

Meeting Notes

Date: November 10, 2005
Time: 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Location: Quincy Place
8111 Quincy Avenue, Suite 100
Cleveland, Ohio 44104
Attendees: CUY-Opportunity Corridor Committee
Re: CUY-Opportunity Corridor PID 77333
Committee Meeting #2

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

1) Introduction

- Terri Hamilton Brown, who has resigned as Executive Director of University Circle Incorporated to become a Vice President of Corporate Diversity for National City Bank, will remain Co-chair of the Advisory Committee. She welcomed the group. She noted that there were several new people present and suggested everyone introduce himself or herself. She said that there were 3 workshops held over the summer since our first full committee meeting and this is the second time the committee as a whole has been together. Hamilton Brown briefly went over what had been accomplished since the last whole group meeting and outlined the agenda of the meeting: the overview, review the alternatives, review the updated matrix, reach recommendations, and solicit comments. Hamilton Brown said the ultimate goal of today's meeting is to narrow down the corridor for further study.

2) Project Updates

- Mary Cierbiej, Deputy Project Manager from HNTB, recapped the various stakeholder meetings held during the last year. See the Power Point presentation posted on the website. Some of the more recent meetings include:
- BBC Master Plan/Urban Design Center (UDC)
 - Concerned about the appearance of and "interchange" and its effects on the neighborhood. UDC prefers the western portion of Alternative #2 (north of the tracks) to the western portion of Alternative #4 (south of the tracks) because of the residential impacts
- Cleveland Clinic
 - Confirmed that East 105th was preferred over E. 89th St. or E. 93rd St. for the terminus due to the neighborhood impacts
 - The Clinic will continue to work with Fairfax to determine the best future use for E. 105th St., as well as assist the study team in gaining support and funding.

- At the last meeting, the question was raised as to whether or not NOACA's model included the future development in the University Circle area. Cierebiej confirmed after meeting with NOACA that their traffic model does not take in account the Cleveland Clinic's new Heart Center on Euclid Avenue, the VA Hospital expansion, and the West Quad campus.
- Hamilton Brown asked about the percentage of traffic that will increase with the new Heart Center. Matt Wahl, HNTB Project Manager, said that NOACA's model currently shows the traffic remaining stable in the University Circle area rather than declining as in other parts of the City. Matt said that HNTB will be requesting zip code information for employees from the Clinic, VA, UH, and Case to see where employees are coming from to create more accurate model of where the traffic is coming and going. Cierebiej added that HNTB had obtained the square footage of the facilities to help predict the traffic, but NOACA feels the number of employees traveling from a specific zip code would be more accurate.

3) Refinements of Conceptual Alternatives

- Wahl went over the original four conceptual alternatives for the Corridor. He showed a map of each alternative showing the potential economic and community development associated with each.
- David Goldberg of Ohio Savings Bank asked if any work or any further study has been done with the proposed spur. Bob Reeves of UCI said UCI will be looking at it as part of the MLK Corridor Study.
- Wahl then went over the acreage of new frontage that could be created with each of the alternatives, as well as the potential impacts.
- Millie Caraballo of the Cleveland Industrial Retention Initiative asked if potential "takes" are vacant. Are most of the impacts residential? Cierebiej said that determining the status of the structures impacted will be part of the next phase. The potential impacts are quantified by residential, religious, commercial etc. for each of the alternatives in the evaluation matrix. Participants were given a copy of the matrix at the beginning of the meeting. A copy is also posted on the project website.
- Wahl said all four of the conceptual alternatives have 26 common residential takes along E. 105th St. (assuming a symmetrical widening). Hamilton Brown asked where on the map the other mentioned takes are. He showed the areas of potential impacts associated with each of the alternatives. Millie Caraballo asked that if "takes" are houses or property. Cierebiej replied that the "takes" are structures, not parcels or property, but physical structures.
- Craig Hebebrand of ODOT District 12 said that the study team will be doing a large amount of documentation in the corridor area in the next phases of study. In February, 2006, he said, ODOT plans to take the data and concepts developed to this point to the public for feedback. In the next phase, he said, ODOT will do more engineering as well as environmental impact studies and studies of cultural resources. Hebebrand stated that this committee will be continually consulted throughout the process. He said the alignments will continue to be refined further and other options for minimizing impacts will be explored. In the coming months, ODOT will also research the environmental sites and begin to

