

## **6.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND AGENCY COORDINATION**

Public outreach activities for the Cincinnati Streetcar project have occurred through the project website, mailings, news articles, meetings and presentations with stakeholders and citizens since 2007. A public involvement program for the Cincinnati Streetcar project was initiated for the *Cincinnati Streetcar Feasibility Study* (July 2007). The City of Cincinnati will continue to develop and implement this program throughout all phases of the project to keep citizens informed and engaged in the streetcar project.

### **6.1 Videos and Website**

The City of Cincinnati developed a video of the proposed modern streetcar, which was distributed throughout the community and posted on [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). The City also developed an enhanced streetcar website found at [www.cincinnati-oh.gov](http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov). This website contains a wide range of information about the streetcar and its benefits to Cincinnati and the region. The website is updated to reflect the latest information associated with the project.

### **6.2 Mailings**

The City of Cincinnati distributes project information through mass mailings to citizens within the study area. In February 2011, approximately 6,000 postcards were mailed to citizens and businesses within a three block radius of the streetcar route. This postcard promoted the benefits of the streetcar and provided an opportunity for citizens to sign up for project updates and construction news.

### **6.3 Community Briefings and Presentations**

The following is a list of public outreach efforts conducted by the City of Cincinnati to educate the public about the Streetcar project:

- 5/30/07 - Presentation to the Cincinnati City Council Economic Development Committee (3CDC)
- 9/20/07 - Open House at the Art Academy
- 9/27/07 - Open House at City Hall
- 2/21/08 - Presentation and group discussion at the Cincinnati Neighborhood Summit
- 6/10/08 - Streetcar Forum at the University of Cincinnati (UC)
- 8/18/08 – Presentation at the Business Community Breakfast Meeting
- 8/19/08 – Presentation at the Business Community Breakfast Meeting
- 8/25/08 – Presentation at the Business Community Breakfast Meeting
- 8/28/08 – Presentation at the Over-the-Rhine (OTR) Chamber of Commerce
- 9/8/08 – Presentation at the Business Community Breakfast Meeting
- 9/12/08 – Presentation at the Business Community Breakfast Meeting
- 10/27/08 – Presentation at the Business Community Breakfast Meeting
- 11/5/08 – Presentation to City of Cincinnati Employees
- 11/17/08 – Presentation to the Cincinnati USA Regional Chamber of Commerce
- 1/8/09 – Presentation to the Executive Committee of Downtown Cincinnati, Inc.
- 2/2/09 - Presentation at Give Back Cincinnati Young Professional Sounding Sessions

- 2/27/09 – Presentation to Hamilton County Commissioners
- 3/4/09 – Presentation to the Board of 3CDC
- 3/18/09 – Presentation to the Urban Design Review Board
- 3/20/09 - Presentation to the Cincinnati Women’s Club
- 3/24/09 - Presentation at the Government 101 Course for the Mayor's Young Professional Kitchen Cabinet
- 6/10/09 - Presentation at the Urban League
- 6/29/09 - Presentation to the League of Women Voters, City Government Committee
- 6/17/09 – Presentation to the Greater Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky African American Chamber of Commerce
- 7/1/09 - Presentation at the Urban League
- 7/22/09 - Presentation at the Urban League
- 8/8/09 – Presentation to the Board of the Cincinnati Business Committee
- 8/19/09 - Presentation at the Urban League
- 9/30/09 – Presentation to the Board of 3CDC
- 10/21/09 – Presentation at C-Change (a Cincinnati USA Regional Chamber leadership development program for young professionals)
- 1/12/10 – Presentation at the Cincinnati Association
- 2/2/10 – Presentation at the City Council’s Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee
- 2/17/10 – Presentation at the Uptown Consortium Board
- 2/22/10 – Presentation at the Cincinnati USA Regional Chamber’s State Capital Bill Prioritization Committee
- 3/2/10 – Presentation at the University of Cincinnati for the Class: Urban Sustainability/Sustainable Cities
- 8/5/10 – Meeting with the Cincinnati Fire Department
- 11/5/10-11/10/10 – Open House at Fountain Square to view a modern streetcar
- 12/6/10 – Presentation at Southwest Ohio Utility Safety Council
- 1/29/11 – Presentation at Friends of Findlay Market Board

## **6.4 Stakeholders**

A Stakeholder Working Group, which included over 50 individuals representing a diverse group of community, civic and business organizations, was organized in the Feasibility Study phase of the project. The working group provided input on various components of the study such as community goals and objectives for potential streetcar transit investments, routes, and study findings and recommendations. Three meetings (March 6, 2007, March 20, 2007 and May 18, 2007) were held during the Feasibility Study (2007).

