Ohio Department of Transportation

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENT

Part I - General Project Identification, Description, and Design Information

Sponsor of the Project: City of Cleveland
Local Name of the Facility: CUY-6-12.20 Lakefront West (West Shoreway)

Program: TRAC
Funding Source: X Federal X State X Local

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Limits of Proposed Work:
Start: 12.20 / W. Shoreway/Lake Int End: 14.49 / W. Shoreway/W. 25th
Total Work Length: 3.685 km or (2.29 mi).

Is an Interchange Modification Study / Interchange Justification Study (IMS/IJS) required?
Yes* No
If yes, when did FHWA grant a conditional approval for this project? Date:

The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the City of Cleveland have developed a strategy that maximizes the effectiveness of the available project budget and accommodates anticipated traffic volumes, while preserving the goals of the “Connecting Cleveland: The Waterfront District Plan.” The scope of improvements for the project will provide new and improved access to the West Shoreway (US-6) and Lakefront. The project has been divided into Phase I and Phase II in response to financial constraints. Specifically, the Lakefront West project proposes the following improvements to the West Shoreway corridor:

At the West Boulevard/Lake Avenue/Clifton Boulevard area (Phases I & II)
– Reconfigure the intersection of West Boulevard and Lake Avenue to calm traffic and improve pedestrian safety (Phase I).
– Close the Edgewater Drive ramp and replace it with expanded parkland (Phase I).
– Add a supplemental multi-purpose trail adjacent to the Shoreway from West Boulevard to Edgewater Park. This multi-purpose trail is located along the Shoreway in lieu of a sidewalk (Phase II).

At West 76th Street (Phase I)
– Provide a multipurpose trail along the south side of the Shoreway to connect the existing Shoreway tunnel with the new park access at West 73rd Street and the existing West 65th Street tunnel.
– Improve the connection to the beach and multi-purpose trail with new steps and a ramp between the underpasses to accommodate strollers and wheelchairs.

At West 73rd Street (Phase I)
– Relocate a regional sanitary interceptor sewer currently located adjacent to the Norfolk Southern (NS) railroad tracks.
– Extend West 73rd Street by building a new bridge under the NS railroad tracks.
– Construct a new two-way road along the south side of the Shoreway between the extended West 73rd Street and Edgewater Park. This road will link with the existing ramps at Edgewater Park to provide full access to lower Edgewater Park and the Shoreway (the existing Edgewater Park bridge will remain).
– Build a multi-purpose trail alongside the road to connect the Detroit-Shoreway neighborhood with Edgewater Park

Continued on page 1a.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: continued

At West 65th Street (Phase I)
– Connect the existing multi-purpose trail to the new multipurpose trail.

At Division Avenue (Phase I or Phase II – based on available funding)
– Construct a new at-grade intersection (right-in/right-out access).

At West 54th Street (Phase I or Phase II – based on available funding)
– Construct a new at-grade intersection (right-in/right-out access). This work results in a cul-de-sac for Cass Avenue and removes the unused Cass Avenue pavement.

At West 49th Street/Herman Avenue (Phase I)
– Re-stripe the existing bridge to permit one lane of traffic in each direction. A two-way multipurpose trail will be provided and the sidewalks will remain. The existing decorative enhancements will remain.
– Close the entrance to the Cleveland Water Division plant, and simplify the exit from/entrance to the Shoreway

At West 45th Street (Phase I)
– Simplify the right-in/right-out access to the Shoreway.
– Construct a cul-de-sac at Tillman Avenue, making Tillman Avenue a two-way street entering and exiting on West 49th Street. Unneeded pavement will be removed.

At West 28th Street and West 25th Street (Phase I)
– Close permanently the eastbound entrance ramp (from West 28th Street to the Main Avenue Bridge). The relocated access to the Shoreway eastbound for these drivers will be at the improved West 45th Street entrance.
– Remove the West Shoreway exit/entrance ramps at West 25th Street, relocating the access to West 28th Street. Widen the intersection of Detroit Avenue and West 28th Street to accommodate the traffic. The abandoned ramps between West 28th Street and West 25th Street will be filled in (subject to utility requirements) and made available for development.
– Reconfigure the intersection of West 25th Street/Main movement for Main Avenue/West 25th Street traffic.
– Simplify the intersection of West 25th Street and Detroit Avenue.
– Widen Detroit Avenue between West 28th Street and West 25th Street, and widen West 28th Street to accommodate the new traffic plan. Traffic will be restricted northbound on West 28th to one-way between the ramps and Washington.

The project also consists of constructing a multi-purpose trail (Cleveland Lakefront Bikeway) from West 25th Street to West 65th Street during Phase I of the project.

Reconstruction of the US 6 West Shoreway pavement by reconfiguring the roadway to reflect a 35 mph speed limit, adding a landscaped median and removing the shoulders will be completed during Phase II of the project. US 6 will remain a six-lane roadway.

One of the purposes of the Lakefront West Project is to provide better access to Lake Erie because the West Shoreway and NS Railroad are currently barriers between the residential community and the Lake. The pedestrian tunnels that exist under the West Shoreway were identified as important community connections to the lakefront that needed to be maintained with the project and upgraded. Improvements to the tunnels were included in the scope of the Lakefront West Project. The proposed improvement to the tunnels included concrete patching, concrete painting, and upgrade lighting. The West 76th Street tunnel work will also replace and upgrade steps located between NS Railroad and the West Shoreway, and provide a new ADA-compliant ramp adjacent to the steps. The Lake Avenue tunnel work will replace the adjacent steps on the south side of the West Shoreway with an ADA-compliant ramp. The Lakefront West Project was presented at a public meeting on December 11, 2008 as being split into separate construction projects to expedite construction and address funding concerns. The proposed Lakefront West project improvements and separation of construction projects concept was approved by the City of Cleveland Planning Commission on January 9, 2009. On April 8, 2009, ODOT updated ELLIS to create five separate construction projects. This would assist in management, construction, timing, and funding the project. Four of the five projects are covered in the environmental document being prepared under PID 77330, however, ODOT also determined that the subject tunnel improvements, CUY-6.12.26112.66 (PID 86478), have independent utility from the other four projects (PID 86479, 86480, 86481 and 86482). The improvement to the tunnels is independent of the rest of the Lakefront West Project because it does not have any impact on vehicular or railroad traffic, is maintenance of an existing system on existing location, and could be done without precluding the work on the remainder of the West Shoreway.

The tunnels are strictly for pedestrian and bicycle use. Motorized vehicles are not allowed currently nor will they be allowed in the tunnels, therefore, there will be no impact on the existing or proposed roadway traffic. The work will be done with no interruption to railroad traffic. The existing connection points between the local street system and Edgewater Park will remain; therefore, there is no change in use anticipated. The tunnels will not be shifted. Minor repairs (patching) will be done to the existing structures, and the lighting will be upgraded. Finally, the tunnel improvements can be completed to provide improved safety and pedestrian access to the lakefront without any of the other Lakefront West Project improvements that are proposed. In addition, the tunnel improvement will not preclude any of the other Lakefront West Project improvements from being made in the future. ODOT then prepared the April 14, 2009 Categorical Exclusion Level 1 for CUY-6.12.26112.66 (PID 86478) referencing the environmental coordination from the Lakefront West Project.

See project location mapping in Appendix A.
PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

The purpose of the Lakefront West Project is the development of transportation infrastructure that supports initiatives in the City of Cleveland for local economic development and improved recreational opportunities by increasing both access and mobility to and across the West Shoreway.

A copy of the Purpose and Need Statement and the FHWA approval correspondence is included in Appendix B.

ALTERNATIVES:

A comprehensive alternatives analysis was performed for the project from March 2006 through December 2008 involving the project subcommittee, ODOT, and the City of Cleveland. The alternatives evaluated included the “Corridor No Build Option” and “Corridor Boulevard Option”. Within the “Corridor Boulevard Option”, numerous options including a “No Build Option” were analyzed for each of the following access points:

- Lake Avenue/West Boulevard/Clifton Boulevard (9 options)
- West 73rd Street (5 options)
- West 65th Street (6 options)
- Edgewater Park (7 options)
- Division Avenue/West 54th Street (5 options)
- West 49th Street/West 45th Street (4 options)
- West 28th Street/West 25th Street (16 options)

The preferred alternative was approved in January 2009. See Appendix C for a detailed Alternatives Analysis as well as discussion of the selection of the preferred alternative.

The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible, prudent or practicable (Mark all that apply):

- It would not correct existing capacity deficiencies; [X]
- It would not correct existing safety hazards; [X]
- It would not correct the existing roadway geometric deficiencies; [X]
- It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems, or [X]
- It would result in serious impacts to the motoring public and general welfare of the economy.
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ROADWAY CHARACTER: *(East of Lake/East of 45th)

Functional Classification: Existing – Urban Other Freeway and Expressway/Proposed - Urban Principal Arterial
Current ADT: 39,700/42,000 vpd 20(06) Design Year ADT: 39,000/42,700 vpd (2010)
DHV: 5,070/5,551 Trucks, 2/10 %
Designed Speed: Ex55/Pr40 mph

Number of Lanes: Existing 6 Proposed 6
Type of Lanes:
Pavement Width: 66± ft. 68 ft.
Shoulder Width: 6± ft. 1 ft.
Median Width: 10 ft. Varies: 3–17.5 ft.
Sidewalk Width: N/A ft. Path 10 ft.

Setting:
Topography:

X Urban
Level
Suburban
Rolling
Rural

DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-6-1224 (West Shoreway over Ramp from Lake/West Blvd to EB West Shoreway)

Structure File Number(s): 1800698 Sufficiency Rating: 74.5 fo

Existing Proposed
Bridge Type: Steel/Beam/Simple Span TBD
Number of Spans: 1 TBD
Weight Restrictions: 36 ton TBD ton
Height Restrictions: 14.0 ft. TBD ft.
Curb to Curb Width: 76± ft. TBD ft.
Shoulder Width: N/A ft. TBD ft.
Under Clearance: 24± ft. TBD ft.

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? X
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? X

DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-6-1226 (West Shoreway over Pedestrian Tunnel near Lake/Clifton)

Structure File Number(s): 1800728 Sufficiency Rating: 80.8*

Existing Proposed
Bridge Type: Cast in Place Reinforced Concrete Box, Ped Underpass Cast in Place Reinforced Concrete Box, Ped Underpass
Number of Spans: 1 (15± Clear) 1 (15± Clear)
Weight Restrictions: 36 ton 36 ton
Height Restrictions: N/A ft. N/A ft.
Curb to Curb Width: 95± ft. 95± ft.
Shoulder Width: N/A ft. N/A ft.
Under Clearance: 10±(Ped) ft. 10±(Ped) ft.

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? X
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? X
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DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: Norfolk Southern over Pedestrian Tunnel at West 76th Street

Structure File Number(s): None       Sufficiency Rating: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Type:</td>
<td>Concrete Box, Pedestrian Underpass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>1 (10'± Clear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>N/A ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>272'± ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Clearance:</td>
<td>9'± ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? X
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? X

DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-6-1266 (West Shoreway over Pedestrian Tunnel at West 76th Street)

Structure File Number(s): 1800752       Sufficiency Rating: 70.0*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Type:</td>
<td>Cast in Place Reinforced Concrete Box, Pedestrian Underpass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>1 (10'± Clear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>36 ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>243'± ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Clearance:</td>
<td>8'± ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? X
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? X
## DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-West 73rd Street under Norfolk Southern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure File Number(s):</th>
<th>TBD – New Structure</th>
<th>Sufficiency Rating:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Type:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Clearance:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? [ ] Y [ ] N
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? [ ]

## DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-6-1300 (West Shoreway over Edgewater Park Ramps)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure File Number(s):</th>
<th>1800787</th>
<th>Sufficiency Rating:</th>
<th>84.2 fo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Type:</td>
<td>Concrete/Frame/Simple Span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>1 (66'± F/F Abutments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>36 ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>13.8'± ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>46.75'± ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>Varies ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Clearance:</td>
<td>13.8'± ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? [ ] Y [ ] N
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? [ ]
### DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-6-1335 (Norfolk Southern over West Shoreway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure File Number(s):</th>
<th>1800817</th>
<th>Sufficiency Rating:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Steel/Girder/Deck</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Steel/Girder/Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>72 ton</td>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>72 ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>52.3+ ft.</td>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>52.3+ ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? Yes [X]
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? Yes [X]

### DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-6-1373 (Herman Avenue/West 49th Street over West Shoreway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure File Number(s):</th>
<th>1800841</th>
<th>Sufficiency Rating:</th>
<th>73.5 fo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Steel/Beam/Continuous</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Steel/Beam/Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>27 ton</td>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>27 ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>13.8/14.6 ft.</td>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>13.8/14.6 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? Yes [X]
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? Yes [X]

### DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-6-1433 West 28th Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure File Number(s):</th>
<th>1800876</th>
<th>Sufficiency Rating:</th>
<th>78.5 fo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Concrete/Frame/Continuous</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>None - Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>27 ton</td>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>50± ft.</td>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? Yes [X]
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed? Yes [X]
**DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES: CUY-2-1441 (Main Avenue Bridge)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Type:</td>
<td>Steel/Girder/Deck Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td>Steel/Girder/Deck Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Main/30 Appr</td>
<td>Steel/Truss/Deck Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>10 Main/30 Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 ton</td>
<td>27 ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>70/82 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
<td>70/82 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Clearance:</td>
<td>Varies ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies ft.</td>
<td>Varies ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?  
Y  N  
X

If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed?  
Y  N  
X
**MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC DURING CONSTRUCTION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a temporary bridge proposed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a temporary roadway proposed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the project involve the use of a detour or require a ramp closure?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions will be made for access by local traffic and so posted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions will be made for through-traffic dependent businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions will be made to accommodate any local special events or festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed MOT substantially change the environmental consequences of the action?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there substantial controversy associated with the proposed method for MOT?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
Per the project Scope of Services (SOS), maintenance of traffic concepts are to address the Permitted Lane Closure Times as depicted on the Permitted Lane Closure Map (PLCM). Currently, a PLCM is not yet available for the West Shoreway. However, in the absence of the appropriate map, the District has provided the following times:

**SCHEDULE OF THROUGH LANES TO BE MAINTAINED FOR SR 2/USR 6/20, WEST SHOREWAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>WEEKDAYS</th>
<th>WEEKENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 lane closed</td>
<td>2 lanes closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10am-7am (21 hrs)</td>
<td>10am-7am (21 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Fri. 10am-Mon. 7am</td>
<td>Fri. 10am-Mon. 7am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Fri. 6pm-Mon. 3pm</td>
<td>Fri. 8pm - Mon. 3pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering:</th>
<th>$ Approx. $7.7 M</th>
<th>Right-of-Way:</th>
<th>$ TBD</th>
<th>Construction:</th>
<th>$ 64,800,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Anticipated Start Date of Construction:**

**RIGHT OF WAY AND UTILITY INVOLVEMENT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of parcels to be affected for temporary ROW:</th>
<th>Exact Impacts TBD - Approx. 198 Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels to be affected for permanent ROW:</td>
<td>Exact Impacts TBD – Approx. 110 Parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate area of temporary right-of-way needed:</td>
<td>Approx. 31 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate area of permanent right-of-way needed:</td>
<td>Approx. 7 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Utility Coordination been completed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are large scale transmission facilities located within the project area?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any private utility easements within the project area?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, will it be impacted by the project?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
Only preliminary ROW impacts have been determined.
Utility Coordination was initiated in December with the submission of the Preliminary Engineering Study. Additional utility coordination will occur with the detailed design of the 4 projects.

Known conflicts existing within the area of West 73rd Street, including an 84” interceptor sewer that will need relocated and OH facilities that will be affected during construction. The interceptor sewer is being modeled currently to determine feasibility of permanent relocation.
**MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC DURING CONSTRUCTION:**

**Remarks:**

Additionally, the District maintains applicable notes within the Permitted Lane Closure Times that further restrict lane closures. Revision #5 specifically states that lanes closures are not permitted during noted holidays and special events that may generate a high volume of traffic. These limitations indicate that 3 lanes of traffic are to be provided during peak travel times.

The District has separately issued Queue Calculations demonstrating that maintaining two lanes in each direction will meet Traffic Management in Work Zones Interstates and other freeways, Policy No.: 516-003(P).

The preliminary investigation of the permitted lane closure requirements for the project entails either a part-width or crossover scheme for Maintenance of Traffic. A full detour, runaround, or signalized scheme would violate the lane requirements.

Horizontal clearances were examined at each structure along the mainline. Structure CUY-6-1270, West Shoreway over the eastbound West Boulevard ramp, does not have sufficient width. It is to be widened to accommodate the proposed section. Mainline structure CUY-6-1300 at Edgewater Park does not exhibit a restriction. The others are overhead structures and are the Norfolk-Southern Railroad bridge, CUY-6-1335, and the West 49th Street bridge, CUY-6-1373. These two structures are to remain and will not be reconstructed.

**Alternative 2 – Contra-flow**

Alternative 2 operates as a Contra-Flow scheme consisting of three construction phases. Each phase maintains 2 lanes of travel in each direction at all times.

The estimated cost of Alternative 2 is approximately $1.7M.

**Phase I**

This phase provides two lanes in each direction. Both westbound traffic lanes are maintained to the outside edge of the westbound side. One lane of eastbound traffic is maintained as a contra-flow lane along the median edge of westbound traffic via crossover. The other eastbound lane is maintained along the median edge of eastbound pavement.

All travel lanes on the westbound pavement are provided with 11-foot widths. The lane on the eastbound pavement is 10 feet wide. A 6-foot width is provided for the portable concrete barrier and barrier offset between the eastbound and westbound travel lanes on the westbound side. A 3-foot width is provided for the portable concrete barrier and barrier offset adjacent to the work zone on the eastbound side. The work zone provided has a minimum width of 29.6 feet from the outside eastbound edge.

All work to, or removals of, egress and ingress points and intersection work to the south of the project are to be constructed during this phase.

**Phase II**

Both eastbound travel lanes are maintained to the outside edge of the eastbound side on the pavement constructed during Phase I. One lane of westbound traffic is maintained along the median edge of westbound traffic. The other westbound lane is maintained as a contra-flow lane along the median edge of eastbound pavement via crossover.

Both eastbound travel lanes are provided with 10-foot widths. The westbound lane on the westbound side also has a 10-foot width. The westbound contra-flow lane is 11 feet wide. A 3-foot width is provided for the portable concrete barrier and barrier offset between the eastbound and westbound travel lanes on the eastbound side. A 3-foot width is provided for the portable concrete barrier and barrier offset adjacent to the work zone on the westbound side. The work zone provided has a minimum width of 29.9 feet from the outside westbound edge.

All work to, or removals of, egress and ingress points and intersection work to the north of the project are to be constructed during this phase.
Phase III

Construction during Phase III consists of the proposed median as well as both westbound and eastbound pavement adjacent to the median. The two westbound lanes are maintained to the outside of the westbound pavement constructed during Phase II. The two eastbound lanes are maintained to the outside of the eastbound pavement constructed during Phase I.

All four travel lanes are provided as 10 feet wide. A 3-foot width is provided for the portable concrete barriers and barrier offsets. The work zone is a minimum 32 feet wide.

Prior to this phase, intersection areas accessing the mainline should have been completed. All remaining median and intersection work is to be completed during this phase. This work is expected to include reconfiguring access at West 28th and West 25th streets. With median work being conducted, movements through these intersections are restricted. Traffic through the intersections from the south is restricted to eastbound movements. Likewise, traffic accessing from the north is restricted to westbound movements.

(Ramp access exists at West Boulevard, Edgewater Park, West 49th Street, West 45th Street, West 28th Street, and West 25th Street via interstate style ramps, as depicted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Access Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.49th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.45th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.25th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ramps at West 28th Street are to be reconfigured. All other ramps are to be removed. Access at the Clifton Boulevard/Lake Avenue intersection is to be maintained. Proposed access from the south will include intersections at West 73rd, West 54th, West 45th, and West 28th Streets. Proposed access from the north includes intersections at a relocated Edgewater Park entrance, Division Avenue, and West 28th Street.

At this time, it is anticipated that cross road traffic at Lake Avenue and West 25th Street can be maintained. Some short-term closures or detours may be necessary to complete structure work as design proceeds. Through traffic along West 28th Street will need to be detoured to West 25th Street during reconstruction of the West 28th Street Bridge and ramps.

Pavement for Maintaining Traffic

Temporary pavement will be used primarily for the mainline median crossover east of the project. As detailed design proceeds, it may be determined that additional temporary pavement will be needed for maintaining access.

Maintenance of Pedestrian Traffic

The project includes several points of pedestrian crossing. The following is a brief discussion of the maintenance of pedestrian traffic.

Near the west project limit, there is pedestrian access through a tunnel to Edgewater Park. It is integrated with the mainline structure over the eastbound West Boulevard ramp. The pedestrian tunnel is to be removed and pedestrian traffic will not be maintained. The pedestrian traffic will, however, be redirected west along Lake Avenue to the West Boulevard park entrance.

Another pedestrian tunnel entering the park exists near the northern terminus of West 76th Street. The pedestrian
tunnel will receive several enhancements including lighting, new stairs, and ADA ramp access. However, this structure itself is not to be reconstructed. Pedestrian traffic will be detoured to West 65th Street pedestrian tunnel while repairs are being done on this tunnel.

A third pedestrian tunnel resides at the north end of West 65th Street and connects with the main Edgewater Park entrance. In recent years, another project included improvements to this tunnel and multi-use path. No work is proposed for this structure and it will remain open to traffic during construction. When removing the Edgewater Park mainline ramps, pedestrian access through the work zone will be maintained.

The project includes connections with several crossroads and Detroit Avenue. As construction occurs at each location, pedestrian traffic along the walks should be detoured to the opposite side of the street to be maintained. If any location cannot permit this, a protected corridor should be provided along the edge of pavement within the street or a pedestrian detour shall be in place.

Temporary impacts are proposed at the Edgewater Park ramps (during the construction of West 73rd), at West 28th and West 25th Streets (during the relocation/reconfiguration of the ramps), and West 49th and West 45th Streets (during their reconfiguration). Impacts due to lane and ramp closures and restrictions will require increased service times for school, police, fire/emergency medical services. ODOT will notify the City of Cleveland, Emergency Services, ODNR, and Cleveland Board of Education prior to each phase of construction. Detours, if necessary, will be coordinated with the City of Cleveland, Emergency Services, ODNR, and Cleveland Board of Education during design development. Additional notifications may include newspaper announcements and public service announcements for a week prior. Included in each notification will be the projected dates and time frames of ramp and lane closures, lane restrictions, and proposed detour routes.

While the project will reconfigure the W. 25th St./W.28th St. ramps, locate a cul-de-sac on Tillman Avenue at West 45th Street, and reconfigure the ramps at the Edgewater Drive/West Boulevard/Lake Avenue intersections, it is anticipated that no local businesses will need special access provisions.

Additional public involvement for MOT will be determined during the detailed design process on a project to project basis.
## Part II – Identification and Evaluation of Impacts of the Proposed Action

### SECTION A – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Streams, Rivers & Watercourses**

- National Scenic River
- State Wild, Scenic or Recreational River
  - Commercial
  - Non-Commercial
- OEPA Aquatic Life Use Designation (eg. WWH)

Remarks: Based on a review of available mapping and a field review conducted in May 2006 by Baker personnel, the Cuyahoga River is located within the project area. The portion of the Cuyahoga River located within the study area is a unique segment identified as the Cuyahoga River ship channel. No impacts to the Cuyahoga River are proposed as part of the West Shoreway project.

According to the Ohio Department of Natural Areas and Preserves, there are no existing or proposed state nature preserves or scenic rivers at the project site and they are unaware of any geologic features, breeding or non-breeding animal concentrations or state parks, forests or wildlife areas in the project vicinity.

Initial ecological coordination for the project was conducted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) on March 20, 2007. Preliminary project plans did not include impacts to aquatic resources; however, over the course of the project and upon the discovery of an additional wetland, impacts to wetlands totaling 0.22 acre were determined. Therefore, the ODNR and USFWS re-evaluated the project and provided comments on February 18, 2010 and February 23, 2010. ODNR and USFWS agency correspondence is included in Appendix D. Agency coordination with the USACE will be included at a later date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Surface Waters**

- Reservoirs
- Lakes
- Farm Ponds
- Detention Basins
- Storm Water Management Facilities
- Other:

Remarks: Lake Erie was identified adjacent to the north of Edgewater Park. The project is located within Ohio’s Coastal Management Area; however, no impacts are anticipated by implementation of the project. No structures will be constructed to arrest or control erosion, wave action, or inundation along Lake Erie, and no structures will encroach on the ordinary high water elevation of 573.4 feet.

The Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District wastewater treatment plant is located within the project area. This facility is also utilized to treat storm water. Storm water detention basins were not observed within the project area.

The City of Cleveland also maintains an underground water reservoir associated with the water treatment plant. The proposed project will not impact the water reservoir.

Based on the May 2006 field review and review of available USGS mapping, no other surface waters are located within the project area. Therefore, the project will not impact any other surface waters.

---

*If the resource is not present, the remainder of this subject section will not be completed.

**If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, the reason why is described under Remarks.

***Any impacts, mitigation, and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.
Presence Impacts
Y N**** Y*** N**
X X

Total wetland area impacted:

Wetlands

(If a determination has not been made for non-isolated/isolated wetlands, fill in the total wetland area impacted above.)

Non-isolated Wetland

Isolated Wetland

OEPA Wetland Category: OEPA Wetland Category:

Size of Area Impacted: Size of Area Impacted:

0.22 acre(s) acre(s)

Documentation

Y N

Wetlands

Wetland Determination

Wetland Delineation Report

Individual Wetland Finding

Improvements that will not result in any wetland impacts are not practicable because such avoidance would result in (Mark all that apply and explain):

Substantial adverse impacts to adjacent homes, business or other improved properties;

Substantially increased project costs;

Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems;

Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts, or

The project not meeting the identified needs.

USACOE Isolated Waters Determination

Mitigation Plan

Measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate wetland impacts need to be discussed in the remarks section

Remarks: A total of three wetland areas were identified within the project area in studies completed during May 2006 and November 2009. Based on the wetland delineations performed during these assessments, a total of 0.84 acres of Category 1 wetlands were identified and delineated within the study area.

