



NHX Stakeholder Meeting Notes, Meeting #3

May 4, 2022 | 5:30 p.m.

Wilks Conference Center & Virtual through Zoom

This third North Hamilton Crossing (NHX) Stakeholder Committee Meeting was held as a hybrid meeting which allowed committee members to participate in person or virtually.

PARTICIPANTS

In-Person Participants

Andrew Bonham
Neil Cohen
Chris Connell
Dustin Gadd
Jody Gunderson
Shannon Hartkemeyer
Liz Hayden
Matt Latham
Kristina Latta-Landefeld
Joel Lauer
Chris Maraschiello
Joe McAbee
Pat Moeller
Eric Pohlman
Edwin Porter
Keith Reiring
TC Rogers
Brandon Saurber
Dave Seilkop
Ken Seilkop
Joshua Smith (City Manager)
Daniel Tidyman
Susan Vaughn
Andy Weltzer
Greg Wilkens
Pat Yingling

Representing

Bonham Farms
Cohen Recycling
Hamilton City Schools
St. Clair Township Trustee
City of Hamilton
Fairfield Township Trustee
City of Hamilton, Planning
MetroParks of Butler County
Rossville Neighborhood, Envision Partnerships, Great Miami Rowing Center
City of Hamilton
Hamilton City Schools/Interested Resident
Fairfield Township Trustee
City of Hamilton, Mayor
City of Hamilton City Council
City of Hamilton, Department of Infrastructure
North End/Fordson Heights
Butler County Commissioner
City of Hamilton, Department of Neighborhoods
Hamilton Precision
Hamilton Precision
City of Hamilton, City Manager
City of Hamilton, City Clerk
City of Hamilton, City Council
German Village
BCEO
City of Hamilton

Virtual Participants

Bob Bass	Ross Township/BCTID
Dan Bates	Greater Hamilton Chamber of Commerce
Anna Bonham	Bonham Farms
Jeff Gambrell	RENEW North End Neighborhood
Wade Johnston	Tri-State Trails/Green Umbrella
Mike Reuter	Prospect Hill
Matt S.	Crawford Hoying
Tim Werdmann	City of Hamilton
Amy Bonham	Bonham Farms
Ellen Yordy	Ross Township
External Services Meetings 1-513-237-8046	Unknown Unknown

Project Team Participants

Dan Corey	Butler County TID
Rich Engle	City of Hamilton
Allen Messer	City of Hamilton
Keith Smith	Ohio Department of Transportation
Caroline Ammerman	Stantec
Scott Connor	Stantec
Matt Crim	Stantec
Steve Shadix	Stantec
Rohini Vembar	Stantec
Mimi Rasor	Rasor
Laura Whitman	Rasor

Public Observers

(Note: Due to the nature of the Stakeholder Committee meetings as working sessions, members of the public are able to come and listen to the meeting discussions, but not participate. Meetings designed specifically to inform the public and gather public input will be held at key points throughout project development).

Sam Beiler	In-person observer
Tim Spoonster	In-person observer
Ron Stewart	In-person observer
Lori Stewart	In-person observer

MEETING SUMMARY

Upon entry to the meeting, attendees were given a printed copy of the Evaluation Matrix and a Conceptual Alternatives map which shows the location of conceptual alternatives A through E-1. Allen Messer emailed Stakeholder Committee members copies of these materials plus detailed plan sheets of each alternative a week prior to this meeting for their review.

Steve Shadix, project manager for the consultant team, opened the meeting, welcomed participants, reviewed the agenda, and initiated project team and meeting attendee introductions. He emphasized that the project team wants feedback from Stakeholder Committee members. Input received will be used to help fine-tune the alternatives and determine which ones to advance for further study. Mr. Shadix then restated that the role of committee members was to:

- Represent their community/organization in discussions related to North Hamilton Crossing (NHX) studies, goals, and anticipated project outcomes;
- Serve as a conduit between their community/organization and the project team to exchange information and address concerns;
- Provide project and study updates to their community/organization.

