

# Meeting Notes

---

**Date:** September 22, 2005  
**Time:** 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
**Location:** Quincy Place  
8111 Quincy Avenue, Suite 100  
Cleveland, Ohio 44104  
**Attendees:** CUY-Opportunity Corridor Committee  
**Re:** CUY-Opportunity Corridor PID 77333  
Workshop #3

---

The Power Point Presentation given at this workshop can be found on the project website accessed through [www.innerbelt.org](http://www.innerbelt.org). The meeting minutes reflect the discussions generated as a result of the presentation.

## 1) Introduction

- Terri Hamilton Brown, co-chair of the Committee and President of University Circle Incorporated, opened the meeting with a brief introduction. This was the third Workshop of its kind, with the last one held on August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2005. Hamilton Brown said the agenda of this meeting is to first go over all of the small meetings/updates they have had with constituents and to discuss their outcomes, take a look at the refined alternatives, and then go through the Conceptual Alternatives Evaluation Matrix with all of its revisions and additions since the last workshop.
- Hamilton Brown noted there were several new people present and suggested everyone introduce themselves. Jamie Ireland, Co-chair of the Committee and President of Early Stage Partners LLP, will be joining the group shortly, she said.
- The co-chairs of the committee and HNTB consultants felt that they needed an additional smaller workshop to review the alternatives before they had the whole committee workshop on October 11, 2005. Hamilton Brown stated they would like to begin eliminating some of the alternatives.

## 2) Project Updates

- Mary Cierebiej, Deputy Project Manager from HNTB, discussed the small group meetings they have had with concerned parties since the last workshop.
  - HNTB and GCRTA met to discuss the status of plans for its new East 55<sup>th</sup> Street station. Final Design will be approved in fall 2006, and then construction will start in spring 2007. GRTA will be coordinating with the city on traffic and access issues.
  - Burten, Bell, Carr (BBC) had a public meeting for its Master Plan on August 25<sup>th</sup>. At that meeting, some residents voiced their concerns about the potential residential takes associated with the Master Plan as well as Opportunity Corridor. At the next public meeting, design strategies will be presented to the community.

- The consultant team also met with the City of Cleveland Economic Development Department and Cleveland Industrial Retention Initiative (CIRI) representatives on September 14<sup>th</sup> and tried to identify commercial businesses they wanted to avoid taking for the Opportunity Corridor (Micelli's and Orlando Bakery) as well as the status of some of the smaller commercial businesses in the study area.
- A meeting was also held with representatives from Slavic Village, BBC, and CIRI to discuss concerns about property takes and access for their residents to the new station. Slavic Village leaders said this project may put them in a holding pattern because of the uncertainty of whether or not this project will be constructed. They are concerned that there may be some disinvestment in properties along Bower and other nearby streets where the proposed boulevard may be located. Slavic Village also asked how they will benefit from the Corridor. They have other sites identified in their master plan for new housing, but they currently do not have the funding to initiate those projects.
- GCRTA and the City of Cleveland will be coordinating the traffic impacts due to the new station, including the #2 bus stopping on 55<sup>th</sup> St. very close to the I-490 and E. 55<sup>th</sup> St. intersection and opening up Bower for an entrance would add another phase to the signal. Mary Cierebiej showed a slide of the proposed East 55<sup>th</sup> St. station parking lot. GCRTA is willing to consider making adjustments to the location of their parking lot. There may still be an option to place the parking on the south side of Bower Avenue.
- ODOT and HNTB also met with the Buckeye CDC where they discussed Alternative 4. Alternative 4 may impact some of property on the Kenneth Johnson Recreational Center site that has been identified for future development. The KJRC has plans to expand significantly as the money becomes available and is working with the city to assemble surrounding vacant land. The Center wants to add a new spray park and pool in their next phase of development. There is also a new housing development planned for the Buckeye area, but there is little detail currently available. The city and CDC will keep the consultant team apprised on any new information.
- At a meeting with Fairfax, Case Western Reserve University, and University Circle Incorporated, the consultant team discussed the proposed spur which is the proposed extension of the Opportunity Corridor east of E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. in the University Circle Area. At this time ODOT is recommending that the spur become part of the MLK Corridor Study. All parties present agreed that the spur was very important but could be given more focus as part of the MLK Corridor Study. The consensus is that East 105<sup>th</sup> St. should be the terminus of the Opportunity Corridor with continued coordination between this consultant team and UDA, the consultant for the MLK Corridor Study.

