

Meeting Notes for I471/KY8 Interchange

Project Item Number: 6-8104

County and Route: Campbell, New Route

Project Description: The I-471/KY 8 Interchange Modification Project is examining modifications to the interchange to reduce traffic delays on southbound I-471 at the KY 8 exit ramp, resulting in improved safety for southbound and exiting traffic.

Project Manager Contact information (Cabinet): Carol Callan-Ramler, KYTC- D6, 859-341-2700 x272, Carol.Callan-Ramler@ky.gov

Project Manager Contact Information (Consultant): Warren A. Iulg, GRW Engineers, Inc., 859-331-9220, wiulg@grwinc.com

Other contacts: Michael Galbraith, Public Involvement Coordinator, H. W. Lochner, Inc., 859-224-4476x224, mgalbraith@hwlochner.com

Stacee Hans, Environmental Coordinator, KYTC District 6, 859-341-2700 x274, Stacee.Hans@ky.gov

Approximate dates: March 7, 2007

Comments (number of people reached, effectiveness of the technique, what you would do differently, etc.): The meeting notes were compiled at the conclusion of the public meeting and are created to establish an account of all of the activities and decision of the meeting. Additionally, the question and answer session is documented and the arrangements for the next public meeting noted. This information is then placed on the website as a reference for meeting attendees or people new to the project. Several members of the public have been able to follow the progress and become current on the status of the project through the meeting notes.

I-471/KY 8 INTERCHANGE MODIFICATION PROJECT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT Meeting of Interchange Advisory Committee (IAC) and Section 106 Review Consulting Parties (S106CPs) and Public Meeting

Location: Callahan Community Center, Bellevue, Kentucky
Date: Wednesday, March 7, 2007
Time: IAC/S106CPs Meeting: 3-5 p.m., Public Meeting 5-7 p.m.
Purpose: To review existing traffic, development and environmental conditions identified in the area, to confirm or correct information the KYTC team has obtained and to summarize the information to begin forming solutions via design alternatives.

(Note: While the meeting notes that follow are as comprehensive and detailed as possible, they are not verbatim recordings).

INTRODUCTION

This meeting consists of two meetings: the IAC/S106CPs meeting which was by invitation only to members of the IAC and S106CPs committees. The second half of the meeting was open to the public. The meeting was announced through invitation mailed directly to all members of the IAC and S106CPs. It was announced to the public via two newspaper advertisements appearing two weeks before and the Sunday before the meeting.

Upon entering the facility, attendants were asked to sign in. Upon signing in, guests were given an [agenda packet](#).

IAC MEETING PRESENTATION

The meeting began at 3 p.m. with Carol Callan-Ramler providing opening remarks. Carol introduced herself as the Project Manager for the I-471/KY 8 Interchange Modification Project for the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC). She manages the project for the owner (KYTC), overseeing the consultants who are providing the design services for the interchange. Carol began by welcoming the attendants. Carol stated the purpose of the meeting being an opportunity for the consultants to present findings of the research and initial analysis that has been done to date to the IAC, the S106CPs, and public. She stated that the findings presented represent the completion of Design Step 2 and the project is entering Design Step 3 as seen on the [Project Development Progress Chart](#). She indicated that the project is currently on schedule.

The goal for this meeting was to learn of deficiencies that may be present in the information/research/analysis that has been gathered thus far. She asked for the attendees' feedback and criticism so the team is confident that all of the existing issues have been captured. From this feedback the team will comprise a summary to begin the design.

Carol reviewed the team of consultants who were chosen to perform the design services for the project and introduced the consulting project personnel in attendance. They included:

Warren Iulg	GRW Engineers, Inc.
Richard Guidi	GRW Engineers, Inc.
Michael Galbraith	H.W. Lochner, Inc.
Steve Bergman	HDR Engineers, Inc.
Adam Lynch	HDR Engineers, Inc.
Helen Powell	H. Powell and Associates
Gina Morris	Third Rock Consultants, LLC
Jennifer Barber	Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc.