estimate the cost for cleaning up those sites. There are costs associated with studying these sites and that is why it is important that this Committee narrow the corridor so that the focus of study is a smaller area. Hebebrand went on to say that the recommendation of this study team is that we stop looking at alternative 1, which primarily follows the existing streets of E. 55th St. and Woodland, and also alternative 3, which is north of the railroad tracks for its full length.

- Hebebrand noted that Alternatives 2 and 3 are basically the same to the west but between E. 75th St. and Buckeye, Alternative 2 runs south of the railroad tracks and Alternative 3 runs north of the tracks. Alternatives 1 and 3 included cemetery impacts and a number of planned improvements sites, and the economic development potential was the lowest of the 4 alternatives. Therefore, it was determined that the benefits did not outweigh the impacts. Hebebrand then reiterated that the recommendation is to remove Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 from further consideration. Hebebrand said ODOT will concentrate on the yellow-colored area of the map, that was distributed to the committee during the meeting, in the next steps, and future alternatives will be developed within this yellow area over the next year. A copy of the map is posted on the website. By this time next year, he continued, we should know the recommended alternative and have a plan in place as to how to finance it.
- Ron Eckner of NOACA asked if we can still look at the possible connection between Kinsman and E. 55th St., where the northern leg of Kinsman would tie into E. 55th St. south of the existing 5 legged intersection with Woodland Ave. even though that alternative 1 is off the table. Hebebrand said we will not look at this as part of this study if we eliminate Alternative 1. He said the city may however do it as a separate study.
- Goldberg inquired about his earlier discussion about a possible connection from the Corridor to University Hospital and Case along the railroad tracks to Mayfield. Bob Reeves said there are a lot of buildings on UH and Case's campus that would be impacted with that kind of connection. Wahl said they did look at some concepts. Hamilton Brown said that UCI's MLK Boulevard study will look for better connections in that area. UCI has agreed to include HNTB as part of the MLK study team to ensure the projects are being coordinated.
- Goldberg asked about cantilevering over the railroad tracks along the Case campus. Is this possible? Bob Reeves said that would make it 30 feet higher and that's not practical. We can't go under it either. Goldberg said that it sounds like the committee has looked into these issues already and he gave his thanks.
- Councilman Anthony Brancatelli of Ward 12 said that he is formally opposing Alternative 4 as it is currently shown because of all the property takes associated with it in Slavic Village. He understood early on that there may be impacts to Slavic Village, but not to this extent. He asked the committee to leave Alternatives 2 and 3 on the table. He said this will give us enough acreage. Hamilton Brown reassured him that the Committee is not saying it will be the precise route shown as alternative 4. She said it will be an alternative we will create that lies in the area between Alternatives 2 and 4. We need additional studying, she said and we are committed to doing that.
- Hebebrand said we need a corridor of specific width in order to be able to put forth several alternatives for study. He said we would not want to move that boundary line any closer to Alternative 2 because that would be limiting the range of alternatives. Plus, the bridge

