



THRU THE VALLEY JUNE 29, 2005 PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

PUBLIC MEETING OVERVIEW

The second public meeting for the *Thru the Valley* project was held on June 29, 2005 from noon to 7 p.m. at the Sharonville Convention Center. The meeting was held in an open house format. Exhibits were displayed around the perimeter of the room. Depending on the time of day, 15 to 17 ODOT and consultant project team members were in attendance to answer questions and explain the exhibits. Various members of the Implementation Committee also attended throughout the day.

Members of the public began arriving at the meeting prior to 12 p.m. Public attendance was greatest between 12 p.m. and 3 p.m. and from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m.; however there was constant flow of people throughout the course of the open house. A total of 338 people signed in and 49 submitted general comment sheets while 430 project alternative and option comment cards were received (at the meeting). The table to the right shows which communities the meeting attendees represent. **Please note that those listing 'Cincinnati' as their contact address may live in one of the many villages or cities in the project area that use a Cincinnati zip code.**

Location	Attendance
Cincinnati	145
Other	66
Lockland	60
Reading	19
Arlington Heights	17
Sharonville	10
Lincoln Heights	9
Wyoming	6
Glendale	4
Evendale	2

There were no complaints from the public or the project team members about the location of the meeting or the facility.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION PRIOR TO THE MEETING

Public notification of the meeting was handled through multiple communication methods.

- Meeting notices were mailed on May 31, 2005 to 2,928 area residents, businesses and community organizations.
- Copies of the notice were provided to local Implementation Committee members for distribution throughout their communities.
- The meeting time and date was posted at www.thruthevalley.com beginning in April 2005.
- A legal advertisement for the meeting ran in The Cincinnati Enquirer and The Cincinnati Post on June 15, 2005 (online and print versions).
- Several articles about the meeting appeared in the Sunday, June 26, and Monday, June 27, 2005 editions of The Cincinnati Enquirer. Several other broadcast media also announced the meeting on June 28 and 29.

MEDIA COVERAGE

Representatives from seven media outlets covered the public meeting including: The Cincinnati Enquirer, Community Press West, News 5 (WLWT-TV), 9 News (WCPO-TV), Fox 19 (WXIX-TV) and WB 64 (WSTR-TV).

COMMENT SUMMARY

Members of the public had the option to fill out a comment sheet, which provided an opportunity to ask questions and provide general comments about the project. To date, 49 comment sheets have been submitted. These were either turned in at the meeting or received later by mail. Also available were 15 different comment cards, which allowed for each alternative or option to be evaluated separately. Attendees submitted 430 individual project alternative and option comment cards at the meeting. When reviewing this summary, please note that not every respondent answered all of the questions or turned in a card for each of the 15 project alternative and options.

Everyone who submitted a comment sheet and/or card (whose contact information is found in the project database) will receive a letter thanking them for their input. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) list, created based upon the questions asked through the comment sheets, will also be included in the mailing.

In addition to comment sheets and cards, comments and questions regarding the public meeting have been received via email and the project website, www.thruthevalley.com. These inputs have been incorporated into the FAQ list and have each received responses on an individual basis.

Comment Sheet

When asked what factors were the most important in the selection of a preferred alternative, the most votes were given to *easing congestion and improving safety* with 34 each. *Increasing regional mobility* received the next most votes with 27 followed by *protecting environmental resources and reducing overall project costs* with ten and eight votes respectively. *Compatibility with local land use plans* and *preserving residential property* each received six votes. There were four factors that received one vote each, these were *diverting non-Cincinnati traffic*, *creating a direct connection to the Ronald Reagan Highway*, *reducing construction impacts*, and *reducing pollution*.

When reviewing the general comments and questions for ODOT there were no underlying themes found. Questions from the comment sheet were incorporated into the Frequently Asked Questions report.

Comment Cards

The public was asked to individually rate the 15 alternatives or options as favorable, unfavorable, or no opinion. They then had the option to write an open-ended comment about that alternative or option. The most favorable alternatives include the *Four Lane Continuity*, *Divided Interstate*, and *Express Lanes B*; while the *Davis/Cooper Interchange* was rated the most favorable option. The following summarizes the rating and written comments provided.

Alternative 1: No Build

- 8 respondents (22 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 27 respondents (75 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 1 respondent (3 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 15 respondents noted this alternative does nothing to solve the problems

Alternative 2: No Build + Minor

- 13 respondents (33 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 22 respondents (55 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 5 respondents (13 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 8 respondents are concerned with access to Lincoln Heights, Arlington Heights, and Lockland

Alternative 3: Four Lane Continuity

- 28 respondents (58 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 15 respondents (31 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 5 respondents (10 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 10 respondents noted this alternative only marginally fixes congestion

Alternative 4A: Express Lanes A

- 18 respondents (49 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 16 respondents (43 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 3 respondents (8 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 6 respondents noted this alternative is too expensive and not needed

Alternative 4B: Express Lanes B

- 23 respondents (56 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 16 respondents (39 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 2 respondents (5 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 5 respondents noted this alternative would ease congestion by separating local and thru traffic

Alternative 4C: Express Lanes C

- 13 respondents (45 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 15 respondents (52 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 1 respondent (3 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 8 respondents noted this alternative is too expensive and not needed

Alternative 5: Parkway

- 19 respondents (50 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 17 respondents (45 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 2 respondents (5 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 14 respondents preferred the suggested direct ramps to the Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway and separation of local and thru traffic

Alternative 6: Divided Interstate

- 23 respondents (59 percent) rated this alternative as favorable
- 14 respondents (36 percent) rated this alternative as unfavorable
- 2 respondents (5 percent) rated this alternative as having no opinion
- 8 respondents preferred the direct access to the Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway that this alternative provides

Option 1: Davis/Cooper Interchange

- 19 respondents (70 percent) rated this option as favorable
- 5 respondents (19 percent) rated this option as unfavorable
- 3 respondents (11 percent) rated this option as having no opinion
- 5 respondents noted this option provides access for Reading and Lockland and redevelopment and growth

Option 2A: Shepherd/Mangham Interchange A

- 5 respondents (31 percent) rated this option as favorable
- 10 respondents (63 percent) rated this option as unfavorable
- 1 respondent (6 percent) rated this option as having no opinion
- 7 respondents noted this option adversely impacts commercial businesses in Lockland and Lincoln Heights

Option 2B: Shepherd/Mangham Interchange B

- 9 respondents (69 percent) rated this option as favorable
- 4 respondents (31 percent) rated this option as unfavorable
- 0 respondents (0 percent) rated this option as having no opinion

Option 2C: Shepherd/Mangham Interchange C

- 16 respondents (67 percent) rated this option as favorable
- 5 respondents (21 percent) rated this option as unfavorable
- 3 respondents (13 percent) rated this option as having no opinion

Option 3: CD Option

- 8 respondents (35 percent) rated this option as favorable
- 12 respondents (52 percent) rated this option as unfavorable
- 3 respondents (13 percent) rated this option as having no opinion
- 5 respondents are concerned about negative effects on business and residences

Option 4: Lincoln Heights/GE Option

- 2 respondents (50 percent) rated this option as favorable
- 2 respondents (50 percent) rated this option as unfavorable
- 0 respondents (0 percent) rated this option as having no opinion

Option 5: Transportation System Management & Transportation Demand Management

- 5 respondents (33 percent) rated this option as favorable
- 6 respondents (40 percent) rated this option as unfavorable
- 4 respondents (27 percent) rated this option as having no opinion