### 3) Refinements of Conceptual Alternatives

- Matt Wahl, Project Manager from HNTB, talked about the intersections that are possible with Alternative 4. At our last meeting there was concern about residents having to cross a wide boulevard to access the new station. In order to remove traffic from the path of the station, HNTB looked at options for building a grade separation for Alternative 4. Two

- options were developed that would send traffic under existing E. 55<sup>th</sup> and allow pedestrians to cross without interfacing with the majority of the traffic.
- Wahl explained what a Diamond Interchange would be like with respect to Alternative 4. This option is a modified diamond due to the proximity of the I-77/I-490 interchange. I-490 through eastbound traffic would be routed under East 55<sup>th</sup> Street, eliminating those volumes at the intersection. I-77 traffic would intersect with East 55<sup>th</sup> St. That traffic could go right or left on E. 55<sup>th</sup> St. or cross 55<sup>th</sup> St. and enter the boulevard on the entrance ramp east of E. 55<sup>th</sup> St. The Diamond Interchange would provide two smaller intersections instead of one larger intersection. One of the drawbacks to the diamond interchange is that several commercial properties are impacted just west of E. 55<sup>th</sup> St, in addition to more residential impacts than the original Alternative 4.
  - A second option is a Parkway Interchange. This option would take I-77 and I-490 eastbound traffic under East 55<sup>th</sup> Street. Traffic wanting to access E. 55<sup>th</sup> would exit the boulevard via a slow speed exit ramp east of E. 55<sup>th</sup>. One of the drawbacks with this option is that it also has more residential impacts to the Slavic Village area than the original Alternative 4. Another potential problem with the Parkway Interchange is that traffic may move too fast because of the elimination of signals. Possible solutions mentioned to slow the traffic include warning signs or speed detection devices. The speed limit on the boulevard will be 35 mph so the character of the road needs to reflect that before you reach E. 55<sup>th</sup> St.
  - Hamilton Brown asked how the volume of traffic changes in the analysis compared to the last alternative. Wahl said the original traffic count was 34,000 cars on E. 55<sup>th</sup> St. and now it is down to 18,000 since more of the traffic is thru-traffic on the new boulevard. He reiterated that the challenge is to make the cars go slower.
  - Wahl noted that creating the grade separation at E. 55<sup>th</sup> Street may impact the combined sewer below the existing street network depending on how deep they are, but that is something that will be looked at in greater detail if this is one of the corridors that moves forward.
  - Hamilton Brown asked, "When you met with Slavic Village, did you show them this? And what was the feedback?" Cierebiej said yes, we showed these concepts to Slavic Village and noted that these two options do what we were asked to do - improve access for the people crossing the intersection to access the station and make it safer; now the majority of the traffic will be under E. 55<sup>th</sup> St. The overall concern is the impacts to the neighborhood with all of the options proposed for Alternative 4. Cierebiej asked if Ben Campbell had anything to add. Ben said they are still digesting a lot of the information that was presented and how it impacts their service area.
  - Bobbie Reichtell, Vice President for Planning, Neighborhood Progress Inc. asked what letter grade the computer model give this intersection. Wahl said the conventional intersection barely got a Level of Service (LOS) D and that was with 3 lanes in each direction plus turning lanes. The parkway interchange received a LOS B and a LOS C at the intersections.
  - Reichtell asked what the plans were for pedestrian and bike access. Cierebiej said the plans call for bike lanes and sidewalks on each side of the road. They will follow the ramps to and from E. 55<sup>th</sup> Street.

