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Overview

Public Involvement Objectives
The objectives for the KY 536 Scoping Study’s public involvement and outreach efforts are:

- Provide multiple opportunities for stakeholders and the public to review project-related information and obtain updates on the progress being made towards identifying a preferred alternative to improve safety and east-west connectivity in Northern Kentucky.
- Provide stakeholders and the public with multiple opportunities through which they can provide feedback to the Scoping Study Team.
- Tie in the KY 536 Scoping Study to the overall purpose and need for improvements to the entire KY 536 corridor to communicate a clear, coordinated and comprehensive public message.
- Update community members who participated in the previous study, (performed in 2000), while identifying and reaching out to new, previously untapped community members and stakeholders.

Purpose of this Document
OKI views comprehensive, strategic stakeholder outreach and public involvement essential to the success of the KY 536 Scoping Study. As such, this Public Comment Summary Report has been developed to record public involvement activities undertaken and the input received during the first of three phases of the Scoping Study’s process.

Phase One Deliverables

Phase One of the KY 536 Scoping Study can be summarized as the Data Collection Phase. This phase was implemented between September 11, 2015 (date of the signed contract between OKI and Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (PB) the consultant team chosen to assist with the Study) and April 24, 2015 (the end date of the Study’s first public comment period).

The research conducted, data analysis performed and presentation of technical information to the public involved a considerable investment of consultant team staff resources. The Study Team worked to compile and analyze data covering all aspects of the KY 536 roadway and study area. The results of these efforts is
presented in three Scoping Study deliverables or documents which can be found as separate documents on the www.oki.org/536 website.

**Purpose and Need Statement**
The function of the Purpose and Need Statement is to provide a general summary of the current Scoping Study’s purpose and why it is being conducted. The purpose and need was determined based on identified issues within the existing corridor and was refined as needed based on input and concurrence by the Project Development Team (PDT). This document defines the transportation problems within the study area and substantiates the need for improvements. The Purpose and Need Statement will be used as a measure upon which to evaluate draft alternatives developed during Phase Two of the Scoping Study.

**Existing Conditions Inventory**
The purpose of the Existing Conditions Inventory is to examine existing traffic, roadway and safety conditions on KY 536 between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell County Line. This inventory defines where there are problems or deficiencies in the study area and includes mapping, identification and review of other transportation projects and reports, roadway characteristics, existing traffic volumes, Level of Service (LOS), and capacity, crash analysis and environmental resources. Due to the extent of data collection, this document includes four appendices which contain detailed information. The Existing Conditions Inventory provides the catalyst for creating draft alternatives during Phase Two of the Scoping Study.

**Red Flag Summary/Environmental Resources Overview**
The purpose of the Red Flag Summary/Environmental Resources Overview is to identify any major environmental issues or concerns that may affect the planning, development and implementation of transportation improvements in the study area. A secondary source review was conducted and supplemented by a windshield survey which examined; air quality, aesthetics, aquatic and terrestrial resources, cemeteries, cultural and historic resources, federal lands, floodplains, farmland, agricultural districts, groundwater resources, hazardous materials, streams/surface waters, threatened and endangered species, underground storage, water, wetlands, noise, socioeconomic overview, Environmental Justice, existing and future land uses, potential relocation and displacements, permits, Section 4(f), and Section 6(f). Due to the extent of data collection, this document includes two appendices which contain reference and detailed information. The Red Flag Summary/Environmental Resources Overview highlights resources to avoid, if possible, in the alternatives drafted during Phase Two of the Scoping Study.
Project Development Team Activities

For this particular level of transportation planning study, OKI established a Project Development Team (PDT). The PDT serves as a key element in the Study's public outreach program by communicating information in the community, exchanging ideas and listening to stakeholder feedback. PDT members work with one another, the Study's consultant team and OKI staff to review and discuss details and progress updates in order to drive the Study toward an on-time and on-budget conclusion -- a preferred alternative recommendation.

