

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



(this page left intentionally blank)

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|----------------------|-------|--------------------|---|--|
| B-1 | Abdul-Slaam, Ferdous | B-1-1 | Future Development | Future development should be small businesses to restore the neighborhood/community feeling as opposed to chain stores and medical development. | <p>The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will not determine future development for the area. This is consistent with the project's purpose and need, which is to improve the transportation infrastructure to allow future planned economic development to occur. Future land use change would largely be determined by local plans and regulations. Both City and local Community Development Corporation (CDC) plans envision various types of redevelopment in the neighborhoods through which the Opportunity Corridor passes. The City of Cleveland has developed a <i>Connecting Cleveland 2020 Citywide Plan</i>, which is the comprehensive plan for the future of Cleveland and its neighborhoods. The 2020 Citywide Plan addresses future land use; zoning; development "opportunity zones" in each Cleveland neighborhood; new housing opportunities; bike routes and greenways; transportation and infrastructure improvements; and policy recommendations. The Opportunity Corridor project is included in the City's 2020 Citywide Plan. Additional details regarding the City of Cleveland 2020 Citywide Plan can be accessed at http://planning.city.cleveland.oh.us/cwp/cpc.html.</p> <p>Based on these established land use plans and long-term visions, the City and the CDCs are actively pursuing redevelopment projects along the project corridor.</p> <p>(See DEIS "Would the project be consistent with planned developments and local land use plans?" on pages 4-5 and 4-6 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment Technical Memorandum</i> (July 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| B-1 | Abdul-Slaam, Ferdous | B-1-2 | Context Sensitive Solutions | The project should include benches for pedestrians and should encourage the feel of the community. | <p>The following features will be included in the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project to improve the look of the roadway and to encourage the feel of the community: benches; mast arm traffic signal supports; combined street and pedestrian lighting; grass tree lawns (parkways); street trees; grassy roadway median with stormwater treatment measures; retaining walls and bridge abutments with form-liner surfaces and colored surface sealer; trash receptacles and bike racks.</p> <p>The project is using a context sensitive solutions (CSS) design process to coordinate the roadway design with the interests and concerns of the community. As part of the CSS process, the project team has completed extensive coordination with residents, business owners and the general public. As the design progresses, visual elements such as landscaping and lighting would continue to be coordinated with the project stakeholders through and in coordination with the affected Community Development Corporations (CDCs).</p> <p>(See DEIS "How has public and stakeholder feedback changed the study?" on page 3-3, Figure 1-3 on pages 1-3 and 1-4, and "How would the project visually affect neighborhoods?" on pages 4-26 and 4-47.)</p> |
| B-2 | Adams, Ms. | B-2-1 | Property Impacts | What amount of property will be acquired at 7102 Grand Avenue? | This location is outside of the Opportunity Corridor project area. No project-related impacts would occur. |
| | | B-2-2 | Existing Roadways | Repave local streets such as Woodland, Buckeye, Quincy, Cedar, Chester and Carnegie and there may not be a need for this project. | <p>ODOT and the City of Cleveland have existing programs and projects to maintain infrastructure near the project area. Maintenance alone would not support the project purpose and need of improving system linkage, access and mobility within the Forgotten Triangle area and supporting redevelopment. Also, the existing street system does not facilitate truck movement, the major mover of manufactured goods in the current economy. As part of the project, ODOT will be reconstructing nearly a mile of existing East 105th Street. Finally, the Opportunity Corridor would be designated as State Route (SR-10), which would make it eligible for State funding for future construction and maintenance.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011) which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|------------|-------|---------|---|--|
| B-2 | Adams, Ms. | B-2-3 | Transit | The project should pay more attention to mass transit involved. | <p>As part of the Opportunity Corridor project development process, the project team worked closely with the regional transit service provider (GCRTA) and other local community organizations to confirm that transit needs were appropriately considered as part of the project. Based on this coordination as well as the transportation needs identified, transit alternatives in the form of capital improvements to the existing transit system were not identified in the range of alternatives studied by the project team.</p> <p>GCRTA and the local community organizations did, however, express an interest in maximizing currently underutilized transit infrastructure. As a result of this input, one aspect of the project's purpose and need is to improve public transportation connections. Figures 4-1 and 4-2 in the FEIS show public transportation in the project area. Existing transit service is currently provided parallel and adjacent to the proposed boulevard via the GCRTA Red Line and portions of the Blue-Green line.</p> <p>The decision to provide additional transit routes and stops along the Opportunity Corridor roadway will be made by GCRTA based on user demand once the project is built. The Opportunity Corridor will be designed so that buses can safely use the boulevard if bus service is added.</p> <p>In addition, ODOT will help construct enhanced bus shelters in areas where existing bus lines will cross the new boulevard. Key intersections being considered include Kinsman Road, East 79th Street, Buckeye Road, and Quincy and Cedar avenues. ODOT will work with GCRTA during final design to identify the specific locations and the design of the shelters.</p> <p>Two pedestrian/bike bridges - one at East 55th Street and one at East 89th Street - to restore connectivity for pedestrians, including those who use public transportation.</p> <p>Finally, ODOT will fund 80-percent of a project to extend the platform to allow three-car service and construct a new entrance to the GCRTA E. 105th Street-Quincy Avenue train station. The station improvements would be scheduled to coincide with the construction of the Opportunity Corridor bridge over the GCRTA Red Line to minimize impacts to transit service. However, the project would be independently planned, designed and constructed by GCRTA.</p> <p>An expanded discussion of public transportation considerations is included in FEIS Sections 3.3, 3.6, and 4.6.