- Ben Campbell, Executive Director of Slavic Village, asked if the alternative still depicts a 15 mph turn radius. Wahl said it is practically a stop, about 5 mph. The problem is, the bigger the radius you make the turn, the faster people try to take it and the more residential impacts you will have. Since we have to make them slow, maybe the answer is to make the radius tighter. Slavic Village is concerned about truck access with that small of a turning radius, especially with the Bessemer extension in place there are a lot of trucks that need to access E. 55<sup>th</sup> and in the interstate system.
- Ron Eckner from NOACA asked if they have considered making U-connections with the side streets south of the boulevard rather than cul-de-sacs in the Slavic Village area. He said that could potentially save nine houses. Matt Wahl said we had not looked at that, but we could. The concept shown at today's meeting was just to let people know that those side streets shown with cul-de-sacs would not have access to the boulevard, except from E. 55<sup>th</sup> St.
- Hamilton Brown said they need to continue meeting with Slavic Village to work out other options and how to minimize impacts because we need to narrow down the alternatives. Campbell said there is simply too much information that his organization, Slavic Village, must review before it can give an answer as to what it endorses. He said there is a larger amount of takes in his area than previously thought.
- Millie Caraballo of CIRI said GCRTA is flexible and offered to look at shift the location of the parking for the station. Cierebiej reinforced that only the parking would be affected if alternative 4 were to be constructed, not the actual station building. GCRTA may move forward with their current parking plan, but indicated as a future phase they could move the station closer to the tracks and allow room for the proposed boulevard south of Bower.
- Robert Jackimowicz of Cleveland City Council asked about the difference in the number property impacts between the Diamond and the Parkway Interchanges. Hamilton Brown requested that HNTB get a count of that for Alternative 4. Cierebiej said the structure impacts for the Parkway Interchange are quantified for Alternative 4, and the Diamond Interchange has more impacts because in addition to the neighborhood impacts, it impacts commercial business just west of E. 55<sup>th</sup> St.
- Hamilton Brown inquired about the cost differences between the diamond and the parkway Interchanges. Wahl said the conceptual cost estimates for the parkway interchange are included in the matrix, but the diamond interchange would be more expensive because of the additional commercial business impacts and the additional ramp structures required.
- Hamilton Brown moved the meeting along. She said the next topic is a decision about the terminus of the boulevard, whether it is East 105<sup>th</sup> St. or the Spur. She asked if they could talk more about this. Bob Reeves, Director of Community Planning and Development, UCI, stated that pedestrian access is a concern in and around University Circle and the spur could be added to the scope of the MLK Corridor Study in addressing access and traffic flow with continued coordination with HNTB and ODOT. Hamilton Brown stated that the UDA study does not have funding for construction of roadway, but it could be constructed as part of this study.
- Joe Schafran of Paran Management Company stated that the UDA study needs to be closely coordinated with this study if they are separate, because the recommendations

- need to be compatible. Bob Reeves added that's why they want HNTB to be involved with the UDA study as well so that there is close coordination.
- Hamilton Brown said the MLK Corridor is just a study. If we looking at E. 105<sup>th</sup> without the Spur, we have to plan for that road to handle more traffic.
  - Wahl explained that 54,000 cars come off of I-490. The further east you go, towards the Buckeye area, the more the traffic counts decrease. By the time you get to E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. and Quincy, the count has dropped to 20,000. Having seven lanes on E. 105<sup>th</sup> was a concern for Fairfax. Wahl said five lanes would probably work, so you could transition the boulevard to five lanes from seven lanes.
  - Roland Newman, Administrative Director for Cleveland Clinic Foundation, stated that the total traffic is 21,000 cars on E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. near the Cleveland Clinic. The Cleveland Clinic is concerned because E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. between Cedar Avenue and Chester Avenue traffic is often gridlocked during shift changes (between 3:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.). There are about 4,000 cars parked in this area, so he is concerned about introducing additional traffic on E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. in the future with the proposed boulevard.
  - Matt Wahl said according to NOACA's model, two thru lanes at Cedar and E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. would handle the traffic. Wahl said they analyzed peak traffic hours. That's 8 – 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 – 5 p.m. He said that it is a benefit that the major institutions do not have typical work hours and that shift change times are staggered throughout the day.
  - Hamilton Brown asked if HNTB looked at traffic volumes along E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. rather than just the east and west movements. She suggested that HNTB look at E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. more closely – like we did for E. 55<sup>th</sup> St. to see how new traffic would impact existing traffic.
  - Joe Schafran said we are moving traffic eastward and asked whether the two studies should interface (MLK and Opportunity Corridor). He said there will be a new volume of traffic coming into an already poorly performing grid. HNTB was asked to be involved in the study for MLK because it is best suited to explain how these two concepts might work together.
  - Hamilton Brown asked again for a reason why the Spur can't be looked at as part of this study. Hebebrand said the two studies can certainly be coordinated, but the Spur cannot be part of Corridor study because it probably would not be eligible for state funding. It can easily later connect to the proposed boulevard. They need to end the boulevard at E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. because of its ability to distribute traffic East and West and to connect with Chester or Euclid because they are US routes, and if the new boulevard is a state route, that connection is necessary. It will be easy to, in the future, continue on to create a Spur to connect to MLK. If we did take it as part of this study, it would be bogged down with all the traffic flow issues of University Circle.
  - Ireland asked about the meeting that was supposed to happen with Cleveland Clinic to decide if E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. was the best terminus for the Boulevard. Hebebrand said it did not take place, but that they will get it scheduled as soon as possible.
  - Meanwhile, the Cleveland Clinic's Roland Newman is concerned that the Corridor would unload all the traffic into University Circle at E. 105 St. If so, he continued, Euclid will only handle one lane of vehicular traffic when the Euclid Corridor project is complete. Chester