- requirements of Alternative 2 would add significant costs so we have to leave options on the table. He pointed out that staying north of the railroad tracks and going along Grand Avenue also requires residential takes. This will be addressed in more detail in the next phase, he said. He added that the Committee will need to look closely at development; weigh it with the property takes, and see if the "cost" will be offset.
- Hamilton Brown pointed out that the Corridor may end up being parts of Alternative 2 and parts of Alternative 4. She stated: We are not trying to make one recommendation today; we are trying to get rid of the ones that do not work. Hebebrand added one consideration is leaving the intersection as it is today, perhaps then improving E. 55th St. and Grand and then the rest of the boulevard.
 - Hamilton Brown asked the Councilman, how do you respond to his suggestions of possibly leaving the intersection the same? Councilman Brancatelli said he is a supporter of this project; it is just that the neighborhood nearby St. Hyacinth Church will be devastated by Alternative 4 as it is currently being shown.
 - Hamilton Brown asked if he was stating an objection to the western end of Alternative 4. Councilman Brancatelli noted that putting new roads in the past have devastated various areas, so he wanted to express his concerns for alternative 4 in its current form. The Councilman submitted a letter to ODOT documenting his concerns. Hebebrand encouraged all attendees to document their concerns, support, etc. so that it is a matter of public record that helps in shaping future decisions.
 - Hebebrand said that the estimate of the number of property takes thus far are close. We have estimated high in hopes of refining the alternatives to minimize those impacts, rather than giving a low estimate and ending up with more impacts than originally estimated. As refinements are made, the numbers will be more accurate.
 - Hamilton Brown said they will study viable options in more detail. She stressed the importance of moving the study to a plan.
 - She addressed the group and asked if we can agree to take alternative 1 off the table. The group agreed and consensus was reached. Hamilton Brown said that Alternative 1 is now off the table.
 - Councilman Brancatelli said he may have been mistaken about Alternative 3 in his earlier remarks. Hebebrand reminded him that Alternatives 2 and 3 are the same between East 55th Street and East 75th Street.
 - Hamilton Brown said they are recommending Alternative 3 be taken off the table. The group agreed and consensus was reached.
 - Hamilton Brown continued by summing up that we have Alternatives 2 and 4 left on the table, noting concerns about Alternative 4 and the associated residential impacts in Slavic Village. She added we are not looking for approval of either just that we move forward looking at both in more detail. She asked Hebebrand to explain what we can expect to happen next.

4) Next Steps

- Hebebrand said a lot of documentation will occur in the near future. The plan is to hold a public meeting in February. Between now and then the study team will meet with

members of the new City of Cleveland administration and look at alternatives that reduce the number of impacts in Slavic Village. We will bring those concepts back to the CDCs and get their input before going to the public. After public feedback has been received, the alternatives will be further refined accordingly.

- Hamilton Brown said we should begin to respond to criticisms now so that we can demonstrate at the public meeting how the committee has been doing its work all along.
- Caraballo suggested we should pay close attention to quantifying the economic development possibilities so that we have that to show also to the public in February.
- Goldberg asked why we would continue to consider alignments against the railroad tracks. That limits economic development. Couldn't we make this into a beautiful gateway into University Circle? Hamilton Brown said she agrees with David Goldberg.
- Hebebrand said that we need to further identify cultural and historical sites and make sure we create alternatives that avoid these areas. He also noted that the Ken Johnson Recreational Center used conservation funds for the construction of the sprayground, which makes the planned expansion site more difficult to impact. Any amount of land impacted would have to be replaced. It is understood that Orlando Bakery should not be impacted.
- Kim Scott from Burten Bell Carr said in regards to their Master Plan which is under development, the BBC consultant (UDC) proposed the middle section of the Alternative 4 be shifted down to Rawlings rather than following Grand. They thought it would provide more opportunities on both sides of the road for redevelopment. Cierebiej responded by saying that originally UDC did suggest that to the study team, but when UDC looked into that option more closely, they decided it may not be the best solution because following Rawlings would impact new infill housing on E. 73rd St. Hebebrand added that they will look at the BBC's consultant's suggestions and still explore a shift of the corridor within the yellow hatched area.
- Hamilton Brown asked Scott to put the ideas in writing to the committee so they can be a matter of public record. Hebebrand reiterated that yes they would like committee members to submit comments, concerns, etc. in writing to ODOT to his attention.
- Councilman Brancatelli again inquired about property takes and vacancies. Hamilton Brown referred him to Page 2 of the matrix but reiterated that we have not determined which of the impacted properties are vacant or occupied.
- Brancatelli advised the Committee not to rely upon County data. He said it would be wise to consult the community development corporations for those figures. Hamilton Brown agreed and said that even though some places look vacant, they are not vacant. Cierebiej added that that situation constantly changes, and we previously requested that type of information from the CDCs and the City of Cleveland and will continue to do that throughout the next steps.
- Hamilton Brown said they are planning on creating a link on the project's web site so that the Committee can view comments that have been submitted to ODOT.
- She went on to discuss the next steps. The public meeting is slated for February. She said there will be additional analysis of engineering before then and also the study team will meet with each CDCs before then.