Wetland 1 is an approximately 0.56 acre palustrine emergent wetland located in a depression, bound by the West Shoreway to the north, east of Father Caruso Drive. Approximately 90 percent of the herbaceous vegetation for Wetland 1 consists of common reed (Phragmites australis), soft rush (Juncus effeuses), cattail (Typha latifolia) and sedges (Carex sp.). Wetland 1 is scored as a Category 1 wetland with an ORAM score of 9 points. Impacts to Wetland 1 total 0.20 acre for the construction of a bike path adjacent to the West Shoreway.

Wetland 3 is an approximately 0.28 acre palustrine emergent wetland located in a depression, bound by the West Shoreway to the south and vacant land to the north, east, and west. Approximately 90 percent of the herbaceous vegetation for Wetland 3 consists of common reed, soft rush, cattail, and sedges. Wetland 3 is scored as a Category 1 wetland with an ORAM score of 6 points. Impacts to Wetland 3 total 0.02 acre for the construction of the Division Avenue intersection.

Continued on page 6a.

Terrestrial Habitat

Unique or High Quality

Remarks: Baker personnel identified no areas within the project limits that accommodates high quality terrestrial species or potentially serves as viable habitat during the May 2006 project field review.

The Ohio Department of Natural Areas and Preserves did not identify any areas of high quality terrestrial habitat within the project area. ODNR correspondence is included in Appendix D.

** If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe the reason why in the Remarks section.

***Any impacts, mitigation and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.

****If "no", discuss in the Remarks details how this determination was made.

Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 Date: 3/25/2010
Wetlands:

Preliminary project plans did not include impacts to the delineated wetlands; however, over the course of the project and upon the discovery of an additional wetland, impacts to wetlands totaling 0.22 acre were determined. Therefore, the ODNR and USFWS re-evaluated the project and provided comments on February 18, 2010 and February 23, 2010. ODNR and USFWS agency correspondence is included in Appendix D. A Jurisdictional Determination has been requested from the USACE. USACE agency coordination will be included at a later date.

The purpose of the Lakefront West Project is the development of transportation infrastructure that supports initiatives in the City of Cleveland for local economic development and improved recreational opportunities by increasing both access and mobility to and across the West Shoreway.

The preferred alternative at West 54th and Division Avenue includes reconfiguring West 54th Street to provide an at-grade connection, adding an intersection with Division Avenue and a multi-use path that connects the mainline multi-use path to Breakwater Avenue.

Impacts to Wetland 1 result from the construction of the multi-use path that connects the mainline multi-use path to Breakwater Avenue. Impacts to Wetland 3 result from the construction of an intersection at Division Avenue and the West Shoreway.

Alternatives evaluated for wetland avoidance included the do nothing alternative, as well as several options for the proposed improvements at West 54th Street and Division Avenue.

It was determined that the do nothing alternative was not feasible because it does not support the project meeting identified needs. Construction of the multi-use path as well as the Division Avenue intersection are necessary to:
- improve the connectivity for bikes and pedestrians,
- improve connectivity for vehicles;
- improve connectivity for trucks;
- improve parkland/greenspace; and,
- improve development potential for the area

Improvements that will not result in any wetland impacts are not practicable because such avoidance would result in the project not meeting identified needs.

Impacts to Wetland 1 were minimized to the extent practical based on engineering constraints. Additionally, topographic constraints and right-of-way impacts were considered in determining the location of the path. The placement of the multi-use path was determined to avoid the West Shoreway “clear zone”. If the path were shifted further north, it would encroach on the “clear zone” of the West Shoreway. If the multi-use path were shifted further south, additional engineering constraints would be necessary due to topography changes. Additional costs for right-of-way would be necessary due to the relocation of a residential property.

Impacts to Wetland 3 were minimized to the extent practical based on engineering constraints. Shifting of the Division Avenue intersection to the east would impact the Soap Box Derby property. Shifting of the Division Avenue intersection to the west is not feasible due to engineering constraints. Additionally shifting the intersection to the west would have a greater impact on the existing wetland.

Wetland mitigation plans will be completed upon completion of agency coordination in the next step of the project.
Ohio Department of Transportation

County: CUY
Route: 6
Section: 12.20
PID: 77330
SJN: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Threatened or Endangered Species

Within the known range of and federal species?
Federal species found in project area?
State species found in project area?
Is the project in accordance with the Letter of Agreement on Endangered Species Coordination?

Remarks:

This project is within the known range of the Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*, Endangered), the Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*, Threatened), and the Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*, Endangered).

**Indiana Bat** – Based on a field review with the USFWS and ODOT personnel on 2/6/2007, this project will impact 20 potential roost trees. Several of these trees were determined to be large isolated trees that fit the size and habitat quality of maternity roost trees, but were too isolated from each other and a woodlot to offer suitable maternity roosting habitat. Although this project meets PC1-a, ODOT has already committed to using the revised dates for Conservation Measure A-1 to minimize potential harm to the species. Based on the above discussion, this project **May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect** this species.

**Bald Eagle** – This project is not within ½ mile of known nesting activity, so this project will have **No Effect** on this species.

**Piping Plover** – This project will not impact any suitable habitat for this species; therefore the project will have **No Effect** on this species.

Continued on page 7a.

**Agency Coordination ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) concurrence letter dated March 20, 2007 determined that the project falls under the Programmatic Consultation between USFWS, FHWA, and ODOT. Portions of the project lie within a densely urban setting within Cleveland, and many of the potential roosting habitat trees would be considered isolated. This project meets the conditions listed under PC1-a, however to address USFWS’s concerns, ODOT has committed to follow seasonal cutting restrictions (conservation measure A-1, tree clearing only between September 30 and April 1) to assure that the project is not likely to adversely affect the Indiana bat. The Service concurred with ODOT’s determination that the project, as proposed, may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Indiana Bat.

Continued on page 7a.

*If the resource is not present, the remainder of this section will not be completed.

**If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, the reason why is described under Remarks.

***Any impacts, mitigation, and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.

****If “no”, discuss in the Remarks details how this determination was made.
**Ohio Department of Transportation**

County: CUY  
Route: 6  
Section: 12.20  
PID: 77330  
SJN: 

**Threatened or Endangered Species: (Continued)**

**Remarks:**

*State species:*

A review of the Department of Natural Areas and preserves Natural Heritage Database Mapping performed on January 19, 2010, based on mapping from April 29, 2009, showed the following species within one mile of the project area: Upland Sandpiper (*Bartramia longicauda*, T), Muskellunge (*Esox masquinongy*, SC), Sweintz’ Umbrella Sedge (*Cyperus schweinitzii*, PT), dotted Horsemint (*Monarda punctata*, E), Seaside Spurge (*Euphorbia polygonifolia*, PT), and Richardsons Pondweed (*Potamogeton richardsonii*, PT).

The populations represented by these records are not found within the study area, and will not be impacted by this project. No suitable habitat for the Upland Sandpiper, Muskellunge, Seaside Spurge, or Richardsons pondweed will be impacted by this project, so no impacts to these species are expected. Marginal habitat for the Schweinitz’ umbrella sedge and dotted horsemint may be found within the project area, but no individuals of these species were found during the ecological survey. No impacts to these species are expected.

In correspondence dated February 18, 2010, the ODNR, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves identified three Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*, Threatened) nests, within a one-mile radius of the project corridor. Due to the status of this species, the project is not likely to impact this species. A copy of the agency coordination is included in Appendix D.

**Agency Coordination: (Continued)**

**Remarks:**

The USFWS re-evaluated the project and provided comments on February 23, 2010. The USFWS concurred with the initial coordination dated March 20, 2007 regarding the Indiana bat. Additionally, USFWS determined that due to the project type and location, impacts to the federally endangered piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and the federal species of concern bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) are not expected.

With regards to wetlands, the USFWS recommends that projects minimize water quality impacts and impacts to high quality fish and wildlife habitat, such as wetlands. Natural buffers around wetlands should be preserved to enhance beneficial functions. The USFWS recommends mitigation activities that reduce the likelihood of invasive plant spread and encourage native plant colonization. Prevention of non-native, invasive plant establishment is critical in maintaining high quality habitats. All disturbed areas in the project vicinity should be mulched and revegetated with native plant species.

The ODNR Division of Wildlife and Division of Natural Areas and Preserves re-evaluated the project and provided comments on February 18, 2010. The ODNR, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves identified three Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*, Threatened) nests, within a one-mile radius of the project corridor.

The ODNR Division of Wildlife determined that the Natural Heritage Database has records near the project area of the peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), a state threatened species. Due to the status of this species, the project is not likely to impact this species.

Copies of the agency coordination are included in Appendix D.
### SECTION B – OTHER RESOURCES

#### Drinking Water Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Sole Source Aquifer**
- **Source Water Protection Area(s)**
- **Public Water System(s)**
- **Groundwater Source**
- **Surface Water Source**
- **Residential Well(s)**

Remarks: No drinking water resources are located within the project area based on a review of the OEPA drinking water resource maps by Baker. The project is not located within one mile of a public water system well, intake or drinking water source protection area. The nearest water intake within Lake Erie is located approximately four miles off shore. The project is not located within a sole source aquifer. A copy of the Public Water System map is included in Appendix E.

#### Flood Plains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Longitudinal Encroachment**
- **Transverse Encroachment**
- **Is the project located in a regulated floodplain?**
- **Will the proposed project result in an encroachment in the designated floodway?**
- **Will the proposed project result in an increase in the 100-year base flood elevation discharge?**
- **Does the project conform to the local flood plain standard?**

Remarks: A portion of the project area is located within FEMA flood zone B based on a review of available floodplain mapping by Baker personnel. The majority of the project is located within Zone C. Should Zone B be encroached upon during construction; floodplain coordination with the local floodplain coordinator will be conducted.

Copies of the FEMA Floodplain maps are included in Appendix F.

#### Farmland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Active Agricultural Lands**
- **Agricultural District**
- **Project in compliance with ORC 929.05(a)**
- **FPPA Project Screening Sheet**
- **Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Sheet**

Remarks: No farmlands were identified within the project area. No coordination with the Natural Resources Conservation Service is required for the project. A FPPA Screening form was approved for the project on August 3, 2006. A copy of the Farmland Screening form can be found in Appendix G.

* If the resource is not present, the remaining boxes for this subject section will not be completed. State how and who made this determination.
Ohio Department of Transportation

SECTION C – CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of Research</th>
<th>Project Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible and/or Listed Resource Present</td>
<td>No Historic Properties Affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Archaeology</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Archaeology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Architecture</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP Buildings/Sites</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP Districts</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP Bridges</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHPO / OES / FHWA Approval Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Short Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Cultural Resources Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I History/Architecture Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Archaeology Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Cultural Resources Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II History/Architecture Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Archaeology Survey Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III Archaeology Data Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation for Consultation / MOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABS / HAER Documentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:

As part of the Lakefront West (CUY-6-12.20) Project in the City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, cultural resources investigations were conducted in accordance to the ODOT Cultural Resources Manual (2004). A Phase I History/Architecture Report (Baker, 2006), a Phase II History/Architecture Report (McCormick Taylor, 2009), and an Archaeological Disturbance Assessment (ODOT, 2009) were completed and submitted to the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) for review and concurrence. The OHPO concurred with these reports on November 30, 2006, July 15, 2009, and December 31, 2009 respectively.

In the December 23, 2009 ODOT Office of Environmental Services (OES) letter to OHPO, OES made the following recommendation for the Lakefront West (CUY-6-12.20) Project in the City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio:

In accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s current regulations and in compliance with 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), a finding of “No Historic Properties Affected” is appropriate upon the following:

- There are no previously recorded archaeological sites within the project APE.
- The proposed right-of-way acquisitions parcels have varying levels of disturbances within preclude further archaeological investigation.
- There is no effect on any historic properties in the project area.
- No land from historic properties is being converted into a transportation facility.

On December 31, 2009, the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office concurred with this finding.

Copies of the ODOT correspondence and OHPO concurrence is included in Appendix H.
### SECTION D – SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks &amp; Other Recreational Land</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned park</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned recreation area</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wild &amp; Scenic River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Determination of No-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Section 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (school, state/national forest, bikeway, etc.)</td>
<td>X***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De Minimis Finding 12/28/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural &amp; Wildlife &amp; Waterfowl Refuges</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Natural Landmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Wildlife Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Natural Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Determination of No-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Section 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resources Areas</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites eligible and/or listed for the NRHP</td>
<td>X***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) Determination of No-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Section 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De Minimis Finding 12/28/2009

** Remarks:**

A Section 4(f) De Minimis was applied to the temporary use of Edgewater Park for the Lakefront West project. The de minimis impact finding is based on the degree or level of impact including any avoidance, minimization, and mitigation or enhancement measures that are included in the project to address the Section 4(f) use. The following measures will be used to minimize recreational disruption during construction:

1. The property within Edgewater Park disturbed by the proposed multiuse trail and the West 73rd Street Connection will remain as City of Cleveland property.
2. The Project will maintain traffic on the trails. However, part-width construction may reduce the width of the trails during construction.
3. Access to Edgewater Park will be maintained during the construction of the Lakefront West Project.
4. The removal of trees will be limited to what is needed to construct the new West 73rd Street Connection.
5. The disturbed areas will be seeded and mulched to stabilize the area.
6. No construction materials or equipment will be staged on the Trail.

The City of Cleveland concurred with ODOT’s findings that the project as proposed will not adversely affect, temporarily or permanently, the activities, features, and attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f). ODOT correspondence is included in Appendix I. A separate Section 4(f) de minimis document is being submitted concurrently with this CE document for FHWA approval.

** Continued on page 10a. **

** If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, the reason why is described under Remarks.**

** Any impacts, mitigation and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.**

**If “No”, discuss in the remarks section details about how this determination was made.**
Remarks:

Section 4(f):

On January 6, 2010, ODOT Office of Environmental Services (OES) made a determination of “no use” of Section 4(f) for six (6) cultural resources. ODOT correspondence is included in Appendix I. These six (6) properties include the following:

- The Main Avenue Bridge (SFN: 18000025)
- Lakeview Terrace
- The Division Avenue Pumping Station (NRHP Listed)
- Federal Knitting Mills (NRHP Listed)
- Van Rooy Coffee Company Building (NRHP Listed)
- Forest City Bank Building (NRHP Listed)
**Ohio Department of Transportation**

**SECTION E – AIR QUALITY & NOISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the project move the travel lanes closer to sensitive land uses?</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformity Status of the Project</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria pollutant in non-attainment or maintenance</td>
<td>PM 2.5 X</td>
<td>PM 10 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this project in the STIP?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this project in the most current MPO air quality conforming TIP?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If NO, is this project exempt from conformity analysis?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a project-level PM 2.5 conformity determination required for this project?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, has FHWA issued a conformity determination?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project-Level Analysis and Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project-Level Analysis and Impacts</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the project scope changed substantially since the conformity analysis?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, will this change require a reevaluation of the MPO TIP conformity?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a PM 2.5 hotspot analysis required for this project?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Analysis: Qualitative X Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

On January 28, 2010, the United States Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration determined that the project is not a project of air quality concern and has met the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act and is exempt from further hot-spot analysis per 40 CFR 93.116(a).

The constructed project will not result in an increase in the ADT of more than 10,000 vehicles within 10 years of project completion date. Also, the projects do not involve a new project right-of-way that will have an ADT of more than 20,000 vehicles within 10 years of construction.

Because this project is listed in the STIP/TIP, ozone is addressed.

Because the project involves new connector roads, a Qualitative MSAT analysis was prepared by ODOT and coordinated with OEPA on 1/11/10. OEPA approved the analysis on 2/1/10. ODOT and FHWA correspondence is included in Appendix J.

---

**Noise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a noise analysis required in accordance with FHWA regulations and ODOT’s statewide noise abatement policy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, is a design year noise impact predicted?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, have all noise attenuation measures been considered, consistent with the policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If NO, explain why not: No noise increase &gt;10 dBA or approached or exceeded 67 dBA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

ODOT District 12 performed a noise analysis of the project area using the Federal Highway Administration’s Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5. The analysis examined the noise impacts of 28 homes located adjacent to West 73rd Street between Detroit Road and Father Caruso Drive. None of the receivers approached or exceeded 67 dBA nor were the existing noise levels for these receivers increased by more the 10 dBA. Actually, the proposed alignment of West 73rd Street is below grade and shields the receivers from the traffic noise. The District determined that noise mitigation is not warranted for the project.

On February 1, 2010, ODOT Office of Environmental Services (OES) concurred with the District’s findings. ODOT correspondence is included in Appendix K.
SECTION F – COMMUNITY IMPACTS

Regional, Community & Neighborhood Factors
Will the proposed action comply with the local/regional development patterns for the area? Y N
Will the proposed action result with substantial impacts to community cohesion? X
Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to local tax base or property values? X

Remarks: The proposed project was developed as part of the City of Cleveland approved Lakefront Plan (Connecting Cleveland: Waterfront District Plan) and should enhance community cohesion and has the potential for positive impacts to the tax base and property values. The project also meets the City of Cleveland’s adopted Five Planning Principals. Details of Lakefront Plan and the Five Planning Principals are discussed in the Purpose and Need Statement included in Appendix B.

Will the proposed action result in reasonably foreseeable secondary or cumulative impacts? Y N

Remarks: The goal of the project is to make the infrastructure changes to “enhance and populate the existing lakefront neighborhoods and attract new residents, economic development, and new jobs. Any impacts should benefit and enhance the community. The project will increase mobility for the community; provide more convenient access to lakefront and Edgewater Park recreational facilities; provide potential improvements to recreational facilities including Edgewater Park, designated bicycle lanes, and multi-use paths; and improve the economic base of the project area by providing a more attractive place to live or work. Details of project impacts are discussed in the Purpose and Need Statement included in Appendix B.

Public Facilities & Services
Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts on health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation or pedestrian and bicycle facilities? Y N

Remarks: The project involves the addition of pedestrian/bike facilities for the length of the corridor, which positively impacts the community. The project also involves minor roadway system changes with the reconfiguration/addition of access points along the corridor. The reconfigured access points include West 49th, West 45th, West 28th and West 25th; the rehabilitated access points include Lake Avenue/West Blvd and Lake Avenue/Clifton Blvd/SR 2; and the new access points include West 73rd, West 54th and Division Avenue. Minor impacts will be seen by fire, police and emergency services through the conversion of West 28th north of the ramps to one-way northbound. This change was approved by all of the municipal and emergency services and the City of Cleveland and the City of Cleveland Planning Commission. No other impacts noted.

Environmental Justice (Presidential Executive Order 12898)
During public involvement activities, were Environmental Justice issues raised? Y N
Are any Environmental Justice populations located within the project area? X
Will the project result in adversely high or disproportionate impacts to the population? X

Remarks: Minority and low income populations are found throughout the project area. Special Interest Meetings were conducted with specific community organizations, utilities and other special interests whose applied knowledge, experience, expertise, interests and/or needs had a direct bearing on project outcomes as work progressed. Meetings were held with the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, Cleveland City Council members, Community Development Corporations and the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority.

Continued on page 12a.
Community Impacts: (Continued)

Remarks:

**Environmental Justice:**
A Social and Economic Analysis was conducted for the project in 2007 and submitted to ODOT detailing the identification of Environmental Justice (EJ) populations. EJ populations were identified through the review of 2000 US Census information and consulting with specific community organizations with direct knowledge of the community population and their needs.

The Social and Economic identified that the Study Area contains two areas with a high percentage of minorities. The first area is around West 25th Street and the West Shoreway. This area contains a 76.6% African American population, as compared to the City of Cleveland which is 51% African American. The second area is between West 65th Street and West 85th Street north of Detroit Avenue. The two census tracts within this area include an 18.2% and 19.2% Hispanic population, as compared to the City of Cleveland which is 7.3% Hispanic.

An effort has been made to include these segments of the community during the planning of proposed project through public information meetings and stakeholder meetings within the community. Meetings were held with the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, Cleveland City Council members, Community Development Corporation, the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority, and St. Malachi, a local church and social services provider. In the case of the Hispanic community, a Spanish-language translator, as well as a sign-language translator has been made available at each event.

No environmental justice issues were raised during public involvement activities. No environmental justice issues were raised during stakeholder or agency meetings.

The April 2007 Social and Economic Analysis is included in Appendix L. A summary of public involvement activities is included in Appendix M.
Displacement of People, Businesses or Farms:

Will the proposed action displace people, businesses or farms?  

Y N

Number of displacements: 

Residences: 3  Businesses: 10  Farms: 0  Institutions: 0

Remarks:

Linda’s Superette (2716 Detroit Avenue) – 2 residences and 1 business
The Jamestown Building (2712 Detroit) – 1 residence and 5 businesses
2628 Detroit – 3 businesses
T&M Plastics - 1246 West 70th (1259 West 73rd and 7201 Father Caruso Drive) – 1 business

All relocations will be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Relocation Act). The Relocation Assistance Program Survey will be submitted at a later date.

SECTION G – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Per ORC 5511.01 and 23 CFR 771.111 (h)(2)(i) and (ii), every Federal action requires some level of public involvement, providing for early and continuous opportunities throughout the project development process. The level of public involvement should be commensurate with the proposed action.

Discuss what public involvement activities (letters to affected property owners and residents, meetings, special purpose meetings, newspaper articles, etc.) have occurred for this project.

Were you inclusive of minority and low income people in your public involvement activities?  

Yes*  X  No

* If YES, explain below.

The public involvement process for the Lakefront West Project is broad in scope to engage the many components of the public. The public involvement process included public meetings, subcommittee meetings, special meetings, and the use of a project website (http://www.dot.state.oh.us/projects/ClevelandUrbanCoreProjects/LakefrontWest/Pages/default.aspx) to gather and solicit public input and disseminate project information. Public comments and input was used by the project team to develop and refine project alternatives; identify, define, and address project issues; and to guide the advancement the project.

The public involvement organizational structure for the Lakefront West Project included the formation of a Stakeholder Subcommittee representing various segments of the project area to assist in the collection and review of community-oriented data and information for consideration by the project Steering Committee throughout project development.

Special Interest Meetings were conducted with specific community organizations, utilities and other special interests whose applied knowledge, experience, expertise, interests and/or needs had a direct bearing on project outcomes as work progressed. Special Interest Meetings were conducted with specific community organization when issues were raised during the development of project alternatives that may impact or be of interest to that organization.

Continued on page 13a.

Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds

Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts?  

Y N

Remarks:

Public involvement activities have not identified substantial controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts. A summary of public involvement activities, including issues raised and how they were addressed, is included in Appendix M.
Public Involvement: (Continued)

Remarks:

Public Meetings were held within the project area at the Minor PDP Concurrence Points and when project development process deemed necessary to inform the public of project information and garner further public input.

Lakefront West Project Stakeholder Subcommittee Meetings, Steering Committee Meetings, Special Interest Meetings, and Public Meetings were conducted in conjunction with the Ohio Department of Transportation’s Minor Project Development Process (PDP) as managed by ODOT District 12.

A summary of public involvement activities, including issues raised and how they were addressed, is included in Appendix M.
SECTION H – HAZARDOUS MATERIALS & REGULATED SUBSTANCES

Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Site Assessment Screening / Checklist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Environmental Site Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Remediation</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
An ESA Screening was completed in October 2006 and identified 90 properties with the potential to contain environmental contamination. Upon revisions to the proposed project, it was determined that Phase I ESAs were necessary for eleven parcels.

The Phase I ESA was performed in accordance with ODOT Environmental Site Assessment Guidelines dated September 1, 1999. Activities conducted during the Phase I ESA investigation included site reconnaissance, historic research, regulatory agency file reviews, and interviews with knowledgeable site personnel for each parcel. Phase II Environmental Site Assessments were recommended and performed on sites 13, 27, 71, and 88.

See page 14a.

SECTION I – PERMITS CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Not Required</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OES Permit Determination (PD)

Army Corps of Engineers (404/Section 10 Permit)
- Individual (IP)
- Nationwide (NWP)
- Pre-Construction Notification (PCN)

OEPA
- Level 1 Review – General Isolated Wetland Permit
- Level 2 Review – Individual Isolated Wetland Permit
- Level 3 Review – Individual Isolated Wetland Permit
- 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC)
- NPDES Construction Storm Water Permit

US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit
- Wetland and/or Stream Mitigation
- Flood Plain Permit

Remarks:
The USACE has not made a jurisdictional determination regarding the regulatory status of the wetlands located within the project area. However, based on the wetland delineations, Wetland 1 may be considered an isolated wetland and Wetland 3 may be considered a jurisdictional wetland. Until the permit determination is completed by OES, the level of permitting is unknown at this time; however, based on findings of the wetlands delineation report, the project will require a USACE Nationwide 404 permit and an OEPA General Isolated Wetland Permit.

The project may also require a floodplain permit prior to construction.
Remarks:

Based on the results of the Phase II ESA investigation, plan notes for petroleum contaminated soils (PCS) should be developed for Site 13, Site 27, and Site 88. A note for underground storage tank (UST) removal should be developed for Site 71 for 2 orphan USTs. An additional Phase II ESA investigation will be conducted on Site 13 and Site 88. Based on the results, plan notes to properly manage any regulated materials will be developed and placed in the plans.

Copies of the correspondence are included in Appendix N.
SECTION J – ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS MADE & RESOURCES TO BE AVOIDED

Environmental Commitments may be necessary for the following:

The project is within the range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) and may impact summer roosting habitat for this species. The summer roosting habitat consists of living or dead trees or snags with exfoliating, peeling or loose bark, split trunks and/or branches or cavities. Therefore, any unavoidable cutting of such trees will be performed only after September 30 and before April 1.

Coordination with the local FEMA Floodplain Coordinator will be completed and a Floodplain permit filed, if necessary.

Until the appropriate waterway permits are obtained, the contractor shall not perform any work in waters of the U.S. or State.

A plan note for petroleum contaminated soils (PCS) will be developed and placed in the plans for Site 13, Site 27, Site 71, and Site 88. Additionally, a plan note for two orphan underground storage tanks (USTs) will be developed and placed into the plans for Site 71. An additional Phase II ESA investigation will be conducted on Site 13 and Site 88. Based on the results, plan notes to properly manage any regulated materials will be developed and placed in the plans.

