 1997. The largest number of accidents occurred around the Pennyrile Parkway interchange. A summary of the accidents on US 62 between the Pennyrile Parkway interchange and coal facility is shown in Table 2 for the same three-year period. Eight of the 48 accidents involved a truck (17 percent), and this percentage was close to the 14 percent of heavy trucks on this route. The accident history does not show a pattern of types or locations of truck accidents so there has been no documented problem related to truck traffic.

### Table 2: Accident Types along Hopkins County Truck Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Truck Accidents</th>
<th>Truck Accidents</th>
<th>Percent Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Accidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Cross Section Features

Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the lane and shoulder widths along the route. The typical 10-foot lane widths on US 62 are considered “less than adequate”. The two-foot paved shoulders on US 62 are also considered “less than adequate”.

No significant clear zone problems were found. Any potential clear zone problems would be related to trees but the typical location of the nearest trees is about nine feet from the painted edgeline. The pavement was in good condition.
Figure 3. Accident Locations (1995-1997)
Figure 4. Lane Widths
Figure 5. Shoulder Widths
3.4 Curvature Features

Grades are considered problematic if they cause trucks to slow down excessively. There were three grades which could potentially cause a truck to slow (Figure 6). Trucks exiting the facility enter US 62 on a steep upgrade for about 1,000 feet (Figure 7). There is an upgrade for trucks approaching the facility starting at KY 1687 and extending for about 0.3 mile. There is also an upgrade westbound approaching the bridge at milepoint 14.9.

There were no segments where safe speed on curves is a problem. There is only one curve with an advisory speed. The advisory speed is 45 mph and a ballbank reading of 6 degrees was obtained at this speed so it would be classified as “adequate.”

There are no segments where offtracking would be a problem along this route for trucks. The only turns required are at the Pennyrile Parkway and the facility entrance. There is an adequate turning radius on the ramps. The entrance to the facility is wide so that the tires of trucks exiting the facility just touch the centerline markings.

3.5 Railroad Crossings

There were no at-grade railroad crossings on this route.

3.6 Bridges

There were five bridges on this route (Figure 8). The bridge at the Pennyrile Parkway (milepoint 15.7) has a sufficiency rating (provided by the Division of Operations of the KYTC) of 81.4 (out of a possible 100 points) which is considered “preferred”. The other major bridge, which is over a railroad and stream (at milepoint 14.9), had a rating of 75.3 which is considered “adequate” (Figure 9). The other ratings were 80.3 (“preferred”) for the bridge at milepoint 12.3, 73.7 (“adequate”) for the bridge at milepoint 12.9, and 76.7 (“adequate”) for the bridge at milepoint 14.0.

3.7 Sight Distance

No sight distance problems were observed at any entrance or side street. The only possible problem would be for drivers exiting the facility observing westbound vehicles (Figure 7).

3.8 Other Route Features

No specific problems were noted.
Figure 7: Exit from Facility
Figure 8: Bridge Locations
4.0 Route Evaluation and Recommendations

4.1 Problem Truck Miles and Truck Points

In order to compare different routes to consider relative urgency of needed route improvements, the features rated as “preferred”, “adequate”, and “less than adequate” along a route have been normalized for the number of miles, number of points and number of trucks using the route section. In the case of this Hopkins County route, five features (lane width, shoulders, bridge ratings, grade, and curvature) that were evaluated quantitatively had sections or points that are considered only “adequate” or “less than adequate.” A section or point that is considered “less than adequate” is weighted two times that of an “adequate” point or section. Sections which not rated as “preferred” are weighted by length as well as the number of trucks on that section.