In addition to the Stakeholder Working Group, the City of Cincinnati has met individually with over 20 business stakeholders representing local banks, hospitals, universities, corporations, and utilities. The list of business stakeholders is provided in Appendix K.

The City of Cincinnati met with Uptown Stakeholders during July and September 2010 to discuss the Uptown connector alignments of the Build Alternatives. Build Alternative 1 would have an Uptown connector alignment that follows Findlay Street to Vine Street and runs north along Vine Street to Corry Street and ends at Short Vine Street Build Alternative 2 would have an Uptown connector alignment that follows Findlay Street to Vine Street and then follows West Clifton Avenue to Calhoun and McMillan streets. During these meetings the engineering

feasibility, neighborhood needs, and economic potential of the Uptown connector alignments were discussed. Following the meetings, stakeholders submitted comments regarding the Uptown connector alignments. Copies of the letters are provided in Appendix K. Total of 18 comments were received, which stated preferences for either Vine Street or West Clifton Avenue.

Sixteen comments favored West Clifton Avenue for the following reasons:

- It would potentially have higher ridership
- There would be more potential for development
- It would provide better access to Uptown, UC, and the business district
- It would provide more access to Clifton-University Heights-Fairview (CUF) residents

Two comments favored Vine Street. The main reasons stated were that Vine Street is in need of economic development and the streetcar would help provide that development.

Two comments also suggested use of both West Clifton Avenue and Vine Street to maximize the areas that the streetcar would access.

## 6.5 Public Meetings

The City of Cincinnati conducted a series of public outreach meetings for the streetcar project in fall 2009. The purpose of these meetings was to update stakeholders and citizens on the development of the project. Four meetings were held within the study area; seven additional meetings were held throughout the City of Cincinnati outside the study area.

### 6.5.1 Meetings Held within the Study Area

The four public outreach meetings within the study area were conducted in September and October, 2009 (Table 31).

**Table 31. Public Meeting Locations**

Date	Time	Location	Number of Attendees
September 22, 2009	5:00 to 7:00 pm	Aronoff Center for the Arts; 650 Walnut Street	54
September 28, 2009	11:00 am to 1:00 pm	Fountain Square; Fifth Street and Vine Street	0 - Meeting ended early due to inclement weather.
September 29, 2009	5:00 to 7:00 pm	The Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County; 800 Vine Street	17
October 21, 2009	5:00 to 7:00 pm	1237 Vine Street	10

The meetings were conducted in an “open house” format. Attendees were encouraged to provide contact information on a sign-in sheet so they could be notified of upcoming project public meetings. Eleven different displays featuring project information were available for review and comment. The displays included the project description, purpose and need, study area,

alternatives under consideration, estimated costs and benefits, and frequently asked questions about the streetcar project.

Project team members from the City were available for questions and comments. Attendees were encouraged to provide comments on the project either via comment forms, e-mail comments, or speaking with project staff.

The following is a summary of public comments and questions received from the four outreach meetings.