With regards to Section 4(f) commitments, the following will be implemented as part of the West Shoreway Project:

1. The property within Edgewater Park disturbed by the proposed multiuse trail and the West 73rd Street Connection will remain as City of Cleveland property.
2. The Project will maintain traffic on the trails. However, part-width construction may reduce the width of the trails during construction.
3. Access to Edgewater Park will be maintained during the construction of the Lakefront West Project.
4. The removal of trees will be limited to what is needed to construct the new West 73rd Street Connection.
5. Disturbed areas will be revegetated with native plant species or mulched to stabilize the area.
6. No construction materials or equipment will be staged on the Trail.

Residential and business relocations will be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Relocation Act).

ODOT will notify the City of Cleveland, Emergency Services, ODNR, and Cleveland Board of Education prior to each phase of construction. Detours, if necessary, will be coordinated with the City of Cleveland, Emergency Services, ODNR, and Cleveland Board of Education during design development. Additional notifications may include newspaper announcements and public service announcements for a week prior. Included in each notification will be the projected dates and time frames of ramp and lane closures, lane restrictions, and proposed detour routes.

SECTION K – CONCURRENCE

It is hereby determined that the subject project meets the criteria for CE in accordance with the Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement between ODOT and FHWA. This action does not: induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use for the area; require relocation of significant numbers of people; have significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic, or other resource; involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts; have significant impacts on travel patterns; or otherwise, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant impacts and do not require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement.

As supported by information contained in this Categorical Exclusion Document, this project qualifies for a CE Level 4, Item Number ____________, in accordance with the Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement between ODOT and FHWA dated 3/25/2010.

Debra E. White & Christopher B. Owen – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Name of Preparer and Organization

District Environmental Coordinator Date District Planning & Programs Administrator Date

Office of Env. Services Administrator 6/13/10 If CE-4: Date Submitted to FHWA 6/13/10

This is page 15 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 Date: 3/25/2010
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PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT
From: Natalie.Conley@dot.state.oh.us
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2009 8:52 AM
To: Bowen, Kirsten
Subject: Fw: Lakefront West (PID 77330) - Purpose & Need Acceptance by FHWA

Kirsten,
this should work as the documentation you need for P&N approval.

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-
Natalie Conley
Ohio Department of Transportation - District Twelve
v: 216.584.2103 | f: 216.584.2279 | e: natalie.conley@dot.state.oh.us
=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-
----- Forwarded by Natalie Conley/Production/D12/ODOT on 07/22/2009 08:51 AM -----
John Motl/Planning/D12/ODOT
07/21/2009 02:04 PM
To Natalie Conley/Production/D12/ODOT
cc Craig Hebebrand/Production/D12/ODOT
Subject Fw: Lakefront West (PID 77330) - Purpose & Need Acceptance by FHWA

Natalie, please see below FHWA's acceptance of the Lakefront West P&N. Mike Armstrong has said no other FHWA action is required prior to the submittal of the environmental document.

John M. Motl, P.E.
Modes Management Engineer
District 12 Planning Office
Tel. (216) 584-2085
FAX (216) 584-2279
----- Forwarded by John Motl/Planning/D12/ODOT on 07/21/2009 01:55 PM -----
"Armstrong, Michael" <Michael.Armstrong@fhwa.dot.gov>
07/19/2007 01:43 PM
To <John.Motl@dot.state.oh.us>
cc <Craig.Hebebrand@dot.state.oh.us>
Subject RE: Lakefront West (PID 77330) - Purpose & Need Revisions

John,

Based on the "text" provided it appears that the ODOT has addressed all of FHWA's comments on the subject action's P&N as provide in FHWA's letter dated October 31, 2006. If the referenced attachments are of sufficient quality to support the provided "text" FHWA does not anticipate a further need to comment on P&N during the processing of the NEPA action.

Michael B. Armstrong, Highway Engineer
Federal Highway Administration
Ohio Federal-aid Division
200 North High Street, Room 328
Columbus, OH 43215
Telephone: (614) 280-6855
Fax: (614) 280-6876

file://L:\Projects\ODOT\CUY\77330\environmental\docs\CE Doc\2A - Purpose Need Acceptanc... 12/30/2009
e-mail: michael.armstrong@fhwa.dot.gov

From: John.Motl@dot.state.oh.us [mailto:John.Motl@dot.state.oh.us]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2007 12:52 PM
To: Armstrong, Michael
Subject: Lakefront West (PID 77330) - Purpose & Need Revisions

Mike, attached are revised sections of the subject P&N, the homeland security discussion and the new conclusion, including the logical termini discussion. Please review and advise if these adequately address FHWA's comments. Note that the attachments are not included except for the new Water Department letter.

Thanks,

John M. Motl, P.E.
Modes Management Engineer
District 12 Planning Office

Tel. (216) 584-2085
FAX (216) 584-2279
Purpose and Need Statement

Prepared by

The Ohio Department of Transportation District 12
1.0 Introduction

The City of Cleveland has adopted as a goal the creation of a more viable and accessible Lakefront. At the present, eight miles of land abutting Lake Erie between Edgewater Park and Gordon Park are used for a variety of recreation, transportation, and industrial activities [See Figure 1]. The Lakefront from Edgewater Park to the Cuyahoga River has begun to see changes in land usage as old industrial and commercial properties are transformed into mostly residential and mixed use developments able to compete with new suburban areas. West of the Cuyahoga River, the West Memorial Shoreway parallels the Lakefront and extends almost three miles as a limited access freeway before transitioning into low speed City streets. In this area lakefront resources are separated from the city itself by man-made physical barriers, in the form of the Shoreway (SR-2/US-6/US-20 west of the W. 28th Street interchange, SR-2 east of W. 28th Street) and the parallel Norfolk Southern rail line. These high-speed, grade-separated transportation corridors combine with a sudden change in elevation where the rail line crosses the freeway to limit connections between the lakefront resources and the adjoining neighborhoods. West of this railroad structure, the West Shoreway turns toward the lake shoreline and its lower elevation, and away from the adjacent neighborhoods on the bluffs next to the rail line. Some uses and users have been successfully accommodated with the current arrangement, because pedestrian and road bridges cross the barriers at some points, and because automobile users from east or west of the study area get quick, direct access via the Shoreway. However, local residents, including some who are among the closest to the lakefront, must travel up to 2 miles to reach the Lakefront or upwards of a mile to access the roadway next to which they live. With more connections to and through the West Shoreway, the lakefront neighborhoods would provide more accessible amenities to residents, and would be more attractive for redevelopment.

2.0 Background

2.1 The Lakefront Plan

In 2002, the City of Cleveland initiated a review of the 1946 Lakefront Master Plan. This review was part of a Lakefront District planning process by the City, called Connecting Cleveland. The Lakefront Master Plan revision was titled The Waterfront District Plan, and focused on improving access to the lakefront and improving lakefront amenities.

On December 17, 2004, the City Planning Commission adopted this new land use plan for the area north of St. Clair Avenue, east of the Cuyahoga River and north of Detroit Avenue, west of the river. The Waterfront District Plan will be the basis for City of Cleveland land use changes both along the lakefront and in the adjoining neighborhoods. The plan included both a Project Vision Statement and a list of Planning Principles, as the basis for future redevelopment projects.

The Vision Statement set the purpose of the plan as “To shape the lakefront as the most vital element in the transformation of Cleveland as a place to live, work, and play.” Eleven goals were identified in furtherance of this mission:

- “Enhance and populate the existing lakefront neighborhoods.” These neighborhoods have great assets and potential for growth, but have vacant
residential and industrial properties. Making the lakefront neighborhoods grow and rebuild is a city priority.

- “Create vibrant new lakefront communities.” Enhancing the existing lakefront neighborhoods with additional construction, either on former industrial and infrastructure sites, or on other lakefront land.
- “Connect people to the lake.” Create multimodal transportation facilities and services that allow maximum access along and to the Lakefront by all possible means (automobile, transit vehicle, bicycle, truck, or walking.)
- “Create a place where the region comes together.” Make the lakefront attractions public places and part of the Cleveland identity.
- “Capitalize on special public assets.” Lakefront space is occupied by unique or prized attractions. Improving on the setting of these attractions and making them work better for the City was a goal.
- “Develop underutilized land.” Some lakefront spaces are taken up by uses benefiting only small groups, or which could be replicated without detriment at less vital locations. For example, the Cleveland Cuyahoga Port Authority is a valuable asset to industry and transportation in the region, but its location directly opposite downtown might be better used for other purposes.
- “Create natural beauty and enhance the environment.” With a major industrial city at the convergence of a river and a Great Lake, natural beauty is a precious commodity that has to be designed for. With two large park spaces anchoring the ends of the lakefront and the river at the center, the plan would incorporate multiple environmental layers.
- “Tailor proposals that are uniquely Cleveland.” Expressing the identity of Cleveland through the plan and the resulting projects was a key value.
- “Develop synergy between the lake, neighborhoods, and commerce.” Inland uses should benefit not just from proximity, but from thematic or programmatic connections to lakefront uses.
- “Attract new residents, economic development, and new jobs.” Accomplish this by improving existing institutions, neighborhoods, and businesses, and by creating new ones.
- “Celebrate Cleveland’s spirit, history, diversity, and culture.” Cleveland’s history can be seen in parts of the lakefront; these historical remnants and cultural reminders should be integrated into new lakefront projects.

In creating a plan to fulfill this goal, the city also adopted five Planning Principles. The Planning Principles emphasized Cleveland’s geographic assets, and the need for the City to use them fully. The five planning principles were:

- “Seamlessly link our lakefront neighborhoods to our shoreline attractions.” This principle advocated creating less of a barrier between the City and its lakefront, so that the two would not have separate identities. Following this principle, the lakefront should reflect the adjacent neighborhoods, and vice versa. The physical environment of being on a Great Lake should be seen in the neighborhoods, while the lakefront should reflect the social and economic context of the community. For example, Edgewater Park might reflect the cultural heritage of its adjacent west side community, while Voinovich Park
might reflect the design, history, and unique needs of downtown Cleveland.

- “Capitalize on topography and natural features as development and open space assets.” This was meant especially to mean opportunities for the lakefront to enhance the city neighborhoods to the south. Lakefront views and access combined with available land make attractive development opportunities. This principle also valued the open spaces along the lakefront, but opened the possibility of extending the city fabric directly to the lake in some places.

- “Fully develop our three great parks – Edgewater, Gordon, and Voinovich – on our great lake.” The three parks that form the core of Cleveland Lakefront State Park are major recreational assets to Cleveland and the region, and are among the public places that anchor the lakefront. This principle builds on the first two, entailing connections to neighborhood streets aping, regional ecology, and the inland park connections of Rockefeller Park and Martin Luther King Jr Drive to the Shaker Lakes, and the Towpath Trail connection to the Cuyahoga Valley National Park.

- “Transform the Shoreway into a lakefront scenic byway.” The West Shoreway is part of the recently designated Lake Erie Scenic Byway which runs along Ohio’s entire Lake Erie coast. While not advocating a specific design for the Shoreway, this principle values the views that traveling along the Shoreway provides, and the potential for their improvement. The Shoreway has views of the Lake and its parks, Cleveland’s downtown skyline and attractions, and the industrial valley and its bridges. The Shoreway could be adjusted in ways that accommodate more scenic viewing opportunities making the road more enjoyable and a better experience of Cleveland’s identity.

- “Develop accessible and connected public spaces.” This final principle is the overriding thought behind Connecting Cleveland and The Waterfront District Plan. The plan advocates pedestrian access spaced every quarter mile throughout the City’s lakefront, ensuring that any pedestrian has easy access (within an eighth of a mile) to lakefront destinations. This combined with the neighborhood district plans to create a goal of providing public places that are both regional attractions and local services.

Finally, Connecting Cleveland identified four transportation issues that would further the City’s goals. First, the study recommended assessing the Shoreway’s impact on the lakefront and surrounding areas. Second, improving local access to the lakefront from the city’s neighborhoods was a major goal in itself. The third and fourth issues, improving non-motorized and public transportation connections within and to the lakefront, were in support of this goal of improving neighborhood-to-lakefront connectivity.

2.2 Project Status
The City of Cleveland determined that it would build on existing redevelopment efforts and focus on the section of lakefront to the west of the Cuyahoga River. This area includes a freeway stub, the West Shoreway, which is not planned for any further
extension, and has seen ongoing redevelopment efforts (see Section 3.0). In 2003, the Ohio Department of Transportation’s (ODOT’s) Transportation Review Advisory Council (TRAC) approved funding for the “Lakefront West” project to reconstruct the West Shoreway in accordance with the still-evolving land-use plan.

In July 2004, the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) designated the Lakefront West project as a Tier 1 project, and added it to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Tier 1 is the highest of four tiers NOACA uses to categorize planned projects. According to NOACA’s Regional Transportation Investment Policy (adopted 2003), “Tier 1 projects are at an advanced stage of planning and have … funding. These projects are on the fiscally balanced part of the [Transportation Improvement] Plan and are used to perform the federally required air quality analysis. They are … expected to be constructed within the next four years.”

### 2.3 Facility History

The West Shoreway was originally built in the 1930s with the name Buckley Boulevard. This facility was a two-lane road starting at Edgewater Park, near the existing interchange (between West 65th and West 76th Streets) with the West Shoreway, and extending to Detroit Avenue at W. 28th Street, where Detroit Avenue continued as a four-lane road across the Detroit-Superior Bridge into downtown.

In 1944, a business civic group called the Regional Association of Cleveland published an *Express Highway Plan of the Cleveland Metropolitan Region* [See Figure 2]. This proposal suggested a radial network of freeways, one of them in place of Buckley Boulevard, which was to be enlarged and extended to become the West Shoreway. An Outer Belt Freeway would encompass Cleveland and its suburbs, and a second belt freeway, the Innerbelt Freeway, would encircle the downtown, collecting and redistributing traffic from the radial freeways. The Innerbelt was to begin at the East Shoreway just east of downtown, and end at the West Shoreway near the west approach of the then-recently-completed Main Avenue Bridge, circling to the south in between. Anticipating a large increase in traffic if this plan was adopted, Buckley Boulevard was replaced in accordance with this plan by a six-lane, limited-access road extending westward to its present terminus.

Cuyahoga County revised the 1944 plan in 1955, in the *Comprehensive Arterial Highway Plan* [See Figure 3]. In this plan the Innerbelt did not curve northward in the west, so it did not intersect the Shoreway. Nor did the Shoreway’s planned western extension appear; instead of following the lake, the road was to curve sharply southward just west of its original terminus. This inland section was to be renamed the Airport Freeway, since it would connect to the Cleveland Airport, now Cleveland Hopkins International Airport.

In 1957 the freeway plan was revised again [See Figure 4]. Taking into account local opposition, the Airport Freeway was rerouted further to the south, leaving part of the Shoreway as a spur. The southern half of the Airport Freeway plan was later merged with the northern half of the Medina Freeway plan to create the I-71 plan, which was constructed. As now constructed, the entire length of the Shoreway west of the Innerbelt Curve is a spur [See Figure 5].
In the late 1970s, I-90 was extended west of downtown. The designation I-90 is now carried by the East Shoreway east of downtown and by the Innerbelt and this new roadway westward out of the city. This new section runs parallel to the Shoreway, and has both higher capacity and design speed. Traffic shifted to this east-west route, and traffic on the Shoreway west of downtown fell from 81,920 vehicles per day in 1956 to 33,920 in 2003. Both of these counts were taken at the W. 45th/49th Street Interchange, which is the peak volume location in West Shoreway. For complete traffic data [See Table 1 below].

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Most Recent ADT</th>
<th>Prev Year</th>
<th>Prev ADT</th>
<th>1956 ADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to West Blvd.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp From West Blvd.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton before Shoreway intersection</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23,514</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18,847</td>
<td>23,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Entrance Eastbound</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Exit Eastbound</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Entrance Westbound</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Exit Westbound</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreway Through at W.45th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreway WB to Herman Ave.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Road to Shoreway WB</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Ave. to Shoreway WB</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreway EB to W. 45th St.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 45th St. to Shoreway EB</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp from W. 28th St. to Shoreway EB</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp from Shoreway WB to W.28th St.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreway Through EB at W. 28th St.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14,810</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>34,334</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreway EB to Detroit Ave. AND Detroit Ave. to Shoreway WB</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7,473</td>
<td>24,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit-Superior Bridge</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19,229</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17,827</td>
<td>42,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Ave. west of W. 25th St.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,887</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 25th St. south of Detroit Ave.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13,362</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Study Area Description

The study area extends from the Cuyahoga River westward, and from Lake Erie southward [See Figure 6]. These two geographic boundaries dictate two sides of the roughly rectangular area. Within the study area, geographic boundaries are also influential. The Lake and the River both have flats adjoining them, while the bulk of the study area sits on bluffs 50 to 100 feet above these lowlands. The Cuyahoga River has a serpentine route through Cleveland, but the mouth of the River is perfectly straight. This is because the outlet is an artificial channel, cut in the early 19th Century for shipping and still in use today. The old river channel hooks westward just south of the lake, and the natural outlet was roughly a mile east of the artificial one. Creating the new river outlet made the bar of lowlands between the old river channel and the lake into an island, now known as Whiskey Island [See Figure 6] because of its use in smuggling during Prohibition.
The natural river outlet is now blocked; the site is occupied by the Westerly Waste Water Treatment Plant [See Figure 6], which stands between the end of the channel and the Lake. This makes Whiskey Island no longer a true island; instead it is a peninsula connected at the west rather than the east end.

To the south of Westerly and across the old river channel is the Garrett Morgan Water Treatment Plant [See Figure 6], which purifies clean drinking water for the city, drawn from a water inlet several miles out in Lake Erie. Next to the water treatment plant and well south of the river channel is Cleveland’s Soapbox Derby Track [See Figure 6], taking advantage of a slope between bluffs and lowlands. The other users of the old river channel all have purposes related to their locations on the water: a marina sits at the west end between the two water plants, Great Lakes Towing Shipyard [See Figure 6] is adjacent to Garrett Morgan and north of the Soapbox Derby, and on Whiskey Island opposite the shipyard the Cargill Salt Mine [See Figure 6] draws its rock salt from deposits beneath Lake Erie.

The north side of Whiskey Island has Whiskey Island Marina, the Cleveland Cuyahoga Port Authority’s Bulk Terminal, and the recently-constructed Wendy Park [See Figure 6]. Branching off the Island to the north is a causeway to the abandoned Coast Guard station [See Figure 6], which may be converted to a maritime museum. The current station is to the east of the study area near the Burke Lakefront Airport.

The Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority’s Lakeview Terrace complex [See Figure 6] is located on the Main Avenue Peninsula, south of the old river channel. The complex is built on the slope that connects the flats to the higher inland neighborhoods.

In the western half of the study area, the lakefront land is occupied by Edgewater Park [See Figure 6], a State Park operated by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR). The park has in its eastern half a swimming beach, a boat launch, and a marina, and has in its western half nature and exercise trails, playing fields, and a large pavilion. Vehicle access to the park is provided at both the east and west ends, but the two road circuits are not connected because of the sharp difference in elevation between them. Bicycle/pedestrian paths do traverse the slope to connect the upper western and lower eastern areas of the park.

To the south of these lakefront resources is a swath of western Cleveland. These neighborhoods are mixed use, containing single- and multi-family residential, light industrial, retail, commercial, and institutional uses. The total population of the study area in the 2000 US Census was about 13000.

### 2.4.1 Transportation Systems

The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (RTA) provides its primary service to the neighborhood along Detroit Avenue [See Figure 7]. The #45 (W. 65th Street/Ridge Rd.) and #326 (Center Ridge/Detroit Avenue) buses go along Detroit Avenue through the study area and into downtown. Route #326 extends beyond downtown, continuing on the east side of Cleveland. Route #326 has the second highest passenger volume among bus routes in the GCRTA system, with over 3.2 million riders per year.
Between the lakefront park and the neighborhoods to the south runs the other major east-west route through the study area, the West Shoreway. It is a limited-access six-lane roadway that begins at Lake Avenue and Clifton Boulevard, and extends eastward across the study area, eventually merging with I-90 east of downtown Cleveland. The Shoreway with the Norfolk/Southern rail line divides the study area into northern and southern sections: northern lakefront uses and southern inland neighborhoods. The only residential area north of the Shoreway in the study area is CMHA Lakeview Terrace.

RTA provides “closed door” bus service along the Shoreway, connecting riders from west of the Shoreway directly with Cleveland’s Central Business District (CBD). Routes 31X (originating in Avon Lake), 46F (Westlake), 55 (Clifton Boulevard), and 75X (North Olmsted) all travel the length of the study area without any opportunity for scheduled stops to discharge or take on passengers.

Running in an east-west alignment along the southern border of the study area is the primary street for commerce in the neighborhood, Detroit Avenue. Detroit Avenue is a zero-setback, four-lane roadway with parking allowed in the outside lane in some areas during off peak hours. Plans are currently underway to narrow the roadway and widen sidewalks in the major commercial area of Gordon Square (see Figures 8 and 9), reducing the roadway to two lanes. This project, two blocks either side of West 65th Street, has been planned with a possible speed reduction on the West Shoreway in mind.

From the west end of the study area eastward the Shoreway is paralleled by a Norfolk Southern Railroad line, separating the study area into northern and southern sections: northern lakefront uses and southern inland neighborhoods. These tracks run along the crest of the bluffs, so that the area between the two transportation corridors is sharply sloped. At the Westerly Waste Water Treatment Plant the Shoreway turns south to remain south of the old river channel, but the NS railroad continues onto Whiskey Island, serving the Cleveland Bulk Terminal and crossing the new river channel by a vertical lift bridge.

The railroad and bluffs act as a double barrier between the neighborhoods and the Shoreway, and the Shoreway, railroad, and bluffs act as a triple barrier between the neighborhoods and the lakefront activities. The Shoreway serves five vehicular access points in the study area, all of which have some pedestrian access associated, plus one additional pedestrian-only access point. There are vehicle access points at West Boulevard, Clifton Boulevard, Edgewater Park, W. 49th/W.45th Streets, and W.28th/W.25th Streets. The Edgewater Park interchange has a pedestrian/bicycle underpass connecting through it to W. 65th Street. A pedestrian-only tunnel at W.76th Street connects the neighborhood directly to the Edgewater Park swimming beach, independent of any interchange.

3.0 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Lakefront West Project is the development of transportation infrastructure that supports initiatives in the City of Cleveland for local economic development and improved recreational opportunities by increasing both access and mobility to and across the West Shoreway.
3.1 Legislation, Local Mandate

The City of Cleveland identified the Western District of the Lakefront Plan as an immediate priority due to private and public development efforts over the last decade and into the future. Major reinvestment (more than $250 million) in this community is underway. The financial and social success of these projects would encourage further development both in the Western District and throughout the lakefront neighborhoods. This area has potential for large numbers of new residences at middle- to upper-income prices, which the City of Cleveland desires.

Between 2002 and 2007, over 200 new housing units were built at a cost of $42 million, and more than 800 units at a total cost of $190 million are either under construction or in development. These residences are also planned to be sold in a price range roughly twice (in excess of $400,000) that of recent new-residence sales in the neighborhood. For more details of completed and proposed developments [See Table 2 within Figure Section, and the preceding Figure 6].

Exemplifying these new developments is Battery Park. Located on the site of the former Eveready Battery factory between W. 76th and W. 73rd Streets, this ongoing $100 million plus development will include approximately 328 units of detached single-family houses, row houses, and loft apartments. The location adjacent to the W.76th Street tunnel provides pedestrian access, but the tunnel is not ADA compliant, so bicyclists and the disabled must go to the W. 65th Street tunnel. This development will generate automobile trips as well, and it is located roughly midway (about three quarters of a mile) between the Clifton Boulevard or the W. 49th Street access points. Closer access to the Shoreway from the development would benefit its residents (about 500 at full occupancy) and comply with the Waterfront District Plan’s first planning principle: “Seamlessly link our lakefront neighborhoods to our shoreline attractions”.

There are also plans to make the Gordon Square area on Detroit Avenue into a “Cultural Arts District” and to redevelop the Detroit Avenue East neighborhood [See Figures 8, 9, 10]. The Detroit Avenue Streetscape projects related to Gordon Square and Detroit Avenue East would include narrowing of that street between W. 69th Street and W. 61st Street to facilitate pedestrian traffic and storefront uses. Left turn lanes at Detroit and W. 65th will permit acceptable peak hour traffic operations (LOS D) through this intersection. With increases in population from new residences and visitors within the “Cultural Arts District”, an increase in commercial and resident traffic is anticipated. The combination of street narrowing and increased local destination traffic demand means that an adequate West Shoreway roadway with increased access is desirable to ensure an acceptable congestion (LOS D) along Detroit Avenue by siphoning off through traffic destined for downtown.

3.2 Mobility For the Community

The most notable gap in the sequence of Shoreway interchanges is a 1.5 mile gap between the Clifton Boulevard and W. 45th Street vehicular access points [See Figures 11 and 12]. This distance seems small at highway speeds, but approximately 4,000 study area residents live between the two access points. Additional population totaling approximately 2,000 live directly south of the study area boundary between the two access points. From most locations, automobile access to the Shoreway requires first
driving north or south to Detroit Avenue, then going east or west along Detroit a distance of up to 1 mile to the nearest entrance street, and then driving north to finally reach the highway. Many local automobile trips (approximately 8000 current ADT) within the community also depend on Detroit Avenue, since it is also the primary commercial street and the only neighborhood east-west through street directly linking Lakewood and downtown Cleveland. Additional access locations on the Shoreway would relieve traffic demand on Detroit Avenue by reducing distance to the nearest access point to allow local traffic increased access to the Shoreway.