Table 3 contains the total problem truck miles for the shoulders along this route. The rating of this route relative to others evaluated will be reported in the final report.
Table 3: Summary of Problem Truck Miles and Truck Points for Entire Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Trucks (/day)</th>
<th>Truck-points</th>
<th>Truck-miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane width</td>
<td>US 62</td>
<td>Facility-Pkwy.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulders</td>
<td>US 62</td>
<td>Facility-Pkwy.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>US 62</td>
<td>MP 12.9 (B0055)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MP 14.0 (B0061)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MP 14.9 (B0163)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>954</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>US 62</td>
<td>MP 11.0-11.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MP 11.6-11.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MP 14.9-15.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>286</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curvature</td>
<td>US 62</td>
<td>MP 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,272</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 point for “adequate” features and 2 points for “less than adequate” features (0 points for “preferred” features not shown)

4.2 Maintenance Improvement Locations

No features noted during the site inspections were found which were causing a substantial problem. Any maintenance issues could be addressed during routine maintenance.

4.3 Overall Route Rating

A panel of UK engineers who studied the route and its features either during a site visit or by viewing a video of trucks using the route rated the overall access on a scale of 1 through 10. They considered the various subjectively and objectively rated route features which were rated along the truck routes throughout the state. The interpretation for these ratings is shown in Table 4. The route on US 62 in Hopkins County from the coal facility to the Pennyrile Parkway was given an overall rating of 6 indicating that minor improvements could improve this route. Access between the NHS (Pennyrile Parkway) and the coal facility was provided by a two-lane roadway with a narrow paved shoulder. The points given on the route related to the lane width, shoulders, bridges, and grade.
Table 4: Interpretation of the Overall Route Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Route Rating</th>
<th>Qualitative Interpretation of Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trucks should not be using this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major construction is required to improve this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Minor improvements are required on this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Minor improvements could improve this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minor problems exist that do not seriously impede truck access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trucks are served with reasonable access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusion was that the facility provided adequate, although less than ideal, access. The access can be improved with minor improvements to the route. While no accident problem has been found to be associated with the roadway width, the 10-foot lanes and two-foot shoulders are considered “less than adequate” and should be widened. This also applies to the bridges along the route.
Appendix A: Phone Survey Conducted with Facility

PHONE SURVEY RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility ID</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location / City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>ADD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-FOUR, Inc.</td>
<td>ST. CHARLES</td>
<td>HOPKINS</td>
<td>PENNYRILE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Mayhew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502-825-0593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Blackmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is the location of your facility on the map correct? P.O. Box 698, Madisonville, KY 42431

2. Our information shows about 10 to 100 trucks per day access your facility. Is that correct? If not, fill in correct volume.

3. Is the truck traffic to and from your facility seasonal or mostly constant? Depends on contracts. 6 mo. 30-80, 6 mo. 60 - 100

4. (If truck traffic is seasonal) Is the trucks/day for the peak season?

5. What is the most common size truck operating at your facility? Coal; 32 feet

6. What is the largest truck operating at your facility?

7. What type of freight or commodity is shipped, and is incoming and outgoing freight different? (one may be an empty truck) Coal

8. Does the truck traffic peak at specific times of the day? (e.g., out in the morning and return in the afternoon) Depends on demand

9. What traffic congestion and delay problems along the routes are you aware of, or feel need improvement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (route segment, intersection, etc.)</th>
<th>Time and Day of Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Where do trucks at your facility go to and come from? (This may be an interstate, cities, general direction-N,S,E,W) Mostly to TVA Drakesboro Plant

11. Do you have any other problems or concerns along the route you would like us to consider? US 62 EB to Pennyrile @ Exit 33
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1.0 Introduction

The Freight Movement and Intermodal Access in Kentucky Study (SPR 98-189) is being conducted on behalf of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC). There are two major objectives of the study: evaluation of the access for trucks between intermodal or other truck generating sites and the National Highway System (NHS); and furthering the understanding of freight commodity flows throughout the state. This report summarizes the access evaluation for one cluster of facilities located in Christian County in the Pennyrile Area Development District (ADD) and KYTC Highway District # 2. The location of the site is shown in Figure 1. Work on other specific sites and the freight commodity flow task are on-going and are reported elsewhere.