Carol introduced Warren Iulg (GRW Project Manager). Warren restated the meeting purpose to look at and review what has been done in the project thus far. He reviewed completed tasks that will be discussed for the purpose of obtaining feedback for accuracy and confirmation from the attendees. Completed tasks include:

- Review of previous studies including 2001 study and the Campbell County study
- Inventories of land use
- Identification of geometric conditions
- Collection of traffic counts
- Collection of accident data, including locations, types, “hot spots”, etc.
- Identification of existing traffic problems
- Identification of environmental red flags

Warren introduced Mike Galbraith (H.W. Lochner, Public Involvement Coordinator). Mike further discussed the IAC and S106CP members' “roles and goals”. He stated that the ultimate meeting goal was to look at existing conditions, identify concerns and issues, review traffic conditions and environmental issues. He continued by saying the attendees' role was to confirm that the information they are being presented is accurate or to help correct this information. The confirmation and/or corrections will then be utilized to design the project.

Mike fielded a question regarding the web site address for the project. Mike noted that the address for the project is www.471project.org whereas the address for the study being performed by OKI is www.471study.org. He stated that we are working with OKI on aspects of this study, however all of the information that is discussed at this and other meetings for the project can be found at the www.471project.org web address.

The attendees were then broken into three groups to take a guided tour. Each group spent 10 minutes at each of three stations where a representative of the consulting team discussed the findings within each category. The categories, as well as the consulting team member who provided the discussion at each station, are listed below. The consultants requested that the attendees write down questions they may have during the tour and ask them during the Q/A at the end of the meeting instead of asking during the tour to keep the tours on schedule. They were also invited to submit questions via mail or email to Mike Galbraith (mgalbraith@hwlochner.com).

OVERVIEW OF GROUP TOURS

Issues and Concerns (Warren Iulg, GRW)

This station shows the progress of identifying existing conditions, problems, issues and concerns. The station included three maps.

Issues and Concerns

- Floodwall, Party Source and ramp
- CSX Railroad as a bordering feature
- Interstate sandwiched between residential and historical areas
- Recreational area of the Levee
- Closely spaced interchanges on 471 that the FHWA would not approve if constructed today
- Riviera Drive between Donnermeyer Dr./6th St. and KY 8 being an access way to the Riverfront
- Close proximity of intersections that cause backups
- Parking on the south side of KY8 from Patchen to Lafayette and then both sides East of Lafayette
- Parking in Bellevue that is important to businesses that the team does not want to disrupt
- Floodwall and gate at KY 8 that will have to involve the Corps of Engineers should changes be required
- Parking at the Levee – when it fills up and alternate parking is required – confusion to drivers = backups
- I-471 south bound ramp at 3rd Street causing backups which is the primary reason for the project

Alternate Routes to the Kentucky Riverfront from Cincinnati

- Reading Road Exit from Southbound I-71
- Gilbert Street Exit from Southbound I-71
- Third Street Exit Southbound I-71.

New Proposed Development

- New housing units in Dayton
- 108 residential units at Harbor Green, 36 residential units at Taylor and Holiday Inn Express in Bellevue
- South shore mixed use development with up to 210 condo units, 250,000 SF office
- Ovation Development consisting of 1000 town homes/condos, up to 1 million SF office, a hotel, entertainment and retail
- Pavillion will have 485,000 SF mixed retail will open in 2008.

An attendee stated to Warren and the group that Dayton is actually looking at 1,000 residential units and around 50,000 square feet of commercial and entertainment space being added within the next 4-5 years.

Traffic (Steve Bergman and Adam Lynch, HDR)

This station identified the results of the traffic analysis that has been performed as well as the 2003-2005 Crash Data obtained from KSP. Six maps were included in this station.

Crash Distribution

This map identified crash frequencies and highlighted three areas with particularly high crash frequencies.

They are:

- The south bound KY 8 exit
- A continuous stream of crash frequencies on KY 8
- Monmouth Street

Crash Types

This map identified the various types of crashes that are occurring in the area (different types can be viewed on attached map). Three areas are noted with reoccurring crash types. They include:

- Daniel Carter Beard Bridge – high rate of rear-end crashes
- KY 8 – high rate of side swipe/angular/rear end
- Monmouth – high rates of parked car and angle collision

Adam stated that a potential cause of the rear-end crashes on the bridge could involve motorists' being blinded by the sun and the Monmouth crashes could be the result of sight deficiencies cause by proximity of buildings to the roadway.

Crash Severity

This map identified three levels of severity of crashes in the area. They include:

- Fatalities
 - Monmouth and 9th – angular
 - York and 10th – pedestrian
 - Memorial Interchange – overturned vehicle
- Injury
- Property Damage

Hotspot Locations

This map identified crash rates that exceed the state average crash rate for like areas (known as hotspots).

