

Zoning Map to reflect General Plan and existing compatible land uses within the Noise Contour Planning Boundary (NCPB); Encourage rezoning several large tracts of land currently developed with low density residential but zoned for higher density non-compatible land uses within the 1999 65 DNL noise exposure contour; Enact overlay zoning to provide noise compatibility land use standards near Airport; Subdivision Regulation Amendment: Require recording of fair disclosure agreements and covenants and over flights within the Noise Contour Planning Boundary (NCPB); Building Code Amendment: Enact construction standards within the Noise Contour Planning Boundary (NCPB); Continue noise abatement information program; Monitor implementation of updated Noise Compatibility Program; Update Noise Exposure Maps and Noise Compatibility Program; and, Expand flight track monitoring coverage.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval endorsed by the Acting Associate Administrator for Airports on September 7, 2001. The Record of Approval, as well as other evaluation materials and the documents comprising the submittal are available for review at the FAA office listed above and at the administrative offices of the city of Phoenix, Phoenix, Arizona.

Issued in Hawthorne, California on September 18, 2001.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, AWP-600, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 01-24218 Filed 9-26-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Nashville International Airport, Nashville, Tennessee

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to rule on application.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use revenue from a PFC at Nashville International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101-508) and part 158 of the

Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 29, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address:

Memphis Airports District Office, 3385 Airways Boulevard, Suite 302, Memphis, Tennessee 38116-3841.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Paul Regalado, President of the Metropolitan Nashville Airport Authority at the following address:

One Terminal Drive, Suite 501, Nashville, Tennessee, 37214.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Metropolitan Nashville Airport Authority under § 158.23 of part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cynthia K. Wills, Program Manager, Memphis Airports District Office, 3385 Airways Boulevard, Suite 302, Memphis, Tennessee 38116-3841, (901) 544-3495, extension 16. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use revenue from a PFC at Nashville International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101-508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On September 20, 2001, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use revenue from a PFC submitted by Metropolitan Nashville Airport Authority was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than January 4, 2002.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC Application No.: 01-09-C-00-BNA.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: September 1, 2002.

Proposed charge expiration date: August 31, 2004.

Total estimated net PFC revenue: \$26,005,000.

Brief description of proposed project(s): Donelson Pike and Terminal Drive Relocation; Inbound Baggage Carousel Security Cages; Elevator on

"A" Concourse; Airfield Pavement Rehabilitation; Airfield Hold Bar Modifications; PAPI Lights on RW's 2L & 31; ARFF Vehicle; Cargo Area Infrastructure and Utility Improvements; Live Scan Fingerprint Equipment.

Class of classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Part 135 Air Taxi's.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Metropolitan Nashville Airport Authority.

Issued in Memphis, Tennessee on September 20, 2001.

LaVerne F. Reid,

Manager, Memphis Airports District Office, Southern Region.

[FR Doc. 01-24220 Filed 9-26-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Assessment(s) or Environmental Impact Statement(s): Cuyahoga County, City of Cleveland, Ohio

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental assessment(s) or environmental impact statement(s) will be prepared for a proposed project in the City of Cleveland in Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael B. Armstrong, Urban Programs Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 200 N. High Street, Room 328, Columbus, Ohio 43215, Telephone: (614) 280-6855.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT), will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) or environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to reconstruct a portion of the Interstate Highway System, known as the Innerbelt, which travels through the City of Cleveland's CBD. Specifically, the proposed action is being considered from Interstate 71 and W. 25th Street, on the west, through the Interstate 90/490

interchange (where the existing alignment changes to Interstate 90) to Interstate 90 and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, on the East.

Reconstruction of this alignment is considered necessary to: provide for the infrastructure which is approaching the end of its useful life especially the 5,000 foot Interstate 90 Central Viaduct bridge; reduce congestion on the facility; improve substandard geometrics which result in high accident rates and operating inefficiencies; and improve access into and out of the Cleveland CBD, the Cuyahoga River Valley and the adjoining neighborhoods.