The sites to be evaluated were selected from two existing databases (a truck facility survey from 1994 and the intermodal facility inventory) based on ADD and KYTC Highway District planner recommendations, geographic location, distance to the national highway system, and the number of trucks accessing the site. Consideration was also made for the freight type handled and transportation modes used. This industrial park is located along US 41 (Pembroke Road) at Hopkinsville. Another company (Phelps Dodge Magnet Wire) was located adjacent to the industrial park along US 41 and was included in the analysis.

The site was visited several times for data collection and video recording as listed in Appendix A. The following facilities are located in the industrial park: Brazeway, BRHVD, Continental Grain, Copar, Dana, Douglas Autotech, Flynn Enterprises, Freudenberg Norwovens, Hopkinsville Coating, IG Autotrim, International Paper, Meritor, MHI Machine Tool, Original Exhaust, Perdue Furniture, Plymouth Tube, and White Hydraulics. These facilities are located on Bill Bryan Boulevard and Commerce Drive off of US 41 while Phelps Dodge Magnet Wire is located on US 41. Approximate locations are also shown in Figure 1. The surrounding area is at the edge of an urban area.

A phone survey of a sample of facility managers was conducted early in the study process. The phone survey did not include all the sites in the cluster so a traffic count was used to obtain the truck volume. A 1991 KYTC volume count indicates that almost 800 trucks per day (12 percent of total volume) travel along US 41 and a 1998 volume count showed 580 trucks per day on Bill Bryan Boulevard (25 percent of total volume). The site trucks are generally semi tractor trailers with a maximum length of 53 feet. The phone survey information can be found in Appendix B.

2.0 Trucks Routes in Use

There is currently only one primary route for trucks to reach the National Highway System. The trucks accessing the industrial areas on US 41 are traveling to and from the Pennyrile Parkway, a distance of about 1.7 miles from the main entrance to the industrial park at Bill Bryan Boulevard (Figure 1). The trucks travel north on US 41 to the Pennyrile Parkway. US 41 is a four lane divided (20-foot mountable median) highway with 12-foot lanes and a 10-foot gravel shoulder between the industrial park and the Pennyrile Parkway (Figure 2). US 41 changes to a two lane
Figure 1: Location of Truck Generating Sites

- COMMERCE DR.
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  - Douglas Autotec
  - International Paper
  - Original Exhaust

- BILL BRYAN BLVD.
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  - Hopkinsville Coatings
  - IG Auto Trim
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  - MHI Machine Tool, USA
  - Mid Continent Spring
  - Perdue Wood Works
  - Plymouth Tube company
  - White Hydraulics

Scale 1:31.25 (at center)
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Figure 2: US 41

Figure 3: Bill Bryan Boulevard
road just south of the industrial park. Trucks in the industrial park travel on a two lane roadway within the park to access US 41. A portion of this road is divided. Bill Bryan Boulevard is about one mile in length with about one third of the road divided (Figure 3). Commerce Drive is about 0.8 mile in length and is a two lane road. The general character of the area is urban. Right of way at the driveways from the industrial park to US 41 is controlled by a stop sign on the driveways. Right of way at the Pennyrile Parkway is controlled by stop signs on the exit ramps.

Phone surveys were conducted with industries in the pre-existing intermodal or truck databases or the major industries observed during the sites visits. While the overall response from industries was very good, in some cases facility managers could not be contacted or did not want to assist with the survey. In order to stay within the resources available for the project not all smaller facilities with lower truck volumes could be contacted. A problem noted from the phone surveys conducted with facility managers was that there had been several accidents at the intersection between the main industrial park access (Bill Bryan Boulevard) and US 41 (Pembroke Road) which was related to the lack of a traffic signal. It was also noted that additional use would be made of US 41 southbound if had four lanes rather than two.