- Hamilton Brown promised there will be no surprises. She also said that since there is a new mayor-elect, we need to present the Opportunity Corridor Study to him before the public meeting.
- Cierebiej asked if any of the CDC's have newsletters, that they inform the study team of deadlines for placing notices about the public meeting once a date is set. Or if they could please make an announcement in their newsletter that a public meeting will be held in February. CDCs can also provide the study team with their mailing list and we can provide notices, newsletters, etc. to their service areas, or let us know how many copies you need to include in their own mailings.
- Hebebrand said that ODOT has funding through the next year to complete Steps 5 and 6, and that HNTB will be getting under contract to perform that work. Beyond that, there is no funding in place so we need to be reaching out to the community and other places for funding beyond Step 6.
- Jim Pressler of Greater Cleveland Partnership said his organization may be able to assist in getting funding for this project. He said it should be a high priority. He suggested that this committee and the Greater Cleveland Partnership work closely together to see what options are available. Hamilton Brown asked that Pressler to let the study team know when it is appropriate to make a presentation to the Greater Cleveland Partnership. Pressler said he will check.
- Someone then asked about State Issue 1 and, since it funds economic development, if it will affect this project. Hebebrand said he didn't know but that he would look into it.
- Hamilton Brown thanked the committee and adjourned.

Meeting Attendees

CUY-Opportunity Corridor Committee Meeting #2 – November 10, 2005

Name	Organization
Debbie Berry	City of Cleveland Planning Commission
Ben Campbell	Business Development Officer, Slavic Village Development Corporation
Millie Caraballo	Industrial Development Manager, CIRI
Tom Chema	President, Hiram College
Mary Cierebiej	Deputy Project Manager, HNTB
Andrew Cross	City of Cleveland Traffic Engineering
Jacek Ghosh	Fairfax Renaissance Development Corporation
Ron Eckner	NOACA
Richard Enty	GCRTA
Geoff Fitch	CIRI
Chris Frohring	Maingate Business Development
David Goldberg	Ohio Savings Bank
Terri Hamilton Brown	Co-chair of the Committee and President of University Circle Inc. (UCI)
Craig Hebebrand	ODOT, District 12
Jamie Ireland	Co-chair of the Committee and Managing Director, Early Stage Partners LP
Robert Jackimowicz	Cleveland City Council
August Napoli	Development Department Cleveland Clinic
Roland Newman	Administrative Director, Facilities Operation, Cleveland Clinic Foundation
Erica Oladeji	CIRI
Claire Posius	City of Cleveland Planning Commission
Jim Pressler	Greater Cleveland Partnership
Bob Reeves	UCI
Bobbi Reichtell	VP for Planning, Neighborhood Progress Inc.
Ed Rybka	City of Cleveland Planning Commission
Bob Reeves	Director of Community Planning and Development, UCI
Kim Scott	Burten Bell Carr
Aubrey Sippola	Whelan Communications
Jeffery Sugalski	Burten Bell Carr
Matt Wahl	Project Manager, HNTB
Joel Wimbiscus	UCI
John Wheeler	VP for Cleveland Regional Affairs, Case Western Reserve University
Ned Whelan	President, Whelan Communications