He reminded committee members that the project is currently in Stage 1 (planning) and Stage 2 (Preliminary Engineering) of ODOT's five-stage project development process. As the project advances to the next stage the team will develop more detailed designs, perform environmental studies, and obtain required right-of-way (ROW).

He also reviewed the purpose the (NHX) project which is to:

Improve east-west connectivity north of SR 129 in the City of Hamilton in order to reduce congestion and improve mobility in support of current and planned economic growth in the City of Hamilton and western Butler County, as identified in Plan Hamilton.

He noted that needs identified for the project include Primary Needs (items/issues that must be addressed by the project) and Secondary Needs (Items/Issues that should be considered, if the necessary funding is available).

Primary Needs include:

- Improve east-west connectivity
- Address insufficient crossings of the Great Miami River
- Address lack of grade-separated railroad crossings
- Address mobility/congestion on local road network
- Improve safety

Secondary needs include:

- Support economic development
- Improve bike/pedestrian connectivity
- Improve multimodal linkage

Mr. Shadix said that part of the evaluation of each alternative includes an assessment of how well it fulfills the Primary and Secondary needs identified for the project. The first two sections of the Evaluation Matrix present the results of a preliminary evaluation of these factors.

- No numeric weights have been assigned to the evaluation results at this point in time because the alternatives are still in the early phases of development. Instead, they've been assigned colors to indicate a generally positive result or relatively minor impacts (green), neutral result or some impacts (yellow), or negative result or greater level of impacts (red).
 - The type of impact considered depends on the category listed. For instance, the first rows of the Evaluation Matrix look specifically at Purpose and Need and how well the alternatives meet those needs. Other categories consider impacts relative to a variety of factors such as historic sites (number impacted), floodplains (acres impacted), farmland (acres impacted), ROW concerns (amount needed), relocations (number required), design issues, project cost (estimated amount).
- The results shown in the Evaluation Matrix include both quantitative and qualitative factors that are based on the preliminary engineering studies completed to date. All environmental impacts are based solely on mapping and secondary sources.
- When comparing alternatives, the project team asks that stakeholders compare the alternatives not only from their community/organization's perspective but also from the perspective of the region. There is no "golden route" for this project. To meet the project's Purpose and Need, compromises will have to be made. The project team's goal is to discuss the pros and cons of the alternatives and narrow the number of alternatives that are advanced to further study.

Conceptual Alternative Review

Following the last Stakeholder Committee meeting, the project team conducted additional study on the alternatives that were advanced (A through E), as well as some hybrid options that had also been suggested. Mr. Shadix reminded the group that at the last meeting, Alternatives F and G were eliminated from consideration due to the high level of impact they would have had on two neighborhoods that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Per federal law, areas listed on the NRHP must be avoided if other reasonable alternatives are available. Although the committee also initially suggested eliminating Alternative A due to impacts to floodplains and farmlands, it was decided to advance Alternative A, as well as several hybrid options of Alternative A since Alternative A did not have any significant impacts relative to the other alternatives that would make it unreasonable to advance.

Mr. Shadix explained that the goal of the meeting was to review and discuss the team's engineering and environmental findings on the Conceptual Alternatives (Alternatives A through E) and the newly created hybrids, as well as to answer questions. The project team will use feedback provided by the stakeholders to gather any additional information needed. At the next meeting, the group will work to reduce the number of alternatives to be advanced to the next stage of project development.

Following is a summary of the discussion held regarding the proposed alternatives.

[Note: Alternatives A, B, C and D all follow the same route south of Joe Nuxhall Blvd. In response to comments received at the February Stakeholder Committee meeting, the project team shifted the section of these alternatives between SR 4 and SR 129 further west. As a result, the proposed routes for

Alternatives A, B, C, and D between SR 4 and SR 129 now travel south between the Butler County Engineer's Office and Butler County Fairgrounds, are several hundred feet further west of the houses along Zoellner Place (in the Fairfield Ridge neighborhood), and go around the west side of the TLC building located at 2052 Princeton Road.]