- traffic will end up at the bottom of Cedar Hill and then you still have to get through the bottom of the hill at MLK. Where will all these vehicles go?
- Eckner said there until there is more development there is not necessarily additional traffic; it's just shifted. Eckner stated that we should look at E. 105<sup>th</sup> and the spur because traffic wants to go more than one direction.
  - Hebebrand replied that traffic can be fed in and out of University Circle at an efficient rate going up E. 105<sup>th</sup> St. and feeding traffic to the east-west streets.
  - Hamilton Brown said, to Joe Schafran's point, there is a way. She wondered how the Opportunity and MLK studies can come up with alternatives together. She expressed that she still does not want to leave the Spur to the MLK study and would like to discuss this further at another time. She then moved the meeting along to the topic of the matrix.

#### 4) Evaluation Matrix

- Cierebiej said that economic development and employment-yield information was taken off the matrix because the city did not prepare estimates for each of the alternatives, rather an estimate for the study area based on proposed future land use. The City of Cleveland estimates about 1,600 new jobs would be created as a result of the Corridor and proposed changes to existing land use. There is a lot of land identified for redevelopment. Cierebiej noted that the city came up with low, mid and high estimates for employment by category. She showed a proposed land use map developed by the city (slide 17 of PowerPoint). It is mostly light industrial and some residential and recreational.
- Hamilton Brown noted that the count of new jobs looks low, as the estimate was only accounting for 130 acres of redevelopment. Cierebiej said this is just the first step in calculating job creation. She said the statistics were compiled by the City of Cleveland and we will continue coordinating with the city to develop more detailed estimates.
- Hamilton Brown asked how aggressive we should get with changing the land zoning at the present time. Cierebiej said they are having ongoing discussions with the City about what is the best use for this land. NOACA's Ron Eckner said the zoning is old. He wondered how zoning can be changed to improve use of the RTA Rapid in the area. Cierebiej said in previous meeting we discussed the land use being zoned mixed-use/multi-family to make the population density higher in the surrounding area and therefore increase ridership.
- Cierebiej directed everyone's attention to the matrix. (A copy of the matrix is posted on the project website – only comments about what is in the matrix are included.)
- Cierebiej stated the entire study area is considered environmental justice population because the majority of the population is low income or minority. Jackimowicz of Cleveland City Council asked how they could say that adding sidewalks and bike lanes is good enough reason to take people's houses. He commented that this idea was not sufficiently studied. He suggested that HNTB specify the number of jobs benefit to each alternative. Cierebiej said this is what they are trying to do, get opinions and add things into the matrix with input from the committee, the matrix is being presented for discussion.
- Hamilton Brown said we need to look closer at each alternative and determine the benefits. Hebebrand said they need to move the benefits into the Purpose and Need statement where they can be explained in a narrative, not just with numbers in a chart.