A wide range of alternatives will be considered including: (1) taking no action; (2) reconstruction within the existing right-of-way; (3) relocating portions of the facility on new alignment; and (4) multi-modal options. Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 have sub-alternatives that may involve (1) the redesign, closure or construction of new ramps or (2) construction of mitigating measures.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. A series of public meetings will be held in the project area with a series already held during the Summer of 2001, a series currently scheduled the Fall of 2001, another series in the Winter/Spring of 2002 and an additional meeting in the Fall of 2002. In addition, a Public Hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meetings and hearing. Project reports will be available throughout the study time frame and the EA(S) or Draft EIS(S) will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EA(S) or EIS(S) should be directed to FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: September 18, 2001.

Michael B. Armstrong,

Urban Programs Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, Columbus, Ohio.

[FR Doc. 01-24156 Filed 9-26-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Petition for Waiver of Compliance

In accordance with part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received a request for a waiver of compliance with certain requirements of its safety standards. The individual petition is described below, including the party seeking relief, the regulatory provisions involved, the nature of the relief being requested, and the petitioner's arguments in favor of relief.

The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company

[Docket Number FRA-2001-10653]

The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company (BNSF) seeks a waiver of compliance with the provisions of the *Track Safety Standards*, 49 CFR 213.121(b), regarding cracked or broken joint bars in Classes 3 through 5 track.

The BNSF is petitioning for a waiver which would provide relief from cracks which can develop between the outermost bolt holes of a specified six-hole skirted joint bar in use on 115-pound rail. The petitioner states that the cracks develop from spike notches on the skirted portion of the bar and in some cases penetrate the entire bar, producing a complete end failure.

The petitioner states that these six-hole bars which develop cracks between the outermost bolt holes are comparable in strength and stability to their conventional 115-pound, four-hole unskirted joint bars and present no additional safety hazards. BNSF has submitted laboratory test results to support their request for a waiver.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communication concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Docket Number 2001-10653) and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, DOT Docket Management Facility, Room PL-401 (Plaza Level), 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Communications received within 45 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.-5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's web site at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Issued in Washington, DC on September 21, 2001.

Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 01-24244 Filed 9-26-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From Requirements

Pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 235 and 49 U.S.C. 20502(a), the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of 49 CFR Part 236 as detailed below.

Docket Number FRA-2001-10594

Applicant: Pioneer Valley Railroad, Mr. Jonathan S. Lasko, General Manager, PO Box 995, Westfield, Massachusetts 01086.

The Pioneer Valley Railroad seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance of the manual block system on the entire Pioneer Valley Railroad system, encompassing the stations of Westfield and Holyoke, Massachusetts, and governed train operations by yard limit rules.

The reason given for the proposed changes is the railroad's decision to return to a true yard limit operation.

Any interested party desiring to protest the granting of an application shall set forth specifically the grounds upon which the protest is made, and

CDTI—Cockpit Display of Traffic Information.

MOPS—Minimum Operational Performance Standards.

NRA—Non-Radar Airspace.

RFG—Requirements Focus Group.

STP—Surveillance Transmit Processing.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairmen, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, August 29, 2006.

Francisco Estrada C.,

RTCA Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 06-7490 Filed 9-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, OH

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared for a proposed project in the City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Victoria Peters, Office Director, Office of Engineering and Operations, Federal Highway Administration, 200 N. High Street, Room 328, Columbus, Ohio 43215, Telephone: (614) 280-6896.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT), will prepare an EIS for proposed improvements to Interstates 71, 77 and 90, and connecting radial freeways and local roadways, known as the Cleveland Innerbelt. The Cleveland Innerbelt is routed across the Cuyahoga River valley and around the south and east sides of downtown Cleveland, Ohio. The project termini are located approximately at the merge/diverse point of State Route 176, (the Jennings Freeway) and Interstate 71 southwest of downtown, south of the existing Interstate 90/77 Central Interchange on I-77 south of downtown, and east of the Interstate 90/State Route

2 interchange east of downtown along the shore of Lake Erie.

