



Urban Core Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
April 2, 2009
9 a.m. at NOACA
1299 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

Agenda

- I. Lakefront West Project Update
- II. Opportunity Corridor Project Update
- III. Cleveland Innerbelt Plan Update



Attendees:

Craig Hebebrand- Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12
Bob Brown- City of Cleveland, Planning
Michael May- Maingate
John Motl- Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12
Sheri Dozier- Greater Cleveland Partnership
Ronald Eckner- NOACA
Jamal Husani- Cuyahoga County Engineer
Mahmoud Al-Lozi- NOACA
Millie Caraballo- Cleveland Industrial Retention Initiative
Scott Frantz- City of Cleveland, Planning
Tim Tramble- Burten Bell Carr
David Beach- Cleveland Museum of Natural History
Kevin Kelley- Cleveland City Council
Jim Folk- Cleveland Indians/Historical Gateway District
Joe Marinucci- Downtown Cleveland Alliance
Debra Janik- Greater Cleveland Partnership
James Haviland- MidTown Cleveland
Neil Mohny- Forest City
Claire Kilbane- Cuyahoga County Planning Commission
Paul Alsenas- Cuyahoga County Planning Commission
Lester Stumpe- Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District
Bill Beckenbach- Quadrangle
Mark Carpenter- Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12
Brian Newbacher- AAA East Central
Tim Hill- Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12
Michael Armstrong- FHWA
Paul Dorothy- Burgess & Niple
Bruce Mansfield- Burgess & Niple
Matt Wahl- HNTB
Anna Matisak- Whelan Communications
Ned Whelan – Whelan Communications
Andy Cross- City of Cleveland, Engineering
Michael Schipper- GCRTA
Dave Lastovka- Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12
Ben Trimble- Ohio City Near West
Chris Garland- Tremont West
Jim Walcott- Commission on Catholic Community Action

Welcome by Craig Hebebrand, Innerbelt Project Manager for Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12. The purpose of this meeting is to provide the committee with updates for the Lakefront West, Opportunity Corridor and the Cleveland Innerbelt Plan.

Lakefront West

Presentation of slides:

1. Approved on January 9, 2009
 - Project Budget provides \$49.8 million
 - Including \$40 million for Construction
 - 35 MPH Continuous Flow Boulevard
2. New Access provided at:
 - West 73rd Street
 - West 54th Street/Division Avenue
3. Modified Access provided at:
 - West Boulevard/Lake Avenue
 - Clifton Boulevard/Lake Avenue
 - Edgewater Park
 - West 45th Street/West 49th Street
 - West 25th Street/West 28th Street
4. Improved Pedestrian/Bicycle Access at:
 - Lake Avenue: Tunnel Rehabilitation & ADA Ramps
 - West 76th Street: Tunnel Rehabilitation & ADA Ramps
 - West 25th Street to West 65th Street: New Multi-purpose Trail
5. Implementation Schedule:
 - Lake and West 76th Street Tunnels – 2010
 - Multi-Purpose Trail – 2011
 - All Other Connections – 2012
 - Mainline Reconstruction - TBD

Summary of Comments and Questions:

Bob Brown: The improvements at W. 25th/W. 28th are imperative for pedestrians. The removal of the eastbound ramp will make it pedestrian-friendly and also eliminate the dangerous merge. It is not new access, but it is significantly improved. W. 73rd will be a key access point and will accomplish the goal of taking the ramp under the railroad tracks instead of across the Shoreway.

Al Lozi: Are you physically removing the W. 28th Street ramp?

Hebebrand: The retaining wall will be removed at the W. 28th ramp. The exit will physically stay in place, but realign the pavement, which will improve the line of sight.

Al Lozi: Will there be a pedestrian crossing access on the new Shoreway?

Bob Brown: No. The new pedestrian access will be at W. 73rd and will have full pedestrian and bike access, but it will not be across the Shoreway.

Lester Stumpe: The environmental documents should be available for review prior to the final approval. Can we work cooperatively in advance of the formal documents to resolve issues such as storm water removal?

Hebebrand: We will coordinate with your offices. There will be a public involvement process so that other parties can formally participate.

Al Lozi: Will the speed limit be lowered prior to the mainline construction? NOACA needs to know for the regional model and State law changes need to be made.

Hebebrand: As soon as the city has the legislation and the signs are erected, the speed will be reduced.

Bob Brown: We can assume that it will be prior to the mainline reconstruction.

Michael Schipper: The current bike trail is "chopped up," are there plans for a multi-purpose continuous trail?

Bob Brown: The current budget does not provide for this right now, the city recognizes the need, but it is not realistic at this time.

Opportunity Corridor

Presentation Slides:

1. Project Budget includes \$20 million ARRA for Preliminary Engineering, Environmental Studies and Detailed Design

Summary of Comments and Questions:

Ron Eckner: NOACA will have to amend the conformity analysis in order for ODOT to access funding. We will have to work out the complications of that aspect.