- Please bring us a streetcar. Our mass transit system is insufficient.
- The streetcar is critical to the future of the region. Citizens want to live on the line, and raise families in vibrant, urban, and walkable neighborhoods. Cincinnati cannot afford not to do this.
- The project is essential to encouraging more development Downtown. Pouring money into neighborhood redevelopment would be short lived if people are concerned with the availability of parking. The issue of how the streetcar will grow into a region-wide mass transit plan needs to be addressed.
- The streetcar can't be built soon enough.
- Bringing a streetcar to Cincinnati will bring growth, development, and economic viability.
- This is a great investment for the City of Cincinnati. It will create jobs and growth in the urban core. This is a smart investment that will benefit generations of Cincinnatians to come.
- This is a good project but should go a step further. The key to development is getting non-residents into Downtown and OTR, and to do this these people must be made to feel at ease. There may need to be some sort of additional security to help people feel comfortable.
- The streetcar is an important economic development tool. It will help renovate buildings, attract young people, and support the "green" movement. Transportation spending should not be limited to supporting private automobiles.
- A streetcar leg could come further up Main Street and take McMicken Street to Vine Street.
- Regarding alternatives under consideration: there is limited residential access to Vine between Hollister and Mulberry. The West Clifton option would probably create more ridership.
- Clifton will generate more users farther from the track by several blocks over Vine Street.
- A better alternative to go up the hill is an aerial tram. A modern tram could start at Findlay Market and end near Calhoun/McMillan streets. This would instantly create a hub/traffic for the market and bypasses a largely residential area and slope concerns.
- The route crossing near 12<sup>th</sup> and Race streets is confusing.
- Is this route for maximum impact now? Or is this the first of numerous phases through OTR? If this is just the first, then consideration needs to be given to how this route would interact with future routes through OTR and Downtown.
- This project is very, very needed!
- The route should continue up Main Street to McMicken Street.
- The streetcar 100 percent needs to happen. If it is guaranteed that a line will go Uptown via Clifton or Vine streets, then the route should be modified Downtown (to go south on Vine Street, not Race Street). The route should go north on Main Street, west on Central Parkway, north on Elm Street, east on McMicken Street, south on Vine Street. This would allow for the Uptown connector from the University to continue south on Vine

street all the way to 4<sup>th</sup> Street. If there will not be a rail-based line on Clifton or Vine streets, then there should be an aerial tram (or incline) to make a direct connection. If that is the case, then the current route is great.

### 6.5.2 Meetings Held Outside of the Study Area

The City of Cincinnati held seven outreach meetings in September and October 2009 at locations outside the study area with locations selected to provide convenient locations for all Cincinnati residents (Table 32).

**Table 32. Public Meeting Locations Outside of the Study Area**

Date	Time	Location	Number of Attendees
September 24, 2009	6:00 to 8:00 pm	Bond Hill Recreation Center; 1501 Elizabeth Place	10
October 13, 2009	6:00 to 8:00 pm	Oakley Recreation Center; 3882 Paxton Avenue	7
October 20, 2009	6:30 to 8:30 pm	College Hill Recreation Center; 5545 Belmont Avenue	21
October 27, 2009	6:00 to 8:00 pm	Corryville Recreation Center; 2823 Eden Avenue	11
November 4, 2009	6:00 to 8:00 pm	LeBlond Recreation Center; 2335 Riverside Drive	4
November 10, 2009	5:00 to 7:00 pm	City Hall; 801 Plum Street	7
November 18, 2009	6:30 to 8:30 pm	Price Hill Recreation Center; 959 Hawthorne Avenue	3

The following is a summary of comments and questions received from the public at these meetings.

- This will bring more people Downtown and thus increase safety. Do not move poorer residents from this route – development should be mixed income.
- This project will improve economic development, encourage people to move Downtown, and improve air quality.
- The route needs to go further towards the university and hospitals. How does this tie into a city-wide mass transit system?

### 6.6 Media and Public Comments

The media has provided communication about the streetcar project. It has been on the front page of various local news publications and featured during local news reports on several television stations numerous times. The announcement of the alignment route, stop locations along the alignment and local concern regarding project costs and funding sources have generated a substantial amount of media interest. As the project moves forward, media relations will be maintained in order to provide information to the media so they can help communicate any messages that are important in obtaining community response. Contact with reporters is maintained by the City of Cincinnati.