- Jackimowicz asked about the low-income houses that will be torn down. Where are they going to relocate these families? There is limited opportunity to find replacement housing in Slavic Village. Due to lack of space and money to build new property, relocating those residents will be difficult. It was explained that the state would compensate those impacted by offering fair market value for their homes and cover moving expenses. The state however cannot tell people where to move, so there are no guarantees that those residents will relocate in the same neighborhood.
- Melissa Williams from Buckeye Area Development Corporation said there is no green space in her neighborhood. She asked if we will be adding the number of newly created parks and green spaces into the matrix, not just impacts to the existing ones. She also noted that there is no mention of public art. Hamilton Brown said that is a separate scope of work to deal with involving streets and landscape. She said that green space will be decided when they rezone the area in the future.
- Millie Caraballo asked if the study includes how the Corridor will positively impact the economic development potential in the area south of the study area. Caraballo said that it opens up the Forgotten Triangle and wondered if those numbers be included as well. Hamilton Brown stated the matrix should only include the study area as the primary focus, and the outerlying areas are more secondary, but it is important information to know when we are vying for the support of the community and local government. Hebebrand said that such information will also help with finding financing sources. Hamilton Brown then commented that the hand-out from the City didn't include so-called "secondary spin-offs." Cierebiej said that coordination with the local institutions and the city to get those numbers.
- Matt Wahl then discussed utilities. Wahl said fiber optic companies like to occupy railroad right of way, so there is a lot of fiber optics in the rail corridors. If the Corridor impacts these kinds of companies, ODOT will have to pay to relocate them.
- Wahl added that the Baldwin water treatment plant is just east of the study area, so there are a lot of water mains in the study area. Large water mains are very difficult to relocate. He said you cannot just turn the water off and move lines. Woodland and Stokes have extensive water lines. It has not been determined what will have to be done with the water lines, but it will be looked at in more details in the next phase of study.
- Cierebiej said that they categorized the potential residential impacts by ward as requested at the last workshop. (See matrix.) Cierebiej showed pictures of representative residential, commercial, and religious properties in the study area. Some of the areas potentially impacted are already in the city land bank and HNTB will continue to coordinate with the city about the status of vacant properties.
- Jackimowicz asked if they are going to do partial property takes. He commented that the value of a property can be ruined if that is done. For the purposes of this matrix, we are only including structure impacts. Until an "alignment" is defined, we won't know the extent of property impacts.
- Cierebiej commented that they tried to obtain information on which of the residential properties were boarded, vacant, condemned, etc., but the information is ever changing and we didn't get the information for all of the service areas. Wahl said that it is difficult to tell why houses are boarded up. Are they condemned or just being repaired? He said that HNTB also found that even if such structures are condemned, there is such a thing as a

24-hour or three-day condemnations, so it is near impossible to get a count on how many houses are truly empty.

- Cierebiej added that HNTB originally estimated the number of structure impacts using 2002 aerial mapping. Recently new base mapping was received and some of the structures originally counted are no longer standing, so we will continue to collect information to provide accurate and up to date information about these properties and will continue to request information from the city and the CDCs.
- Campbell said the city has a system to determine condemnations. They spray-paint dots on the houses that are condemned. He added that police also board up drug houses and mark them. Hebebrand simplified the problem by saying the term “condemned” has temporary meaning.
- Someone commented that there are city “demo lists” that exist. Cierebiej stated that a request was made to the city to obtain that information but it was not received prior to this meeting.
- Hamilton Brown said it is important to note that even though these counts can change daily and may not be accurate, they still provide a good snapshot of the area.
- Cierebiej brought up the issue of church takes. She said there is also a subjective judgment call to be made about traditional versus nontraditional churches. She gave some examples by showing slides of pictures. Some are obvious, but others may be non-traditional yet they were constructed for the purpose of worship. In this version of the matrix we have included names of churches potentially impacted by each of the alternatives.
- Wahl said that Woodland Cemetery is part of the National Register so it should be avoided. He said this pushes the Corridor south on Woodland and that takes some non-traditional churches that are close to the road. This also may cause potential impacts to St. John’s Cemetery on the south side of Woodland.
- Wahl went over the cost estimates for each alternative in 2005 dollars including contingencies:
  - Alt. 1 - \$181 M
  - Alt. 2 - \$272 M
  - Alt. 3 - \$238 M
  - Alt. 4 - \$199 M
  - Alt. 4 with the Parkway Interchange - \$206M
- Hamilton Brown suggested that at this point they should be discussing eliminating certain alternatives. Are we there yet?
- Hebebrand said that when the Purpose and Need document is examined, Alternatives 2 and 4 are the ones that fulfill the areas transportation needs and have the most potential for community and economic development. He suggested they take alternatives 2 and 4 forward for further study. That would give us an option to go north or south of the tracks at E. 55<sup>th</sup> St. and then the corridor becomes all of the area in between alternatives 2 and 4 and alignments would be developed within that corridor.
- Newman asked about the reasoning behind this suggestion. He noted that alternatives 2 and 4 are merged together at certain points on the maps. On the maps of the alternatives,

2 is the yellow line and 4 is the red line and they overlap at some points so yellow is covered over by the red line in some areas.