Schipper: It is difficult to envision applying the ARRA funding in a timely fashion. The committee needs to be cognitive of the environmental documentation process.

Bob Brown: The environmental documentation is necessary to move through the process. We need to be realistic about the timetable and money. Is there a chance of requesting an extension?

Millie Caraballo: What can the neighborhoods do to maximize the use of the money? What happens if we don't use all of the allocated money? How long will the environmental study take?

Hebebrand: At the end of the obligated number of days, the money will be redistributed if it isn't spent. There is some pressure to use the money.

Mike Armstrong: ODOT and the FHWA are actively engaged in the legal requirements. The neighborhoods can assist in supplying information during the process.

Hebebrand: The planning process is nearing the end and the next phase will be the environmental study.

Tim Hill: The environmental study will take 3-5 years. We cannot contract a consultant for future phases until the early steps are complete.

Cleveland Innerbelt

Presentation Slides

1. Early Deployment Projects
 - Quigley Road is complete
2. GCRTA Park-N-Ride Lot Expansions
 - Strongsville – NOW OPEN
 - North Olmsted – NOW OPEN
 - Westlake – 2010
 - Environmental clearance by the end of the month
 - Roadwork to begin in 2009
 - Triskett – TBD
3. Freeway Management System – Construction 2009
 - Being processed for sale
 - Several dozen DMS screens
 - Save \$8-10 million by switching from fiber optic cable to leased communication
4. East 55th Street over I-90 – NOW OPEN
 - Deck replacement is complete
5. CSX over East 55th Street
 - Plan development currently suspended
 - TBD – Pending Coordination with Port Relocation
 - Rail spur for Port may impact the Bridge design
 - The key is the number of tracks on the rail line
 - The outcome is still 4 lanes plus bike paths on E. 55th Street.

6. Draft Environmental Impact Statement

- DEIS Approved by ODOT – March 2, 2009
- DEIS Approved by FHWA – March 3, 2009
- Notice of Availability (DEIS) – March 20, 2009
- CUCP Advisory Committee – April 2, 2009
- Public Hearing – April 21, 2009
- Close of DEIS Public Comments – May 21, 2009
- Final EIS – June 2009
- Notice of Availability (FEIS) – July 2009
- Record of Decision – August 2009

7. Draft Environmental Impact Statement

- On-Line at www.innerbelt.org
- CD's available upon request
- Copies Available for Review at:
 - ODOT D12, Cleveland City Hall, NOACA, CCEO, CCPC
 - Cleveland Public Library: Main, South and Sterling Branches
 - Community Development Corporations: Tremont West, MidTown, Quadrangle, Street. Clair-Superior and Flats Oxbow

8. Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing

- Scheduled for April 21, 2009:
 - Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church
 - 2187 West 14th Street
 - 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM – Open House
 - 5:30 PM to 6:00 PM – Project Presentation
- Public Comments to follow Presentation
- Submit Comments by 5 p.m. on May 21, 2009

9. Draft Environmental Impact Statement

- \$1.5 - \$2.0 billion investment
- Provides for New Westbound Bridge to North of Existing
- Provides for Replacement of Existing Bridge with New Eastbound Bridge on approximately the same alignment
- Provides for one-way pair frontage road system between Carnegie Avenue and Chester Avenue

10. CCG1 - New Westbound Bridge

- Budget is \$400 million including:
- \$200 million ARRA Funds
- \$97 million SAFETEA-LU Earmark Funds
- ARRA Funds Required to be Obligated within 365 Days
- Transportation Budget Bill Includes Provisions to:
- Increase Biennium Limit for Design-Build Contracts from \$250 million to \$1 billion from July 1, 2009 to July 1, 2011
- Allow ODOT to Use a Value-Based Selection Process for Design-Build Contracts from July 1, 2009 to July 1, 2011

11. CCG1 - New Westbound Bridge

- Prepare DB Contract Documents by December 1, 2009
- Federal Authorization to Advertise by March 1, 2010
- Award Design-Build Contract 2010
- Design & Construction 2010 through 2013

Summary of Comments and Questions:

Paul Alsenas: What happens to the public comments?

Hebebrand: The comments are addressed and issued a response if necessary. Each comment and response will then be published in the FEIS.

Stumpe: The Agency comments are in Appendix E. Are those files available to review? Are all of the comments received thus far published in the DEIS? Is NOACA a cooperating agency?

Armstrong: Yes, all comments are included in the DEIS.

Tim Hill: NOACA is not a cooperating agency.

Chris Garland: Other than collecting data, should residents expect any response at the Public Hearing?

Tim Hill: The project team members will answer immediate questions. The verbal questions will not be addressed in the forum, but included in the documentation.

Armstrong: It is more efficient to address all of the comments in totality.

Alsenas: The public comment and official response could turn into a conversation or dialogue. How much iteration does the commenter get? Will the public participation have the avenue, the sophistication of an official process? At this stage in the plan, how will you address the concerns of the public? There is an assumption that each commenter has been involved since day one, but what if someone just moved here?