### **6.6.1 Newspapers and Television Stations**

Between May 2009 and February 2011, there have been approximately 130 news articles and stories presented by the following four newspapers and four television stations:

- Cincinnati Business Courier (business weekly)
- Cincinnati Enquirer (mainstream daily)
- Cincinnati Herald (African-American-oriented weekly)
- City Beat (alternative weekly)
- WCPO-TV
- WKRC-TV
- WLWT-TV
- WXIX-TV

The articles and stories presented by these newspapers and television stations are categorized by various subjects below. The number of articles and stories varies by topic, the results of which are listed in descending order:

- City council/city funding: 16
- 2009 ballot issue: 16
- Federal funding/stimulus: 14
- Route and stops: 13
- Mayor's support of project/lobbying for funds: 12
- Proposed 2011 ballot issue to prohibit expenditure of funds: 9
- State/Transportation Review Advisory Council (TRAC) funding: 7
- Project schedule: 5
- Opinion polls: 5
- Opposition to project (general): 5
- Casino impact: 4
- Support of project (general): 4
- Project description/overview: 3
- Experiences of other cities with streetcars: 2
- Operations/ Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Agency (SORTA): 2
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) opposition: 2
- Project manager appointed: 2
- Streetcar display on Fountain Square/costs for police patrols: 2
- Transit-oriented development: 2
- Utility relocation and costs: 2
- Project costs: 1
- Public open houses: 1
- State position on project: 1
- Streetcar vehicles: 1

Three recent, major news articles were reviewed to quantify the public comments by topic. The topics are listed in descending order of the number of comments received by the media.

Article: "*Cincinnati Wants to Break Ground on Streetcar in November*," Cincinnati Enquirer, October 15, 2010 (38 comments):

- Support project: 15
- Oppose project: 14
- Can't afford/waste of money/spend money elsewhere: 4
- Crime concerns (oppose project): 2
- Unsure or neutral: 2
- Enquirer is biased against Streetcar: 1

Article: "*City Unveils Streetcar Route*," Cincinnati Enquirer, February 16, 2011 (115 comments):

- Oppose project: 29
- Support project: 22
- Can't afford/waste of money/spend money elsewhere: 18
- Crime concerns (oppose project): 11
- Good alignment: 10
- Wrong alignment: 10
- Uses buses instead of rail: 9
- Project will mean tax increase: 2
- Disputes cost estimate: 1
- Disputes travel time estimate: 1
- Questions fare structure: 1
- Will congest traffic: 1

Article: "*Streetcar Backers Prepare for 'Round Two'*," Cincinnati Enquirer, February 16, 2011 (32 comments):

- Dispute development projections: 9
- Oppose project: 6
- Support project: 6
- Can't afford/waste of money/spend money elsewhere: 5
- Enquirer is biased against Streetcar: 2
- Wrong alignment: 2
- Want more information: 1
- Will not make a profit: 1

### **6.6.2 Editorials**

During the same two-year period 2009-2011, there were eight media editorials and 34 letters to the editor published in local newspapers. Five media editorials were in support of project. Three media editorials were in opposition to the project and questioned the effectiveness of the streetcar.

The topics and opinions presented in the 34 letters to the editor are categorized by various subjects and quantified below in descending order:

- Oppose project (variety of reasons): 9
- Can't afford/waste of money/spend money elsewhere: 6
- Support project (variety of reasons): 4
- Streetcars ineffective: 3
- Change route: 2

- Did not like streetcars during the streetcar era: 2
- Use buses instead of rail: 2
- Enquirer poll is biased (support project): 1
- Want vote on spending city money on project: 2
- Streetcar may attract business: 1
- Streetcar technology: 1
- Utility issues: 1

## **6.7 Past Public Involvement Activities Related to Streetcar Development**

Since 1995, several projects and plans for public transportation in the region have promoted the development of a modern streetcar as a transportation option for the City of Cincinnati. Table 33 presents a summary of public involvement activities completed for these previous studies to illustrate how the public has been involved in the development of the streetcar project and regional transportation. Streetcars, and/or the physical accommodation of rail modes that include streetcar, were included in the Fort Washington Way, Central Riverfront, MetroMoves, Central Area Loop, and Ohio Kentucky Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI) Long Range Plan Update projects