Members

The PDT consists of Northern Kentucky OKI Board of Directors members and other key stakeholders who represent diverse and well-established governmental and civic-based organizations in the region. Members represent large groups of people with whom they work and correspond regularly, as well as receive feedback. The PDT members' broad reach and representation throughout the project area and region provide information as a working group to the OKI KY 536 Scoping Study Team. PDT members serve in an advisory capacity without compensation. Appendix A lists the PDT members, alternates, their agency or affiliation and title.

Responsibilities

- Providing Scoping Study updates and disseminating information to your community/organization/agency to encourage an exchange of information.
- Sharing your community/organization/agency's questions, concerns and general feedback with OKI and the Study's consultant team.
- Assisting with public involvement and outreach efforts, as appropriate.

Meetings

Over the course of the Scoping Study, it is anticipated that the PDT will meet four (4) times at key milestones in the Study's development. During Phase One of the Study, two PDT meetings were held.

The first meeting was held at the city of Independence Council Chambers on December 12, 2014. This was a kick-off meeting to review general information including Study area, timeline, goals and staffing. Minutes for this meeting can be found in Appendix B.

The second PDT meeting was held at the Independence Senior and Community Center on March 13, 2015. At this meeting, the PDT reviewed and provided key
input on the Draft data documents in preparation for the first Public Open House. Minutes for this meeting can be found in Appendix C.
March 24, 2015 Public Open House

Overview
A Public Open House meeting is planned for each of the three phases of the KY 536 Scoping Study. The purpose of the Open Houses is to share project information with the public and gather their input.

The Phase One Public Open House was held on Tuesday, March 24, 2015 at Simon Kenton High School (11132 KY 17 (Madison Pike), Independence, Kentucky 41051) from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm. The format was open-house style, meaning that visitors could arrive and stay as long as they liked to receive same information and have same opportunity to share comments with project representatives. Staff greeted visitors at the front registration table where they were invited to provide their contact information and were given a KY 536 Scoping Study Fact Sheet and Comment Form. A copy of the Fact Sheet is provided in Appendix G and a copy of the Comment Form is in Appendix F.

Attendance
136 people signed in at the registration table. More individuals attended the meeting, however, they chose not to sign in for various reasons (his/her partner or spouse signed in for the pair, but listed just one person; he/she was attending with a friend and didn’t want to sign in; etc.). Staff managing the registration table did not capture the number of individuals who attended but did not sign in.

Study Team members in attendance were:
- OKI Staff: Robyn Bancroft, Regina Brock, Florence Parker, Mark Policinski, Lorrie Platt
- PB Staff: Valerie Robbins Jones, Corrin Gulick, Jeff Wallace, Jim Brannon, Steve Lane, Chris Clemons
- Other Staff: Laura Whitman, Rasor Marketing Communications and Andy Videkovich, Planning and Development Services of Kenton County

PDT members in attendance were:
- Mayor Dan Bell, city of Taylor Mill
- Gailen Bridges, Kenton County Planning Commission
- Carol Callan-Ramler, KYTC District 6
- Kathy Donohoue, South Kenton Citizens Group
- Marc Hult, Kenton County Planning Commission
- Judge Executive Kris Knochelmann, Kenton County Fiscal Court
• Alex Kraemer, Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce
• Cindy Minter, Campbell County
• Mayor Chris Reinersman, city of Independence

Study/Open House Overview Presentation
A looped PowerPoint slideshow presentation was shown continuously throughout the Open House to provide an overview for the Scoping Study and purpose of the evening’s meeting. Appendix D provides thumbnails of each of the slides shown.

Summary of Information Presented
Ten 36” x 48”, Information Display Boards were used at the Open House to share key data and Scoping Study information. Staff members were positioned at each display board to answer questions and receive comments from guests. Appendix E contains snapshots of each display board.