Alternative A

Alternative A begins with a proposed roundabout connecting NW Washington Boulevard and North B Street, crosses Combs Park, and then crosses a new bridge over the Great Miami River. The alignment bridges over US 127 (a J hook-shaped ramp connects the road to US 127), bridges over the railroad tracks, crosses the floodplain and Bonham Farm before crossing a bridge over the hydraulic canal to tie into Neal Boulevard at the intersection with Joe Nuxhall Boulevard. The route continues south on Neal Boulevard before shifting to the southeast just past Greenwood Avenue. Using an "S" shaped curve, the route connects with SR 4 just west of the Marathon station and continues south between the Butler County Engineer's Office and the Butler County Fairgrounds. The route then shifts slightly east, travels south and runs between the Animal Shelter and the TLC building on Princeton Road, connects with Hampshire Drive at a new intersection slightly west of the existing intersection and follows Hampshire to SR 129.

Pros for Alternative A

- Alternative A has fewer curb cuts which allows for a smoother flow of traffic.
- Of the alternatives, Alternative A has one of the fewest numbers of residential relocations (5 to 15)
- Alternative A provides an overall loop connection between NW Washington and SR 129.

Cons for Alternative A

- Alternative A is one of the worst alternatives in terms of reducing traffic on SR 129. It achieves a 5% reduction of traffic in the morning, 6% in the evening.
- Alternative A has the greatest impact to floodplains (20 – 30 acres) and farmland (35 – 45 acres).
 - According to the Butler County Flood Damage Prevention Regulations, compensatory flood storage¹ must be provided to offset a reduction in floodplain storage resulting from filling within the special flood hazard area. This floodplain storage compensation must be within the same watershed and be provided on the same property or at an alternative site if administrative approval is given. It may be advantageous to consider using this compensatory flood storage area as a wetland bank which the city could use for mitigation purposes on other projects.
- With an estimated construction cost of \$97M to \$127M, Alternative A is the most expensive of all the alternatives.

¹ Compensatory flood storage means the mitigation of the placement of fill within the floodplain by providing additional storage by lowering the ground storage to compensate for the volume of the floodplain area that has been filled in. Butler County requires storage to be provided at hydraulically equivalent sites at a ratio of 1 (storage) to 1 (fill).

Discussion Points for Alternative A

- Alternative A would have to cross over US 127 because there isn't enough room for a full NHX/US 127 intersection and it's too close to the river to go under US 127. A proposed J-hook ramp would connect the NHX road to US 127. Traffic signals would manage access to and from the ramp.
- There would be a roundabout intersection with North B Street on the west side of the river. Just west of that, the road would tie into West Elton Road.

Alternative B

Alternative B begins at the Lagonda Avenue & North B Street intersection and bridges across the Great Miami River just north of the hydraulic dam. The alignment intersects with US 127 and crosses over the railroad and floodplain (southwest corner of the Bonham Farm), then bridges across the hydraulic canal just past the power plant before turning east through the northern portion of LJ Smith Park and tying into Joe Nuxhall Boulevard. The remaining portion of the alignment follows the same path as Alternative A.

Pros for Alternative B

- Alternative B has less farmland impact (20 to 30 acres) than Alternative A (35 to 45 acres).
- Alternative B has fewer relocations (5 to 15) compared to other alternatives, except for Alternative A.

Cons for Alternative B

- Alternative B is one of the worst alternatives for reducing traffic on SR 129/High Street traffic (5% in the morning, 5% in the evening).
- The alignment stops at Lagonda Avenue; this alternative does not provide continuation westward.
- Alternative B has long-term maintenance issues that the city would have to address.
- North B Street would have to be raised by five feet to maintain the levee system; this would have an impact on nearby homes.
- At an estimated construction cost of \$96M to \$116M, Alternative B is of the most expensive options.