On September 18, 2001 the FHWA issued a Notice of Intent, (66 FR 49448, Sep. 27, 2001), for the Cleveland Innerbelt action, which was in the planning phase of project development, indicating that an Environmental Assessment or EIS would be prepared. Since 2001 project development and public involvement activities have been ongoing. To effectively and efficiently manage the Cleveland Innerbelt Project the FHWA, in cooperation with the ODOT, has decided to prepare an EIS for the proposed Project.

The purpose of the Cleveland Innerbelt Project is to improve the physical condition of the existing bridge decks and roadway pavements, improve the operational performance of the roadway system, improve the safety of the roadway system, and improve the access provided by the roadway system, while supporting community goals and objectives. Alternatives under consideration include: (1) the no-build (Defined as: maintaining/reconstructing the facility in kind); and (2) rehabilitation/upgrading of the existing infrastructure combined with construction of new facilities on modified alignment(s).

Letters describing the proposed Project and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, and State, agencies known to have interest in this proposal. Moreover, public involvement activities will continue to facilitate the further development of alternatives, and to identify and quantify the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed Project. A public hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. The Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing.

To ensure that the full range of issues relating to this proposed Project are addressed, and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed Project and the EIS should be sent to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: August 31, 2006.

Victoria Peters,

Office Director, Office of Engineering and Operations, Federal Highway Administration, Columbus, Ohio.

[FR Doc. E6-14814 Filed 9-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-2003-15818]

Exemption to Allow Werner Enterprises, Inc. To Use Global Positioning System (GPS) Technology To Monitor and Record Drivers' Hours of Service

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

ACTION: Renewal of exemption; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FMCSA announces its decision to renew Werner Enterprises, Inc.'s (Werner) exemption from the Agency's requirement that drivers of commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) operating in interstate commerce prepare handwritten records of duty status (RODS). Werner has requested that its exemption be renewed so that it may continue its practice of monitoring the hours of service (HOS) of its drivers by means of GPS technology and complementary computer programs. Werner proposes in this application that the terms and conditions of the current exemption remain in place for a second two-year period. The FMCSA believes that with the terms and conditions in place, Werner will maintain a level of safety that is equivalent to, or greater than, the level of safety that would be obtained by complying with the requirement for a written RODS.

DATES: This decision is effective September 7, 2006. Comments must be received on or before October 10, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments to the DOT Docket Management System (DMS), referencing Docket Number FMCSA-2003-15818, using any of the following methods:

- Web Site: <http://dmses.dot.gov>.

Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.

- Fax: 1-202-493-2251.
- Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

- Hand Delivery: Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building,

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

September 24, 2008

Mr. Mark Epstein, Department Head
Resource Protection and Review
Ohio Historic Preservation Office
567 East Hudson Street
Columbus, Ohio 43211

Attn: Nancy Campbell, ODOT Review Manager, History/Architecture
Thomas Grooms, ODOT Review Manager, Archaeology

Re: CUY-IR71/90 PID: 77510

Section 106 Assessment of Effects for the Feasible Alternatives

Dear Mr. Epstein:

The purpose of the enclosed report, *CUY-IR71/90 PID: 77510 Section 106 Assessment of Effects for the Feasible Alternatives, September 2008*, is to identify the effects of the feasible alternatives on historic properties located within the Area of Potential Effects. Upon the identification of the preferred alternative, ODOT intends to make a de minimis Section 4(f) impact finding based on the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OSHP) concurrence with findings of "no adverse effect" in accordance with Section 6009(a) of the 2005 SAFETEA-LU highway program re-authorization.

We would appreciate the return of this letter, signed to indicate that you do not object to ODOT/OES cultural resources findings as presented by the enclosed report. If no response is received within 30 days, in accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's current regulation under 36 CFR Part 800.3(c)(4), it will be presumed that the State Historic Preservation Officer agrees with the determination made in the above coordination.