Materials Shared with Attendees
Several printed informational materials were made available to guests at the Open House to take for later use and/or to share with family members, friends and neighbors unable to attend the event. Printed materials available to the public included:

• A one page, two-sided Comment Form (Appendix F)
• A one page, two-sided KY 536 Scoping study Fact Sheet (Appendix G)
• Printed copies of the Project/Meeting Presentation (Appendix D)
• Copies of each of the three full DRAFT data documents, listed below. These documents were made available in five separate binders placed around the meeting space. Guests were advised that copies of each report were also available for review on the project website. The reports in the binders included the:
  − Draft Purpose and Need Statement
  − Draft Existing Conditions Inventory and its four appendices
  − Red Flag Summary/Environmental Resources Overview and its two appendices
• OKI Northern Kentucky Bike Route Guide
Public Comment Summary

Comment Opportunities Made Available to the Public

The following opportunities were made available to solicit public input during Phase One of the Study:

- Copies of the Comment Form was made available at the Public Open House on March 24, 2015.

- An online version of the Comment Form, created using Survey Monkey, was posted on [www.oki.org/536/Public Comments](http://www.oki.org/536/Public Comments) to coincide with the start of the Public Open House (4:00 pm on March 24, 2015). A Constant Contact message was emailed to PDT members and the general contact database on March 25, 2015 to notify all of the 30-day comment period, and the availability of Open House materials and online comment form. The survey closed at midnight on April 24, 2015.

- [www.oki.org/536](http://www.oki.org/536) also had an open comment text box available 24/7 since the website went live on December 15, 2014. This channel for public input will remain open throughout the KY 536 Scoping Study and questions and comments may be submitted at anytime.

- The website and all printed material provided the OKI Project Manager’s email address (rbancroft@oki.org).

- The website and all printed material provided the OKI Project Manager’s direct office telephone number (513-619-7662).

Documentation of Comments Received

- General Comments Received via Website: The Study Team received 74 messages via the project website’s general comment box between December 15, 2014 and April 24, 2015. A summary of feedback received is provided in the following section. Appendix J lists the date, time and content shared by each individual. Names and email addresses have been removed from Appendix J to ensure anonymity and privacy.

- Comment Forms: A total of 120 Comment Forms were submitted during the Study’s Phase One public comment period. The Comment Forms were distributed and collected at the March 24 Public Open House and were available online between March 24, 2015 and April 24, 2015. A copy of the Comment Form is provided in Appendix F and a summary of the feedback received is provided in the Comment Form Summary section of this report. Appendix H includes each of the 120 Comment Form submissions. Names and email addresses have been removed from Appendix H to ensure anonymity and privacy.
• No direct emails from members of the public were received by the Project Manager at rbancroft@oki.org.

• One phone message from a member of the general public was left for the Project Manager at her direct office phone number (513-619-7662) during Phase One of the Study. The call was received during the March 24, 2015 Public Open House. The Project Manager returned the call upon returning to the office on the morning of March 25, 2015. The gentleman wanted to know when the next Public Open Houses are scheduled. The Project Manager acquired the gentleman’s email address and informed him that he would be added to the Study’s general contact list, so that he would receive updates as they develop. She also informed him that the information from the open house was available at www.oki.org/536, since he expressed that he was unable to attend the March 24th event. The gentleman’s name and email addresses are not included in this report to ensure anonymity and privacy.

Summary of Comments Received from Study Website
The Study Team received 74 emails through the general comment box available on the project website during Phase One of the KY 536 Scoping Study. All messages received were responded to by OKI staff within 48 hours. Of these:

• Fifteen (15) messages offered comments for the Study Team’s consideration:
  – Two (2) outlined the senders’ desires that improvements be made
  – Four (4) discussed how an improved KY 536 is important for east/west connectivity
  – Four (4) outlined areas of concern including impacts on personal property, impacts on land and vegetation and potential increases in traffic volume resulting from improvements
  – Two (2) included suggestions for improvements to be made
  – Two (2) challenged the need and demand for improvements
  – One (1) stated that semi-trucks should not be allowed on KY 536

• Three (3) messages included questions about the study and related reports

• Twelve (12) messages were requests for project updates

• Five (5) messages identified where the senders lived but did not include any additional content

• Thirty-nine (39) included an email address but no comments
Appendix J lists the date, time and comment shared by each individual. Names and email addresses have been removed from Appendix J to ensure anonymity and privacy. The address of every email received was added to the Study’s general contact database and senders will be kept informed of the Study’s progress and updates to the website via Constant Contact messaging.