In addition, each access point has some individual shortcomings, and combined they form a network that imperfectly serves the neighboring communities. Access to the Shoreway is only available from the neighborhoods at four locations, with large gaps between them [See Table 3 below]. Only the W.45th/W.49th Street and W.25th/W.29th Street interchanges also provide vehicular connection across the Shoreway, and neither of them directly reaches many existing public attractions. W. 45th/W.49th Streets provide access north of the Shoreway only to the Soapbox Derby track which is open only about 20 times a year. W. 25th/W.28th Streets access the Lakeview Terrace public housing development and the Old River channel with its primarily industrial uses. Edgewater Park, representing the major recreational area for residents north of Detroit Avenue from West 45th to West 117th Streets [See Figure 13], is only directly accessible to vehicles from the neighborhood at the western end, and this access does not connect to the eastern lower level of the park. All residents of the neighborhood trying to reach the Park’s lower level by car must take the Shoreway, which with a 1.5 mile gap between access points can be a detour of up to 1.5 miles.

In addition, each access point has some individual shortcomings, and combined they form a network that imperfectly serves the neighboring communities. Access to the Shoreway is only available from the neighborhoods at four locations, with large gaps between them [See Table 3 below]. Only the W.45th/W.49th Street and W.25th/W.29th Street interchanges also provide vehicular connection across the Shoreway, and neither of them directly reaches many existing public attractions. W. 45th/W.49th Streets provide access north of the Shoreway only to the Soapbox Derby track which is open only about 20 times a year. W. 25th/W.28th Streets access the Lakeview Terrace public housing development and the Old River channel with its primarily industrial uses. Edgewater Park, representing the major recreational area for residents north of Detroit Avenue from West 45th to West 117th Streets [See Figure 13], is only directly accessible to vehicles from the neighborhood at the western end, and this access does not connect to the eastern lower level of the park. All residents of the neighborhood trying to reach the Park’s lower level by car must take the Shoreway, which with a 1.5 mile gap between access points can be a detour of up to 1.5 miles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interchange</th>
<th>SR-2 Mile Marker</th>
<th>Distance to Adjacent Interchange</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Blvd. &amp; Lake Ave.</td>
<td>12.02 (equivalent)</td>
<td>0 / 0.3 mile</td>
<td>Ramps connect to mainline at MM 12.52(W B) and MM 12.62 (EB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Ave. &amp; Lake Ave.</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>0.3 / 0.8 mile</td>
<td>Signalized intersection at end of freeway segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater Park Entrance</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>0.8 / 0.9 mile</td>
<td>Entrance to Edgewater Park and Lakefront only. No access to neighborhoods south of the Shoreway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 49th St. / W. 45th St.</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>0.9 / 0.56 mile</td>
<td>Access to neighborhoods south of the Shoreway. Access to Soapbox Derby Track only to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 28th St. / West 25th St.</td>
<td>14.45 / 14.58</td>
<td>0.56 / 0.97 mile</td>
<td>Access to west via W. 25th St. Access to east via W. 28th St. Next access point across the Main Ave. Bridge at W. 6th St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrians have an even more difficult time accessing lakefront resources. Most of the access points are not fully ADA accessible; some do not meet current standards; and others are made dangerous by vehicular traffic. Only the West Boulevard, W. 65th Street, and W. 25th/W.28th Street access points are ADA accessible. These are spaced at intervals of over 1 mile, whether measured along neighborhood streets or along the Shoreway. Non-ADA accessible points are at more frequent intervals, but gaps of over half a mile still exist [See Table 4 below and Figure 13]. The Waterfront District Plan envisions pedestrian access points every ¼ mile.
Bicycle access across the Shoreway is possible at the ADA accessible points. Access at other locations is hindered by stairs, which would require a bicyclist to carry the bike down into the park and up on the return trip. The W.65th Street tunnel is part of the Lakefront Bikeway, a marked bicycling route connecting points along the lakefront [See Figure 13]. This route is Type I (grade separated from vehicles) in Edgewater Park, but is Type III (signs along roadway, no bike lane markings) along neighborhood streets connecting to the Detroit Superior Bridge. On the bridge the bikeway is Type II (striped bike lane) in the approaches and Type I in the main span, where the bikeway passes outside the bridge’s above-deck arch on both sides while vehicular lanes pass through the arch.

**West Boulevard and Lake Avenue Interchange**

Westernmost of the six access points is the West Boulevard/Lake Avenue interchange, near the western entrance to Edgewater Park. This interchange is accessed by a pair of ramps through the Park, which connect to the mainline of the Shoreway. The ramps connect as a fifth leg to the intersection of West Boulevard and Lake Avenue, a signalized intersection. Pedestrian access here requires crossing on the west side West Boulevard, since the ramps block the east side to pedestrians [See Figures 14]. The entrance to the park is 500 feet north of the intersection, and on the east side of West Boulevard, so that pedestrians approaching the park from the east must cross West Boulevard twice. This pedestrian access is the least used in the study area, since it
connects to only local streets and the mainline of the Shoreway terminates one block away.

**Clifton Boulevard and Lake Avenue Intersection**
The mainline of the Shoreway ends by meeting Clifton Boulevard, the second access point, about 0.25 miles to the east. Clifton is a six-lane roadway like the Shoreway, and the Shoreway connects with Clifton on the same alignment, as a continuation of the same route: SR-2, US-6, and US-20. The transition from Clifton to the Shoreway is controlled by a traffic light at an intersection with Lake Avenue. This intersection includes a non-ADA-compliant pedestrian tunnel connecting the neighborhood with Edgewater Park [See Figures 15]. This access is provided from the northeast corner of the intersection, by following a sidewalk along the Shoreway briefly, and then taking a flight of stairs down to the tunnel. Unfortunately, the northeast corner of the intersection is not accessible by crosswalks from the other three sides. Pedestrians must either cross Lake Avenue and a short ramp illegally, or walk east to the nearest marked intersection, at the corner of Lake and Detroit Avenues, and then walk back west the same distance on the north side of Lake, a total of roughly a mile. Using this access point essentially requires pedestrians to cross the intersection without aid of crosswalk or pedestrian signal.

**West 76th Street Pedestrian Tunnel**
The next access point is the W. 76th Street pedestrian tunnel. This access is not ADA accessible; it consists of two unlit tunnels under the railroad and Shoreway, with stairs between [See Figures 16]. At the north end no walk exists for use by persons entering Edgewater Park. The tunnel is reported by ODNR Park Rangers to be sparsely used. This is partially because the immediately surrounding area on the neighborhood side has historically been nonresidential; the tunnel is surrounded by current and former industrial buildings. This is expected to change at the south tunnel entrance as land is cleared to be the site of the new Battery Park residential development.

**Edgewater Park Interchange/West 65th Street Tunnel**
There is a partial interchange from the Shoreway at Edgewater Park. This interchange allows traffic on the Shoreway to enter and exit the Park from both directions of travel. This interchange does not however connect to the neighborhood, so that residents closest to the Park entrance have the longest route for automobile access. This is partially compensated for by a pedestrian access point connecting from W. 65th Street [See Figures 17]. This path is grade-separated through the interchange and is ADA and bicycle accessible. Unlike the tunnel at W. 76th Street, the newer W. 65th Street tunnel is in good repair and well lit.

**West 49th and West 45th Street Interchange**
The next interchange is at W. 49th and W. 45th Streets, 1.6 miles east of the Clifton Boulevard intersection. This interchange provides access both north and south of the Shoreway. Eastbound traffic can enter and exit the Shoreway to the south, accessing that neighborhood, while westbound traffic can enter or exit from/to either the north or south via an overpass. The overpass also has a non-ADA-compliant pedestrian walkway, with stairs down to ground level at the north end [See Figures 18]. The overpass provides neighborhood access to the Soapbox Derby course, but a greater fraction of vehicle traffic on the ramp is going in the westerly direction. Trucks are prohibited west of West 49th.
Street on the Shoreway; therefore, westbound trucks must exit here. To reach Detroit Avenue, they must traverse residential streets.

**West 28th and West 25th Street Interchange**

W.25th/W.28th provides westbound exit and eastbound entrance at W.28th Street and eastbound exit and westbound entrance at W. 25th Street, via a pair of double ramps [See Figures 19]. In this section the Shoreway is elevated in its approach to the Main Avenue Bridge, and both W. 25th and W. 28th pass under it. These higher-speed double ramps, which tee into W. 25th and W. 28th, impact the pedestrian environment. The westbound exit ramp at West 28th is blocked from pedestrian view on the east side of the street by the adjacent easterly abutment wall carrying the westbound Shoreway. There are no sidewalks on the west side of West 25th crossing the Shoreway ramps. These streets connect the neighborhood to the south with the Lakeview Terrace public housing project to the north.

**Truck Mobility**

Truck access to and from Whiskey Island and its adjoining Old River Channel just south of it is critical for trucks headed to eastbound I-90. The Willow Lift Bridge allows trucks access from the Cargill Salt Mine and the Ontario Stone docks located on Whiskey Island. These and other Ontario Stone docks lining the Old River Channel rely on trucks to transship bulk materials offloaded from lake freighters and barges. Typically these trucks are trying to access the freeway system. The roads within this industrial area only have a few connections to the upper level [See Figure 20]. These connections lead to Main Avenue and W. 25th Street. From here trucks bound for I-71, I-77, or I-90 to the west head east over the Detroit – Superior Bridge into downtown Cleveland, skirt the western edge of the CBD to access these freeways at the south end of downtown. Trucks wanting to follow I-90 east have what appears to be an easy task by using the eastbound entrance ramp onto the Main Avenue Bridge which leads directly into I-90 at the northeast corner of the CBD. However, after maneuvering large tractor trailers through city streets to reach the ramp, drivers are presented with a 4% upgrade ramp which enters on the left side and has a short merge of just over 100 feet with less than 200 feet sight distance. Due to this lack of sight and merge distance, trucking interests advise that some drivers choose to follow Detroit Avenue west to the West 45th eastbound ramp.

**Homeland Security Requirements and Access**

New regulations from the Federal Department of Homeland Security require that water treatment plants assess their existing issues [See attached Water Dept. letter]. When doing so, the Garrett Morgan Water Treatment Plant assessed that it has inadequate secured access. The plant shares an access road with an industrial facility, Great Lakes Towing. This site has been used by Great Lakes as dock space for its tug boats over several decades and has just been expanded to include its headquarters and a ship yard. As such, private autos and trucks bound for the site pass in close proximity to a vital facility (filter building) of the water supply. This business cannot be easily relocated because it relies on access to the water. Relocating private traffic away from the treatment plant would reduce the risk to the City’s water supply [See Figures 21].

### 3.3 Lakefront Access
More convenient access to Lakefront recreational facilities (e.g., Edgewater Park) is a goal of the Lakefront Plan – “Connect people to the lake” and its’ first planning principle – “Seamlessly link our lakefront neighborhoods to our shoreline attractions.” At the present, access is inconvenient due to those obstacles described above. This disconnect between neighborhood and waterfront is identified as the single largest problem in the City’s Lakefront Study. Public comments requested that lakefront access by foot, bicycle, or motor vehicle be made more frequent and direct.

An indication of the present difficulty of accessing the lakefront from adjacent neighborhoods is shown by sample travel times between neighborhood locations and destinations in Edgewater Park [See Table 5 below and Figure 22]. The disparity between proximity and access heightens the sense of separation between the neighborhoods and the lakefront amenities. Convenience of access affects usage, especially for pedestrians. By providing more access points, an increase in pedestrian usage can be expected by widening the area from which pedestrian users are drawn. The Waterfront District Plan has a goal of pedestrian access every quarter mile.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W.75th Street &amp; Detroit Avenue to Edgewater Park</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Existing Travel Time</th>
<th>Straight Line Distance</th>
<th>Straight Line Travel Time</th>
<th>Round Trip Time Difference</th>
<th>Assumed Average Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>1.4 miles</td>
<td>2.5 min.</td>
<td>.5 miles</td>
<td>1.0 min</td>
<td>3.0 min</td>
<td>35 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>.5 miles</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>.5 miles</td>
<td>10.0 min</td>
<td>0 min.</td>
<td>03 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>1.2 miles</td>
<td>8.5 min.</td>
<td>.5 miles</td>
<td>3.3 min.</td>
<td>10.5 min</td>
<td>09 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W. 58th Street &amp; Detroit Avenue to Edgewater Park</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Existing Travel Time</th>
<th>Straight Line Distance</th>
<th>Straight Line Travel Time</th>
<th>Round Trip Time Difference</th>
<th>Assumed Average Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>1.5 miles</td>
<td>2.6 min.</td>
<td>.65 miles</td>
<td>1.1 min</td>
<td>3.6 min</td>
<td>35 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>.75 miles</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>.65 miles</td>
<td>13.0 min</td>
<td>4.0 min</td>
<td>03 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>.75 miles</td>
<td>4.8 min.</td>
<td>.65 miles</td>
<td>4.6 min.</td>
<td>0.4 min</td>
<td>09 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Potential Improvement to Recreational Facilities

From West Boulevard to the park entrance interchange near the Edgewater Marina, the Shoreway runs through land owned by the City of Cleveland, leased to ODNR and technically part of Edgewater Park (total of 222 acres, north and south of the West Shoreway). As a limited-access, grade-separated, high-speed roadway, the Shoreway not only limits access to and through the facility, it also reduces the area park visitors can enjoy. The ramps from West Boulevard are shielded by tree covered embankments north of Lake Avenue [See Figure 14A], but this uses parkland which might be enjoyed by the public. The mainline is elevated on an embankment in several places, and two overpass bridges are part of the mainline. Beyond the land paved over, the ramps capture swaths of parkland as infield, and the embankments and high-speed road noise make the adjacent outfields prohibitively unsafe for recreational use. The ramps at West Boulevard and Lake Avenue capture 13.8 acres of parkland, and the ramps at the Edgewater Park interchange capture 5.7 acres of parkland [See Figure 23]. As a freeway facility, the Shoreway has no parking permitted within its right-of-way.
The Cleveland State Lakefront Park (CSLP) is unique among Ohio’s State Parks as it is located within a dense urban area, the City of Cleveland. As a unit of the CSLP, Edgewater Park acts more as a local park than the typical State Park where patrons visit a few times annually. With about thirteen thousand residents located within a half mile of the park, this recreational facility can be visited by residents on almost a daily basis. Indeed, CSLP has the highest usage of any State Park in Ohio with seven million annual visitors.

Historically, Edgewater Park was a municipal park with baseball fields, swimming beach, picnic shelters, outdoor picnic tables, and large open play areas. It was and is the only park with a beach on the City’s west side. Except for Herman Park (one block north of Detroit near West 58th Street), a two acre playground, and Fairview Park (midway between Detroit and Lorain Avenues off West 38th Street), a four acre playground/community garden, Edgewater Park is the sole recreational space in the study area. When the State took over administration under a lease in the mid 1970’s, the baseball fields and all municipal youth programs were relocated to eliminate locally sponsored recreation programs from the State Park.

The City has independent plans to create additional public amenities on the lakefront, as per the Waterfront District Plan’s goals of “Connect people to the lake” and “Create a place where the region comes together”. The future attractions include a park at the west end of the old river channel, the expansion of recently-opened county-owned Wendy Park on the east end of Whiskey Island, and a renovation of the abandoned US Coast Guard Station [See Figure 6]. The City has already acquired the land at the old river outlet, and has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Port Authority agreeing to future recreational uses for Wendy Park. The Coast Guard Station project remains speculative, but a $50,000 study has been commissioned by the City to determine what future uses might be appropriate. The present freeway facility and local street system block access to the Old River Channel west end park site. Access to Wendy Park and the Coast Guard Station is possible via the Edgewater Park interchange near West 65th Street and then accessing Whiskey Island Drive.

3.6 Indirect Economic Gains

Improving access to recreational facilities located on the lakefront would make the project area a more attractive place to live and play. Further improved mobility and access to the Shoreway itself would make the surrounding area more attractive to live or work. The City’s promise of financial incentives makes the area more attractive for prospective residents, and, therefore, also for prospective developers. These various incentives include property tax abatement, HUD grants, loans from the City, State, and City-County Port Authority, and new zoning to encourage reuse of old commercial or industrial buildings such as those found in the western Lakefront area. All of this would aid the City’s efforts to redevelop the Western District. Cleveland State University’s March 2003 Study Assessing Current and Projected Market Conditions in Lakefront Neighborhoods projected that, with improvements to lakefront access, the Cleveland’s western lakefront could support 2400 additional residential units and 300,000 additional square feet of retail and office space. Such an increase in residents would be desirable in
a City like Cleveland whose overall population has fallen to 478,000 from 914,000 in the last fifty years.

4.0 Conclusion

The logical termini for the Lakefront West project are West Boulevard in the west and West 25th Street in the east [See Figure 6].

On Cleveland’s west side at the end of the freeway, SR-2/SR-6/US-20 changes from the West Shoreway, a high-speed, limited-access roadway, into Clifton Boulevard, a low-speed, signalized urban street. The road’s capacity, character, and identity shift at this point. The West/Lake interchange serviced by ramp extensions is the last segment of the high-speed roadway. West of this point, the lakefront land is privately held by residents of adjoining properties, rather than the business and institutional owners and uses that characterize the study area. Edgewater Park is the westernmost lakefront public attraction in Cleveland. South of the Shoreway, the area east of the Lake Avenue intersection is a mixed-use community with industrial, retail, cultural and institutional uses [See Figure 24]. West of this intersection, most land use is residential, with comparatively few storefronts or large multifamily structures.

At the eastern end of the study area, the Main Avenue Bridge crosses the Cuyahoga River Valley, leading into Cleveland’s Central Business District, which has land uses and transportation needs that differ from those of the study area’s low-rise, mixed-use neighborhoods [See Figure 25]. The CBD is home to nearly 140,000 workers, mostly office employees in the private and public sector. Major sports venues (Jacobs Field, Quicken Loans Arena, Browns Stadium, and the Wolstein Center) and cultural attractions (Rock & Roll Museum/Hall of Fame, Great Lakes Science Center, and the six live theaters of Playhouse Square) are also found in the CBD. These make downtown Cleveland at the east end of the Main Avenue Bridge the largest destination in northeast Ohio. Thus, the character of the neighborhoods at the west and east ends of the bridge are quite different. The River itself reinforces the logic of W. 25th Street as a logical terminus, since the street grid is divided by the river, with 25th Street being the last access point on the west approach of both major bridges in the study area: the Main Avenue Bridge and the Detroit Superior Bridge.

The convergence of private developers, public projects, and the availability of development funding in the Lakefront’s Western District has encouraged the City of Cleveland to partner with ODOT in a review of the existing West Shoreway. The West Shoreway is a crucial part of the City’s Lakefront Plan in how it relates to existing, planned, and anticipated development. The reduced usage level of the Shoreway (1956 ADT – 82000 versus 2003 ADT - 34000, see Table 1) enables this review to consider options that would reduce mainline capacity but that would improve other measures of access and mobility. A six lane high speed freeway can typically accommodate up to 90000 vehicles daily. In the Cleveland area, a six lane arterial with only a few access points can usually handle up to 40000 vehicles daily.

The existing transportation infrastructure in the project area does not facilitate the community’s efforts toward economic and social growth, since it provides only limited
vehicular access to the West Shoreway freeway itself and, thus, hinders access from the adjacent neighborhoods to the lakefront. Access for pedestrians and cyclists across the two and a half miles of the West Shoreway between West Boulevard and West 28th street is limited to non ADA compliant tunnels at Clifton / Lake and West 76th, the West 65th Lakefront Bikeway tunnel, and the West 49th Bridge. Within that same segment only the Edgewater Park entrance provides vehicular access to the Lakefront while access from the south is possible only from Lake Avenue or West 45th Street. Each is about three quarters of a mile west and east of the park entrance from the West Shoreway. The City’s land-use plan anticipates the provision of a multimodal transportation system accessing the Lakefront, which the present freeway facility with few access points does not accommodate. Providing an increased variety of means and places of access both to and across the Shoreway would improve connections between existing and future neighborhood developments and the lakefront attractions that make those communities desirable.
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## Table 2

### Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Cost (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtland Bldg. (2002)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 54th</td>
<td>16 Apts. + Retail</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handley-Boyt Gallery (2003)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 75th</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Mt. Carmel (2004)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 70th</td>
<td>3 New Classrooms + Indoor Playground</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeway (2004)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 83rd</td>
<td>Community Services Center + Apts</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschke Architects (2004)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 64th</td>
<td>Offices + Art Gallery</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Dog (2005)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 58th</td>
<td>Bar / Restaurant</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snickers (2005)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 58th</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes of Ohio City(2005)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clinton / W. 32nd</td>
<td>12 Luxury Townhouses</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Terrace (2005/2007)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Herman / W. 54th</td>
<td>35 Townhouses</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Point Townhouses (2005)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fr. Caruso/W.67th</td>
<td>17 Townhouses</td>
<td>$4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Square Homes (2006)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 65th</td>
<td>85 Affordable Apts.</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saigon Plaza (2006)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 54th</td>
<td>Store</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Avenue Lofts (2006)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 28th</td>
<td>21 Loft Condos</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villas at Water Edge (2006)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fr. Caruso / W.70th</td>
<td>18 Townhouse Condos</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murville Bldg. (2006)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 80th</td>
<td>11 Apts.</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M% Gallery &amp; Detroit Studio (2007)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 65th</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Under Construction(UC) or Proposed(P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Cost (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battery Park (UC)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>W 73rd to W 76th, South of NS RR</td>
<td>328 Loft Condos, Townhouses, &amp; Homes</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Mad (UC)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Herman / W. 65th</td>
<td>Restaurant / Pub</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters Union Bldg. (UC)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 26th</td>
<td>8 Apts.</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Lofts (UC)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Franklin / W. 32nd</td>
<td>18 Loft Condos</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Grill (UC)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 64th</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Weitzel Gallery (UC)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 62nd</td>
<td>Art Gallery &amp; Studio</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Terrace (UC)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Washington / W. 28th</td>
<td>186 Public Housing Apts.</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Superior Lofts (P)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 28th</td>
<td>58 Loft Condos</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Charter Place (P)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 32nd</td>
<td>55 Loft Condos</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyse Bldg. (P)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Franklin / W. 28th</td>
<td>30 Apts.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Theatre (P)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 65th</td>
<td>Rehab of One Theatre into Three Movie Theaters</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Public Theatre (P)</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 64&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Renovation of Community Theater + Air Conditioning</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near West Theatre (P)</td>
<td>Detroit / W. 67&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>New Community Theater</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewater Condos (P)</td>
<td>W. 76&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, South of NS RR</td>
<td>40 Loft Condos</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Terrace (P)</td>
<td>Church / W. 26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75 Public Housing / Market Rate Townhouses &amp; Condos</td>
<td>$15.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Hill Homes (P)</td>
<td>Cass / W. 54&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 Luxury Homes</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park (P)</td>
<td>Crescent Ave./Division Ave.</td>
<td>New city park</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Ave. Streetscape (P)</td>
<td>West 69&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St. / West 61&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; St.</td>
<td>Aesthetic enhancement to sidewalks and streetscape</td>
<td>$3.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Project Locations, See Figure 6.
Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (GCRTA) Transit Service

Closed Door Service  (55F, 55X, 75X)
Open Door Service  (55F, 55X, 75X)
The intersection of West 65th Street and Detroit Avenue, known as the Gordon Square Commercial District, has long been considered the heart of the Detroit Shoreway neighborhood. Often cited as being the most diverse district in the City of Cleveland, Detroit Shoreway was originally settled by immigrants from Italy, Romania, Ireland, and Germany, along with the indigenous American Indians.

Today our neighborhood is as vibrant as ever, but lacks the economic vitality found in other communities. Our vision is to revitalize the district using cultural and performing arts and entertainment as economic stimulants.

The consortium of avant-garde theatre at Cleveland Public Theatre; mainstream and classic musical favorites with near West Theatre; and cutting edge art films in the Capitol Theater; along with renovated storefronts filled with vibrant art galleries, interesting shops, restaurants and bars. West 65th Street and Detroit Avenue will once again become the heart of our neighborhood.

Key
1. Near West Theatre Site (5710 Detroit Ave.)
2. Capitol Theater
3. CPT Main Stage
4. Gordon Square Theatre
5. Acoustic Gallery
6. Parish Hall
7. Parish House
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June 6, 2007

John M. Motl
Modes Management Engineer
Ohio Department of Transportation
District 12 Planning Office
5500 Transportation Boulevard
Garfield Heights, Oh 44125

RE: Lakefront West Project: Security Issues at the Garrett A. Morgan Water Treatment Plant

Dear Mr. Motl:

The tragic events of September 11, 2001 forever changed our world and how we think about security. Not surprisingly, 9/11 changed the way we secure and operate drinking water treatment plants and associated assets across the country. The Federal government has identified drinking water systems as critical infrastructure that must be protected.

As the purveyor of drinking water for 1.5 million customers in the greater Cleveland area, the Cleveland Division of Water (CWD) has a significant public health responsibility. In order to accomplish our mission, CWD operates four water treatment plants including the Garrett A. Morgan Water Treatment Plant (WTP) located at 1245 West 45th Street, Cleveland, Ohio. The Morgan WTP, built in 1917, has the capacity to produce 150 million gallons of drinking water per day (mgd) and serves approximately 350,000 customers on the City's near west side and portions of Cleveland's western and southern suburbs.

After 9/11, CWD took immediate action and implemented “Heightened Security” which included restricting access to our facilities to protect our employees, our facilities, the drinking water supply as well as the welfare of our customers. As part of CWD's heightened security measures at the Morgan WTP, public roads (Division Avenue, Crescent Avenue and a portion of West 45th) that once divided the plant were closed to the public. It was determined that a public road running through the middle of an

Attachment
important water treatment plant posed a significant security risk. At that same time, fencing improvements were also made to create one, continuous perimeter and to improve the overall quality of the fencing. Despite security concerns, CWD made arrangements with Great Lakes Towing to provide access to their facility through the water treatment plant now that the public roads were closed.

CWD then embarked on an aggressive program to fully understand the new security threats we were facing and to develop and implement strategies to protect our water system. In January 2003, CWD completed a comprehensive Vulnerability Assessment (VA) of our water system using U.S. EPA approved RAM-W® method in accordance with Section 1433(a)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended by the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-188, Title IV—Drinking Water Security and Safety). The VA revealed that our existing physical protection systems were not adequate to protect our assets from current and emerging threats. The VA resulted in security improvement recommendations that were intended to reduce our risk and to better protect employees, facilities, and customers. Recommendations at the Morgan WTP included eliminating “gaps” in our physical protection system, improving access control at the plant, securing the perimeter and adding a perimeter detection system. The design of a new security system followed shortly thereafter and presently we are nearing the end of the construction phase. Over the past couple of years, CWD has invested over $25 million to dramatically enhance the security of our water system.