**Table 33. Past Public Involvement Activities**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Project Plan</b>	<b>Activities</b>
1996 - 2000	Fort Washington Way	I-71 corridor oversight subcommittee reviewed and recommended alternatives for the reconstruction of Fort Washington Way; Public involvement included public meetings, workshops and hearings, speakers bureau, presentations, business briefings, newsletters, news releases, website, hotline, roving display.
1997 - 2000	Central Riverfront Urban Design Master Plan	A riverfront steering committee made up of City and County elected officials and staff was formed as a joint policy board for the Central Riverfront Plan. Public involvement included focus groups, interviews, and public meetings.
2000 – 2001	Central Area Loop Study	Advisory committee met monthly; Public involvement included stakeholder surveys, media communications, public forums, newsletters, website.
1997 - 2001	MetroMoves Regional Transit Plan	Citizens advisory council was created to set goals and objectives; Public involvement included regional forums, exhibit bus surveys, community meetings, presentations, video, brochures, hot line, website.
2001	I-71 Preliminary Engineering/ Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Light Rail Transit	Advisory committee met quarterly, corridor oversight committee met monthly. Public involvement included speakers bureau, presentations, business briefings, public meetings, public workshops, newsletters, website, hotline, roving display.

**Table 33. Past Public Involvement Activities**

Date	Project Plan	Activities
2000 – 2004	North South Transportation Initiative (NSTI)	Task force and oversight committee met monthly; Public involvement included stakeholder interviews, surveys, open house meetings, newsletters, website, displays, brochures.
2007 - 2008	OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan Update	Public involvement included public hearings, surveys, open houses, special presentations.

## 6.8 Agency Coordination

Agency coordination for the streetcar project was initiated in December 2009. A scoping letter and project information was sent to the following federal, state and local agencies:

- US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Region 5
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Region 5
- US Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, Philadelphia Region
- Ohio Department of Development
- Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR)
- Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OHPO)
- Cincinnati Preservation Association (CPA)
- Ohio Kentucky Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI)
- Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA)
- Port of Greater Cincinnati Development Authority

The scoping letter provided descriptions of the study area, build alternatives, maintenance and storage facility sites. A summary of the project's purpose and need, photographs of the study area, and maps of the build alternatives and maintenance and storage facility locations were also included in the information sent to the agencies.

Table 34 summarizes agency responses to the streetcar project.

**Table 34. Agency Coordination**

Agency	Comments
Ohio Historic Preservation Office December 15, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OHPO requested to be a consulting party for the Section 106 process.</li> <li>• The OHPO noted that there are numerous properties in the project area that are included in the Ohio Historic Inventory and listed in the National Register of Historic Places.</li> </ul>

**Table 34. Agency Coordination**

Agency	Comments
Cincinnati Preservation Association) December 22, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CPA supports construction of the streetcar as an important first step toward a more balanced and environmentally friendly transportation system.</li> <li>• The CPA needs more information before they can take a stand in favor of the Vine Street or Clifton Avenue routes.</li> <li>• The CPA supports the alternative that would have less adverse impact on National Register-listed or eligible historic resources along the route.</li> <li>• The CPA understands that the rights-of-way are the same width (60 feet), so one would not be preferable to the other in this regard.</li> <li>• The CPA would like to see the Gilbert Avenue alternate included for consideration.</li> </ul>
Cincinnati Park Board February 25, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Park Board supports the streetcar project.</li> <li>• It is understood that the closest stop and substation are located well south of the Inwood Park boundaries and that access will be maintained at all times during and after construction.</li> <li>• The Park Board feels the project will not adversely impact access to the park or limit use of any activity within Inwood Park.</li> </ul>

### 6.8.1 Cultural Resources Coordination

The Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their projects on historic properties. The Section 106 process requires the coordination of findings of the Section 106 investigations with the OHPO as well as other defined consulting parties. Table 35 provides a list of local, state, and federal consulting parties identified for the streetcar project. The City of Cincinnati and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will coordinate with the consulting parties throughout the project development process.