**Comment Form Summary**

Comment Forms were distributed to Public Open House attendees on March 24, 2015. An online version of the same form, created using Survey Monkey, was also posted on the project website on March 24 and kept online until the Phase One public comment period closed on April 24. A copy of the printed version of the Comment Form is provided in Appendix F.

A total of 120 comment forms were submitted to the Study team during the public comment period. Of these:

- Fifty-six (56) were completed at the March 24, 2015 Public Open House. To facilitate tabulation of the data received, staff entered the information submitted on these forms into the Survey Monkey database.
- Sixty-three (63) comment forms were completed online using the Survey Monkey link provided on the project website ([www.oki.org/536](http://www.oki.org/536)).
- One (1) comment form was received by mail between March 24 and April 24, 2015. The content of this form was entered into the Survey Monkey database.

A copy of each of the 120 comment forms received is included as Appendix H. Names and email addresses have been removed to ensure anonymity and privacy.

Following is a summary of the feedback received from the comment forms.

**Question 1: Did you attend open house?**

The comment forms are very evenly distributed between those who did and did not attend the Open House. Of the total 120 comment forms received, 51% (or 60 respondents) did not attend the Open House in comparison to 49% percent (or 58 respondents) who did. A total of 118 respondents answered this question. Two respondents skipped this question.
Table 1. Comment Form Question One Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: Please indicate which of the following best describes you.

A majority of respondents indicated that they live within or near the Study area (74% or 84 people). The next most frequent response was that they own property within or near the Study area (52% or 60 people). Eighteen percent (or 21 respondents) stated that, “Though I don’t live, own property, own a business or work within or near the Study area, I frequently travel through it.” Ten percent (or a dozen people) shared that they work in or near the Study area. Only two respondents (two percent) stated that they own a business within or near the Study area. A total of 116 respondents answered this question. Four respondents skipped this question. Respondents were permitted to respond to more than one answer.
Question 2 offered “Other” as a possible answer to respondents completing the comment form. Six respondents chose “Other” and provided the following responses:

- I hunt the area and enjoy hiking the area
- Resident of Pendleton County
- UC student working with PDS on 536
- I do live on KY536 or now Harris Pike
- I see KY 536 a lot
- I live on 536. 3 cars have crashed thru my pasture fence and my horses have gotten out on 536 in the past months
Question 3: In general, how often do you travel on KY 536 between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell County Line?

The two responses that tied for most mentioned were “Several times a week” (37 respondents) and “Daily or almost daily” (36 people). Twenty percent (22 people) said they travel the Study area “Once every few weeks.” Fourteen percent (16 people) travel it “Once every few months.” Six percent (seven people) stated, “Once a month.” A total of 118 respondents answered this question. Two respondents skipped this question. Respondents were permitted only one response.

Figure 3. Comment Form Question Three Responses

Table 3. Comment Form Question Three Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily or almost daily</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every few weeks</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every few months</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3 offered “Other” as a possible answer to respondents completing the comment form. Six respondents chose “Other” and provided the following responses:

- Would travel more if better route
- Weekly
- About 7 or 8 times a year
- Multiple times daily
- Mostly when riding motorcycle
- 5+ times each day

Question 4: Which of the following problems identified so far by the Study for existing KY 536 (from KY 17 to the Kenton/Campbell County Line) are of highest concern to you?