Tim Hill: There has been a constant opportunity throughout the public involvement process for individuals and agencies to address their concerns.

Armstrong: This has been a process since 2000, and the accumulation of those nine years is included and considered in the DEIS. The FHWA has addressed each and every comment and there have been extensive iterations over those nine years. This final Public Hearing is to comment specifically on the DEIS.

Stumpe: NOACA submitted concerns for the discharge violating the water quality and it was not recorded in the DEIS.

Hebebrand: I will make a note and look into it.

Joe Marinucci: Craig is one of the most responsive people available for this process.

Caraballo: There is a need to be sensitive to the fact that people may have questions regarding the answers that ODOT submits, especially if it is a generic answer. Who is the contact person to follow up with for further correspondence?

Armstrong: Each comment is forwarded to Craig, who has become the official contact person for this issue.

E-mail at craig.hebebrand@dot.state.oh.us
Mail at Ohio Department of Transportation
5500 Transportation Boulevard
Garfield Heights, Ohio 44125
Attn: Craig Hebebrand

Schipper: Will official ODOT responses be published in the FEIS? What are the terms of the process for the FEIS?

Armstrong: The FEIS will be made available by the end of July. All environmental commitments are listed in the DEIS.

Marinucci: Can you explain what "design-build" means in ODOT's terms?

Hebebrand: The Design-Build Process combines the design and construction into a single contract. ODOT will be using a Value-Based Design-Build Process, which will consider the Design-Build Team Technical Proposal and Price Proposal.

Bob Brown: The visual elements are very important and will be considered between now and December 2009.

Alsenas: I think that we should revisit the Aesthetics Subcommittee to put the necessary items in order for the Design-Build contract. There is a major concern regarding the decision not to build the cable-stay bridge. It seems that the public involvement wasn't taken seriously enough.

Hebebrand: The cost and maintenance of the cable-stay bridge design is not an economic reality, and similar bridges (e.g., Toledo Bridge, Boston, and Mackinaw) have had structural issues.

Armstrong: The Public Involvement is certainly one of the biggest challenges of this project.

- Alsenas: The public expects to get a unique bridge. If cost is the issue, perhaps the public needs to understand the complexity with the changing economics.
- Eckner: Is this the first time that we are hearing that we won't be getting the bridge we decided on a few years ago?
- Bob Brown: Yes, the recent decision is due to economics.
- Schipper: The value-based Design-Build process is preferred. Does FHWA have guidance on the Design-Build?
- Armstrong: ODOT will engage with FHWA to set up the framework for value-based projects. Design-Build is the preferred method, which is pursued as a way to get into the construction quickly; the deck details are not necessary to begin.
- Schipper: What is the timeline of the land acquisition? How many parcels are involved?
- Hebebrand: Many parcels have already been acquired and negotiations are currently active with a number of owners. The contract will include the schedule of availability.
- Claire Kilbane: When, during the process, will it be determined where the bridges will land into the street network? Will the public be able to comment when the decisions are made?
- Armstrong: The footprint has already been addressed and is available in the DEIS. Appendix A has line work on aerial views and the description of the impacts are adequate. The ultimate decision will be the implementation plan and will be included in the FEIS. The comments should be as accurate as possible and tie to specific document pieces.
- Bob Brown: There will be large boards of the key areas of the project for viewing at the Public Hearing.
- Schipper: The DEIS schedule is aggressive. What happens if the comment period drags beyond the time allotted? When does Design-Build need a record of decision?
- Tim Hill: What would happen to the ARRA funding if the dates slip?
- Hebebrand: It is challenging to obligate the funds in the set time frame. If we do not get the record of decision then we cannot spend the funding. If we fail to spend the money, it will be redistributed, most likely not to Ohio.

Armstrong: We will process the comments as they come in. There are many requirements that need to be met in order to get the record of decision.

Neil Mohney: Has the bridge closure option been considered? What about educating the motorist about alternate routes around the city?

Hebebrand: Yes, and unfortunately there would need to be extensive improvements to the alternate routes in order to accommodate traffic. We feel it is better to keep the bridge access open.

Mohney: Building the south bridge would maintain the openness of the Gateway District.

Hebebrand: There are alternatives documented in the DEIS, the Northern alignment is preferred.

Alsenas: Has there been an analysis of diversion (closure option)? Can the public acquire access to all of the background information from day one of the project? He would like to see the causal linkage as to how the project evolved.

Hebebrand: You can send a request to the ODOT office, where it is all kept.

Armstrong: The past documentation may not be accurate at this point in time. Chapter three of the DEIS shows how the alternatives have evolved over the process. Also, Table 439 is a good resource for alternative evaluation.

Alsenas: Who is the team under contract?

Hebebrand: Burgess & Niple.

Closing by Craig Hebebrand. He thanked the committee members for their input and attendance, and looks forward to continuing work on the Innerbelt, Opportunity Corridor and Lakefront West.