3.0 Route Data Collection and Evaluation

The route features that were evaluated in this study are shown in Table 1 along with a brief description of the evaluation method. While some of these features require only subjective evaluation during site inspection, others required quantitative measurement to label the particular point or section as “preferred”, “adequate”, or “less than adequate” for truck access. The guidelines for labeling a point or section into one of these three descriptive categories are provided in both the interim and final reports for this project. In several cases measurements were only taken where subjective evaluation indicated a problem might exist since “preferred” type sections and points do not contribute to an increase in the problem truck points or miles that are summed for the route.

3.1 Traffic Operations and Level of Service

Potential problem areas identified in the surveys were with the entrance ramps to the Pennyrile Parkway from US 41 and a possible need for a traffic signal at the intersection of US 41 and the entrance to the industrial park at Bill Bryan Boulevard.

Traffic counts conducted at the intersection of US 41 and Bill Bryan Boulevard (Appendix C) indicate that there is no need for a traffic signal due to low volumes along US 41. A 15-minute count was taken during a time indicated as a peak time according to the surveys. The volume was then converted into hourly volumes. Moreover, the analysis of this unsignalized intersection using the Highway Capacity Manual indicates that the intersection operates at Level of Service A.

Traffic counts were not conducted at the parkway ramps due to the low volumes observed for a
15-minute period. Therefore, no problems were observed at these intersections as well.

Observations were made as an observer traveled along US 41 in both directions while maintaining the speed of the traffic. It was apparent that no significant delays or operational problems experienced along US 41 since the arterial operates at acceptable LOS. Given this analysis, the access route appears to operate at an adequate traffic and operational level.

Table 1: Route Features and Method of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Team Consensus based on Committee Meeting and Draft Report Feedback</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offtracking</td>
<td>Lane Width with formula based on wheel and axle spacing</td>
<td>Evaluate where observation of trucks indicates possible offtracking - use HIS data and collect in field</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Safe Speed on a Curve</td>
<td>Ball Bank Indicator Reading</td>
<td>Evaluate complete route due to ease of data collection</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Speed Reduction Tables with Percent Grade and Direct Observation</td>
<td>Evaluate where observation of trucks indicates speed reduction occurs using HIS data and collect in field as needed</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width</td>
<td>HIS data and field measurement</td>
<td>Review complete route due to ease of data collection</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Zone</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Subjective evaluation</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulders</td>
<td>HIS data and field measurement</td>
<td>Evaluate where HIS data is available and estimate based on observation elsewhere</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Subjective evaluation</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>Field measurements</td>
<td>Measure only when observation indicates possible problem</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Radii</td>
<td>Field measurements and observations of trucks</td>
<td>Measure only when observation indicates possible problem</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident History</td>
<td>Accident data files and KTC High Truck Accident Report</td>
<td>Do for entire route</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td>Traffic counts</td>
<td>Only where problems are indicated by facility managers</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route LOS</td>
<td>Traffic counts and travel time studies</td>
<td>Only where problems are indicated by managers</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Crossings</td>
<td>Field Observation</td>
<td>Evaluate all level crossings</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>KYTC Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>Evaluate all bridges</td>
<td>Point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Accident History
In 1997 the Kentucky Transportation Center studied all state-maintained roads throughout Kentucky and determined average truck accident rates for different types of road sections. A critical accident rate was then calculated using the average accident rate for a specific highway type along with an assumed level of statistical significance and exposure (vehicles miles traveled). Critical rate factors were calculated for one-mile sections having critical numbers of accidents. No sections were identified along US 41 with either a critical number or rate.

Figure 4 shows the locations of accidents during the years 1994, 1995 and 1996. The largest number of accidents occurred around the Pennyrile Parkway interchange. A summary of the accidents on US 41 between the Pennyrile Parkway interchange and Bill Bryan Road is shown in Table 2 for the same three year period. Only two of the 30 accidents involved a truck (6.7 percent), and this percentage was less than the 12 percent of heavy trucks on this route. The accident history does not show a problem related to truck traffic.