Although progress has been made, improvements are still needed at the Morgan WTP to address some of the “gaps” identified in the VA. One outstanding risk is the need for Great Lakes Towing employees, visitors and customers to drive through the Morgan WTP to access their facility. Furthermore, the volume of Great Lakes Towing traffic has greatly increased in the past year due to the relocation of their headquarters from Tower City to this location. In order to improve access control and security at the plant, it is necessary that a new public access route be created from a new West 54/53 exit from Route 2 (i.e., Cleveland Shoreway). This would allow Great Lakes Towing to enter their facility without entering the plant and it would allow for a new primary access point and Security Guard Station for the Morgan WTP. A Security Guard Station at West 54/53 would provide more functionality and improve site surveillance at the plant.
The Cleveland Division of Water is very concerned and dedicated to protecting its plants and the population that we serve. Any assistance you can provide in reducing the risk to the Morgan WTP would be greatly appreciated. Please keep me posted as to the developments of the Lakefront West Project as it relates to our water treatment plant.

Thank you for your help and cooperation in this matter. Please feel free to contact Robin Halperin at (216) 664-2444, extension 5634 if you should have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

J. Christopher Nielson
Commissioner

JCN/rlh

cc: Julius Ciaccia, Jr., Director, Department of Public Utilities
    William Tell, Chief of Security
    Rolfe Porter, Assistant Commissioner of Operations
    Tyrone Butler, Plant Manager, Garrett A. Morgan WTP
    Joe Sika, Risk Manager
    Robin Halperin, Assistant Risk Manager
    Alex Margevicius, Assistant Commissioner of Engineering
November 2, 2009

Mr. Patrick A. Bauer, Acting Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
200 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Attn: Michael B. Armstrong, Highway Engineer

Re: CUY-6-12.26/12.66 (PID 86478);
Categorical Exclusion Level 1

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

Enclosed, as requested, is the Categorical Exclusion Level 1 approved on April 14, 2009. Per your request to provide documentation on how this project was initiated and developed as part of project PID 77330 and how and why it was split out as a separate independent action, this letter was prepared to supplement the NEPA document to specifically address FHWA's expectations.

The April 14, 2009 Categorical Exclusion Level 1 references Lakefront West Project (CUY-6-12.20 TRAC, PID 77330) in the Project Description:

Project Description: Improvements to the West 76th Street tunnel under NS Railroad and West Shoreway (US-6), and Lake Avenue tunnel under the West Shoreway east of Clifton Boulevard. Also refer to the Lakefront West Project (PID 77330).

The Lakefront West Project will reconstruct the West Shoreway between West 25th Street and Clifton Boulevard. The West Shoreway will change from a high speed freeway to a low speed boulevard. One of the purposes of the Lakefront West Project is to provide better access to Lake Erie because the West Shoreway and NS Railroad are currently barriers between the residential community and the Lake. The aforementioned pedestrian tunnels that exist under the West Shoreway were identified as important community connections to the lakefront that needed to be maintained with the project and upgraded.

Improvements to the tunnels were included in the scope of the Lakefront West Project. The proposed improvement to the tunnels included concrete patching, concrete painting, and upgrade lighting. The West 76th Street tunnel work will also replace and upgrade steps located between NS Railroad and the West Shoreway, and provide a new ADA-compliant ramp adjacent to the steps. The Lake Avenue tunnel work will replace the adjacent steps on the south side of the West Shoreway with an ADA-compliant ramp.

The area of the tunnels was included in the environmental study area for the Lakefront West Project and investigated for ecological, historic, and public park resources in 2006 and 2007. The tunnel areas were also investigated for regulated materials. Based on these investigations for the Lakefront West Project, no environmental impacts are anticipated from the proposed improvements to the tunnels.
The Lakefront West Project was presented at a public meeting on December 11, 2008 as being split into separate construction projects to expedite construction and address funding concerns. The proposed Lakefront West project improvements and separation of construction projects concept was approved by the City of Cleveland Planning Commission on January 9, 2009.

On April 8, 2009, ODOT updated ELLIS to create five separate construction projects. This would assist in management, construction, timing and funding the project. Four of the five projects are covered by the environmental document being prepared under PID 77330, however, ODOT also determined that the subject tunnel improvements, CUY-6-12.26/12.66 (PID 86478), have independent utility from other four projects (PID 86479, 86480, 86481 and 86482).

The improvement to the tunnels is independent of the rest of the Lakefront West Project because it does not have any impact on vehicular or railroad traffic, is maintenance of an existing system on existing location, and could be done without precluding the work on the remainder of the West Shoreway.

The tunnels are strictly for pedestrian use. Vehicles are not allowed currently nor will they be allowed in the tunnels, therefore, there will be no impact on the existing or proposed roadway traffic. The work will be done with no interruption to railroad traffic. The existing connection points between the local street system and Edgewater Park will remain; therefore, there is no change in use anticipated.

The tunnels will not be shifted. Minor repairs (patching) will be done to the existing structures, and the lighting will be upgraded. The proposed ADA-compliant ramps are within existing roadway right-of-way. The replacement steps will take more area in order to meet current design standards, yet they are also all within existing right-of-way.

Finally, the tunnel improvements can be completed to provide improved safety and pedestrian access to the lakefront without any of the other Lakefront West Project improvements that are proposed. In addition, the tunnel improvement will not preclude any of the other Lakefront West Project improvements from being made in the future.

ODOT then prepared the April 14, 2009 Categorical Exclusion Level 1 for CUY-6-12.26/12.66 (PID 86478) referencing the environmental coordination from the Lakefront West Project.

ODOT requests FHWA to proceed with the required authorization to proceed to with detail design. If you have any questions, please contact me at (216) 584-2089.

Respectfully,

Mark Alan Carpenter, P.E.
District Environmental Coordinator

DAS:MAC

c: PID 86478
   PID 77330
   T. Hill
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1.0 Background
A comprehensive alternatives analysis was performed for the Lakefront West project from March 2006 through December 2008 involving the project subcommittee, ODOT, and the City of Cleveland. The alternatives evaluated included the “Corridor No Build Option” and “Corridor Boulevard Option”. Within the “Corridor Boulevard Option”, numerous options were analyzed for each of the following access points:

- Lake Avenue/West Boulevard/Clifton Boulevard (9 options)
- West 73rd Street (5 options)
- West 65th Street (6 options)
- Edgewater Park (7 options)
- Division Avenue/West 54th Street (5 options)
- West 49th Street/West 45th Street (4 options)
- West 28th Street/West 25th Street (16 options)

Development of the Preferred Options for each access point as well as the overall project Preferred Alternative was conducted during meetings conducted with the public and key stakeholders from April 2006 through December 2008 and are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Meeting #1</td>
<td>Apr 26, 2006</td>
<td>ODOT discussed the project status and the subcommittee determined the goals for the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Meeting #2</td>
<td>May 10, 2006</td>
<td>The subcommittee was broken up into two groups to brainstorm ideas for the various access points. Members sketched their ideas onto plastic sheets overlaid on the existing mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Meeting #3</td>
<td>Jun 14, 2006</td>
<td>The design team presented the ideas developed for comments. These conceptual Options were refined based on these comments, engineering criteria, and preliminary traffic information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Meeting #4</td>
<td>Jul 11, 2006</td>
<td>The design team presented the refined Options to the subcommittee for feedback before presenting to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #1</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2006</td>
<td>Options were presented to the public for comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mtg #1</td>
<td>Aug 8, 2006</td>
<td>Options were presented to the public for comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Meeting #5</td>
<td>Sept 12, 2006</td>
<td>The design team presented the refined Options to the subcommittee for comments before presenting to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #2</td>
<td>Sept 27, 2006</td>
<td>The design team presented the Options to the public with traffic analysis on for final comments to determine the preferred Option. The Options were refined per the comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design team presented the Options to the public with traffic analysis for final comments to determine the preferred Option.

The design team presented the refined Options to the subcommittee and a preferred Option was determined for all of the access points except the west end.

The design team presented the refined Options based on meeting with ODOT and the City of Cleveland. The new Options were presented to the subcommittee prior to the community meeting.

The design team presented additional Options to the Lake Avenue communities. Options were refined based on the public comments.

The design team presented the refined Options to the subcommittee. Additional Options were discussed at this meeting.

The design team presented the refined Options to the Planning Commission for input.

The design team presented the preferred Option to the Planning Commission for approval. The project was not approved.

The design team became aware of issues with the level of service not being acceptable after the traffic was certified in March 2007. The traffic analysis, the construction budget shortfall, and the project not being approved by Planning Commission led to a temporary design delay. During this delay, ODOT and the City of Cleveland had a series of meetings to discuss the Options and potential phasing opportunities. The design team was then reengaged in the fall of 2008 to take further refined Options to the subcommittee, the public, and the planning commission, as shown below.

The design team presented the Options to the subcommittee to get consensus on a preferred Option before presenting to the Planning Commission for approval.

The design team presented the preferred Option to the Public for input.

The design team presented the preferred Option to the Planning Commission for input. Additional information was requested.

The design team presented the preferred Option to the Planning Commission for approval. The project was approved.
2.0 Description of Corridor Alternatives

The existing mainline corridor is approximately 2 miles in length and begins at the intersections of Lake Avenue/West Boulevard and Lake Avenue/Clifton Boulevard, travels through Edgewater Park, and connects to the near west side while turning into the Main Avenue Bridge.

2.1 Corridor No Build Option

The existing corridor is a six-lane freeway with four existing vehicular connections and three existing bike/pedestrian connections. The vehicular connections utilize freeway style ramps and are located at Lake Avenue (west end), Edgewater Park, East 49th Street/East 45th Street, and West 28th Street/West 25th Street (east end). The three bike and/or pedestrian connections are located at Clifton Boulevard (pedestrian only), West 76th Street (pedestrian only), and West 65th Street (bike and pedestrian).

The eastbound and westbound lanes of the six-lane typical section are separated with a concrete barrier and narrow shoulders. The outside shoulders are wider and lined with guardrail for the majority of the project. The only pedestrian access is across the West Shoreway via the pedestrian/bike tunnels at Clifton, West 76th, and West 65th.
2.2 Corridor Boulevard Option

The original intent for the corridor was a six-lane boulevard separated with a grassy median, lined with trees, a multi-use trail that traveled the length of the project, decorative lighting, and signals. In addition to the existing access points that were to be reconfigured as signalized intersections, alternatives were studied to provide additional vehicular connections at West 73rd Street, West 65th Street, and West 54th Street.
During the process of alternative development, an initial preferred alternative was determined for the corridor that included the following:

- Reconfigure the Lake Avenue/ West Boulevard intersection
- Close the pedestrian tunnel under the West Shoreway near Clifton
- Rehabilitate the West 76th Street Tunnels
- Reconfigure the Edgewater interchange into an at-grade signalized intersection with West 73rd Street and Edgewater Park
- Leave the bike and pedestrian access as is at West 65th
- Add an at-grade signalized intersection at West 54th and Division
- Close West 49th to vehicular traffic
- Convert West 45th Street into a signalized “T” intersection
- Convert West 28th Street into an at-grade signalized intersection with the ramps to the West Shoreway, close the EB entrance ramp, reconfigure Main Avenue
- Installation of a multi-purpose trail from West 28th Street to West 49th Street and through the neighborhoods to connect to Wet 65th Street and parallel to the mainline from Edgewater Park to Lake Avenue/West Boulevard

In March of 2007, this alternative had an estimated construction budget that exceeded the available funding by approximately $25 Million. The traffic analysis was being updated with the recently certified traffic and it was determined that the corridor did not operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition or traffic signals in the PM peak. The preferred alternative was presented to the Cleveland Planning Commission and it was not approved.

This led ODOT and the City of Cleveland to determine alternative phasing of the project that would address budgetary and operation concerns, resulting in the following proposal.

**Phase 1**

- Installation of the Lakefront Bikeway multipurpose trail along the West Shoreway from West 65th to West 28th.
- Reconstruction of the West 49th St. ramps and reconfiguration of the Herman Ave. Bridge over US-6.
- Reconstruct the Lake Ave/West Blvd/US-6 ramp intersection and close the WB ramp to Edgewater Drive.
- Closure of the Main Ave. bridge EB entrance ramp from West 28th St and the realignment of the Main Ave. WB exit ramp to West 28th St.
- Reconstruction of the West 45th St ramps to the West Shoreway to accommodate the West 28th St traffic.
- Relocate the US-6/West 25th St Ramps to West 28th St, widen Detroit Ave (US-6A) and widen West 28th St., reconstruct West 25th St/Main Ave corridor.
- Addition of new access points to the West Shoreway at West 54th St on the south and Division Ave to the north.
- Relocate the Lakefront Bikeway to West 25th St and Washington Ave.
• Extend and relocate West 73rd St under the NS RR to access the West Shoreway (US-6) and Edgewater Park, including relocation of the NEORSD trunk sewer.

Phase 2
• Replacement of the existing West Shoreway mainline pavement from Clifton Blvd. to the Main Ave Bridge, including the ramps to/from West Blvd.
• Shoulders will be eliminated to reflect the non-freeway speed limit.
• New multipurpose trail will be constructed along the north side of the West Shoreway from West Blvd to Edgewater park lower level.

This phasing along with the revised alternatives was presented to the subcommittee, public and Planning Commission in December 2008. It was approved as the preferred alternative in January 2009.

3.0 General Discussion

3.1 Geometry/Design Exceptions
The horizontal alignment is the same for the mainline no-build and Boulevard options. The vertical alignment varies in that adjustments have been made to make the existing edge of pavement as close to the proposed edge of pavement while meeting criteria for crest and sag vertical curves. Superelevation is not required for the Boulevard option due to the design speed and degree of curvature; however, the pavement under the Norfolk Southern structure will be superelevated to maintain the existing vertical clearance and minimize construction impacts.

3.2 Traffic
With the exception of the speed, the traffic operates similarly in the no-build and Boulevard options. The Level of Service in the no-build option is slightly better than the Boulevard option; this was not viewed as a negative impact due to the added benefit of the additional access points.

3.3 Multi-Use Path
The original intent for the multi-use path was to extend the length of the corridor. This was determined to not be feasible due to insufficient width at the structure carrying Norfolk Southern over the West Shoreway. There was some discussion of the existing structure having an opening to the north for the original road alignment, but it was determined that the structural integrity of the opening was compromised when it was abandoned. The cost implications exceeded the benefit.

The proposed multi-use path will act as a continuous path from the intersection of West Boulevard and Lake Avenue to the intersection of West 25th Street and Detroit Avenue. The
path starts at the intersection of West Boulevard and Lake Avenue following the westbound exit road to parallel the mainline. The path follows the mainline to a point east of West 76th and connects with the existing path in the park. The existing path takes a turn under the Edgewater Bridge, then proceeds south and connects with the West 65th Street path.

From the West 65th Street path, the path turns to the east following Breakwater Avenue to Cass Avenue and crosses West 54th Street where it parallels the mainline on the south and travels up a bluff to connect to the West 49th Street Bridge. The path crosses the bridge and continues along the north side of the mainline to the intersection of Washington Avenue and West 28th Street. The path continues along Washington Avenue to West 25th Street and connects with existing bike lanes at West 25th and Detroit Avenue.

Additional multi-use paths connect West 49th Street Bridge to the new Division extension on the north side of the mainline. Bike lanes connect West 73rd Street to a multi-use path near the Edgewater bridge and the West 65th Street path.

3.4 Pavement Design

Based on the City of Cleveland’s preference, ODOT’s Pavement Selection Committee provided the following pavement design:

- 9” Item 452 Non-Reinforced Concrete
- 6” Item 304 Aggregate Base

All of the typical sections are based on this pavement design.

3.5 Maintenance of Traffic

The Conceptual Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) was submitted in February 2007 for flexible and rigid pavements. The recommended phasing was a contra-flow scheme that would maintain 2 lanes in each direction. The concepts were mainline focused. The design team’s direction at this stage is to leave the MOT concept unchanged and to refine the conceptual MOT during the detailed design phase.

3.6 Signals

A Highway Capacity Software (HCS) analysis of the SR 2 operations with signalized intersections within the Study Area showed that an acceptable level of service (LOS) could not be obtained. The analysis included the accommodation of pedestrians.
## 4.0 Comparison Table

The design comparison table shown compares several design features for the No Build versus Boulevard options. The table summarizes differences in design criteria, traffic operations, ability to accommodate the multi-use trail along the mainline, right-of-way impacts, and general costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MAINLINE (WEST SHOREWAY) - DESIGN COMPARISON TABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Build Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Speed</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width</td>
<td>3 - 12'±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width</td>
<td>Median - Varies 1' - 2' ± Outside - 6' - 11' ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Width</td>
<td>Width over EB entrance Ramp - 76' - 0' ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width over Edgewater Entrance - 96' - 0' ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width under NS - 44' - 0' ± WB &amp; EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width under West 49th - 43' - 0' ± WB &amp; EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width over West 28th - 64' - 8' ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Alignment</td>
<td>Varies - 2' - 6' ± - Does Not Meet Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superelevation</td>
<td>0.06 Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Alignment</td>
<td>K Value - 114 Crest, 115 Sag - Does Not Meet Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Varies - 0.25% - 4.75% ± - Does Not Meet Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>495' - Meets Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Slope</td>
<td>0.016 - Meets Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance</td>
<td>VC over EB entrance Ramp - 15' - 3 1/2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VC over Edgewater Bridge - 13' - 9 1/2'±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VC under NS - 13' - 9 1/2'±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VC under West 49th - 13' - 9 1/2' ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VC over West 28th - 13' - 8 1/2' ±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Offset</td>
<td>ML over EB entrance Ramp - H20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Capacity</td>
<td>NS - No work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West over West 28th - To be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signals</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB, AM Peak - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB, PM Peak - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB, AM Peak - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB, PM Peak - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>Along mainline between West 28th and West 49th to connect with neighborhood and between Edgewater Bridge to West Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trail</td>
<td>None along mainline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Lake Avenue/Clifton Boulevard/West Boulevard Analysis

5.1 Description of Options

The No Build Option gives access to the West Shoreway from Clifton Boulevard and from the West Boulevard/Lake Avenue intersection. Clifton Boulevard becomes the West Shoreway at the intersection on Lake Avenue. Access to and from West Boulevard is via “freeway” style ramps through the park.

Seven options, labeled A through G, were developed for this access point, as defined below. The ideas brainstormed by the members of the subcommittee included various scenarios of removing the ramps with all traffic accessing the West Shoreway from Lake Avenue and Clifton Boulevard and the potential for a roundabout at the Clifton Boulevard/Lake Avenue/West Shoreway intersection.
5.1.1 **Option A**

- Close the ramps to West Boulevard, widen Lake Avenue to four lanes with parking on both sides, allow left turns from eastbound Lake Avenue to the West Shoreway
- This Option was removed due to preliminary traffic indicating a two-lane road was sufficient to carry the proposed traffic on Lake Avenue.
5.1.2 Option B

- The original Option B considered closing of the ramps to West Boulevard, creating a one-way access street to the residents on Lake Avenue between West Boulevard and Clifton Road, and creating a four lane road north of the one way road with a small median. It also considered allowing left turns from the eastbound four-lane Lake Avenue onto the Shoreway (currently prohibited).
- This option was refined to make adjustments to the width of the median.
- The one-way access street was changed to be a two-way road with parking on both sides. The parallel run-around street was narrowed to two lanes, to meet the requirements of the traffic analysis. Essentially, the option entails tying existing Lake Avenue on both ends into a new, parallel, two-lane street several hundred feet from the end of the block. In addition, eastbound Lake Avenue would incorporate two dedicated left turn lanes onto the West Shoreway in order to carry the expected morning rush-hour traffic.
- This option was removed after community comments against changing existing conditions.
5.1.3 Option C

- The original Option C involved removing the ramps to West Boulevard and creating a “Lake Avenue run-around”, a new two lane road with intersections at West Boulevard and Clifton Boulevard/West Shoreway/Lake Avenue. It also involved closing existing Lake Avenue before the intersections at West Boulevard and Clifton Road with cul-de-sacs, providing access to existing Lake Avenue from the new run-around road at mid-block, and permitting left-hand turns onto the West Shoreway from the eastbound run-around road.

- This Option was then changed to eliminate the cul-de-sacs on existing Lake Avenue, and to connect Lake Avenue to the “run-around” road at both ends, just before the intersections with West Boulevard or Clifton Boulevard.

- It was further refined by the addition of the two dedicated left turn lanes from eastbound Lake Avenue onto the West Shoreway. This option is essentially the same as option B except the run-around street is located several hundred feet off of the existing Lake Avenue, creating a 3.7 acre space in between the roads (compared to 1.1 acre for option B).

- This option was removed because it functioned similarly to Option B, but took up a greater part of the park.
5.1.4 Option D

- The original Option D involved closing the ramps to West Boulevard, widening Lake Avenue to four lanes, and creating a roundabout for the Lake Avenue/Clifton Road/West Shoreway intersection.
- The Option was then changed to eliminate the unpopular roundabout and the Lake Avenue widening, as preliminary traffic numbers deem it unnecessary. The option entails only closing the ramps to West Boulevard and allowing left turns from eastbound Lake Avenue onto the West Shoreway.
- After additional traffic analysis, this Option was further refined to include two dedicated left turn lanes from eastbound Lake Avenue onto the West Shoreway.
- This option was removed after community comments.
5.1.5 **Option E**

- This option debuted at the January 2007 Subcommittee Meeting. It reconfigures the existing ramps and incorporates a new bike/pedestrian bridge over the ramps to connect to the park mid-block.
- The subcommittee favored this option with the caveat that the Lake Avenue/West Boulevard intersection be refined for both turning movements and pedestrian accessibility.
- This option was removed after community comments.
5.1.6 **Option F**

- This option debuted at the January 2007 Subcommittee Meeting. It removes the ramps, relocates Lake Avenue northward, and provides a one-way access road with parking to existing Lake Avenue residents.
- This option was removed after community comments.
5.1.7 **Option G (also known as the “Modified No Build”)**

- This Option debuted at the January 2007 Community Meeting. It reconfigures the westbound ramp to merge with the eastbound ramp, creating a two-lane road. The eastbound ramp would merge into the West Shoreway, rather than add a lane, and a pedestrian/bike bridge would be added to span the two ramps and provide direct access to the park.
- This proposal was decisively favored by residents in attendance and ultimately was selected as the preferred option.
5.1.8 Option G – Updated

Further modifications were made to Option G during the final phase of alternative development. The potential pedestrian bridge was removed and the existing pedestrian tunnel was decided to be rehabilitated to comply with ADA standards in lieu of being removed. In addition, the pedestrian island at the Lake Avenue/West Boulevard intersection was removed as recommended by the City.
5.2 **Lake Avenue/Clifton Boulevard/West Boulevard Evaluation Matrix**

The matrix below is the original evaluation matrix developed after the initial round of public meetings. Option A was not presented for a vote, because of the results of the preliminary traffic analysis noted above. Options E, F, and G were developed at a later date, and thus were not voted on at the early public meetings. A preferred alternative was not determined at this time, and additional development and evaluation subsequently took place.

![Access Point Options Evaluation Matrix](image-url)

Legend:
- Positive Change or Impact
- Minor / No Change or Impact
- Negative Change or Impact
5.3 **Lake Avenue/Clifton Boulevard/West Boulevard Summary/Conclusion**

The matrix shown on this page compares and evaluates the Options that were carried forward after the initial public meetings and refined as described above. The preferred alternative selection, based on the evaluation criteria shown and on Stakeholder preference, was **Option G**. This alternative includes minor realignment of the ramps to reduce the impacts to the park and rehabilitation of the existing tunnel for ADA compliance.

![Access Point Options Evaluation Matrix](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Point Options</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves Connectivity for Pedestrians &amp; Bikes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Connectivity for Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Connectivity for Trucks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Access to Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Parkland/Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Contiguous Parkland/Green Space (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates Excess Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in Pavement Area (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Green Space Disturbed between EB Ramp and Lake Avenue (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bridges to be Maintained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Development Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations/Level of Service - Lake @ Clifton</td>
<td>B (B)</td>
<td>C (B)</td>
<td>C (B)</td>
<td>B (B)</td>
<td>C (B)</td>
<td>B (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations/Level of Service - Lake @ West</td>
<td>D (C)</td>
<td>B (A)</td>
<td>B (A)</td>
<td>C (A)</td>
<td>B (A)</td>
<td>D (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Issues - 5-Leg Intersection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimate (in $ Millions)</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Gudell/Edgewater Public Response_

**Legend:**
- Green: Positive change or impact
- Orange: Minor/No change or impact
- Red: Negative change or impact
- X: AM (PM) Peak Hour Level of Service
6.0 West 73rd Street Analysis

6.1 Description of Options

The No Build Option consists of an existing pedestrian/bike tunnel that takes West 65\textsuperscript{th} Street under Norfolk Southern Railway, ramps down the slope, travels under the West Shoreway and connects to Edgewater Park. West 65\textsuperscript{th}, 67\textsuperscript{th}, 69\textsuperscript{th}, 70\textsuperscript{th}, and 73\textsuperscript{rd} Streets “T” into Father Caruso Drive. There is no vehicular connection to the park from this neighborhood.

At this location, originally referred to as the Father Caruso access point, the subcommittee desired access to the West Shoreway from West 73\textsuperscript{rd} Street, West 65\textsuperscript{th} Street, or both. The initial ideas for this access point brainstormed by the subcommittee included:

- A connection to the West Shoreway from West 65th Street in which the alignment of West 65th Street extends north and slightly east to go under the railroad and meet the West Shoreway.
- A connection to the West Shoreway from West 73rd Street in which West 73rd Street extends north and drops under Father Caruso Boulevard as well as the railroad before coming to an at grade intersection with the West Shoreway.
- An option which employs connections with both West 73rd Street and West 65th Street.
For all these concepts, the entrance to Edgewater Park was relocated to directly across from West 73rd Street, creating a full intersection at the options which contained a West 73rd Street connector.