Respectfully,

Timothy M. Hill
Administrator
Office of Environmental Services

Ohio State Historic Preservation Office Concurrence:

Date

TMH:sg
Enclosure

c: FHWA, w/att.; Consulting Parties, w/att.; ODOT-District 12, w/att.; file, w/att.
Reading file

CUY-IR71/90 PID 77510

SECTION 106 ASSESSMENTS OF EFFECTS FOR THE FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES



Prepared by:
The Ohio Department of Transportation
1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223

September 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Page 1
INTRODUCTION - Page 2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION - Page 2
DESCRIPTION OF GEOGRAPHICAL SECTIONS OF UNDERTAKING - Pages 2-3
AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS (APE) - Page 3
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT - Page 3
SUMMARY OF SECTION 106 CONSULTATION 2006-2008 - Pages 3-4
CRITERION OF EFFECT - Page 5
PHASED APPLICATION OF CRITERION OF EFFECT - Pages 5-6
ASSESSING EFFECTS ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES WITHIN APE - Pages 6-17
ARCHEOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS - Page 17
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS - Pages 18-19
PROPOSED TREATMENT PLANS FOR ADVERSE EFFECTS - Page 20

FIGURES

Figure 1	Map of Geographic Areas of Corridor
Figure 2	Area of Potential Effects (APE) map illustrating location of historic properties
Figure 3	Documentation of the Section 106 consultation process 2006-2008 - CD Rom
Figure 4	Aerial maps illustrating historic properties with historic boundary descriptions
Figure 5	OSHPO concurrence (July 10, 2008) Section 106 NR Boundaries for history architecture properties potentially effected by the feasible alternatives

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AASHTO Practitioner's Handbook, Consulting Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 06, February 2007

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Federal Register Vol. 65, No. 239. Washington, D.C. 2000.

Hardlines Design Company, Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Cleveland Innerbelt, CUY-Innerbelt (PID NO. 77510) Cleveland, Cuyahoga, Ohio. 2006.

Gray & Pape Inc. Phase I History/Architecture Survey Addendum for the Cleveland Innerbelt Project (CUY-Innerbelt, PID 77510), Cuyahoga County, Ohio. 2007.

Gray & Pape Inc. Phase II History/Architecture Survey for the Cleveland Innerbelt Project (CUY-Innerbelt, PID#77510), Cuyahoga County, Ohio. 2006.

ODOT, Cleveland Innerbelt: Conceptual Alternatives Project File. July 2006.

ODOT. Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Cleveland Innerbelt Project, CUY-90-Innerbelt, PID No. 77510. 2008

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Tremont Historic District. Cleveland, Ohio. 1994.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Cedar Apartments, Cedar-Central Apartments, United States Housing Authority Project No./H-1001. Cleveland, Ohio. 1971.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Superior Avenue Historic District. Cleveland, Ohio. 2007.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Loraine-Carnegie Bridge. Cleveland, Ohio. 1976.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Upper Prospect Multiple Resource Area. Cleveland, Ohio. 1984.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: National Town and Country/Fenn Tower. Cleveland, Ohio. 2003.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Samuel Mather Mansion/University Hall. Cleveland, Ohio. 1972.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Pilgrim Congregational Church. Cleveland, Ohio. 1976.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Charles Olney House and Gallery. Cleveland, Ohio. 1988.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Trinity Episcopal Cathedral, Cleveland, Ohio. 1973.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Zion Lutheran Church. Cleveland, Ohio. 1984.

US Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Zion Lutheran School. Cleveland, Ohio. 1984.

Introduction

The purpose of the subject report is to identify the effects of the feasible alternatives, Central Viaduct, Northern Bridge Alignment and the Central Viaduct, Southern Bridge Alignment, on historic properties located within the Area of Potential Effects (APE).