Discussion Points for Alternative B

- The project team looked at extending Lagonda Avenue to Eaton Avenue but determined it's not feasible due to topography limitations and anticipated impacts.

Alternative C

Alternative C begins at relocated Rhea Avenue & North B Street and bridges across the Great Miami River between Black Street and the hydraulic dam. The alignment intersects with US 127 and bridges over the railroad. The alignment then crosses the Chem-Dyne site and LJ Smith Park, before intersecting with Joe Nuxhall Boulevard, which it follows to the intersection with Neal Boulevard. The remaining portion of the alignment follows the same route as Alternative A.

Pros for Alternative C

- Alternative C requires a fewer number of relocations (10 to 20) than some of the other alternatives.
- Alternative C has better anticipated traffic reduction numbers on SR 129/High Street than Alternatives A, B, and D (7% in the morning; 8% in the evening).
- At an estimated construction cost of \$55M to \$65M, it is the least expensive of all the alternatives.

Cons for Alternative C

- With this alternative, it would be necessary to raise US 127 by eight feet to meet the new NHX road.
- Alternative C could inhibit potential development along the east side of the river.

Discussion Points for Alternative C

- The portion of the road that runs through LJ Smith Park could be shifted a little further to the north into the power plant area to preserve park space.
- The NHX road would go over the railroad tracks. Going under the tracks would be challenging at this location because the Chem-Dyne site, which is adjacent to the tracks, is a Superfund site. Excavating it for an underpass could be problematic.
- Raising US 127 would potentially impact approximately one-third of the developable area around Black Street.

Alternative D

Alternative D begins at Gordon Avenue and North B Street and bridges across the Great Miami River between the hydraulic dam and Black Street Bridge (the starting point could be shifted to relocated Rhea Avenue, if preferred). The alignment connects with US 127, then shifts to the southeast and bridges over the railroad tracks near Joe Nuxhall Boulevard. The alignment then follows Joe Nuxhall to Neal Boulevard. Any one of the three intersection options could be used here ("T" intersection, curved roadway, or roundabout) and the remaining portion of the alignment follows the same path as Alternative A.

Pros for Alternative D

- Alternative D has fewer relocations (15 to 25) than Alternatives E and E1.
- Alternative D doesn't require as much of a road height adjustment as Alternative C.
- This alignment can be modified to tie into other streets such as Rhea Avenue or Gordon Avenue at its western terminus. The best end point for this alignment can be further studied after traffic data from Spooky Nook is obtained.

Cons for Alternative D

- Traffic modeling shows that the additional time required to travel the length of Joe Nuxhall Boulevard would deter some drivers from following this route. As a result, less traffic will be

diverted from SR 129/High Street. The overall traffic reduction to SR 129/High Street would be just 5% in both the morning and evening.

- Like Alternatives C, D, E, and E1, this alternative would have a greater impact to developable land along the riverfront than Alternatives A and B.

Discussion Points for Alternative D

- A committee member proposed leaving the Black Street Bridge open to vehicular traffic, rather than limiting it to bicycles and pedestrians. Mr. Shadix noted that one of the primary reasons for planning a new bridge crossing is that the Black Street Bridge is nearing the end of its useful life. Further, there is no room to expand the bridge to add more traffic lanes. However, the project team will look at the options for keeping the Black Street Bridge open to vehicular traffic and how that would impact traffic flow. Findings will be shared at the next meeting.