The three highest responses were “Sharp, winding curves” with 60%, “Lack of roadway shoulders” with 48% and “Steep grades/hills” with 45%. “High accident rates” and “Poor sight distances” both received a third of the responses. The lowest response was “Delayed/long travel times” which still received 11 percent. A total of 101 respondents answered this question. Nineteen respondents skipped this question. Respondents were permitted to check up to three of the choices.
Figure 4. Comment Form Question Four Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharp, winding curves</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of roadway shoulders</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steep grades/hills</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High accident rates</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor sight distances</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of east/west connectivity</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to pass slower moving vehicles</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sidewalks and/or bike paths</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stop signs/turns onto new roads</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed/long travel times</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4 offered “Other” as a possible answer to respondents completing the Comment Form. Twenty-seven respondents chose “Other.” Their responses were grouped into the general categories listed below and each individual response is documented in Appendix I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>General Categorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Safety issues: Respondents mentioned poor sight distances, speed of traffic, difficulty with getting out of driveways, need for lights, dangerous conditions in winter, driver inattention as safety concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Impacts: Respondents mentioned concerns with project impacts including increased truck traffic, loss of homes, loss of property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not needed: Respondents stated that the project is not needed, they like it as it is now, there aren’t currently any problems, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Miscellaneous: Respondents offered comments that could not be placed in any other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Suggestions: Respondents provided suggestions for improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Needed: Respondent said the project needs to be completed as soon as possible to provide better access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No comment: Respondents had marked “Other” but did not explain his/her answer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5: Please share any additional concerns you have about the existing KY 536 roadway between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell County Line.
Question 5 was an open-ended question and 51 individuals provided responses. Their comments were grouped by the Study Team into the general categories listed below. Each individual response is documented in Appendix I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>General Categorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Suggestions: Responses offered a variety of suggestions to be considered including adding more lights, adding bike/walk paths, not adding bike paths, and keeping speed limits low. Other ideas included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparing traffic levels with other similar roads in the area, evaluating the effectiveness of recently erected signs and conducting additional direct communications efforts. Several responses also included route alignment suggestions.

10 **Safety:** Responses referenced a variety of safety concerns including steep grades, curvy roads; dangerous conditions in bad weather; people drive too fast; poor sight lines and truck noise. One response expressed concern regarding cars pulling out of driveways along the route.

7 **Impacts to property/homes:** Responses identified concerns with losing homes, property or portions of properties. Several responses also indicated a preference to preserve the rural nature of the area through which the road travels.

5 **Project is Needed:** Responses outlined that the project is needed. Several stated that the project is needed to address safety and connectivity issues.

4 **Environmental Concerns:** Responses identified concerns with impacts to the natural environment.

4 **Geometrics:** Responses outlined concerns with existing roadway geometrics such as curves and a narrow roadway.

2 **Connectivity:** Responses pertained to improved traffic flow through better connectivity.

2 **Design:** One respondent indicated a concern with a lack of street lights and another asked about planned roundabouts.

2 **Development concerns:** Responses outlined concerns about how areas along the roadway would be developed and what the impacts would be.

1 **No benefit:** One respondent indicated that there would be no benefit to the project and that funding would be better utilized elsewhere.

1 **Miscellaneous:** Response outlined concerns pertaining to increased traffic, particularly on Harris Pike. As part of another portion of his/her response discussing safety concerns, one respondent also stated that
he/she doesn’t want the Adams Family Cemetery moved or disturbed.

Question 6: Please share any comments, concerns or suggestions you may have regarding the improvements to be developed through this KY 536 Scoping Study. Question 6 on the Comment Form was an open-ended question and 46 individuals provided responses. Their comments were grouped into the general categories listed below. Each individual response is documented in Appendix I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>General Categorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Design Suggestions</strong>: Responses included suggestions to be considered by the project team. Seven responses included ideas pertaining to roadway alignment. Other responses suggested wider roads, especially if semi-trucks would be using the road. Others included suggestions to study speed limits, and to build new bridges and/or overpasses at specific locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Impact concerns</strong>: Responses identified concerns pertaining to environmental impacts, potential loss of homes and/or property, reduced property values, increases in traffic volumes, increases in the number of semi trucks using road, future development facilitated by the project and maintaining the rural nature of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>General comments</strong>: Comments in this category pertained to a variety of issues including project communications, suggestions to increase night time monitoring by the police, restricting tractor trailers from road and concerns with the length of time between study completion and project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Opposed to project</strong>: Responses outlined a preference to not modify the roadway, some stating that improvements aren’t needed, the locals won’t benefit enough or the project will negatively impact the rural nature of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4                | **Supportive of project**: Responses outlined a preference to proceed with improvements to the
roadway citing safety improvements and improved connectivity as reasons for their support.

3 **Miscellaneous**: Responses included a question about a past study and issues related to different KY 536 project. One response simply said “Not Campbell County.”

