

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING #1

PUBLIC MEETING OVERVIEW

The first public open house meetings for the **SR 32 Corridor Study** were held on Wednesday, January 30 and Thursday, January 31, 2008 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The Wednesday meeting was held at Williamsburg High School, located in Williamsburg, Ohio and the Thursday meeting was held at Batavia High School, located in Batavia Township, Ohio. The same content was presented at both meetings. The meetings were held in an open house format with exhibits displayed around the perimeter of the room. Exhibits shown at the meetings include: the study area, study goals, environmental red flags, existing utilities, current and future land use, accident data, urban spacing requirements, study matrix, future transportation development strategies and future steps for the study. County staff, including members of the Clermont County TID, County Engineer's Office and Water and Sewer District as well as study team members were in attendance to answer questions and discuss the study details.

Members of the public began arriving at the meeting prior to 5:30 p.m. Public attendance was greatest between 5:30 p.m. and 7 p.m. Wednesday's meeting drew 164 attendees, while 109 members of the public attended Thursday's meeting, for a total of 273 public open house attendees. A total of 50 comment sheets were collected at the Wednesday meeting, while 30 comment sheets were returned at Thursday's meeting. An additional 21 comment sheets and one e-mail were returned after the meeting. The total number of comments collected for the first open house meeting was 102. Exhibits shown at the meetings have been posted on the Clermont County TID's website.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION PRIOR TO THE MEETING

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

- Clermont County TID submitted a News Release to their media list on Wednesday, January 16, 2008.
- Clermont County TID posted a News Release on <http://tid.clermontcountyohio.gov> and www.clermontcountyohio.gov on Wednesday, January 16, 2008.
- Clermont County Chamber of Commerce e-mailed a News Release to their contact list.
- Meeting notices were mailed to 1,182 area residents, businesses and community organizations on Friday, January 18, 2008.
- 500 meeting flyers were distributed to Batavia Local Schools.
- 500 meeting flyers were distributed to Williamsburg Local Schools.
- 250 meeting flyers were distributed to local businesses.
- 100 meeting flyers were distributed to Dualite Sales & Service, Inc.
- 100 meeting flyers were distributed to Mercy Hospital Clermont.

MEDIA COVERAGE

Representatives from The Clermont Sun and the Community Press & Recorder attended the Thursday public open house meeting and interviewed County officials, study team members and the general public. Newspaper and web articles appeared in The People's Defender on January 30, 2008, in the Community Press & Recorder on February 4 and 6, 2008 and The Clermont Sun on February 10, 2008.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A comment sheet provided the public an opportunity to ask questions and provide general comments about the project. To date, 101 comment sheets have been submitted. Eighty were turned in at the meeting and 21 were received later during the two week comment period. It should be noted that not every respondent answered all of the questions, and some questions had more than one answer.

One additional set of comments were received from the public via e-mail and incorporated into the general comments. Additionally, respondents asked four questions about the study and those questions were personally answered via telephone by the project team.

A majority of respondents agree with the five draft goals of the study, and are most concerned about Congestion (65%) and Traffic Issues (62%) within the study area. These respondents also (73%) believe that improving SR 32 in the study area will benefit the community. A detailed breakdown of the findings follows:

Responses Regarding the Draft Study Goals

In terms of project related goals pertaining to the project area, respondents answered as follows:

Do you agree or disagree with Draft Goal #1: To develop transportation solutions that adequately address the future land use and infrastructure needs of the *SR 32 Corridor East Study* area?

- 84% Agreed
- 8% Were Not Sure
- 6% Did Not Respond
- 3% Disagreed

Do you agree or disagree with Draft Goal #2: To preserve needed right of way for future transportation and infrastructure investments?

- 81% Agreed
- 11% Were Not Sure
- 5% Did Not Respond
- 3% Disagreed

Do you agree or disagree with Draft Goal #3: To develop infrastructure solutions that are compatible with the rural character of the corridor while at the same time allowing for economic development opportunities?

- 81% Agreed
- 9% Were Not Sure
- 6% Did Not Respond
- 4% Disagreed

Do you agree or disagree with Draft Goal #4: To improve the safety and efficiency of the *SR 32 Corridor East Study* transportation system by preserving capacity, decreasing travel times, and providing adequate connectivity?

- 89% Agreed
- 5% Did Not Respond
- 4% Were Not Sure
- 2% Disagreed

Do you agree or disagree with Draft Goal #5: To develop innovative financing options for the phased implementation of the preferred transportation and infrastructure improvements?