Table 2: Accident Types along Christian County Truck Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Truck Accidents</th>
<th>Truck Accidents</th>
<th>Percent Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Accidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Cross Section Features

Figures 5 and 6 illustrate the lane and shoulder widths along the route. The 12-foot lane widths provided on US 41 are considered "preferred" and the roadway widths on the road in the industrial park gave a lane width of over 12 feet (also "preferred"). The 10-foot gravel shoulders on US 41 are considered "adequate" while no shoulders were provided on the industrial park road (considered "less than adequate").

No significant clear zone problems were found. The pavement was in fair condition on US 41 and in good condition along the rest of the route.

3.4 Curvature Features

Grades are considered problematic if they cause trucks to slow down excessively. No such grades were found on this route. There were no segments where safe speed on curves or off tracking would be a problem along this route for trucks. The turning radius at the major intersections were observed. No radius problems were noted.

Figure 4: Accident Locations (1994-1996)
Figure 6: Shoulder Widths

**LEGEND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Scale - 1:25000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Shoulder</td>
<td>0.25 0 0.25 0.5 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width: 10 Feet</td>
<td>500 0 500 1000 Meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Railroad Crossings

There were no at-grade railroad crossings on this route.

3.6 Bridges

There were no bridges on this route. The interchange involved an overpass.

3.7 Sight Distance

No sight distance problems were observed at any entrance or side street.

3.8 Other Route Features

No specific problems were noted.

4.0 Composite Route Evaluation and Recommendations

4.1 Problem Truck Miles and Truck Points

In order to compare different routes to consider relative urgency of needed route improvements, the features rated “preferred”, “adequate” and “less than adequate” along a route were normalized for the number of miles, number of points and number of trucks using the route section. In the case of this Christian County route, only one of the features that were evaluated quantitatively had sections or points that are considered only “adequate” or “less than adequate.” A section or point that is considered “less than adequate” is weighted two times that of an “adequate” point or section. Sections which are not rated as “preferred” are weighted by length as well as the number of trucks on that section.

Table 3 contains the total problem truck miles for the shoulders along this route. The rating of this route relative to others evaluated will be reported in the final report.

Table 3: Summary of Problem Truck Miles and Points for Entire Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Trucks (/day)</th>
<th>Truck-points</th>
<th>Truck-miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoulders</td>
<td>US 41</td>
<td>Parkway-Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>765</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bryan</td>
<td>US 41</td>
<td>Casky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>US 41</td>
<td>Bill Bryan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 point for “adequate” features and 2 points for “less than adequate” features (0 points for “preferred” features not shown)

4.2 Maintenance Improvement Locations

No features noted during the site inspections were found which were causing a substantial problem and should be addressed during routine maintenance.
4.3 Overall Route Rating

In order to account for both the subjectively and objectively evaluated route features along truck routes throughout the state, UK engineers who studied the route and its features either during a site visit or by viewing a video of trucks using the routes rated the overall access on a scale of 1 through 10. The interpretation for these ratings is shown in Table 4. The route in Christian County from the Hopkinsville Industrial Park to the Pennyrile Parkway was given an overall rating of 10 indicating that trucks are served with reasonable access. Access between the NHS (Pennyrile Parkway) and industrial park was provided by a four lane roadway with full width shoulders. The only points given on the route related to the shoulders, primary in the industrial park, which did not impede truck access.