The highest hotspot areas included:

- 471/KY 8 interchange (which is 6x the state average crash rate)
- Monmouth Street..

The criteria and factors that determine like areas include:

- Average annual daily traffic
- Urban or rural setting
- Type of facility (interstate, two-lane highway, local street etc.)
- Number of lanes

Level of Service (LOS)

This map identified the level of service for the roadways contained in the project area. The levels of service were rated from A to F, with A being a high (or the greatest) level of service and F being the lowest level of service. A VISSIM (traffic software program) model was utilized to determine the level of service of all roadways. Two maps were utilized to display this information. The first map showed weekday morning drive time. The group discussed three areas on that map that were experiencing particularly levels of service:

- Northbound 471
- KY 8
- Taylor/Southgate

The afternoon drive time map showed that the level of service for each of the three roadways above changed direction. For instance, where the Northbound 471 LOS was an F in the morning, it was a B in the afternoon. However, Southbound 471 then became an F in the afternoon and Northbound a B.

Environmental (Helen Powell, Gina Morris and Jennifer Barber)

This station had two maps showing areas of [environmental, historic](#), and [archaeological evaluations](#).

Gina Morris discussed the environmental document and how they are responsible for developing a NEPA document for this project. According to NEPA law (1969) they are required to look at various aspects of the project area to identify constraints and opportunities. She referred to the map that showed the boundary areas of the project and discussed the process of identifying potential impacts on noise quality, air quality and how they may affect historic structures. The blue area showed an extended project area where transportation may be placed in the future.

She continued by discussing the red flag summary which pinpoints the issues constraining the project. Gina stated that while there were no major issues found to date, there are still a few issues that they are further investigating.

The light blue area on the map showed the 100 year flood plain, the yellow area showed designated historic districts.

Gina cited various places within the area that were considered possible issues that were or will be investigated or areas that the project will want to avoid any impact for 4f standards. They include:

- 3 gas stations
- 1 drycleaner
- A landfill where Kroger is located
- Parks
- Library
- High School
- Ball fields

Helen Powell spoke next regarding the Area of Potential Effect (APE). She cited a number of Historic Districts, including:

Newport

- Mansion Hill National Register Historic District
- East Newport National Register Historic District
- East Row Local Historic District

Bellevue

- Taylor's Daughters Historic District
- Fairfield Avenue Historic District

She continued by discussing 450 structures within the project area that are 50+ years old and are therefore eligible for the National Register of Historic Places as historic properties if qualified. She stated that there are approximately 100 properties that have not been determined yet and that they will be researching the eligibility

of these structures. She stated that they know what has been listed but now must look at the structures that may meet the national registry criteria.

Helen cited some areas and structures that would require further study, including:

- Cote Brilliant
- Fairfield
- Monmouth
- Campbell County Courthouse
- Episcopal Church
- Maddox House
- 3rd Street
- Posey Flats

Jennifer Barber spoke next regarding the archaeological assessment requirements involved in the project. She stated that her company's archaeological duties are minimally involved at this point in the project and will be conducted following the selection of a recommended alternate. She discussed that the current area is too large and probable alternates will assist them in narrowing down their investigation area. She referred to the [map](#) that showed high/moderate/low archaeological potential. The archaeological items that they will be specifically looking for include prehistoric, Native American and European remains. She discussed that the urban nature of the area had withstood high disturbance due to industry and lots of fill. The residential areas will probably divulge more archaeological hotspots. She added that a probability study has been completed and more will be able to be done following alignment selection.

Gina Morris ended the discussion by reviewing some of the red flag issues of the area, which include:

1. Air quality
2. Noise quality
3. Ecological resources and impact
4. Running Buffalo Clover
5. Indiana bats
6. 7 species of mussels

TRAFFIC SIMULATION MOVIE

Following the group tours of each station, the attendees were shown a traffic simulation movie prepared by HDR and presented by Steve Bergman and Adam Lynch. The movie reiterated information from the traffic station then included an actual traffic simulation model utilizing VISSIM 4.2 software. Adam and Steve explained how the traffic model was created. They stated that traffic counts from last summer as well as individual characteristics of motorist-types/paths/etc. were input into the software which then provides a visual movie simulation of the traffic. The movie was based only on the existing conditions (the current trends of traffic in the area today). Future forecasts of traffic estimates will be added after this simulation is confirmed as accurate which will impact the design characteristics. The current simulation showed where backups were occurring at various times of day, including:

- KY 8 interchange
- 471 northbound in the mornings (due to weaving to get over which is a result of interchanges being too close)
- Riviera Drive in the mornings
- 471 backups to and onto Fort Washington Way (US 50) (especially on Fridays)

The group confirmed immediately that for the most part the traffic modeling was an accurate model of the backups and congestion that is occurring in the area. Several areas were identified by HDR as needing more investigation and better determination of conditions after which the model would be refined accordingly.

Following the movie, Mike Galbraith opened the floor for questions and answers.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

Q: Are the statewide averages that you speak of for crashes different between Ohio and Kentucky?

A: That is unknown. It may be a number issue or have some variation, however we are trying to pinpoint hotspots regardless. We are coordinating with Ohio on this and many other issues in the project.

Q: In the hotspots, is there any weighting considered for multiple-vehicle accidents?

A: An incident can be any number of vehicles. Whether one car or a 6 car accident chain, it is reported as one incident. The number of cars, or of people in the cars, is not represented and the data is all consistent.

Q: Fairfield Avenue Eastbound in the evening is very bottlenecked. Your level of service traffic map showed them rated as A/B/C. I think it is much more significant than that.

A: That's exactly what we are looking for – verification from you that our data represents the problems that you are experiencing. I would like more information after the Q/A if you will.

Q: Memorial and Grand Avenue modeling – were they done at the same time?

A: Yes, modeling of all streets and intersections was completed at the same time.

Q: It was mentioned earlier that the interchanges on 471 are located in too close proximity. Wouldn't it make sense to eliminate one?

A: If you got rid of an interchange the problem there would be solved because it would eliminate the weaving which we have identified as the problem with congestion there. That's why the FHWA has developed the standards for how interchanges are to be spaced. (SEE QUESTION BELOW "The FHWA has gotten more restrictive over the years..." FOR AN EXPLANATION WHY THE FHWA WOULD LIKELY NOT ELIMINATE AN INTERCHANGE I.E. WOULD WORSEN PROBLEMS ELSEWHERE.)

Q: With Kroger moving, will that alleviate some of the evening congestion?

A: We are working with OKI who performed the study to get future models so we can determine if it will indeed have an impact on congestion or not.

Q: The FHWA has gotten more restrictive over the years. Since this is a tight urban area, is there some leeway considering the fact that this is a tight urban area?

A: The FHWA won't require taking an interchange out, however if this roadway and interchanges were being newly constructed today, the FHWA would not approve of interchanges that close together. The FHWA does not give us specific or hard and fast numbers to go by. They provide us with a range that we must fall within. We've learned that systems in the past days did not work and improvements were made by upgrading or eliminating. We can consider this as long as the impact is good for everyone and every part/aspect of the project. Each component of the project has an impact on other parts of the project so we must ensure that doing this would be beneficial for all roadways in the area (and not cause a problem in another area that did not exist previously).

Q: The closing of Riverboat Row has had a big impact on traffic. It has never reopened. Can it be reopened to alleviate congestion? Coming towards Bellevue, it is a good route for locals.

A: It is a construction site. That's something that we will have to check into. Steve Bergman requested further discussion with questioner after the meeting.

Q: You showed in the level of service and crash data displays and data that Monmouth Street has a high crash rate and a low level of service. I don't think that's right. (Multiple attendees indicated that they agreed with this comment).

A: That's what we are wanting to know – if the data that we have collected and are presenting is not accurate. We will research this. The crash types will raise the accident rate – it may not be the volume on the road but the conditions may raise the rate.

Q: Are speeds causing this?

A: It could be the case. There are a number of factors that we will be getting more involved data in. Is speed an issue on Monmouth to you (addressing the attendees)? Are there issues here that we are not perceiving correctly? Do you feel like our models are correct?

Attendee Response:

I have witnessed 8 accidents on the bridge but none on Monmouth.

Q: Going south onto 471 – could there be signs added to direct traffic to another bridge to the Levee from Ohio? That would alleviate a lot of congestion.

A: We have been working with Cincinnati to achieve this.

Q: We have continually suggested signage (in Cincinnati) to Grand or 10th to accomplish this. Why hasn't it been done?