Three specific Options, labeled A through C, were developed for this access point as described below.

6.1.1 **Option A**
- Option A initially consisted of an at-grade intersection with the railroad and West 73rd Street, with the road immediately turning east along the hillside and then going under the Shoreway (via the existing Edgewater bridge) to enter Edgewater Park.
- It was refined based on subcommittee comments to extend West 73rd Street north under Father Caruso Boulevard and the railroad to an at-grade intersection with the Shoreway. Also, the Westerly Interceptor was re-routed south, under West 73rd Street, and then back north to connect with the existing interceptor.
- This option was not carried forward due to similarity to Option B, but with steeper grades and more retaining wall impacts.
6.1.2 **Option B**

- Option B initially extended West 73rd Street north under Father Caruso Boulevard and the railroad to meet the Shoreway with an at-grade intersection.
- It was further refined by shifting the West 73rd Street alignment east slightly, reducing the grade of the road as it travels under the railroad to an at-grade intersection with the Shoreway. Father Caruso Drive would end at West 70th Street. Again, the Westerly interceptor would be relocated south, under the new West 73rd Street, and then back north to its existing alignment.
- This option was selected as the preferred option.
6.1.3 Option C

- This option involved extending West 73rd Street north under the railroad to an at-grade intersection with the Shoreway. It also involved lowering Father Caruso Drive to an at-grade intersection with West 73rd Street just south of the railroad.
- This option was not carried forward due to the retaining wall impacts.
6.1.4 Option B – Updated
Further modifications were made to Option B during the final phase of alternative development. It was determined that the corridor did not operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition or traffic signals. The removal of the signals necessitated the West 73rd Extension to connect with the ramp, then traveling to the east on a two-way ramp connector road and ultimately going under the West Shoreway utilizing the existing Edgewater Bridge.

6.2 West 73rd Street Evaluation Matrix
The table shown below compares the Options developed for this access point. Option C was developed after the public involvement preferences shown on this table were collected.
6.3 West 73rd Street Summary/Conclusion

Option B was identified as the preferred alternative. This alternative includes shifting the alignment for West 73rd to the east, and lowering the road under the Norfolk Southern tracks to connect to a relocated low speed exit ramp. The West 73rd extension then curves to the east and connects with the existing road under the Edgewater Park Bridge. The interceptor sewer needs to be relocated as part of this option. Modeling of the sewer will be completed in February 2010.
7.0 Edgewater Park Analysis

7.1 Description of Options

The No Build Option gives access to and from Edgewater Park via “freeway” style ramps to the West Shoreway.

A total of 5 Options, A through E as described below, were developed for this access point. The ideas brainstormed by the members of the subcommittee included modifying the existing access while retaining current access to Whiskey Island, Edgewater parking, and boat club. The new entrance was originally developed to be an at grade intersection with the West Shoreway.
7.1.1 **Option A**

- This option intersects the West Shoreway at the location of the existing Edgewater Bridge. The bridge would be removed and the vertical alignment of the West Shoreway would be lowered. This option works with several of the early Father Caruso alternatives that had connectors from the neighborhood snake along the hillside to this location.
- This option was removed because the Father Caruso Drive connections were determined to be not feasible in this location.
7.1.2 **Option B**

- This option locates an intersection with the Shoreway directly across from West 73rd Street. This would be accomplished with either West 73rd Street forming a full intersection or with West 65th Street forming an offset intersection. In the park, the entrance immediately "T's", west for parking and east to the marina or Whiskey Island.
- This option was removed after subcommittee comments.
7.1.3 **Option C**

- This option proposed an intersection with the Shoreway directly across from West 73rd Street. This would be accomplished by either West 73rd Street forming a full intersection or with West 65th Street forming an offset intersection. In the park, the entrance meanders to the existing intersection with Whiskey Island drive, the road to the marina, and the access road to Edgewater parking.
- This option was removed after subcommittee comments and because the connection at West 65\textsuperscript{th} was determined to be not feasible.
7.1.4  **Option D**

- This option contains an intersection with the Shoreway directly across from West 73rd Street. This would be accomplished by either West 73rd Street forming a full intersection or with West 65th Street forming an offset intersection. In the park, the entrance meanders to the location of the existing intersection with Whiskey Island drive, the road to the marina, and the access road to Edgewater parking. In addition, either the West 73rd Street or West 65th Street proposed connector could pass under the Shoreway and Edgewater bridge and also meet at the intersection.

- This option was removed after subcommittee comments and because the connection at West 65th was determined to be not feasible.
7.1.5 Option E

- This option is the same as Option D, but contains a roundabout instead of the five-way intersection.
- This option was removed after subcommittee comments and because the connection at West 65th was determined to be not feasible
7.1.6  **Option No Build - Update**
Maintaining Edgewater Park access from the West Shoreway using “freeway” style ramps was identified as the preferred alternative for West 73rd and West 65th. The project includes the rehabilitation of the ramps on the south side of the West Shoreway. The ramps on the north side of the West Shoreway were removed from the project. They will be incorporated into a new Master Plan for the park.

7.2  **Edgewater Park Evaluation Matrix**
The matrix shown is the original evaluation matrix, which was produced before Options D and E were developed. In addition, the stakeholder preference numbers shown were collected prior to the development of Options D and E.
7.3 Edgewater Park Summary/Conclusion
The preferred alternative was determined to be the No Build Option.
8.0 West 65th Street Pedestrian Tunnel Analysis

8.1 Description of Options

Originally referred to as the Father Caruso access point, the subcommittee proposed that access to the West Shoreway would be from West 73rd Street and/or West 65th Street. The ideas brainstormed by the members of the subcommittee for this access point include:

- A connection to the West Shoreway from West 65th Street in which the alignment of West 65th Street extends north and slightly east to go under the railroad and meet the West Shoreway.
- A connection to the West Shoreway from West 73rd Street in which West 73rd Street extends north and drops under Father Caruso Boulevard as well as the railroad before coming to an at grade intersection with the West Shoreway.
- An option which employs connections with both West 73rd Street and West 65th Street.

For this access point, four Options, A through D, were developed as described below.
8.1.1 Option A

- This option originally extended West 65th Street north to an at grade intersection with the railroad, with the road turning west along the hillside and then going under the West Shoreway (via the existing Edgewater bridge) to enter Edgewater Park.
- This option was refined by shifting West 65th Street slightly east, over the Westerly interceptor and then under the overflow sewer and railroad to an at-grade intersection with the West Shoreway.
- This option was removed because it was determined to not be feasible.
8.1.2 **Option B**

- The original intent of this option was to extend West 65th Street northeast to an at-grade intersection with the railroad, then turn west along the hillside and pass under the West Shoreway (via the existing Edgewater bridge) to enter Edgewater Park.
- This Option was refined to shift West 65th Street slightly east, over the Westerly interceptor and then under the overflow sewer and railroad. It then turns west along the hillside and comes to an at-grade intersection with the West Shoreway at the current location of the Edgewater bridge, which was to be removed.
- This option was removed because it was determined to not be feasible.
8.1.3 **Option C**

- This option involved extending West 65th Street northeast after the intersection with Father Caruso Drive and then under the railroad to an at-grade intersection with the West Shoreway.
- This option was removed because it was determined to not be feasible.
8.1.4 Option D

- This option proposed extending West 65th Street north under the railroad to an at-grade intersection with the West Shoreway. For this option to work, retaining walls would be required south of Father Caruso Drive and cul-de-sacs would be necessary at Father Caruso Drive and Breakwater Ave.
- This option was removed because it was determined to not be feasible.
8.1.5 Option No Build - Update
West 65th Street will not be modified as part of this project.

8.2 West 65th Street Pedestrian Tunnel Evaluation Matrix
The matrix shown is the original evaluation matrix, which was produced before Options C and D were developed. In addition, the stakeholder preference numbers shown were collected prior to the development of Options C and D.
### 8.3 West 65th Street Pedestrian Tunnel Summary/Conclusion

The preferred alternative was determined to be the No Build Option.
9.0 West 54th Street/Division Avenue Analysis

9.1 Description of Options

West 54th Street and Division Avenue do not have access in the No Build scenario. West 54th Street runs north and turns into Cass Avenue just south of the West Shoreway. Division Avenue ends at the Cleveland Water Department.

A total of three specific Options, A through C as described below, were developed for this access point. The ideas brainstormed by the members of the subcommittee initially focused on developing an at-grade intersection with the West Shoreway connecting Division Avenue and West 54th.
9.1.1 Option A

- This option creates an at-grade intersection with West 54th Street, Division Avenue and the West Shoreway. Cass Ave. ends in a cul-de-sac just east of its intersection with West 58th Street. West 54th Street swings west and then north to an at-grade intersection with the Shoreway. North of the Shoreway, West 54th Street travels northeast to a connection with Division Avenue.
- This option was removed due to the impacts to the adjacent property.
9.1.2 Option B

- In this option, West 54th Street stays on its current north-south alignment and intersects the West Shoreway. West 54th Street continues due north after the West Shoreway intersection until it connects with existing Division Avenue. Cass Ave. ends in a cul-de-sac just east of its intersection with West 58th Street. This option involves taking West 54th Street through the existing Soap Box Derby track.
- This option was removed due to the impacts to the adjacent property.
9.1.3 **Option C**

- In this option, West 54th Street stays on its current north-south alignment and intersects the West Shoreway. North of the West Shoreway, West 54th Street continues as an offset intersection, west of the existing Soap Box Derby track. Cass ends in a cul-de-sac just east of its intersection with West 58th Street. This street travels northeast around the track to connect to existing Division Avenue.
- This was selected as the preferred option.
9.1.4 Option C – Updated

Further modifications were identified for Option C during the final phase of alternative development. It was determined that the corridor did not operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition or traffic signals. The removal of the signals necessitated the intersections as right-in and right-out as shown. The cul-de-sac at Cass Ave. was moved to the north to accommodate additional parking.

9.2 West 54th Street/Division Avenue Evaluation Matrix

The matrix shown below is the original evaluation matrix, prior to the above-referenced modifications to Option C.
9.3 West 54th Street/Division Avenue Summary/Conclusion

The preferred alternative selected was Option C. This alternative includes reconfiguring West 54th Street to provide an at-grade connection, adding an intersection with Division Avenue and a multi-use path that connects the mainline multi-use path to Breakwater Avenue.
10.1 Description of Options

At this access point, West 45th Street and West 49th Street have “freeway” ramp access in the No Build scenario. West 45th Street runs north and connects with West Shoreway (eastbound exit and eastbound entrance). West 49th Street connects with West Shoreway (westbound exit and westbound entrance).

Two specific options, A and B as described below, were developed for this access point. The ideas brainstormed by the members of the subcommittee initially involved developing an at grade intersection with the West Shoreway connecting West 45th and West 49th Streets.
10.1.1 Option A

- This option creates two right-in/right-out access points at West 45th Street and off of the approach of the West 49th Street Bridge. Tillman Avenue would be modified to a cul-de-sac west of West 45th Street.
10.1.2 Option B

- This option closes the West 49th Street bridge to vehicular access and creates a full intersection with West 45th Street and the West Shoreway. The entrance to the Water Department is relocated to Division Avenue at the request of the department, although concerns were raised about the substandard vertical clearance for the West 49th Street Bridge. Tillman Avenue would be converted to a cul-de-sac west of West 45th Street.
- This option was preferred until it was determined that signals were not feasible.
10.1.3 Option A - Updated

Further modifications were proposed for Option A during the final phase of alternative development. From traffic analysis it was determined that the corridor did not operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition or traffic signals. The removal of the signals necessitated defining the intersections as right-in and right-out as shown. The intersection modifications improve the safety of the existing interchange. The West 49th Street Bridge will change from 4 lanes of vehicular traffic to two, and a bike path will be added.

10.2 West 49th Street/West 45th Street Evaluation Matrix

The matrix shown below is the original evaluation matrix, prior to the above-referenced modifications to Option A.
10.3 West 49th Street/West 45th Street Summary/Conclusion

The preferred alternative selected was Option A. This alternative includes geometric improvements to the intersection, a dedicated bike path over the West 49th Street Bridge, and a cul-de-sac at Tillman Avenue.
11.0 West 28th Street/West 25th Street Analysis

11.1 Description of Options

The **No Build Option** provides access to the West Shoreway from West 28th Street and West 25th Street via freeway ramps. In the current configuration eastbound entrance and exit ramps are accessed from West 28th Street and westbound entrance and exit ramps are accessed from West 25th Street. The eastbound entrance ramp has a substandard acceleration length with a left entrance and no sight distance.

A total of 11 separate Options were identified for this access point. These Options, labeled A through K, are described in detail below. The ideas brainstormed by the members of the subcommittee included several concepts that attempted to beautify the neighborhood, increase connectivity across the West Shoreway between Ohio City and CMHA, create developable space, remove excess infrastructure and make the West Shoreway safer and less confusing.
11.1.1 Option A

- The intent of this option was to create a full intersection between West 28th Street and the Shoreway. This would require a new mainline structure over West 25th Street to the existing Main Avenue Bridge and the widening of Detroit Avenue between West 25th and West 28th Streets, as well as West 28th Street between the West Shoreway and Detroit Avenue.
- The West 28th Street bridge would be eliminated.
- The subway ramp would be replaced with new ramps that travel down to an intersection with West 28th Street. This Option would also retain existing ramps to West 28th Street, creating a full intersection (two sets of ramps, north and south West 28th Street).
- The mainline structures over West 28th Street and West 25th Street would be retained and the left exits/entrances converted to drop/add lanes to eliminate substandard merging distances.
- This option was removed because of comments from trucking interests.
11.1.2 Option B

- This option would create a full intersection between West 28th Street and the West Shoreway. It would require a new mainline structure over West 25th Street to the existing Main Avenue Bridge and the widening of Detroit Avenue between West 25th and West 28th Streets, as well as West 28th Street between the Shoreway and Detroit Avenue.
- This option was not selected because it does not function at an acceptable level of service.
11.1.3 Option C

- This Option is similar to Option B, but would close Washington Avenue between West 28th and West 25th Streets. It would provide access to the substation and parking lot by a private drive off of West 25th Street along the existing Washington Avenue right-of-way.
- This option was not selected because it does not function at an acceptable level of service and also because it was desired to keep Washington Avenue open.
11.1.4 Option D

- This option creates two at-grade intersections with the West Shoreway. West 29th Street is extended to an intersection with the West Shoreway, and then further north to a new intersection with an extended Washington Avenue. A full intersection between West 28th Street and the West Shoreway would be created. A new structure would carry the West Shoreway over West 25th Street and connect to existing Main Avenue Bridge. Detroit Avenue would be widened between West 25th and West 28th Streets. This Option would convert West 28th Street one-way northbound, West 29th Street one-way southbound, and Washington Avenue between West 28th and West 29th Streets one-way westbound.

- This option was dropped because of uncertainty with the ability of West 29th Street to support the proposed traffic modifications, and the fact that it was not deemed possible to widen West 29th Street.
11.1.5 Option E

- This option is the same as Option D except Washington Avenue would be closed between West 28th and West 25th Streets. Access to the substation by a private drive off of West 25th Street along the existing Washington Avenue right-of-way.
- This option was dropped because of uncertainty with the ability of West 29th Street to support the proposed traffic modifications, and the fact that it was not deemed possible to widen West 29th Street.
11.1.6 **Option F**

- This Option is the same as Option B except the West 25th Street/Detroit Avenue intersection would be replaced with an oval roundabout. The alignment of Vermont Avenue would be modified and directed into the roundabout.
- This option was abandoned due to the inability of the roundabout to carry the traffic required, and the roundabout’s incompatibility with the abundance of public transportation in the area.
11.1.7 Option G

- This Option is the same as Option F except Washington Avenue would be closed between 28th and 25th Streets. Access to the substation would be provided by a private drive off of West 25th Street located on the existing Washington Avenue right-of-way.
- This option was abandoned due to the inability of the roundabout to carry the traffic required, and the roundabout’s incompatibility with the abundance of public transportation in the area.
### 11.1.8 Option H

- This option would create an intersection with the West Shoreway and West 28th Street. The West 25th Street/Detroit Avenue intersection would be replaced with a roundabout. The alignment of Vermont Avenue is modified and directed into the roundabout. The mainline alignment east of West 28th would be modified and the West Shoreway would require a new structure to meet with the existing Main Avenue Bridge. West 25th Street would be closed under the West Shoreway and West 28th Street would be widened between Detroit Avenue and the West Shoreway.
- This option was removed because it would require significant work on the Main Avenue bridge which was beyond the scope and budget of this project.
11.1.9 Option I

- This Option is the same as Option G, except that the roundabout would be oval-shaped in the east-west direction with a direct connection to West 28th Street.
- This option was removed because it would require significant work on the Main Avenue bridge which was beyond the scope and budget of this project.
11.1.10 Option J

- This Option is the same as Option A, except that the intersection between Washington Avenue, Main Avenue, and West 25th Street has been changed to make the Main Avenue to southerly West 25th Street the main movement. There will be a two-way stop on Washington Avenue and northerly West 25th Street. This will preclude trucks having to stop on the steep Main Avenue hill, and the re-design of the intersection will improve currently inadequate sight distances.
11.1.11 Option K

- This Option is the same as Option B, except that the intersection between Washington Avenue, Main Avenue, and West 25th Street has been changed to make the Main Avenue to southerly West 25th Street the main movement. There will be a two-way stop on Washington Avenue and northerly West 25th Street. This will preclude trucks having to stop on the steep Main Avenue hill, and the re-design of the intersection will improve currently inadequate sight distances.
- This option was removed because further traffic studies revealed that it would require a fourth mainline lane to operate at Level of Service D.
11.1.12 Option J - Updated

For Option J, further development determined that the corridor did not operate at acceptable levels of service with the addition or traffic signals. This option creates an at-grade intersection with the west bound entrance and exit ramps and the eastbound exit ramp. The eastbound entrance ramp would be removed, and West 28th and Detroit would be widened. The intersection between Washington Avenue, Main Avenue, and West 25th Street has been changed to make the Main Avenue to southerly West 25th Street the main movement. There will be a two-way stop on Washington Avenue and northerly West 25th Street. This will preclude trucks having to stop on the steep Main Avenue hill, and the re-design of the intersection will improve currently inadequate sight distances. Washington Avenue would be one way eastbound at Main Avenue.
11.1.13 Option J - Further Updated

Further modifications were made to Option J during the final phase of alternative development. The recertification of traffic indicated that West 28th Street between the ramps and Detroit would need to be six lanes for an acceptable level of service. It was determined that restricting access to northbound traffic between Washington and the ramps would allow West 28th Street to function at acceptable levels with four lanes.

11.2 West 28th Street/West 25th Street Evaluation Matrix

The matrix shown is the original evaluation matrix. Options H and I were not presented because of the above-mentioned impact to the Main Avenue Bridge. The modifications to Option J mentioned above occurred subsequent to the collection of public preference for Options A through K.
11.3 **West 28th Street/West 25th Street Summary/Conclusion**

The preferred alternative selected was **Option J**, including the updated development as described above. This alternative includes converting West 28th Street and the ramps into an at-grade intersection at West 28th, closing the EB entrance ramp for safety concerns, realigning the Main Avenue to West 28th movement, and the addition of a multipurpose trail.
12.0 Preferred Alternative Summary/Conclusion

As a result of the collaborative effort described above between ODOT, key stakeholders, and the design team, the boulevard option was selected as the preferred alternative for the mainline. The boulevard option can be summarized as follows:

**Phase 1**
- Installation of the Lakefront Bikeway multipurpose trail along the West Shoreway from West 65th to West 28th.
- Reconstruction of the West 49th St. ramps and reconfiguration of the Herman Ave. Bridge over US-6.
- Reconstruct the Lake Ave/West Blvd/US-6 ramp intersection and close the WB ramp to Edgewater Drive.
- Closure of the Main Ave. bridge EB entrance ramp from West 28th St and the realignment of the Main Ave. WB exit ramp to West 28th St.
- Reconstruction of the West 45th St ramps to the West Shoreway to accommodate the West 28th St traffic.
- Relocate the US-6/West 25th St Ramps to West 28th St, widen Detroit Ave (US-6A) and widen West 28th St., reconstruct West 25th St/Main Ave corridor.
- Addition of new access points to the West Shoreway at West 54th St on the south and Division Ave to the north.
- Relocate the Lakefront Bikeway to West 25th St and Washington Ave.
- Extend and relocate West 73rd St under the NS RR to access the West Shoreway (US-6) and Edgewater Park, including relocation of the NEORSD trunk sewer.

**Phase 2**
- Replacement of the existing West Shoreway mainline pavement from Clifton Blvd. to the Main Ave Bridge, including the ramps to/from West Blvd.
- Shoulders will be eliminated to reflect the non-freeway speed limit.
- New multipurpose trail will be constructed along the north side of the West Shoreway from West Blvd to Edgewater park lower level.

Some of the strengths offered by this Option that contributed to its selection as the preferred alternative are the following:

- The boulevard will represent a less-intrusive and more compatible infrastructure element to the neighborhoods.
- The boulevard will provide more connections to the neighborhoods, as well as to the Lakefront.
- The boulevard accommodates a multi-use path along the mainline, which will enhance bicycle and pedestrian mobility.
- The boulevard will enhance the driving experience for this key entry experience into the City.
APPENDIX D

ECOLOGICAL COORDINATION
Tom,

the USFWS concurrence is attached below.

Matt Raymond, Environmental Specialist
Office of Environmental Services
Ohio Department of Transportation
(614) 466-5129

---- Forwarded by Matt Raymond/Environmental/CEN/ODOT on 04/10/2009 09:42 AM ----

Mark,

Attached for your use and information is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s concurrence dated March 20, 2007, that the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the federally endangered Indiana bat. The attached letter should be included in the environmental document for the project as evidence of coordination with USFWS.

Matt Raymond, Environmental Specialist
Office of Environmental Services
Ohio Department of Transportation
(614) 466-5129

c: file

---- Forwarded by Matt Raymond/Environmental/CEN/ODOT on 03/21/2007 09:14 AM ----

Matt,

This is in response to your February 13, 2007 letter requesting U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) concurrence on your Endangered Species Act section 7(a)(2) effect determination for the Indiana bat. This subject project falls under the Programmatic Consultation between USFWS, FHWA, and ODOT. The project will not impact any streams, wetlands, or known populations of state or federally listed
species, but may impact suitable summer roosting habitat for the Indiana bat. The proposed project was field reviewed by Troy Wilson from the USFWS and Matt Raymond and Mark Carpenter from ODOT on 02/06/07. Portions of the project lie within a densely urban setting within Cleveland, and many of the potential roosting habitat trees would be considered isolated. This project meets the conditions listed under PC1-a, however to address USFWS’s concerns, ODOT has committed to follow seasonal cutting restrictions (conservation measure A-1, tree clearing only between September 15 and April 15) to assure that the project is not likely to adversely affect the Indiana bat. The Service concurs with your determination that this project, as proposed, may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Indiana Bat. This concludes consultation on this action as required by section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act. Should, during the term of this action, additional information on listed or proposed species or their critical habitat become available, or if new information reveals effects of the action that were not previously considered, consultation with the Service should be reinitiated to assess whether the determinations are still valid. If you have any questions of concerns, please contact me.

Troy Wilson
Transportation Liaison
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
6950 Americana Pkwy, Ste. H
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
Phone - 614.469.6923 x23
Fax - 614.469.6919
June 15, 2006

Debra White
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
The Halle Bldg.
1228 Euclid Ave., Suite 1050
Cleveland, OH 44115

Dear Ms. White:

I have reviewed our Natural Heritage maps and files for the West Shoreway (CUY-6-12.2.0) project area, including a one mile radius, in Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, and on the Lakewood and Cleveland South Quads (108044). The numbers/letters on the list below correspond to the areas marked on the accompanying map. Common name, scientific name and status are given for each species.

**Lakewood/Cleveland South/Cleveland North Quads**

A. Cleveland Lakefront State Park - ODNR, Division of Parks & Recreation
   1. *Potamogeton richardsonii* - Richardson’s Pondweed, potentially threatened
   2. *Monarda punctata* - Dotted Horsemint, endangered
      - *Euphorbia polygonifolia* - Seaside Spurge, potentially threatened
   3. *Cyperus schweinitzii* - Schweinitz’ Umbrella-sedge, threatened

There are no existing or proposed state nature preserves or scenic rivers at the project site. We are also unaware of any geologic features, breeding or non-breeding animal concentrations or state parks, forests or wildlife areas in the project vicinity.

Our inventory program has not completely surveyed Ohio and relies on information supplied by many individuals and organizations. Therefore, a lack of records for any particular area is not a statement that rare species or unique features are absent from that area. Please note that although we inventory all types of plant communities, we only maintain records on the highest quality areas. Also, we do not have data for all Ohio wetlands. For National Wetlands Inventory maps, please contact Madge Fitak in the Division of Geological Survey at 614-265-6576.

Please contact me at 614-265-6818 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Debbie Woischke, Ecological Analyst
Natural Heritage Program
APPENDIX E

WATER RESOURCES MAP
Public Water System Wells, Intakes & Drinking Water Source Protection Areas near the Lakefront West Project, Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio

Base Maps:
- Cleveland North 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Topo Map, United States Geologic Survey
- Cleveland South 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Topo Map, United States Geologic Survey
- Lakewood 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Topo Map, United States Geologic Survey

Site Location Provided by:
Kirsten Bowen
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Map created on November 2, 2009
APPENDIX F

FEMA MAPS
APPENDIX G

FPPA SCREENING FORM
I. PROJECT INFORMATION:

A. County-Route-Section: CUY-U.S. 6-12.20
   PID: 77330   Length: 2.21 mi. Baltic Avenue to W. 25th Street

B. Brief Description: Reconstruction of Cleveland's West Shoreway. Change from a limited access freeway to a boulevard.

C. Screening Criteria for Land to be Acquired (only one need be marked if it applies to entire project area; if none can be marked, FCIR form is required):

   [X] Developed with a density of at least 30 structures per 40 acres.

   [X] Identified as "urbanized area" (UA) on U.S. Census Bureau Map.

   [ ] Identified as urban area mapped with a "tint overprint" on USGS topographical map(s).