Alternative E

Alternative E begins at a relocated Rhea Avenue & North B Street (could be moved to Gordon Avenue, if preferred) and includes a bridge across the Great Miami River between the hydraulic dam and the Black Street Bridge. The alignment then connects with US 127, where it then proceeds southeast, and crosses over the railroad tracks to connect with Joe Nuxhall Boulevard. The alignment then follows Joe Nuxhall Boulevard to North 9th Street, curves southeast to connect with Heaton Street, and continues east to an intersection with SR 4 in the vicinity of the firehouse. At this point, the alignment crosses the parking lot of the Butler County Educational Service building, connects to Gilmore Avenue, and continues across North Fair Avenue. The alignment runs east behind the Butler County Children Services Board, Juvenile Justice Center and Butler County Board of Developmental Services buildings, turns southeast to go behind the Humane Society, and then turns south to cross Princeton Road, slightly west of the existing intersection with Hampshire Drive, just past the TLC building at 2052 Princeton Road. At this point, the alignment ties back into Hampshire to connect with SR 129.

Pros for Alternative E

- Alternatives E and E1 would provide the greatest traffic reduction on SR 129/High Street; both morning traffic and evening traffic would be reduced by 16% for each alternative.
- Alternative E is the shortest alternative (2.26 miles in length).
- Cost estimates for Alternative E are in the middle of all the other alternatives (\$65M to \$75M).

Cons for Alternative E

- The number of relocations is among the highest of the alternatives and would be between 45 and 55 structures. This includes both residential and commercial properties.

Alternative E1

This alternative, which is a variation of Alternative E, evolved from comments received at the February Stakeholder Committee meeting. Like Alternative E, E1 begins at a relocated Rhea Avenue & North B Street (could be moved to Gordon Avenue, if preferred) and crosses the Great Miami River on a new bridge between the hydraulic dam and the Black Street Bridge. The alignment connects with US 127 slightly south

of the intersection with North Second Street and travels southeast to cross through the yard of the Hamilton Power Plant, over the railroad tracks, through the middle portion of the Chem-Dyne site and LJ Smith Park ballfields and across Joe Nuxhall Boulevard to connect with Miami Street. E1 then follows Miami Street (which runs next to the southwest edge of Greenwood Cemetery) to Heaton Street. From there, it shifts to the southeast on new alignment to cross North Erie Boulevard, immediately south of the Advance Auto Parts store. The remaining portion of the alignment follows the same route to SR 129 as Alternative E.

Pros for Alternative E1

- Alternatives E and E1 would provide the greatest traffic reduction on SR 129/High Steet; both morning traffic and evening traffic would be reduced by 16% for each alternative.

Cons Shared for Alternative E1

- This alternative would require the highest number of relocations (55 – 65) of all the alternatives.

Discussion Points for Alternative E1

- We can potentially shift the alignment for Alternative C south by substituting in the piece of E1 that travels by the power station. Doing so could help maximize available land for development.
- North B Street won't be easy to widen.

Alternatives AC, AD, and AE

These hybrids use the river crossing from Alternative A and tie directly into US 127 at its current elevation (this is possible because the road doesn't have to go over the railroad tracks at this location.). The route then follows US 127 south to the connections proposed for Alternatives C, D, and E and then follows the associated routes.

Pros

- The pros for these alternatives would be similar to those for the full Alternatives C, D and E.

Cons

- Alternatives AC and AD are the worst in terms of reducing traffic on SR 129/High Street. The overall benefit would be less than 1%. Modeling showed that people wouldn't make the turns required and would instead continue to travel along the existing routes.

Discussion Points for Alternatives AC, AD and AE

- City representatives participated in a walkthrough of Fordson Heights with neighborhood representatives. The neighborhood representatives preferred that the NHX route go along Miami Street. Some committee members felt that the route chosen in that area should be a neighborhood decision.
- The project team kept Alternative AE because there were 10 fewer relocations than Alternative E1

- Of the alternatives, Alternative AE has the second-best benefit to traffic flow on SR 129/High Street (after Alternative BE).

Alternatives BC, BD, and BE

These hybrids use the river crossing from Alternative B (starting at the Lagonda Avenue and North B Street intersection and bridge over the Great Miami River just north of the hydraulic dam) to link directly to US 127 at its current elevation. The route then follows US 127 to the connections proposed for Alternatives C, D, and E, and then follows the associated routes.