**Question 7**: If you would like to receive email updates about the progress of this KY 536 Scoping Study, please provide us with your email address.

Of the 120 comment forms received, 65 respondents provided their email address. Email addresses have been removed from Appendix H to ensure anonymity and privacy.
Open House Publicity Summary

Public Open House Flyer
OKI staff created and shared a Public Open House flyer with 120 OKI members at the March 10, 2015 OKI Intermodal Coordinating Committee and March 12, 2015 OKI Executive Committee meetings. Multiple copies were made available at the March 13, 2015 PDT meeting for PDT members to take with them and distribute. Following the meeting, the South Kenton Citizens Group PDT member placed copies of the flyer at the William E. Durr Kenton County Public Library and in commercial establishments around the KY 536 Study area. Appendix K shows the logo and text included on the Public Open House flyer.

Legal Ad Placement
Notices were placed in several key regional newspapers prior to the public Open House meeting including the \textit{Cincinnati Enquirer} (Cincinnati.com) and the Community Press newspapers. Appendix L presents the text submitted to these outlets. The ads were published on March 13, 2015. Cost incurred by OKI for this ad placement was $492.90.

Constant Contact and Social Media Communications

Constant Contact Messages
A general email database comprised of OKI Kentucky contacts identified through previous studies and new project-specific contacts obtained through the project website (www.oki.org/536) is maintained by OKI staff as part of this Scoping Study. The PDT members received notice of the Open House via Constant Contact on January 29, 2015. Open House notices were sent via Constant Contact to the general database on February 26, 2015. A reminder message was sent on March 17, 2015. Immediately following the Open House, meeting materials and information were posted on the project website and an email notifying recipients of their availability was distributed through Constant Contact to PDT members and the general database on March 25, 2015.

Website Postings
All Public Open House materials (the looped Project/Meeting Presentation, display boards, project fact sheet and a link to the online Comment Form) were posted on the project website (www.oki.org/536) to coincide with the Public Open House at 4:00 pm on March 24, 2015.
Social Media Postings
OKI uses the agency’s Facebook page and Twitter account for all Social Media networking activities. During Phase One, the KY 536 Scoping Study has been the subject of seven Facebook posts and seven Tweets. These messages have been shared by numerous staff, PDT members and citizens. Information about the Public Open House and meeting date/time were posted on the following dates:

- 12/15/14 Facebook/Twitter
- 1/6/15 Facebook/Twitter
- 1/14/15 Facebook
- 1/20/15 Twitter
- 2/3/15 Facebook/Twitter
- 3/10/15 Facebook/Twitter
- 3/17/15 Facebook/Twitter
- 3/24/15 Facebook/Twitter

Media Relations Summary

Press Release
A media or press release was prepared for the Public Open House and submitted to local print, TV, radio and online media news outlets. A copy of the release is included in Appendix M. The release was sent to 21 unique media-related email addresses on March 23, 2015 including: The Cincinnati Enquirer, Cincinnati Business Courier; Community Press/Recorder newspapers; Kentucky Post, Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Northern Kentucky Business Journal, Northern Kentucky USA, WCPO, WLWT, Local 12, FOX 19, 700 WLW-AM, WNKU-FM and WVXU-FM.

The following media outlets are known to have shared the press release information:

- Cincinnati.com, March 13, 2015
- Rcnky.com (The River City News)
- Kentoncounty.org
- Cincygis.com

Media Coverage
Two members of the media were recorded as attending the March 24, 2015 Open House on the event’s sign-in sheets. These reporters were Melissa Stewart with The Community Recorder and Bryan Burke with River City News. Their attendance at the Open House resulted in two news article publications on March 25 and March 26, 2015.
• March 26, 2015 (CINCINNATI.com) Residents want ‘rural fabric’ of south Kenton preserved
• March 25, 2015 (The River City News) What to Do with KY 536?

In addition to coverage at the Public Open House, four other articles have been published by the media on the KY 536 Scoping Study since its inception. Links to each article are provided on www.oki.org/536.