A: Cincinnati has expressed concern regarding the great number of fixed signs already in place. The Artemis electronic sign could help. We are coordinating with the City of Cincinnati to figure out how to effectively re-direct traffic via alternate City routes to be able to find and use the Taylor-Southgate Bridge. Later this year, new permanent signage will be erected over Southbound I-471 lanes on the north end of the Daniel Carter Beard Bridge that will advise Newport traffic to utilize the next two exits.

Q: Can you take the island out (at Taylor-Southgate Bridge/US27 intersection with KY 8) and put lights in to direct traffic?

A: That is a good idea.

Q: This meeting was not well advertised.

A: Emails were sent to the IAC and 106 committee members as well as to attendees of the last meeting who provided an email address. It was also in the newspapers – in the classifieds. The news media is not as interested in this project now so it was not as prevalent on electronic media.

Q: Can we do more for the east part towards Dayton?

A: That is outside of the project area.

Q: Can it not be extended?

A: We can't extend the project area. But whatever we do here to improve the roadways and congestion should not worsen KY 8 to the east. While the work will not be done in that area, whatever is done within the project area should not worsen conditions to the east. Design factors take great considerations to making sure that any improvements provide positive impacts to the surrounding areas outside of the project area.

Q: But the study of KY 8 went through Bellevue and Dayton.

A: The OKI study looked at a larger area than the area defined for this project is. The study is wider, from the Licking River to the beginning of Dayton. The modeling performed for the project, however, is done more regionally and reviews the impacts of the proposed improvements on areas outside of the I-471 Interchange Modification Project area.

Q: Who sets the timing on the street lights?

A: KYTC does this on KY 8 because it is a state road. All of the others are set by their respective communities.

Q: Can't this information be used to set up traffic?

A: That is what we are trying to do – find the issues and problems with your assistance so we can come up with solutions for immediate fixes that could help both short term and long term.

Q: Who is responsible for setting the traffic signals at Monmouth and York when they go out?

A: It depends on if it operates as an independent signal or as part of a grouping of signals that are synchronized in the same system.

Q: Can't we implement the short term fixes today?

A: That's what we're trying to do. We have to know what the issues are before we fix them – the reason for this meeting is to make sure that what we perceive to be the problems are what we are getting ready to fix.

Q: Who would coordinate the entire traffic signal system? Can it be coordinated together?

A: We are looking at the entire area and are working with the respective entities who control each signal to achieve this. Different systems can be implemented and we are looking at all of them and what will work best.

A: The Central Area Loop study found that signals were not timed well on KY 8 and timing will provide better traffic flow. Additionally, a representative from Bellevue informed a project team engineer recently that there are not sensor loop detectors on side streets that feed into the connections to KY 8. This results in the lights on KY 8 turning red regardless if there is traffic on intersecting roads to enter KY 8 or not. Sensors added to all roadways that intersect with KY 8 at a signal would trigger the lights to turn red and stop traffic on KY 8 only when there are vehicles attempting to enter KY 8, not just based on time. The representative stated that the volume of traffic intersecting KY 8 is very small in volume at some times of the day.

Q: Can't we shorten the timeframe of the project?

A: The steps and processes that we are required to follow by the FWHA dictates the timeframe of the project. Such things as NEPA and 30 day notice for meetings such as this dictate certain time constraints that we have no control over. We do not want to commit to a schedule when we haven't even met with everyone that we have to meet with.

Q: There has to be leeway in the schedule that could help move it along quicker.

A: We don't want to make false promises.

Q: Who are the people who haven't been contacted?

A: We have looked at all the county/city/government officials, neighborhood associations, etc.

Q: Regardless of the schedule set up by FWHA, signalization is something that could be done in the interim.

A: We have to have it so FWHA will approve it. When we start to look at alternates, we may be able to implement some fixes, but we have to follow their process in order to obtain the money from them. Fortunate or unfortunate, that's the rules of the game. Packaging processes may be able to be done at a later date, but we are not at a phase in the project where there's an opportunity to do that.

Q: The environmental and artifact studies were done when 471 was built yet we're doing them all over again. The stuff they're looking for is much older than when 471 was built. Why can't we use those studies?

A: Those studies for I-471 were done before NEPA was passed. We have to provide all of the requirements that NEPA requires and those studies do not contain that information.