   [ ] Identified as "urban-built-up" on USDA Important Farmland Map(s).

   [ ] Bridge replacement requiring less than 1 acre of new R/W – (approx. ___ acre required).

   [ ] Widening or intersection improvement requiring less than 3 acres of new R/W – (approx. ___ acres required).

   [ ] Temporary R/W to be returned to existing or greater productive capability – (approx. ___ acres required).

   [ ] Channel easement for shaping existing channel – (approx. ___ acres required).

II. CONCURRENCE:

It is hereby determined that completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form (USDA Form AD-1006) is not required because the project will not affect farmland as defined in 7 CFR Part 658, as amended, or because the project falls within the criteria in the 1984 Memorandum of Understanding between ODOT, FHWA and USDA/SCS.

[Signature]  Date
District Environmental Coordinator  August 3, 2006

Revised 10/31/00
APPENDIX H

CULTURAL RESOURCES COORDINATION
TO: David J. Coyle, D12 District Deputy Director  DATE: December 4, 2006
Attention: Mark Carpenter, District Environmental Coordinator

FROM: Timothy M. Hill, Administrator, Office of Environmental Services

SUBJECT: Cultural Resource Coordination

PROJECT: CUY-LAK-6-12.20 PID:77330

Enclosed is a copy of the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OSHPO) concurrence dated November 30, 2006. They concurred with our letter stating that the following seven resources would require a Phase II report if they are in the Area of Potential Effects during further stages of the Project Development Process:
- The Main Avenue bridge (SFN:1800035)
- The Continuous Beam Bridge over Lake Road (SFN 1869450)
- The Ohio City Cleveland Landmark Historic District.
- Clifton Blvd./West Blvd. Cleveland Landmark Historic District
- The commercial building at 7437 Detroit Avenue (WS-146).
- The Division Avenue Pumping Station, and associated buildings.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Monica Kuhn, Office of Environmental Services, at 614-466-6981

TMH:mlk

c: File – Reading File
October 30, 2006

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

Subject: CUY/LAK-6-12.20 PID: 77330

Dear Mr. Epstein:

Project Description
The subject undertaking, CUY-6-12.20, is located along West Shoreway (US 6) in Cuyahoga County. The scope of work includes the following activities: converting the West Shoreway and existing six-lane limited access highway to a six-lane boulevard. The undertaking begins at West Boulevard/Lake Avenue, and ends at the Main Avenue Bridge on the west bank of the Cuyahoga River, in Cleveland. The Project includes the removal of existing interchanges and construction of, or improvements to ten intersections. The range of alternatives considered and number and location of intersections will be determined during the project development processes (PDP)

Previous Coordination
On October 11, 2006, ODOT’s Office of Environmental Services (OES) submitted the Phase I History/Architecture Investigations for CUY-6-12.20, PID: 77330, Cuyahoga County, Ohio to the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OSHPO) for review.

Staff members of Michael Baker Jr., Inc., ODOT/OES, OSHPO, and ODOT/District 12 conducted a field review on October 11, 2006.

History/Architecture
The literature review of the Area of Potential Effects identified: 4 resources individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); 0 historic districts listed in the NRHP; 8 resources previously recorded on Ohio Historic Inventory forms; 2 Cleveland Landmark Historic Districts; 0 individually designated Cleveland Landmark properties; Lakeview Terrace (7 of the components have been previously recorded on OHH forms, none are located within the APE); and 1 Reserve Pool Bridge on the Ohio Historic Bridge Inventory.
The history/architecture survey identified buildings and structures which included mid to late nineteenth, and early twentieth century residential architecture with pockets of commercial and industrial development of the same period, which is interspersed in some areas with modern development.

**Bridges**
There are eight bridges in the APE that are listed in the Ohio Bridge Inventory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure File Number</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Crossing</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Historic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800698</td>
<td>Rt. 6</td>
<td>West Blvd. Ramp</td>
<td>Simple Steel Beam</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Not Historic Type (2002 Bridge PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800728</td>
<td>Rt. 6</td>
<td>Lake Ave. Ped. Under</td>
<td>Concrete Culvert Filled</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Not Historic Type (2002 Bridge PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869450</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Under RR</td>
<td>Continuous Steel Beam</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Requires evaluation pending an effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800752</td>
<td>Rt. 6</td>
<td>Edgewater Ped. Under</td>
<td>Concrete Culvert Filled</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Not Historic Type (2002 Bridge PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800787</td>
<td>Rt. 6</td>
<td>Edgewater Park Ramp</td>
<td>Concrete Frame Simple</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Not Historic Type (2002 Bridge PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800817</td>
<td>Rt. 6</td>
<td>NSC RR@ W 58th St.</td>
<td>Steel Girder Deck</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Not Historic Type (2002 Bridge PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800876</td>
<td>Rt. 6</td>
<td>Under W. 28th St.</td>
<td>Concrete Frame Simple</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Not Historic Type (2002 Bridge PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800035</td>
<td>Rt. 2</td>
<td>Cuyahoga River, RTA, Flats</td>
<td>Steel Truss Deck</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Reserve Pool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Seven resources are recommended for Phase II investigations:
- The Main Avenue bridge (SFN:1800035)
- We also recommend a Phase II for the Continuous Beam Bridge over Lake Road (SFN 1869450), because it predates the 1939 standardized plans for this bridge type.
- The Ohio City Manchester Historic District.
- Clifton Blvd./West Blvd. Cleveland Landmark Historic District
- The commercial building at 7437 Detroit Avenue (WS-146).
- The Division Avenue Pumping Station, and associated buildings.

Of the remaining 39 history/architectural resources identified within the project’s APE during the Phase I History/Architectural survey effort, none retain sufficient integrity to convey historic significance and therefore are not eligible for listing in the National Register. This includes the six bridges on the above chart that were not recommended for Phase II research. No further history/architectural investigation is recommended for these 39 resources. If the project alternatives as defined above change resulting in a modified APE, further history/architectural investigations may be needed.
Mr. Mark Epstein  
CUY-6-12.20 PID:77330  

October 30, 2006  

On behalf of the FHWA, and in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.4(a)(1), we request your comments on the enclosed by 30 days after your receipt of this letter. If no objection is received within 30 days, in accordance with the Advisory Council On Historic Preservation's current regulations under 36 CFR Section 800.3(c)(4), FHWA and ODOT will proceed to the next step in the process based on these findings.

Respectfully,

Timothy M. Hill  
Administrator  
Office of Environmental Services

OHIO STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE CONCURRENCE:

\[ \text{Nancy H. Campbell} \quad \text{Nov. 30, 2006} \]  
(Date)

TMH:mlk  
Enclosure

c: Mark Carpenter, DEC, ODOT D12; Project File, w/att.; Reading File
June 2, 2009

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

Subject: CUY-6-12.20 PID:77330

Re: History/Architecture Coordination, Phase II, Lakefront West Roadway Improvement Project, City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio

Dear Mr. Epstein:

In this letter we seek your concurrence on properties we believe are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) which are located within the area of potential effects (APE) of the subject undertaking.

Phase II Report
Enclosed for your review is a paper copy of the Phase II History/Architecture Investigations (McCormick Taylor, Inc. April 2009). It addresses the following history/architecture resources:

• The Main Avenue bridge (SFN:1800035)
• The Ohio City and Gordon Square Cleveland Landmark Historic Districts
• Lakeview Terrace (WS-126)
• The Division Avenue Pumping Station and associated buildings
• Edgewater Park and the Edgewater Cliff Subdivision

Previous Coordination
As a result of the Phase I History/Architecture Survey, ongoing project development and consultation with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) and consulting parties, ODOT determined that Phase II history/architecture investigations were needed for the following properties:

• The Main Avenue bridge (SFN:1800035)
• The Ohio City Cleveland Landmark Historic District. Gordon Square Historic District was added to the list later. It contains Max Hayes High School, which is within the APE for the project.
• Lakeview Terrace (WS-126)
• The Division Avenue Pumping Station's associated buildings. The Pumping Station is listed in the NRHP, but none of the associated buildings were included in the nomination.
The following three properties were previously identified as needing Phase II research, but are no longer within the APE for the project:

- The continuous beam bridge over Lake Road (SFN:1869450).
- Clifton Blvd./West Blvd. Cleveland Landmark Historic District
- The building located at 7437 Detroit Avenue (identified as WS-146 in the Phase I report)

**ODOT’s NRHP Eligibility Recommendations**

Based on the results of the Phase II investigation, historic boundary recommendations and the NR Criteria, and in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800, ODOT is requesting concurrence with the following findings:

- The areas of the APE that are within the two Cleveland Landmarks Historic Districts, Gordon Square and Ohio City, are not eligible for listing in the NRHP as part of Historic Districts.
- The Main Avenue Bridge (SFN:1800035) is eligible for listing in the NRHP, with the boundaries described in the attached report.
- Lakeview Terrace is eligible for listing in the NRHP, with the boundaries described in the attached report.
- The remaining buildings that were associated with the Division Avenue Pumping station were not included in the Station’s original NRHP nomination, and are not eligible for listing in the NRHP. The Division Avenue Pumping Station has been demolished by the City of Cleveland Division of Water in 2007 using City funds.
- Edgewater Park and Edgewater Cliff Subdivision are not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

**Conclusion**

On behalf of the FHWA, and in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.4(c), we request your response to the enclosed within 30 days after your receipt of this letter. If no objection is received within 30 days, in accordance with the Advisory Council On Historic Preservation’s current regulations under 36 CFR Section 800.3(c)(4), FHWA and ODOT will proceed to the next step in the process based on these findings.

Respectfully,

Timothy M. Hill
Administrator
Office of Environmental Services

**OHIO STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE CONCURRENCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nancy H. Campbell</th>
<th>July 15, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TMH:mlk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c: Larry Hoffman, ODOT-OES, Mark Carpenter, ODOT-D12 DEC, Project File, w/att., Reading File
December 23, 2009

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

Subject: CUY-US6-12.20 (Lakefront West)  PID: 77330

Dear Mr. Epstein:

Project Description
The project is located in the city of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio along US6 (Cleveland Memorial Shoreway) along the west bank of the Cuyahoga River. The project corridor is approximately 3.5 miles long, extending from the Main Avenue Bridge on the west bank of the Cuyahoga River to West Boulevard/Lake Avenue in the City of Cleveland, Ohio.

The City of Cleveland, together with various other entities, has initiated a long-range plan of development along the lakefront. A portion of this plan includes the transportation-related improvements along US6. Specifically, nine work locations are being studied to introduce new or modify existing at-grade intersections to connect the surrounding neighborhoods to the West Shoreway and the lakefront. These modifications and improvements are located at:

- West Blvd/Lake Avenue/Clifton Blvd.
- West 76th Street
- West 73rd Street
- West 65th Street
- Division Avenue/West 58th Street
- West 54th Street
- West 49th/Herman Avenue
- West 45th Street
- West 28th/West 25th Street

Area of Potential Effect (APE)
The Area of Potential Effects (APE) can be seen in Appendix A of the attached Archaeological Disturbance Assessment for CUY-US6-12.20 (PID 77330) (2009) by ODOT/OES staff. Plans provided by ODOT District 12 office staff show the areas of right-of-way required for this project. Right-of-way will be required for improvements to the roadway, the construction of a bike path, intersection improvements, and work on pedestrian/bike and vehicle access points. Although there are specific work locations noted above, right-of-way of varying width but averaging 25-30 feet will be required along most of the length of US6 (on the north and south sides) throughout the project area.
Literature Review
A literature review was conducted for the enclosed Archaeological Disturbance Assessment for CUY-US6-12.20 (PID 77330) (2009). Examination of the OHPO Online GIS system showed no previously surveyed areas or previously identified sites archaeological sites in the project area. There are ten archaeological sites in the vicinity of the project area, nine of which are historic and either residential or industrial. Sites 33-CU-353 and 354 are part of the Irishtown Bend Archaeological District, which is an archaeological district on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Site 33-CU-370 is just east of the West 28th/West 25th Street work location; this site is likely related to Irishtown Bend and has been recommended for further study to determine its eligibility for inclusion on the NRHP. Work for this project in this location will not impact this site or any other associated with Irishtown Bend.

Also near the West 28th Street/West 25th Street work location are the remnants of Cleveland’s “subway,” a streetcar line that once ran beneath the adjacent Detroit-Superior bridge. A subway entrance once stood on the southeast corner of the Detroit Avenue/West 25th Street intersection until the 1940s or 1950s, when all streetcar and subway lines were converted for trackless trolley use.

The literature review showed that the majority of the other work locations and areas along US6 where work will take place appeared to have been altered and disturbed by the urban development associated with the City of Cleveland. It is unlikely that significant archaeological deposits of outstanding research potential exist within the areas of new right-of-way for this undertaking.

Field Review
Field reviews were conducted by ODOT/OES for this project in February and July of 2009. The area around the West 28th Street/West 25th Street location was examined to determine how close the proposed undertaking might come to either site 33-CU-370 or the disused subway entrance at the southeast corner of Detroit Avenue/West 25th Street. The subway entrance has been completely removed and capped by a large concrete slab. A tour of the streetcar tunnels underneath the Detroit Avenue/West 25th Street intersection was provided by the Cuyahoga County Engineer. This showed the tunnels to be in good condition; the ramp the subway entrance can be seen in Figure 32 of the attached report. It appears that work will not affect what remains of this entrance or the tunnel system beneath the intersection and the Detroit-Superior Bridge.

Site 33-CU-370 is currently covered by a parking lot and an associated structure. While the western end of the site could contain deposits related to Irishtown Bend with decent integrity, from the midline to the eastern end appears to be affected by slumping as the slope that separates the higher area bordering West25th Street from the lower riverbed gradually collapses. Regardless, it appears that work will not take place outside of right-of-way or impact this site. No further archaeological investigation is required for this work location, however if the construction/right-of-way limits were to change a re-evaluation would be required to determine potential impact on these cultural resources.

Field reviews were also conducted along the length of the project along US6 and at Cleveland Lakefront State Park, Edgewater Park, West Boulevard/Lake Avenue, West 76th Street, and West 73rd Street. These reviews confirmed the urban/industrial disturbances noted above. Details of these reviews can be found in the attached disturbance assessment. No further work is required for this project unless the scope of work were to change.
Previous Coordination-History/Architecture

A Phase I History/Architecture report was submitted to the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) with a letter dated October 30, 2006. As a result of the Phase I History/Architecture Survey, ongoing project development and consultation with the OHPO and consulting parties, ODOT determined that Phase II history/architecture investigations were needed for the following properties:

- The Main Avenue bridge (SFN:1800035)
- The Ohio City Cleveland Landmark Historic District. Gordon Square Historic District was added to the list later. It contains Max Hayes High School, which is within the APE for the project.
- Lakeview Terrace (WS-126)
- The Division Avenue Pumping Station’s associated buildings. The Pumping Station is listed in the NRHP, but none of the associated buildings were included in the nomination.

The following three properties were previously identified as needing Phase II research, but were later determined to be no longer within the APE for the project:

- The continuous beam bridge over Lake Road (SFN:1869450).
- Clifton Blvd./West Blvd. Cleveland Landmark Historic District
- The building located at 7437 Detroit Avenue (identified as WS-146 in the Phase I report)

Based on the results of the Phase II investigation, historic boundary recommendations and the NR Criteria, ODOT and OHPO agreed on the following findings in letter dated June 3, 2009, that was signed by OHPO on July 15, 2009:

- The areas of the APE that are within the two Cleveland Landmarks Historic Districts, Gordon Square and Ohio City, are not eligible for listing in the NRHP as part of Historic Districts.
- The Main Avenue Bridge (SFN:1800035) is eligible for listing in the NRHP, with the boundaries described in the Phase 2 report.
- Lakeview Terrace is eligible for listing in the NRHP, with the boundaries described in the Phase 2 report.
- The remaining buildings that were associated with the Division Avenue Pumping station were not included in the Station’s original NRHP nomination, and are not eligible for listing in the NRHP. The Division Avenue Pumping Station has been demolished.
- Edgewater Park and Edgewater Cliff Subdivision are not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Effects-History/Architecture

There are six historic properties in the project area. The effects on them are based on the plans in Appendix A of the attached Archaeological Disturbance Assessment (they are labeled by letter on the plans; NRHP boundaries for these properties are included in the Phase II History/Architecture report, or in their NRHP nominations)

A. Main Avenue Bridge (SFN: 18000025)- No new permanent or temporary right of way is being taken from inside the NRHP boundary for this property. The east end of the project is west of the NRHP boundaries for the bridge, as shown on the last page of the attached plans.

B. Lakeview Terrace- No new permanent or temporary right of way is being taken from inside the NRHP boundary for this property as shown on the ninth page of the attached plans.
C. The Division Avenue Pumping Station has been demolished (per Phase 2 coordination), therefore there is no effect.

D. Federal Knitting Mills—No work being done near the buildings. The new right of way takes in this area of the project are on the opposite side of US 6 from the buildings.

E. Van Rooy Coffee Company Building—No work is being done near the building. The new right of way takes in this part of the project are on the opposite side of US 6 from the building as shown on the ninth page of the attached plans.

F. Forest City Bank Building—No effect, no right of way taken from this building. The building is at the southwest corner of Detroit Avenue and 25th Street. The intersection is being widened to the north, but it will have no effect on this building as shown on the ninth page of the attached plans.

Recommendation
In accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s current regulations and in compliance with 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), a finding of “No Historic Properties Affected” is appropriate based upon the following:

- There are no previously recorded archaeological sites within the project APE.
- The proposed right-of-way acquisition parcels have varying levels of disturbance which preclude further archaeological investigation.
- There is no effect on any historic properties in the project area.
- No land from historic properties is being converted into a transportation facility.

On behalf of FHWA and in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3(c)(4), we request your comments on the enclosed by 30 days after the receipt of this letter. If no objection is received within 30 days, in accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s current regulations under 36 CFR Part 800.3(c)(4), the Federal Agency Official and ODOT will proceed in the next step in the process based on these findings. Please address questions or concerns to Megan Shaeffer, at megan.shaeffer@dot.state.oh.us, 614-752-8279 or Monica Bruns at monica.kuhn@dot.state.oh.us, 614-466-6981.

Respectfully,

Timothy M. Hill
Administrator
Office of Environmental Services

OHIO STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE CONCURRENCE:

[Signature]

(Date)

TMH:nks
C: Project File; Reading File; Tom Sorge, ODOT-D12, Larry Hoffman, ODOT-OES
APPENDIX I

SECTION 4(f) DOCUMENTATION
November 17, 2009

Department of Parks, Recreation, and Properties
Michael E. Cox, Director
500 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Subject: Edgewater Park
          CUY-6-12.20 PID 77330; Lakefront West
          Section 4(f) De Minimis Concurrence

Dear Mr. Cox:

The Ohio Department of Transportation is proposing to improve the Lakefront West Shoreway through downtown Cleveland. In this area, lakefront resources are separated from the city itself by man-made physical barriers in the form of the Shoreway (SR-2/US-6/US-20 west of the W. 28th Street interchange, SR-2 east of W. 28th Street) and the parallel Norfolk Southern rail line. These high-speed, grade-separated transportation corridors combine with a sudden change in elevation where the rail line crosses the freeway to limit connections between the lakefront resources and the adjoining neighborhoods. This would provide the residents with improved access to the lakefront amenities, such as Edgewater Park and would be more attractive for redevelopment.

This would provide improved access to the lakefront amenities, such as Edgewater Park, to residents, and would be more attractive for redevelopment. The project will include enhanced connections to Edgewater Park via the Multipurpose Trail along the north side of the Shoreway that would connect to the existing trails throughout Edgewater Park and multimodal access by the use of the proposed West 73rd Street connection to the existing Edgewater Park Interchange from the Shoreway. See the attached Project Update Brochure.

The Multipurpose Trail portions of the project will require approximately 2.68 acres of temporary right-of-way from the park for a period of approximately 8 months. These areas are not currently used for recreational activities and the existing trails will not be impacted by the proposed project. No permanent right-of-way acquisition is required.

The West 73rd Street connection will require approximately 0.51 acres of temporary right-of-way from the park for a period of approximately 24 months. The impacted City of Cleveland property is separated from the recreational facilities by the Lakefront West Shoreway. No recreation facilities within Edgewater Park will be adversely impacted by the proposed project.

On August 10, 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was signed into law. Section 6009(a) of this legislation amends the existing Section 4(f) legislation to simplify the processing and approval of projects that have only de minimis impacts on lands protected by Section 4(f) under your jurisdiction. In accordance with Section 6009(a), de minimis impacts on publicly owned parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges are defined as those that do not “adversely affect the activities, features and attributes” of the eligible Section 4(f) resource.
De Minimus Section 4(f) Determination
The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) would like to apply the de minimis standard to the temporary use of Edgewater Park for the Lakefront West project. The de minimis impact finding is based on the degree or level of impact including any avoidance, minimization, and mitigation or enhancement measures that are included in the project to address the Section 4(f) use. The following measures will be used to minimize recreational disruption during construction:

- The property within Edgewater Park disturbed by the proposed multiuse trail and the West 73rd Street Connection will remain as City of Cleveland Property.
- The Project will maintain traffic on the trails. However, part-width construction may reduce the width of the trails during construction.
- Access to Edgewater Park will be maintained during construction of the Lakefront West Project.
- The removal of trees will be limited to what is needed to construct the new West 73rd Street Connection.
- The disturbed areas will be seeded and mulched to stabilize the area.
- No construction materials or equipment will be staged on the Trail.

ODOT requests written concurrence from the City of Cleveland, as the property owners of the Edgewater Park, that the project as proposed will not adversely affect, temporarily or permanently, the activities, features, and attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f). ODOT and FHWA intend to make de minimis Section 4(f) finding based upon the assessment of this letter and the City of Cleveland’s written concurrence. If the City of Cleveland concurs, please sign, date the bottom of this letter, and return to the ODOT-District 12 Planning Department.

If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Thomas K. Sorge, Environmental Specialist at (216) 584-2086 or by e-mail at Tom.Sorge@dot.state.oh.us.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Dale A. Schiavoni, P.E.
Planning and Programs Administrator

c: PID 77330
Robert N. Brown, Director, Cleveland City Planning Commission

[Signature]

City of Cleveland Concurrence

Date
Ohio Department of Transportation
Inter-Office Communication

Office of Environmental Services

TO: Bonnie Teeuwen, District 12 DDD
    Attention: Mark Carpenter, District 12 DEC

FROM: Timothy M. Hill, Administrator, Office of Environmental Services

DATE: January 6, 2010

SUBJECT: Determination of “No Use” of Section 4(f) for Cultural Resources

PROJECT: CUY-6-12.20 (Lakefront West) PID: 77330

Project Description
The project is located in the city of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio along US6 (Cleveland Memorial Shoreway) along the west bank of the Cuyahoga River. The project corridor is approximately 3.5 miles long, extending from the Main Avenue Bridge on the west bank of the Cuyahoga River to West Boulevard/Lake Avenue in the City of Cleveland, Ohio.

The City of Cleveland, together with various other entities, has initiated a long-range plan of development along the lakefront. A portion of this plan includes the transportation-related improvements along US6. Specifically, nine work locations are being studied to introduce new or modify existing at-grade intersections to connect the surrounding neighborhoods to the West Shoreway and the lakefront. These modifications and improvements are located at:
- West Blvd/Lake Avenue/Clifton Blvd.
- West 76th Street
- West 73rd Street
- West 65th Street
- Division Avenue/West 58th Street
- West 54th Street
- West 49th/Herman Avenue
- West 45th Street
- West 25th/West 25th Street

Section 106 Effect on Section 4(f) Cultural Resources
There are six historic properties in the project area. All are either listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or were found eligible for the NRHP during the Section 106 consultation process. There is no land being taken from any of these properties, and no historic buildings are being removed.
A. Main Avenue Bridge (SFN: 18000025) - No new permanent or temporary right of way is being taken from inside the NRHP boundary for this property.
B. Lakeview Terrace- No new permanent or temporary right of way is being taken from inside the NRHP boundary for this property.
C. The Division Avenue Pumping Station (NRHP Listed) has been demolished using local funds during the course of project development (per Phase 2 coordination), therefore there is no effect. The building’s demolition was not related to this undertaking.
D. Federal Knitting Mills (NRHP Listed)- No work being done near the buildings. The new right of way takes in this area of the project are on the opposite side of US 6 from the buildings.
E. Van Rooy Coffee Company Building (NRHP Listed) – No work is being done near the building. The new right of way takes in this part of the project are on the opposite site of US 6 from the building.
APPENDIX J

AIR QUALITY DOCUMENTATION
Tom Sorge, Environmental Specialist 2  
Planning ODOT District 12  
(216) 584-2086  
Tom.Sorge@dot.state.oh.us  

----- Forwarded by Tom Sorge/Planning/D12/ODOT on 01/21/2010 12:47 PM -----  
Morris.Patricia@epamail.epa.gov  
01/21/2010 12:03 PM  

Yes, I also concur that this is not a project of air quality concern.

Patricia Morris  
Environmental Scientist  
USEPA Region 5  
(312) 353-8656  
morris.patricia@epa.gov

From: Noel.Acala@dot.state.oh.us

To: "Paul Braun" <Paul.Braun@epa.state.oh.us>, Patricia Morris/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Tom.Sorge@dot.state.oh.us, Elvin.Pinckney@dot.state.oh.us

Date: 01/21/2010 06:54 AM

Subject: Re: CUY-6-12.20 PID 77330 (Lakefront West Project)- PM2.5 Project LevelConformity Determination Request for Nonexempt Project

Please include this email in the air quality section for the CE 4?

Tom Sorge, Environmental Specialist 2  
Planning ODOT District 12  
(216) 584-2086  
Tom.Sorge@dot.state.oh.us  

----- Forwarded by Tom Sorge/Planning/D12/ODOT on 01/21/2010 12:47 PM -----  
Morris.Patricia@epamail.epa.gov  
01/21/2010 12:03 PM  

Yes, I also concur that this is not a project of air quality concern.

Patricia Morris  
Environmental Scientist  
USEPA Region 5  
(312) 353-8656  
morris.patricia@epa.gov
Thanks, Paul.