Project Description

The proposed roadway improvement commonly referred to as the Cleveland Inner Belt (CIB), will improve traffic flow and safety by reconstructing portions of the interstate highway system in the City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. The Innerbelt refers to the actual interstate roadway that is the central focus of the study which begins at I-71 and West 25th Street and proceeds north along I-71 past the merger with SR 176 (Jennings Freeway) to the I-71/I-90/I-490 interchange. From this interchange the Innerbelt proceeds north along I-90, over the Central Viaduct Bridge, which carries the traffic over the Cuyahoga River. From the Central Viaduct, the Innerbelt (I-90) continues north along the eastern edge of downtown Cleveland in a depressed section of freeway (Innerbelt Trench), through the Innerbelt Curve to where it merges with SR 2 (The Shoreway). At the end of the Innerbelt, I-90 continues to the east through Cleveland and on to Lake County.

Description of Geographical Sections of Undertaking

The Innerbelt has a number of logical break points that were used to divide the project into sections to facilitate the development and evaluation of alternatives. Refer to Figure 1 for project location map illustrating the geographical sections of the undertaking. The geographical sections from north to south are: Innerbelt Curve, Innerbelt Trench, Central Viaduct and Central Interchange, and Southern Innerbelt, and I-77 Access (from the Central Interchange to south of the I-77/I-490 interchange).

The Innerbelt Curve section is the northern terminus and is north of the Innerbelt Trench section. The Innerbelt Curve is in an urban neighborhood of mixed land uses east of the City of Cleveland Central Business District. The area around the Innerbelt Curve is mixed commercial and residential. North of the Innerbelt Curve is the Cleveland Lakefront and the Burke Lakefront Airport. To the east is an industrial and commercial area just south of I-90 that contains larger manufacturers and wholesale distributors. There are a number of residential clusters throughout this area. Vacant rail yards and outdoor storage is located to the west.

The Innerbelt Trench section lies between the Innerbelt Curve section and the Central Viaduct and the Central Interchange section. The Innerbelt Trench section consists of I-90 from approximately East 22nd Street, through the Carnegie Curve, and to Superior Avenue. This section of I-90 is trenched: the freeway is depressed and bordered by walls or slopes on both sides with the adjacent streets and surrounding neighborhoods on an elevation above the freeway. The Innerbelt Trench forms the eastern boundary for the City of Cleveland Central Business District. The area around the Innerbelt Trench is mixed use and predominantly commercial on both sides with offices, retail, business services, storage and light manufacturing.

The Central Viaduct and the Central Interchange section is located south of the Innerbelt Trench section, north of the Southern Innerbelt section, and west of the I-77 Access section. This section stretches from the southern edge of the City of Cleveland's Central Business District and is bounded by an urban setting of commercial, recreational/entertainment, and institutional land uses. Land use under the bridge consists of commercial use along the valley edge, sand and gravel storage and transshipment activities near the river.

The **Southern Innerbelt** section is south of the Central Interchange and Central Viaduct section. It consists of I-71 from just north of the Fulton Road/West 25th Street to just north of the I-71/I-90/I-490 interchange. This section is in an older urban residential and mixed use neighborhood. At the SR

176 (Jennings Freeway) merge with I-71, the freeway sits on top of a bluff west of the Cuyahoga River Valley. A modern retail and commercial development is located immediately to the east and below I-71. Further to the east are the Cuyahoga River and an active steel mill. To the west of I-71 is a hospital and to the south a cemetery.

The **I-77 Access** section is east of the Central Interchange. This section consists of I-77 from approximately the Broadway ramps to East 22nd Street, at the Central Interchange. For the length of this section, the freeway is elevated on fill and structure above the adjacent streets and surrounding neighborhoods. The area between IR-490 and East 22nd Street features commercial development and food industries. The area between Broadway and IR-490 features steel industries and residences.

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

The APE was established to incorporate an area large enough to encompass the feasible alternatives under consideration. *Figure 2* features the APE map and a table that lists the historic properties within the APE by address and NR status. Upon identification of the preferred alternative, ODOT will consult with the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OSHP) and other Section 106 consulting parties to identify the revised APE for the undertaking. At that time, it will be determined whether additional identification efforts are warranted. Any additional identification efforts will be submitted to the OSHP and other Section 106 consulting parties concurrently for review and comment. Comments received by ODOT will be forwarded to the FHWA and the OSHP.