Discussion Points for Alternatives BC, BD and BE

- Alternative BC showed a traffic flow benefit on SR 129/High Street of 1% for morning traffic and 2% for evening traffic.
- Alternative BD showed 0% benefits to SR 129/High Street traffic flow.
- Alternative BE showed an 8% benefit for both morning and evening traffic flow.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED/MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION POINTS

General questions, comments, and discussion points shared throughout the meeting are summarized below.

Several lines on the Conceptual Alternatives map look like they go through buildings (in particular, the Butler County buildings in Alternatives A, B, C and D). Does this mean that the buildings would be torn down?

- The lines on the Conceptual Alternatives map are representative of the general routes for each alternative, but it's hard to see where the actual road would be at that scale. The plan sheets that were sent to each committee member prior to this meeting are much more detailed. On those sheets, the green lines indicate grading and impact limits.
- In regards to the Butler County buildings, for the alternatives that pass between the Butler County Engineer's Office (BCEO) and the Fairgrounds, there is one BCEO building and two Fairgrounds buildings that would likely be impacted.
- For Alternatives A, B, C, and D, the area where the green lines widen between the Fairgrounds and SR 129 indicate where there would be a cut in the hillside.
- As proposed, the road would be a five-lane, boulevard style road and designed for a 35-mph speed limit. It would not be a limited-access road. A shared-use path would be one side of the road with a sidewalk on the other side.
 - A committee member expressed concern that drivers are likely to exceed the 35-mph speed limit.

What is the cost of each alternative?

- Estimated costs for construction, ROW acquisition, and project design and management are provided for each alternative at the bottom of the Evaluation Matrix. These costs are based on the information the project team has at this time.

- A committee member said that the costs to ancillary areas should be considered when determining project costs. He noted that by moving the alignment away from houses and onto county land removes some of the variables, but there is still a cost to it.

How close does the NHX route come to the homes along the west side of Zoellners Place [in the Fairfield Ridge neighborhood]?

- Approximately 440 ft at its closest point. This measurement is the distance between the back fence line of the residential properties on the west side of Zoellners Place to the east edge of the bike path that would run alongside the new NHX road.

Is Phase 3 necessary?

The NHX project consists of three phases. Phase 1 focuses on a new bridge across the Great Miami River. Phase 2 focuses on establishing a more direct route from the river to SR 4. Phase 3 would connect SR 4 to SR 129 in the vicinity of Hampshire Drive. A committee member suggested that if the NHX project stopped at Phase 2, people could use existing SR 4 to get where they need to go and Phase 3 may not be necessary.

- The project team has already looked at that option (stopping after Phase 2) in terms of the impact on traffic flow on SR 129/High Street and project cost (Mr. Shadix reminded the group that the purpose of the project is in part to reduce congestion and improve mobility). Based on engineering analyses, it was determined that if the project is built only through Phase 2, the new alignment was 40% less effective at pulling traffic off of SR 129 while overall costs were reduced by just 20%. This shows that completing Phase 3 is an important part of making this a successful project.
- A committee member suggested that project planning focus first on determining where the new river crossing will go; the rest can come later. Keith Smith, ODOT, said that not considering the full requirements of the project from the outset could limit future options for a roadway extension and make future planning more complicated.

Railroad Overpasses/Underpasses

Each of the proposed alternatives includes a crossing over the railroad tracks. Alternative F, which was eliminated at the February Stakeholder Meeting, was the only alternative which was designed to cross under the railroad tracks. Going over railroad tracks is generally the most economical option. It was noted, however, that underpasses would allow the footprint of the crossing to be a little tighter and have less impact on developable areas. The project team will evaluate the overpass/underpass options in more detail and will share their findings at the next Stakeholder Committee meeting.