Q: Can't we use them?

A: In addition to components of the NEPA requirements that were not provided by the previous study, there are aspects of it that have changed, such as noise and air quality.

Q: We are trying to analyze a lot more here than what the problems are. This doesn't affect the noise level, the environment – why can't we use the old one?

A: Before [in the previous studies] we were considering designing for 1995 traffic. Now we are considering 2035 traffic. We have to demonstrate that the level of service now and in 2035 projected will be no worse. If we improve this intersection, it could affect other interchanges to the north and south of the area. We are responsible for an overall fix.

Q: Can we get alternates as you come up with them instead of waiting to see all of them at once? Maybe by email?

A: There are two this week that will be up on the web site. Our next meeting will be in April where we will provide an opportunity to exchange ideas about alternates. Then in July we will provide 6-9 alternates and then work with you to narrow it to 4. The meeting in April will be your opportunity to bring suggestions to help us create these alternates. Emailing them to you to provide earlier review is a good idea. We will be glad to do that. If you will, add your email addresses next to your name on the sign-in sheet so we can do that.

QUESTIONS and COMMENTS FROM THE STATION TOURS and TAKE HOME QUESTION SHEET THAT WERE SUBMITTED:

Comment: The most dangerous situation at the interchange (KY 8) is traveling south on 71 to 471. It is extremely difficult to merge onto 471 and immediately over to the exit merging with traffic coming from 71 Washington Way. Perhaps yield signage is the primary reason for the traffic.

Comment: Two issues and concerns are prevalent to me. They are speed getting the project done and communicating respective alternates as they are developed so we can make suggestions.

Comment: Regarding environmental issues – any sound barriers should be transparent so not to block views, don't go into neighborhoods and get the current ramp out.

Comment: Regarding traffic: I don't see any wrecks on Monmouth. There are issues late in evenings after rush hour going to the Levee, especially on weekends. Traffic backup does sometimes begin at the Levee garage. Use more signage for different routes and Artemis to suggest bypassing Route 8.

Concern: Having to build to current FWHA standards that may not work as well in a tight urban environment and waiting for traffic management like signalization and other short term fixes that we would like to implement now. Also, speed the time frame up.

Question: Are there flood plain issues with the historic buildings and is the flood plain hindering any potential design?
Answer (MGG): Flood issues primarily involve the presence of flood walls which are the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers. Coordination with the Corps will be necessary as we develop alternative designs. An exact assessment of the flood plain boundaries will be necessary to determine effects of the Project on historic resources and alternative designs.

Comment: I would like to see traffic management implemented immediately with an overseeing entity that is responsible for implementation and management.

Question: Are any mass transit improvements being considered?

Answer (MGG): No mass transit improvements have been examined at this point. The Project team is working with the Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky to determine the benefits that may be offered by TANK services.

Concerns: Inconsistent traffic signal timing at Riviera, short term relief for traffic (i.e. 2-lane turn to on ramps and timing at rush hour), plan for four hours of rush hour or character of community on KY 8 and Monmouth.

Question: Are we creating an unrealistic expectation of traffic flow on surface streets regarding urban area?

Answer (MGG): Levels of Service will be used to evaluate all proposed alternative designs for addressing present and future traffic problems. The expectation being that some congestion is experienced at peak hours or during special events. The goal will be to accomplish a level of service typical of urbanized settings for the "design year" of 2035.

Comment: The "Ohio River Path" is a shared use trail proposal along KY 8 and the Ohio River that was proposed around 10 years ago and is intended to serve bicyclists traveling along the river in Campbell/Kenton/Boone Counties. Currently cyclists follow an on-road route, usually KY 8. Consequently, the River Path passes under I-471. An off-road route is being planned by South Bank Partners thru Dayton and Newport. While this is incidental to the I-471/KY 8 project, the design alternates should consider this bike route as not to preclude the use of the surface streets or other alternates for passing through the area. (There is also a KY designated Scenic Byway passing under the bridge on Riverboat Row).

PUBLIC MEETING

Following the IAC meeting, the public was invited to review the findings that were presented at the IAC meeting. Representatives of all consulting parties were present to field questions, provide explanations and gather concerns/issues from attendees.

WEB ADDRESS: www.471project.org

The next meeting is scheduled for April 13th 2007.

A newsletter is also available, either in hard copy or via email. [Click here to sign up.](#)