- 68% Agreed
- 19% Were Not Sure
- 8% Did Not Respond
- 5% Disagreed

Study Issues

Respondents were asked to choose which issues(s) they are most concerned with pertaining to the study area. Most correspondents have chosen more than one response; therefore the total number of responses will be greater than 100%. The responses are rated from highest to lowest as follows:

- 65% Congestion
- 62% Traffic Crashes
- 40% Economic Development
- 39% Residential Properties
- 38% Preservation of Local Access
- 33% Business Issues
- 33% Access to Businesses
- 31% Community Issues
- 30% Environmental Concerns
- 29% Truck Traffic
- 24% Other
- 22% Speed Limits
- 21% Historical Properties
- 1% Did Not Respond

When respondents were asked whether improving SR 32 in the study area would be a benefit to the community, 73 percent responded 'yes', 20 percent were not sure, four percent said 'no' and three percent did not respond.

Additional Comments, Concerns and Issues

Respondents were also asked to provide any additional comments, concerns and/or issues regarding the study. A total of 115 individual comments were collected from the responses and grouped into 10 categories. The response categories are listed by largest amount of responses to the smallest amount:

- 23% Access Concerns on SR 32
- 18% Interchanges and Overpasses along SR 32
- 15% SR 32 Access Concerns and Road Issues at McKeever Road/Dela Palma Road
- 12% SR 32 Corridor Development Issues
- 7% Preservation Concerns in the SR 32 Corridor
- 7% General Concerns in the SR 32 Corridor
- 5% Safety and Traffic Concerns in the SR 32 Corridor
- 5% SR 32 Corridor East Study Issues
- 5% Other Issues
- 3% Arch Materials/Mine Concerns

A breakdown of each of the 10 categories, are listed below. The number in parenthesis lists the total number of comments received for that specific concern or comment.

(26) SR 32 Corridor – Access Concerns

- (10) Prefers access roads/frontage along SR 32.
- (9) Concerned about possible closure of and access points in general.
- (4) Concerned about access to local roads.
- (3) Prefers the SR 32 is a controlled-access highway with more interchanges.

(21) SR 32 Interchanges and Overpasses

- (8) Prefers an overpass of McKeever Road and/or Dela Palma Road.
- (3) Prefers interchange at Bauer Road.

- (2) Preserve the SR 133 Interchange.
- (2) Prefers overpass at Herold Road.
- (2) Prefers interchange at Herold Road.
- (1) Prefers an interchange at Dela Palma Road.
- (1) Prefers an interchange at McKeever Road.
- (1) Redesign Batavia Road Interchange.
- (1) Prefers partial-interchange at Bauer Road.

(17) McKeever Road/Dela Palma Road - Access Concerns and Road Issues

- (11) Concerned about road closures, convenience and emergency access north of Williamsburg/SR 32.
- (4) Dela Palma Road Issues: confusing intersection striping, turn-signal, people are running red light.
- (2) Flower vendor at Dela Palma Road is a distraction.

(14) SR 32 Corridor Development Issues

- (4) Widen/improve SR 276 roadway.
- (2) Widen Half-Acre Road.
- (2) Would like to see an increase in sewer coverage.
- (2) Would like to see more businesses in the study area.
- (2) Development is unnecessary and undesirable.
- (2) Would like to see "Business District" signage off of SR 23.

(8) SR 32 Corridor - Preservation Concerns

- (5) Prefers that rural areas/wildlife/watershed are preserved.
- (2) Prefers that land is purchased now along SR 32 for the preservation of right-of-way.
- (1) Preserve current residences.

(8) SR 32 Corridor - General Concerns

- (2) Prefers that politicians and developers are kept out of any decisions in the corridor.
- (2) Township, County, State and Local officials must coordinate efforts together.
- (1) Prefers a second outerbelt with connection to Dela Palma Road.
- (1) Prefers a 65mph speed-limit along SR 32.
- (1) Very much in favor of community goals.
- (1) Prefers landscaping along SR 32.

(6) SR 32 Corridor - Safety and Traffic Concerns

- (2) Concerned about traffic congestion.
- (1) Concerned about safety at SR 32 crossroads.
- (1) Concerned about traffic on Old SR 32.
- (1) Traffic signals adjacent to SR 32 need synchronized.
- (1) Concerned about accidents at SR 133 and Jackson Pike.

(6) SR 32 Study Issues

- (4) Study should include Village of Batavia and Batavia Interchanges.
- (1) Study needs traffic counts for better analysis.
- (1) Prefers that SR 32 Study have smaller and larger improvements with a phasing schedule.

(6) Other Issues

- (5) Concerned about the Eastgate study.
- (1) Concerned about an increase in taxes.

(3) Arch Materials/Mine Concerns

- (2) Concerned about truck traffic from Arch Materials.
- (1) Concerned about the Arch Materials mine.