Patricia- Do you concur as well? Thanks.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call or send an email.

Noel Alcala, Noise and Air Quality Coordinator, P.E.
ODOT, Office of Environmental Services
Phone: 614/466/5222

"Paul Braun"
<Paul.Braun@epa.state.oh.us>

01/11/2010 02:59 PM

To: <Noel.Alcala@dot.state.oh.us>
cc: <Morris.Patricia@epamail.epa.gov>

Subject: Re: CUY-6-12.20 PID 77330 (Lakefront West Project)- PM2.5 Project LevelConformity Determination Request for Nonexempt Project

Noel,

I've reviewed the project information you supplied and I concur that, based on the projected traffic levels, this would not qualify as a project of air quality concern.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thanks
Paul

Paul J. Braun, P.E.
State Implementation Plan Development and Rulemaking
Ohio EPA, Division of Air Pollution Control
614-644-3734
The subject project is a nonexempt project that is not a project of air quality concern and has met the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act and is exempt from PM2.5 hot-spot analysis. The subject project involves improving access to the West Shoreway and the Lakefront. The project is listed on the 2008-2011 STIP and TIP. This project does not have an ADT >87,500 AND diesel trucks >7,000 in the design year. This project requires a project level conformity determination from FHWA in accordance with 40CFR93 and the FHWA and EPA Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot Spot Analysis in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas. Below is the traffic information for the project.

Please let me know if you agree that this project is not a project of air quality concern and no PM2.5 hotspot analysis is required so that we can request FHWA issuance of their project level conformity determination for this project. A response by January 19, 2010 (1 week) would be greatly appreciated.

Dist.  
Project  
PID  
County  
Project Description  
Sponsoring Agency  
Fiscal Year  
Type A Opening year ADT  
Truck % Opening year  
Diesel Trucks Opening year  
Type A Design year ADT  
Truck % Design year  
Diesel Trucks Design year  
12  
CUY-6-12.20 (Lakefront West Project)  
77330  
CUY  
Improve access to the West Shoreway and the Lakefront  
City of Cleveland  
2011  
41,600  
1  
344  
42,300  
1  
350
If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call or send an email.

Noel Alcala, Noise and Air Quality Coordinator, P.E.
ODOT, Office of Environmental Services
Phone: 614/466/5222
Director Jolene M. Molitoris  
Ohio Department of Transportation  
1980 West Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43223

January 28, 2010

Subject: PM 2.5 Project Level Conformity Determination  
Non-exempt projects: PID 77330 CUY-6-12.20 (Lakefront West)

Dear Director Molitoris:

This letter responds to ODOT, Office of Environmental Services January 22 request for project level PM 2.5 conformity determination for the subject project. The FHWA Ohio Division has reviewed and consulted with FTA Region 5 and USEPA Region 5 to determine the status of the subject project.

Section 176(c)(1)(B) states that all projects in nonattainment areas are subject to transportation conformity. The March 10, 2006 final rule requires PM 2.5 and PM 10 hot-spot analyses to be performed for projects of air quality concern. USEPA has determined that projects not identified in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) as projects of air quality concern have met statutory requirements and are exempt from further hot-spot analysis (40 CFR 93.116(a)).

Based upon our review of the subject projects and through consultation with FTA and USEPA, we find that the subject project is not a project of air quality concern has met the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act and is exempt from further hot-spot analysis per 40 CFR 93.116(a). Documents prepared to satisfy NEPA requirements for the subject project should cite this letter when discussing the status of project level conformity.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Ms. Leigh Oesterling, Air Quality Specialist, at (614) 280-6837, or leigh.oesterling@fhwa.dot.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For: Laura S. Leffler  
Division Administrator
ecc: Noel Alcala, ODOT
      Paul Braun, Ohio EPA
      Mike Armstrong, FHWA
      Patricia Morris, USEPA
      Leigh Oesterling, FHWA
      Elvin Pinckney, ODOT
      Dave Snyder, FHWA

File: 9-M
January 22, 2010

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
200 North High Street, 3rd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Attention: Leigh Oesterling, Air Quality Specialist

Re: CUY-6-12.20 PID 77330 (Lakefront West Project)- Particulate Matter (PM) 2.5 Project Level Conformity Determination Request for Non Exempt Project

Dear Ms. Oesterling:

The subject project is a nonexempt project in a PM 2.5 nonattainment area currently listed in the 2008-2011 Ohio Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) and MPO TIP. This project requires a project level conformity determination from FHWA in accordance with 40CFR93 and the FHWA and EPA Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot Spot Analysis in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas. This project is not exempt under 40CFR93.126 and is not deemed to result in a significant increase in diesel trucks and/or busses. This project does not have an ADT greater than 87,500 nor more than 7,000 diesels in the design year. Both USEPA and OEPA reviewed and approved the subject project as one not of air quality concern. **ODOT requests a conformity determination for this project by January 29, 2010 (1 week).**

If you have any questions or concerns or if you need additional information, please contact Noel Alcala, Noise and Air Quality Coordinator at (614) 466-5222.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Timothy Hill, Administrator
Office of Environmental Services

TMH:naa

c: Dave Snyder, FHWA – File - Reading File
APPENDIX K

NOISE DOCUMENTATION
DATE: February 1, 2010

TO: Dale Schiavoni, D-12 Planning and Programs Administrator
   Attention: Tom Sorge

FROM: Noel Alcala, Noise and Air Quality Coordinator, Office of Environmental Services

SUBJECT: Noise Analysis

PROJECT: CUY-US60-12.20 Lakefront West, PID 77330

OES has reviewed the subject document prepared by D-12. Based on our review, we concur with the District’s conclusion that no noise abatement is warranted for the subject project, since none of the receivers approached or exceeded 67 dBA nor does the existing noise levels for these receivers increase more than 10 dBA in the design year. The subject document is accepted by OES.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Noel Alcala, Noise and Air Quality Coordinator at (614) 466/5222.

NAA:naa

c: Larry Hoffman, OES - File - Reading File
One of the two following situations must occur before ODOT will investigate the possibility of noise mitigation further per Federal Highway Administration's *Standard Procedure for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise*:

- The projected noise level at the adjacent sensitive land use exceeds or approaches 67 decibels (dBA) or
- The projected noise level at the adjacent sensitive land use is increased more than 10 dBA over the existing noise level.

If one of the preceding criteria is met then an analysis must be performed. The analysis must determine if noise mitigation will provide a substantial reduction in noise at the adjacent sensitive land uses. The mitigation cost does not exceed the Cost Reasonableness Threshold of $25,000 per receiver that obtains a substantial reduction in noise as established in the January 23, 1990 agreement between the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The FHWA's *Standard Procedure for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise* defines a substantial reduction in noise as greater than 5 dBA for front line receptors. However, the FHWA will allow noise reductions of greater than 3 dBA for receptors beyond the front line when calculating the noise mitigation cost.

The Ohio Department of Transportation's (ODOT) District 12 was required to determine if a noise analysis is warranted as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Document. The proposed project warrants a noise analysis due to the realigning of West 73rd Street and moving the travel lanes closer to adjacent sensitive land use. The new connection to the Edgewater Park Interchange will also slightly increase the traffic on West 73rd Street.

The District investigated alternative abatement measures as listed in 23CFR 772.13. The alternative abatements that were analyzed are traffic management measures, alteration of vertical and horizontal alignments, acquisition of property rights for construction of noise barriers, construction of a noise barrier, and the acquisition of property to be used as a buffer zone to pre-empt development and noise insulation of public use and nonprofit institutional structures. The District determined that traffic management measures could not be implemented due to fact that West 73rd Street is a route to and from a new interchange with the Shoreway. The District also determined that the altering the horizontal and vertical alignment was not economically feasible. The option of the acquisition of property for the construction of noise barriers was not analyzed because the breaks required for residential driveways. The alternative of purchasing right-of-way for a buffer zone is not possible due to the close proximity of the existing home to the highway.

The District also examined the impacts of construction noise and determined that will add to the average noise level during the construction phase. Construction activities are temporary in nature. All activities are expected to occur in normal daylight waking hours. However, noise from construction could result in annoyance or disruption of sleep if nighttime operations should occur. In any case, construction operations will adhere to any local construction noise ordinances.

Noise may also be generated by increases in heavy truck traffic to and from the project area. This increase in noise will typically occur during daylight hours.

Increases in the average noise level due to construction are temporary but measures should be taken
to minimize the impact of additional noise. Recommended standard measures include:

- Limited operation of heavy equipment and other noisy procedures to daylight hours whenever possible
- Install and maintain effective mufflers on equipment
- Locate equipment and vehicle staging areas as far from noise sensitive areas as possible
- Limit unnecessary idling of equipment

The District performed a noise analysis of the project area using the Federal Highway Administration’s Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 2.5. The Analysis uses the 2009 traffic volumes and the projected 2010 design year traffic volumes. The 2030 design year traffic was not used because traffic decrease in future projections. Therefore, the District used the 2010 Traffic projections to evaluate the maximum traffic levels. The traffic volumes were calculated for the Certified Traffic prepared by Baker and Associates and approved by ODOT and are attached in the Appendix. The analysis examined the noise impacts of 28 homes located adjacent to West 73rd Street between Detroit Road and Father Caruso Drive in the City of Cleveland. The analysis examined existing noise levels, opening day of the realigned West 73rd Street. The District took two Noise Readings to verify the analysis. Reading were taken at Receivers 22 (56.2 dBA) and 30 (57.4 dBA), on January 21, 2010 at 5:10 P.M. and 5:30 P.M. The weather was Sunny with winds less than 5 mph and a Temperature of 44 Degree Fahrenheit. None of the receivers approached or exceeded 67 dBA nor is the existing noise levels for these receivers increased more than 10 dBA. Actually, the proposed alignment of West 73rd Street is below grade and shields the receivers from the traffic noise. Therefore, the District has determined that noise mitigation is not warranted for the subject project. See the attached site map and Sound Level Tables.
### RESULTS: SOUND LEVELS

**Lakefront West (pid 77330)**

**28 January 2010**

**TNM 2.5**

**Calculated with TNM 2.5**

**PROJECT/CONTRACT:**

Lakefront West (pid 77330)

**RUN:**

Existing West 73rd Street

**BARRIER DESIGN:**

INPUT HEIGHTS

**ATMOSPHERICS:**

68 deg F, 50% RH

Average pavement type shall be used unless a State highway agency substantiates the use of a different type with approval of FHWA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>#DUs</th>
<th>Existing LAeq1h</th>
<th>No Barrier LAeq1h</th>
<th>Increase over existing LAeq1h</th>
<th>Type Impact</th>
<th>With Barrier LAeq1h</th>
<th>Noise Reduction</th>
<th>Calculated minus Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiver2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>dbA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESULTS: SOUND LEVELS**

**PROJECT/CONTRACT:**
Lakefront West (pid 77330)
Proposed West 73rd Street Tunnel

**RUN:**
INPUT HEIGHTS

**ATMOSPHERICS:**
68 deg F, 50% RH

Average pavement type shall be used unless a State highway agency substantiates the use of a different type with approval of FHWA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>#DUs</th>
<th>Existing LAeq1h</th>
<th>No Barrier LAeq1h</th>
<th>Increase over existing Type Impact</th>
<th>With Barrier LAeq1h</th>
<th>Noise Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculated</td>
<td>Calculated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crit’n</td>
<td>Sub’l Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>dBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

Public Meetings were held consistent with ODOT’s Minor PDP to provide members of the community at-large an opportunity to review updated project information at developmental milestone to provide feedback to the project team and the project sponsors.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee was formed primarily of study sponsors, including ODOT, the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in addition to the City of Cleveland. The Steering Committee was convened to establish general direction for project development, consistent with the City of Cleveland’s Lakefront Plan and ODOT’s Minor PDP. The Steering Committee also reviewed project progress and Stakeholder Subcommittee and public input.

Stakeholders Subcommittee

Stakeholders representing various community segments throughout the project area were assembled into the Stakeholders Subcommittee acting in an advisory capacity to provide community-based input into study development.

Community segments that were represented on the Subcommittee included but were not limited to:

- City of Cleveland Engineering
- City of Cleveland Planning
- Greater Cleveland Transit Authority
- Cleveland City Council Ward 13
- Cleveland City Council Ward 17
- Cleveland City Council Ward 18
- Cudell Edgewater CDC
- Cuyahoga County Commissioners
- Cuyahoga County Engineer
- Detroit Shoreway CDC
- Edgewater Park Homeowners’ Association
- FHWA
- Flats Industry
- Flats Oxbow CDC
- Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (RTA)
- NOACA
- Norfolk Southern Railroad
- Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District
- Ohio City Near West CDC
- Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR)
- Ohio Department of Transportation Central Office
- Ohio Department of Transportation District 12

The Stakeholders Subcommittee met at key points during project development so that individual stakeholders could review work in progress and offer feedback on behalf of their respective community segment. The Subcommittee Meetings were held as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1</td>
<td>04-26-2006</td>
<td>Subcommittee Orientation; Discuss Project Needs; Brainstorm Potential Goals &amp; Objectives; Identify Project Constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #2</td>
<td>05-10-2006</td>
<td>Review Draft Measures of Effectiveness; Brainstorm Access Point Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #3</td>
<td>06-14-2006</td>
<td>Present Engineered Access Options for Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #5</td>
<td>09-12-2006</td>
<td>Finalize Evaluation Matrix with Subcommittee Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #6</td>
<td>10-10-2006</td>
<td>Presented Corridor Alternatives for Subcommittee Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #7</td>
<td>01-11-2007</td>
<td>Review additional Lake Ave. options and updates regarding cost and feasibility for the other Access Point Options, gather input from the Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #8</td>
<td>02-09-2007</td>
<td>Present update on the West Boulevard/Lake Avenue/Clifton Boulevard Access Point Options and gather Subcommittee preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #9</td>
<td>03-23-2007</td>
<td>Review the remaining West Boulevard/Lake Avenue/Clifton Boulevard Access Point Options and identify the Subcommittee’s recommended option and discuss funding options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #10</td>
<td>12-02-2008</td>
<td>Explain project phasing due to budget constraints and the removal of traffic signals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Interest Meetings**

Periodically throughout project development, the Project Team would conduct Special Interest Meetings with targeted agencies, organizations, neighborhoods, utilities or other groups with special, focused areas of interest or expertise that had a direct bearing on project outcome. Special Interest Meetings were conducted with such groups as the Community Development Corporations (CDC), the Regional Transit Authority, the regional Sewer District and the Edgewater Park Homeowners’ Association. Those meetings were conducted as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soap Box Derby</td>
<td>07-31-2006</td>
<td>Discuss the location of the track and understand the potential impacts of the options at W 54th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats Industry and Flats Oxbow</td>
<td>08-02-2006</td>
<td>Introduce two new alternatives and gather comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudell/Edgewater Neighborhood Meeting #1</td>
<td>08-08-2006</td>
<td>Provide project overview and discuss Access Point Options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio City Near West Board</td>
<td>09-06-2006</td>
<td>Provide project overview and discuss Access Point Options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Cimperman</td>
<td>09-22-2006</td>
<td>To provide project overview and discuss remaining options for West 25th/West 28th Street area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Towing/St. Ignatius Boathouse</td>
<td>09-22-2006</td>
<td>Discuss the potential impacts of the options at W 54th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gillespie</td>
<td>09-26-2006</td>
<td>To provide project overview and discuss remaining options for West 25th/West 28th Street area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats Taskforce/Private Trucking Co.</td>
<td>09-28-2006</td>
<td>To provide project overview and discuss remaining options for West 25th/West 28th Street area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudell/Edgewater Neighborhood Meeting #2</td>
<td>01-25-2007</td>
<td>Examine the remaining Access Point Options at Lake Ave and gather comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Park/NEORSD</td>
<td>01-26-2007</td>
<td>Determine sewer needs related to the Battery Park Development and the potential connection at West 73rd Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats West Bank Block Club</td>
<td>02-21-2007</td>
<td>To provide project overview and discuss remaining options for West 25th/West 28th Street area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHA/City of Cleveland/Fire/Police/EMS</td>
<td>08-27-2009</td>
<td>To discuss the West 25th/West 28th Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Meetings**

Public Meetings were held consistent with ODOT’s Minor PDP to provide the general public an opportunity to review and comment on the work completed as the result of stakeholder input and technical studies. The collection of input from the general public provided broad-based
validation of work performed and ensured that study activities were on-target. The Public Meetings were scheduled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Meetings</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #1</td>
<td>07-19-2006</td>
<td>Present Access Point Options &amp; collect public feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #2</td>
<td>09-27-2006</td>
<td>Present Corridor Alternatives &amp; collect public feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #3</td>
<td>12-11-2008</td>
<td>Present the Refined Strategic Plan for public feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public meetings were advertised two weeks in advance in the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the El Sol De Cleveland. Additionally, informational flyers were posted in high traffic locations within neighborhoods throughout the project area. Due to the presence of a large Spanish-speaking population in the project area, interpreters were offered at all public meetings. Likewise, professional signers were made available to the hearing impaired. Also, in sensitivity to low-income populations, public meetings were held at locations in local communities that were serviced by transit routes. All meeting locations were also compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

**City of Cleveland and ODOT Coordination**

The project team participated in the City of Cleveland’s Planning Commission Meetings at key milestones throughout the project’s development to ensure compatibility with the Commission’s Lakefront Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Meetings</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1</td>
<td>10-06-2006</td>
<td>Present corridor alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #2</td>
<td>02-16-2007</td>
<td>Present preferred corridor with Lake options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #3</td>
<td>03-31-2007</td>
<td>Present the preferred corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #4</td>
<td>12-19-2008</td>
<td>To present the preferred corridor without the signals and explain that the preferred alternative will be undertaken in phases due to budget. Review schedule and early deployment projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #5</td>
<td>01-09-2009</td>
<td>To present the preferred alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role of Public Involvement in Decision Making

By design, the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for this project provided the widesweeping cross sections of the general public with opportunities for interaction with the Project Sponsors and the Consultant Project Team. Decision-making authority pertaining to the project direction and development was maintained by the Project Sponsors, who comprised the majority of the Steering Committee, although the ultimate decision making authority for the final approval of project outcomes, recommendations, identification of conceptual alternatives, measures of effectiveness et al remained with ODOT and the FHWA consistent with all precepts of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and ODOT’s own PDP requirements and consistent with ODOT’s November 26, 2002 Public Involvement Guide: Path to Successful Projects. Key stakeholders and members of the general public, through routine opportunities for interactions at Stakeholders Subcommittee Meetings and Public Meetings, offered input and locally-qualified information that for consideration by the Project Sponsors to potentially influence decision making and ultimate outcomes.

Two-way communication models were the foundation of the Public Involvement Plan for this study. In a two-way model, all participants in the communication process (Project Sponsors, Steering Committee, Stakeholders Subcommittee, Consultant Study Team and the General Public) were charged with the ability and responsibility to share meaningful information and to provide feedback to each other. In short, the responsibility for quality communications rested with all participants in the Project Development Process.
APPENDIX M

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS COORDINATION
April 23, 2007

Baker & Associates
2000 East Ninth Street, #1220
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Attn: Kirsten Bowen

Re: CUY-6-12.21 (PID 77330);
Environmental Site Assessment Screening Approval and Phase I Authorization

Dear Ms. Bowen:

The Ohio Department of Transportation’s Office of Environmental Services (OES) has reviewed the Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Screening for the CUY-6-12.21 Project. OES has determined that a Phase I ESA must be completed for the thirty-nine (39) sites on the attached IOC. Please complete the Phase I ESA and send two (2) copies to the District Planning Office.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (216) 584-2089 or Tom Sorge at (216) 584-2086.

Thomas K Sorge Jr.
Environmental Specialist 2

DAS:MAC:TKS

encl: (as stated)

c: PID 77330
This office has evaluated the information provided for the Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Screening for the above referenced project which was prepared by Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Based on the additional information provided, we believe that a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is warranted for the following properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SITE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Gas Station</td>
<td>9308 Clifton Road</td>
<td>Site #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 J Distributing</td>
<td>1246 70th Street</td>
<td>Site #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1259 West 73rd Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7201 Father Caruso Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Gas Service</td>
<td>1201 West 65th Street</td>
<td>Site #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Building (former Tenk Machine &amp; Tool Co.)</td>
<td>1240 West 58th Street</td>
<td>Site #16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Building (Breakwater Properties Inc.)</td>
<td>1230 West 58th Street</td>
<td>Site #17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Buckeye Company</td>
<td>1216 West 58th Street</td>
<td>Site #18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Corp. West</td>
<td>1270 West 58th Street</td>
<td>Site #20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKM Inc.</td>
<td>5502 Cass Avenue</td>
<td>Site #27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1300 West 54th Street/Cass Avenue</td>
<td>Site #28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leimkuhler Inc.</td>
<td>4605/4625 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMD Properties</td>
<td>4529 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant gas station</td>
<td>4507 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max S. Hayes Vocational School</td>
<td>4600 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Parking Lot</td>
<td>4414 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Food Mart</td>
<td>1407 West 45th Street</td>
<td>Site #41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Weld Inc.</td>
<td>4411 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biro Sales</td>
<td>4307 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Club</td>
<td>2920 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-tenant (industrial/commercial)</td>
<td>2900 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>2882 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>2820 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>2814 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaefer Printing Company</td>
<td>2817 – 2819 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getco Office</td>
<td>2710/12 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant office/warehouse building</td>
<td>2628 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant office/warehouse building</td>
<td>2605 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>Site #76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County Engineer's Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>2429/2433 Superior Avenue</td>
<td>Site #80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1 Substation</td>
<td>1320 West 25th Street</td>
<td>Site #83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Site #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Morgan Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>1245 West 45th Street</td>
<td>#86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Port Authority</td>
<td>5418 Crescent Avenue</td>
<td>#88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerly Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
<td>5800 Whiskey Island Drive/ Memorial Shoreway</td>
<td>#90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater Marina</td>
<td>6500 Memorial Shoreway</td>
<td>#91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Helmer Corporation Warehouse</td>
<td>7706 Lake Avenue</td>
<td>#95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Helmer Corporation Warehouse</td>
<td>7608 Lake Avenue</td>
<td>#96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Power Laundry</td>
<td>7600 Lake Avenue</td>
<td>#97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Hermetic &amp; Supply</td>
<td>7724 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>#98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunoco Gas Station</td>
<td>7700 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>#99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance &amp; Furniture Rental</td>
<td>7315 Detroit Avenue</td>
<td>#103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1379 West 29th Street</td>
<td>#112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Craig Kerscher, Environmental Specialist, at (614) 752-2175.

TMH:ctk

cc:  Mark Carpenter, D-12
     File w/attachment
     Reading file
TO: Bonnie Teeuwen, District 12 Deputy Director
Attn: Thomas Sorge
FROM: Timothy M. Hill, Administrator, Office of Environmental Services
SUBJECT: Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Work Plan

PROJECT: CUY – 6 – 12.21

This office has reviewed the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Work Plan for the above referenced project which was prepared by Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Based on the information provided, we believe that a Phase II ESA is warranted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th># of SBs</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Lab Analysis of Soil</th>
<th># of MWs</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Lab Analysis of GW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T&amp;M Plastics Co., Mobile Martin, &amp; Machine Shop</td>
<td>1246 70th St., 1259 W 73rd, &amp; 7201 Father Caruso Dr.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>VOCs, SVOCs, TPH, PCBs, RCRA Metals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>VOCs, SVOCs, RCRA Metals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>HKM Direct Market Communications Co.</td>
<td>5502 Cass Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>VOCs, SVOCs, TPH, RCRA Metals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Bounce Night Club</td>
<td>2814 Detroit Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>VOCs, SVOCs, TPH, RCRA Metals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Former Chemical Mineral Recovery (CMR)</td>
<td>5418 Crescent Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>VOCs, SVOCs, TPH, PCBs, RCRA Metals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>VOCs, SVOCs, RCRA Metals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We agree with the locations of soil borings (SBs) and monitoring wells (MWs) depicted in the Phase II ESA Work Plan, which may be adjusted based on professional opinion of the consultant with respect to the geophysical survey results. Monitoring wells will be 4 inches in diameter. Neither Site 27 nor Site 71 warrants groundwater sampling. Methods in laboratory analysis should be as follows: VOCs by EPA Method 8260, SVOCs by EPA Method 8270, PCBs by EPA Method 8082, TPH by EPA Method 8015, and RCRA Metals by EPA Method 6010.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Craig Kerscher, Environmental Specialist, at (614) 752-2175.

TMH: ctk

cc: Mark Carpenter, D-12
    File w/attachment
    Reading file
TO: Bonnie Teeuwen, District 12 Deputy Director
Attn: Thomas Sorge
FROM: Timothy M. Hill, Administrator, Office of Environmental Services
SUBJECT: Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

PROJECT: CUY – 6 – 12.21

This office has reviewed the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the above referenced project which was prepared by Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Based on the information provided, we believe additional Phase II ESA work is warranted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13   | T&M Plastics Co., Mobile Martin, & Machine Shop | 1246 70th St., 1259 W 73rd, & 7201 Father Caruso Dr. | Resample GP-2,(S-2) and run a TCLP test for Barium and Lead.  
Resample GP-9,(S-1), GP-10,(S-2), and run a TCLP test for Lead.  
Resample MW-2 to confirm/refute Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate.  
Resample MW-2 & MW-3 for total metals (use a filtering method to remove suspended solids) |
| 88   | Former Chemical Mineral Recovery (CMR)         | 5418 Crescent Ave.           | Resample GP-6,(S-2) and run a TCLP test for Chromium and Lead.  
Resample GP-1,(S-1), GP-7,(S-4), and run a TCLP test for Lead.  
Resample MW-88-1 for total metals (use a filtering method to remove suspended solids) |

A plan note for petroleum contaminated soil (PCS) should be developed and placed into the plans for Site 13, Site 27, Site 71, and Site 88. Additionally, a plan note for two orphan underground storage tanks (USTs) should be developed and placed into the plans for Site 71.

Contrary to what is stated in the subject report, the most recent alignment requires right-of-way from Site 13, Site 27, Site 71, and Site 88.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Craig Kerscher, Environmental Specialist, at (614) 752-2175.

TMH:ctk

cc: Mark Carpenter, D-12  
File w/attachment  
Reading file