Public Involvement

The overall project public involvement activities include: public meetings, charrettes, community workshops, newsletters, community stakeholder meetings, small neighborhood meetings, and an inter-active information website (www.innerbelt.org). A Design and Aesthetics Subcommittee was also assembled for the project. Documentation of the public involvement process conducted in conjunction with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process may be found in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Summary of Section 106 Consultation

Documentation of the Section 106 Consultation Process conducted thus far for the undertaking is included in *Figure 3, Documentation of the Section 106 Consultation Process 2006-2008* and summarized below.

May 8, 2006 - As a result of the NEPA public involvement activities referenced above, a list of potential Section 106 Consulting Parties was compiled. On May 8, 2006, ODOT sent an invitation to the identified potential Section 106 Consulting Parties to attend a Section 106 Kickoff Meeting. The invitation included the APE map and a Section 106 Consulting Party Application form.

May 24, 2006 - A Section 106 Consulting Party meeting was held at the NOACA Boardroom in Cleveland. A presentation was made by FHWA which included an overview of the Section 106 process. The roles and responsibilities of the agencies, and the Section 106 Consulting Parties were discussed.

June 22, 2006 - A revised APE map was sent to the Section 106 Consulting Parties as requested at the May 24, 2006 Section 106 Consulting Party meeting.

July 17, 2006 - A letter was sent to the Section 106 Consulting Parties with a copy of the Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for review and comment.

August 17, 2006 - Invitations were sent to the Section 106 Consulting Parties to attend the September 6, 2006 Section 106 Consultation meeting. An invitation to participate in a tour of the study area was also extended. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and respond to the Section 106 Consulting Party comments on the APE and the Phase I Cultural Resources report.

September 6, 2006 - A Section 106 Consultation meeting was held at the NOACA Boardroom in Cleveland at 9:00 A.M. A tour of the project area followed.

September 21, 2006 - The OSHP responded to the May 30, 2006 submission by ODOT regarding the *Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Cleveland Innerbelt, CUY-Innerbelt (PID No. 77510), Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio*.

January 19, 2007 - ODOT District 12 sent a copy of the *Phase II History/Architecture Survey for the Cleveland Innerbelt Project (CUY-Innerbelt, PID# 77510), Cuyahoga County, Ohio*, dated December 31, 2006, to the Section 106 Consulting Parties for review. An invitation to the February 22, 2007 Section 106 Consulting meeting was included in the correspondence.

February 12, 2007 - ODOT-OES requested OSHP concurrence with ODOT's NRHP eligibility recommendations as a result of the Phase I and Phase II surveys.

February 22, 2007 - The Section 106 Consultation meeting was held at the NOACA Board Room in Cleveland.

March 16, 2007 - A revised submission (superseded the February 12, 2007 submission) was made to the OSHP requesting concurrence with eligibility of resources as a result of the Phase I and Phase II surveys and Section 106 Consulting Party comments.

April 2, 2007 - The OSHP responded to the March 16, 2007 submission.

July 20, 2007 - The OSHP concurred none of the history architecture properties located within the expanded APE were eligible for inclusion on the NRHP as a result of the survey entitled, *Phase I History/Architecture Survey Addendum for the Cleveland Innerbelt Project (CUY-Innerbelt, PID 77510), Cuyahoga County, Ohio*, dated June 15, 2007.

July 2, 2008 - On July 2, 2008, a submission was made to the OSHP requesting concurrence with National Register (NR) boundaries for the historic architectural properties potentially affected by the feasible alternatives. The NR boundaries were based on: 1) collaboration with the OSHP; 2) existing NR nomination forms and determinations by the OSHP and the Keeper of the NR; 3) the significance of the resource; and 4) the existing parcel boundaries, landscape features, and modern development.

July 10, 2008 - The OSHP concurred with the boundary clarifications submitted on July 2, 2008.