- Bob Bertsch from the City of Cleveland asked if we have met with Orlando Bakery. Wahl said we met with Orlando very early in the study process and they shared their expansion plans with us. Wahl said that with alternative 2 they may need to take the Orlando loading dock which would greatly impact their operations. Hebebrand said that when they met with Orlando in the beginning, the Orlando owners liked alternative 4 because it would give them a new front door.
- Jackimowicz said he was reluctant to take any alternative off the table at this point. He has many people to whom he must show this data before he can give his endorsement to removing an alternative. Cierebiej said they wanted to make the decision at the October meeting and in the meantime everyone should be taking this information back to stakeholders and gathering their opinions.
- Hamilton Brown said we need a recommendation, but not a hard recommendation. She said she respects that Jackimowicz does not yet want to take any alternatives off the table. Alternatives 2 and 4 do have impacts, but they are the best fitted, she said.
- Eckner asked if we can break out the data where alternatives 2 and 4 differ. Hamilton Brown agreed that would be a great idea.
- Hebebrand said they need a wide range of alternatives for the NEPA process and we have given the same level of detail for each of the alternatives at this point so they can be equally compared.
- Campbell asked if he means that the study team is further defining an area to work with and if hybrids of alternatives of 2 and 4 will be developed. He wanted to make sure they aren't choosing the actual alternative today. Hebebrand confirmed that he was correct.

## 5) Next Steps

- Hamilton Brown closed the meeting and said the next meeting is October 11<sup>th</sup> between 10 a.m. and noon at Quincy Place. Craig Hebebrand stated, if anyone needs information in the meantime, please contact Mary Cierebiej and copy him, Jamie Ireland and Terri Hamilton Brown on the e-mails.
- A public meeting will be held either late November or early December.

## Meeting Attendees

---

### CUY-Opportunity Corridor Workshop #3 – September 22, 2005

Name	Organization
Bob Bertsch	City of Cleveland
Kelly Brooker	ODOT, Central Office
Ben Campbell	Business Development Officer, Slavic Village Development Corporation
Millie Caraballo	Industrial Development Manager, Cleveland Industrial Retention Initiative (CIRI)
Mary Cierebiej	Deputy Project Manager, HNTB
Andrew Cross	City of Cleveland Traffic Engineering
Brian Drobnick	Econ. Dev. Coordinator, Fairfax Renaissance Development Corporation
Ron Eckner	NOACA
Richard Enty	GCRTA
Marka Fields	City Planning Commission
Geoff Fitch	CIRI
Chris Frohring	Maingate
Terri Hamilton Brown	Co-chair of the Committee and President of University Circle Inc. (UCI)
Craig Hebebrand	ODOT, District 12
Lora Hummer	ODOT, District 12
Jamal Husani	Cuyahoga County Engineers Office
Jamie Ireland	Co-chair of the Committee and Managing Director, Early Stage Partners LP
Robert Jackimowicz	Cleveland City Council
Ndeda N. Letson	UCI
Roland Newman	Administrative Director, Facilities Operation, Cleveland Clinic Foundation
Connie Perotti	Maingate
Bobbi Reichtell	VP for Planning, Neighborhood Progress Inc.
Bob Reeves	Director of Community Planning and Development, UCI
Aubrey Sippola	Whelan Communications
Joseph Shafran	President, Paran Management Company; Chair, UCI Property Committee
Timothy Tramble	Executive Director, Burten, Bell, Carr Development Corporation
Matt Wahl	Project Manager, HNTB
Ned Whelan	President, Whelan Communications
Melissa Williams	Business Development Director, Buckeye Area Development Corporation
Joel Wimbiscus	UCI