Table 4: Interpretation of the Overall Route Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Route Rating</th>
<th>Qualitative Interpretation of Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trucks should not be using this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major construction is required to improve this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Minor improvements are <strong>required</strong> on this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Minor improvements could <strong>improve</strong> this route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minor problems exist that do not seriously impede truck access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trucks are served with reasonable access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices
Appendix A: Field Site Visit Dates and Activities

January 14, 1998 - site layout, facility identification, photographs and video
May 19, 1998 - traffic counts and geometric measurements
May 26, 1998 - final data collection
Appendix B: Phone Surveys Conducted with Facilities
PHONE SURVEY RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility ID</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location / City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>ADD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Phelps Dodge</td>
<td>Hopkinsville</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Pennyrile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnet Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Moran</td>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>502-886-3961</td>
<td>502-887-5254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is the location of your facility on the map correct? Yes

2. Our information shows about ___ trucks per day access your facility. Is that correct? If not, fill in correct volume. Yes

3. Is the truck traffic to and from your facility seasonal or mostly constant? Constant

4. (If truck traffic is seasonal) Is the ___ trucks/day for the peak season?

5. What is the most common size truck operating at your facility? 45' Semitrailer 5-axle

6. What is the largest truck operating at your facility? 53' Semitrailer

7. What type of freight or commodity is shipped, and is incoming and outgoing freight different? (one may be an empty truck)
   - In - Raw materials
   - Out - Insulated copper wire

8. Does the truck traffic peak at specific times of the day? (e.g., out in the morning and return in the afternoon)
   - Receive - A.M.
   - Shipping - P.M.

9. What traffic congestion and delay problems along the routes are you aware of, or feel need improvement?
   - Location (route segment, intersection, etc.): None
   - Time and Day of Week:

10. Where do trucks at your facility go to and come from? (This may be an interstate, cities, general direction-N,S,E,W)
    - Pennyrile TO US 68 EB
    - US 41 TO US 41A N&S

11. Do you have any other problems or concerns along the route you would like us to consider? None

12. Would you like a copy of the final report (roadway/route evaluation ???) Yes

NOTES/COMMENTS:

PHONE SURVEY RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility ID</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location / City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>ADD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>White Hydraulics</td>
<td>Hopkinsville</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Pennyrile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contact Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phone</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fax</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doyle Shelton</td>
<td></td>
<td>502-885-1110</td>
<td>502-887-0393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is the location of your facility on the map correct? **Yes**

2. Our information shows about ___35___ trucks per day access your facility. Is that correct? *If not, fill in correct volume.* **Yes**

3. Is the truck traffic to and from your facility seasonal or mostly constant? **Constant**

4. *(If truck traffic is seasonal)* Is the _____ trucks/day for the peak season? **Yes**

5. What is the most common size truck operating at your facility? **45' Semitrailer**

6. What is the largest truck operating at your facility? **50' Semitrailer**

7. What type of freight or commodity is shipped, and is incoming and outgoing freight different? *(one may be an empty truck)*  
   - **In:** Iron castings, steel plates, steel bars  
   - **Out:** Hydraulic motors

8. Does the truck traffic peak at specific times of the day? *(e.g., out in the morning and return in the afternoon)* **3:00p.m. - 6:00p.m. (Both)**

9. What traffic congestion and delay problems along the routes are you aware of, or feel need improvement?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location (route segment, intersection, etc.)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Time and Day of Week</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bryan/ Pembroke (US 41A) - No signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift work congestion on US 41A exits off Pennyrile to US 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Where do trucks at your facility go to and come from? *(This may be an interstate, cities, general direction-N,S,E,W)*  
    - **In:** N. Ohio, N. Indiana, Detroit  
    - **Out:** Central U.S.

11. Do you have any other problems or concerns along the route you would like us to consider?  
    Several accidents at intersection of Bill Bryan/ Pembroke (US 41) no signal. Two multiple vehicle accidents in last two days, would use US 41 SB to US 79 to I-24 if it were four lane.

12. Would you like a copy of the final report *(roadway/route evaluation)***? **Yes**

**NOTES/COMMENTS:**

Appendix C: Traffic Counts

A 15-minute count was taken at the intersection of US 41 and Bill Bryan Boulevard on May 19, 1998 during a time indicated as a peak time according to the surveys. The volume was then
converted to the following hourly volumes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Volume (Truck Volume)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>US 41</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>48 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>US 41</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>136 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Bill Bryan</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>144 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>