Appraisal Values

Property appraisal values currently tend to run two to three times more than the city's valuation. Right now, there does not appear to be a limit/cap to potential valuation amounts, likely because there are not many replacement/relocation options available. This may change in the future, but right now, this is a really high-risk factor.

Traffic Benefits

Traffic benefit measurements are based on the reduction of traffic traveling on SR 129/High Street. It was noted that drivers' travel needs vary – some need to travel on SR 129 to SR 4. Others travel in the other direction. If you looked at these varying needs, would the benefit/cost analysis be impacted?

- Mr. Corey reminded the group that the city and county are looking for ways to attract state and federal funds. Reducing traffic is a good way to do that and therefore traffic reduction measurements are important. If we reduce choices that reflect positive traffic improvements, we won't score as well for federal funding.

Parting Comments

A variety of comments addressing multiple topics were shared near the end of the meeting. These included:

- A committee member said that priorities for the NHX project should be traffic flow and economic development.
- Another committee member said the first step [for project planning] should be to lock down the two end points of the project.
- Fairfield Township isn't asking for connectivity to SR 129. Township neighborhoods won't really be supportive of impacts to their community.
- A committee member expressed an opinion that traffic congestion is a side effect of healthy, vibrant communities. Broad boulevards that bypass the best community assets can be a threat to the health of a community. After acknowledging the comment, Mr. Shadix noted that the NHX project is not just a road. It also includes multi-modal travel options which can support community enhancement and vibrancy.
- Is it redundant to have a sidewalk and shared-use path on the new bridge and converting the Black Street Bridge to bike and pedestrian only?
- Many of the alternatives divide LJ Smith Park and its ballfields in two. Although it is a Superfund site, it's conceivable that the neighboring Chem-Dyne site could be used as ballfields since no digging would be involved. Community input would be needed to determine if this would be an acceptable option.
- LJ Smith Park is divided in two with most of these alternatives. Moving the road closer to the canal would avoid this division but cut off the canal to the neighborhoods. The neighborhoods should be asked what their preference is - complicate park access from the neighborhoods or cut off easy access to the canal?

Mr. Corey and Mr. Messer said that the project team would be happy to meet with smaller groups of stakeholders to discuss these and other topics in more detail. The results of any discussion held would be brought back and shared with the full committee at the next stakeholder meeting.

NEXT STEPS

As the meeting concluded, Mr. Shadix repeated that the goal for the next meeting is to narrow down the alternatives to two or three options that would be advanced for the next phase of study. This next phase will be much more detailed and will include field studies, soil borings, additional public involvement, and detailed environmental and engineering studies.

- After the next Stakeholder Committee meeting (likely to be held this summer), the project team will complete the Feasibility Study.
- The Feasibility Study and its recommendations will be shared with the public later this summer through an effort that will include both in-person and virtual components. The in-person segment

will be a traditional public meeting; the virtual component will be similar to the first public input opportunity where project information and opportunities for questions and comments are posted online. The public will have at least 30 days to review the material and provide feedback. The project team hopes that Stakeholder Committee members will help spread the word about upcoming public input opportunities so we can get a high level of public review and participation in the process.

- After the public input opportunity concludes, the project team will begin preparing an Alternative Evaluation Report (AER) which will include more detailed study and analysis of the alternatives advanced for further study. The Stakeholder Committee will continue to be involved in this process. Results of the AER will be taken back to the public; feedback received will be used to recommend a preferred alternative.
- This phase of planning will likely conclude with a recommendation for the full project (Phases 1, 2 and 3). Funding is expected to come in stages, however, so the project would be constructed in parts. This will allow the city and county time to adjust to any new or changing needs that come up in the future, five or 20 years from now.

The project team agrees with Mr. Corey and Mr. Messer and strongly encourages any groups or individuals not comfortable speaking out in the Stakeholder Committee meeting to reach out to the city, County and/or project team to discuss questions, concerns and ideas in more detail.