Section 106 coordination with consulting parties was initiated in September 2010 by FTA. Invitation letters were sent to the identified consulting parties requesting their participation in the project's Section 106 review process (Table 35). The following responded that they would like to participate as consulting parties in the project:

- Eastern Shawnee Tribe
- CPA
- Cincinnati Park Board
- OTR/Gateway Quarter Merchants Group
- OTR Foundation
- OTR Community Council

**Table 35. Consulting Parties Invitation List**

	<b>Consulting Party</b>
<b>Local Agencies and Community Groups</b>	Cincinnati Historic Conservation Office Cincinnati Preservation Association Over-the-Rhine Chamber of Commerce Over-the-Rhine Foundation Over-the-Rhine Community Council Over-the-Rhine/Gateway Quarter Merchants Group Cincinnati Park Board Cincinnati Museum Center Merchants of Main Central Vine Business Association University of Cincinnati National Underground Railroad Freedom Center Cincinnati Center City Development Corporation Pendleton Community Council
<b>State Agencies</b>	Ohio Historic Preservation Office Ohio Department of Transportation Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority
<b>Federal Agencies</b>	Federal Highway Administration US Environmental Protection Agency
<b>Indian Tribes</b>	Citizen Potawatomi Nation Delaware Tribal Headquarters The Delaware Nation Forest County Potawatomi Keweenaw Bay Indian Community Miami Tribe of Oklahoma Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma Prairie Band of Potawatomi Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma Seneca Nation of Indians Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma Wyandotte Nation Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians

The draft *Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation Report* (December 2010) was distributed to consulting parties on December 10, 2010. Following circulation of this report, a consulting parties meeting was held on January 7, 2011 to discuss the role of the consulting parties and the results of the *Phase I Cultural Resources Investigations Report*. Discussion during the meeting included identification of historic resources, determinations of effects, impacts of stops and substations, other studies, archaeological resources, and development of a Memorandum of Agreement.

Following the January 7, 2011 meeting, consulting parties provided comments regarding the Streetcar project and the *Phase I Cultural Resources Investigations Report* (December 2010). The consulting parties' comments were addressed and the report revised in accordance with the comments. The revised *Phase I Cultural Resources Investigations Report* (February 2011) was distributed by FTA in March 2011 to the consulting parties along with a cover letter explaining how the comments were addressed in the report.

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is being developed between FTA, City of Cincinnati and OHPO, to facilitate future consultation so that specific aspects of the design that may affect historic properties will be considered. This approach will allow avoidance or minimization of potential effects where possible. The MOA will establish a structure for discussions so that, as the project moves towards final design, consulting parties who have an interest in various aspects of the project can return to consultation. The extent of potential adverse impacts on any particular historic resources and the resolution have not yet been determined as noted in the March 16, 2011 Section 106 letter from FTA to OHPO (Appendix K; Agency Coordination).

## **6.9 Future Public Involvement and Agency Coordination**

### **6.9.1 Public Hearings**

There will be a minimum 30-day comment period following the release of this Environmental Assessment (EA) during which the public and agencies will be given the opportunity to comment on the alternatives, the potential impacts, and proposed mitigation measures. The EA will be made available to the public in hard copy format at a number of accessible locations. The document will also be made available electronically in a common format (PDF) on the City of Cincinnati's streetcar website found on [http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/streetcar\\_environmental/](http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/streetcar_environmental/). Electronic data (CD-ROM) copies will be provided to representatives of SORTA, OKI, and the Ohio Department of Transportation. State and federal agencies listed in Section 6.8 will receive a Notice of Availability for the EA.

During the public comment period, public hearings will be held on April 13 and 14, 2011 to discuss the project and answer questions. Informational displays will be used to illustrate alternatives and important aspects of the project. A presentation will be given during the public hearings. The public will be encouraged to provide written and/or verbal comments. A court reporter will be available to document verbal comments. These hearings will be advertised through notices in newspapers and website postings..

### **6.9.2 Public Outreach**

The City of Cincinnati will continue to implement the public involvement program for the streetcar project throughout all phases of the project to keep citizens informed and engaged in the project. Ongoing activities include:

- Website updates
- Monthly updates to City Council
- Mailings and meetings with business owners within the study area
- Social media updates
- Meetings with stakeholders
- Newsletters and postcards
- Events to celebrate milestones such as groundbreaking, first stop installation, and other significant activities
- Ridership safety campaign to introduce ridership to the streetcar
- Information describing construction timeline