• April 20, 2015 (CINCINNATI.com) Rural Kenton concerned about future Ky. 536
• March 13, 2015 (CINCINNATI.com) Open house invites Ky. 536 discussion
• January 16, 2015 (Cincinnati Business Courier) OKI to study major east-west connector in Ky.
• January 5, 2015 (CINCINNATI.com) Safety at heart of Ky. 536 study
Conclusion

The KY 536 Study Team actively reached out to stakeholders (regional and local civic leaders and elected officials, business and community organization representatives, neighborhood groups, property owners, residents and more) in Phase One of the KY 536 Scoping Study to ensure that community members were informed about the Study and its goals, and had multiple opportunities to exchange information with the Study Team, share their comments, questions and concerns and provide input. Feedback received will be used to help inform and guide the development of project alternatives to be considered.

Overall, stakeholders recognize that improvements are needed along KY 536 between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell county line, although the rationale for why they feel improvements are needed and the extent to which they should occur varies. Most feel that improvements are needed to address a variety of safety issues; others felt that improving the flow of local and/or regional traffic was important. There is concern, however, that modifications made to the roadway will result in a loss of homes, farmland and other properties. Some feel that improvements would increase traffic; facilitate unwanted development and negatively impact the rural nature of their community—an asset they value highly. Individuals of this mind tended to oppose the suggestion of roadway improvements or prefer that any changes made be confined to the existing roadway and its current alignment.

Concerns with Existing Roadway
When asked about the existing roadway, stakeholders cited the following issues among their highest concerns:

- Roadway design and geometry: The existing roadway consists of a large number of sharp, winding curves and is characterized by steep grades and hills. These features can be difficult to navigate, especially in bad weather, and lead to accidents, particularly if a driver is not paying close attention.

- Lack of shoulders: There are no shoulders along much of the roadway within the study area. This poses a safety risk to pedestrians, bicyclists, anyone standing on or near the road and to drivers.

- High accident rates and poor sight distances also ranked higher among concerns with the existing roadway.

While stakeholders reported that sharp, winding curves were a top concern, they were less troubled by the number of stops signs found along the road and the
number of times a driver must turn onto a new road to continue along the KY 536 route.

Other concerns about the existing roadway included the need for more lights, problems with speeding vehicles, lack of bike lanes, slow moving vehicles and truck noise.

**Roadway Improvement Comments**

When asked specifically for comments regarding improvements to be developed, most agreed that something needed to be done. Many stakeholders expressed, however, concern about the potential loss of homes and/or property or portions thereof. A number of respondents also mentioned concerns about impacts to the natural environmental (vegetation, rivers, endangered species, etc.). Others shared their concern about the impact of increased traffic volumes (to drivers as well as to residents living along KY 536), an increased presence of semi-trucks traveling along the route and increases in noise. Several individuals suggested that roadway improvements would result in unwanted development. As mentioned previously, some were also concerned that an improved roadway will negatively impact and/or change the rural nature of their community.

**Suggestions for Improvements**

Phase Two of the KY 536 Scoping Study will focus on developing improvement alternatives to be considered for the roadway between KY 17 and the Kenton/Campbell county line. In preparation for that task, stakeholders were asked if they had any suggestions that the Study Team should consider.

Several stakeholders offered specific route/alignment suggestions. Each of these is documented in the Appendix J under Question 5: Suggestions and Question 6: Design Suggestions. Other ideas proposed included:

- Add more lights
- Add bike/walking paths (others said don’t add bike paths)
- Widen roadway
- Create bridges/overpasses at key locations
- Keep speed limits low
- Evaluate the effectiveness of recently erected signs
Next Steps
Following the Phase One public comment period which closed on April 24, 2015, the Study Team will review the feedback received and make any necessary edits and finalize the following draft documents:

- Purpose and Need Statement
- Existing Conditions Inventory
- Red Flag Summary/Environmental Overview

During Phase Two, the Study Team will use data contained in these documents as well as input from stakeholders to develop and evaluate a series of conceptual project alternatives. The results of this process will be shared with the public for review and comment during summer 2015. In fall 2015, a recommendation for specific improvements to be made – a preferred alternative – will be presented. Construction timing is dependent upon funding availability.