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and "How would public transportation be affected?" on page 4-23.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|--------------|-------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-3 | Adams, Debra | B-3-1 | Pedestrian Mobility | I wasn't clear on the distance between the pedestrian crossings and I was concerned about the safety of those people that will need to use them. | <p>The preferred alternative will include thirteen signalized intersections spaced between 650 feet and 2,300 feet apart. Pedestrian signals and crosswalks will be provided at every traffic light. The signals will be timed so that pedestrians have enough time to cross the entire street before the opposing light turns green. Also, a curbed median was added along East 105th Street between Quincy and Cedar avenues to facilitate pedestrian crossings; and medians, where present, will be used as pedestrian refuges where possible. Finally, each block along the Opportunity Corridor boulevard was evaluated to determine if a midblock crossing (a crosswalk located between intersections) would help pedestrians move more easily through the area. Based on this analysis, no midblock crossings were added to the design of the preferred alternative. Section 4. 4 of the FEIS contains a detailed summary of the midblock crossing analysis.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would bicycles and pedestrians be affected?" on page 4-19.)</p> |
| | | B-3-2 | Stormwater Management | Was any thought put into drainage and flooding for the homes that would be remaining, how that runoff would impact the residents in those communities. | <p>The planning and design of the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project was closely coordinated with the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEORSRD) plans and ongoing efforts to address regional water quality issues. These coordination efforts included numerous meetings and addressed the project's compatibility with NEORSRD's Green Infrastructure Plan, EPA's Consent Decree for the reduction of raw sewage discharges and stormwater management.</p> <p>The coordination efforts focused not only on the immediate project area but also the larger service area for NEORSRD. Furthermore, the storm sewer system that would be built as part of the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project would be designed to meet ODOT water quality standards and NEORSRD flow volume requirements. These requirements would assure that drainage from the roadway is managed appropriately and would not adversely affect residents.</p> <p>ODOT will continue the coordination efforts described above into the project's final design. These efforts would assist ODOT in delivering a transportation project that incorporates the most cost-effective solutions that are in the best interests of the community and the environment.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would water quality be affected?" on pages 4-35 and 4-36. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Stormwater Summary</i> (December 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|--------------------|---|--|
| B-3 | Adams, Debra | B-3-3 | Transit | Is there any proposed transit that's going to be part of this freeway system so the people can park their car in a location and then catch that bus to go to University Circle or stops along the way? | As noted in the response to Comment B-2-3, transit capital improvements, such as park and ride bus/express bus service, were not studied as alternatives for the Opportunity Corridor project. It is important, however, to note that the design of the Opportunity Corridor will not preclude planned transit and transit service improvements from occurring in the future. |
| B-3a | All Aboard Ohio | B-3a-1 | Transit | Consider relocation of the East 79th Red Line station to near East 89th Street, in the vicinity of Buckeye Road and Woodland Avenue, as recommended in the Dual Hub Transitional Analysis adopted by GCRTA et al. | GCRTA is currently studying the viability of the E. 79th Red Line station to determine if it will be upgraded, relocated or closed. A final decision regarding this station will be made by the end of 2014. Based on coordination with GCRTA, the design of the proposed boulevard will not preclude the ability to relocate or improve the existing E. 79 th Street Red Line station in the future. |
| | | B-3a-2 | Transit | Lengthen the East 105th-Quincy Red Line station platform to accommodate 3-car trains and add a station pedestrian entrance from the east side of a widened East 105th Street. | In conjunction with the Opportunity Corridor project, ODOT will fund 80-percent of a project to improve the existing GCRTA E. 105th Street-Quincy Avenue train station. The improvement project would extend the platform to allow three-car service and construct a new entrance at E. 105th Street. The entrance will provide both stair and elevator access to comply with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). The station improvements would be scheduled to coincide with the construction of the Opportunity Corridor bridge over the GCRTA Red Line to minimize impacts to transit service. However, the project would be independently planned, designed and constructed by GCRTA. |
| | | B-3a-3 | Future Development | Partner with the City of Cleveland and the affected CDCs on TOD planning and zoning, including making available a basket of incentives to developers for providing a dense mix of land uses within a half-mile radius of both stations. | The Opportunity Corridor project will not determine future development, including Transit Oriented Development (TOD). See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| B-4 | Allen, Curtis | B-4-1 | General Opposition | The project is unfair and a waste of public money. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|----------------|-------|---------------------|---|---|
| B-5 | Baszuk, Peter | B-5-1 | Traffic Operations | Truck and automobile traffic should be diverted away from residential streets. While businesses in the area will continue to need truck access for deliveries, any changes to traffic which increase traffic which will have a negative impact on the quality of life for residents of this neighborhood. | <p>The Opportunity Corridor was designed with the goal of providing for the through movement of traffic from I-490/E. 55th Street to University Circle while providing for local access.</p> <p>The Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency's (NOACA's) Travel Demand Model (TDM) was updated to incorporate the new boulevard, planned development anticipated to occur independent of the proposed boulevard and complementary development anticipated to occur in conjunction with the proposed boulevard. After the TDM was updated, traffic volumes were generated for both the design year Build and No Build scenarios for the years 2020, 2030 and 2040. The traffic projections were certified by ODOT's Office of Technical Services on April 11, 2012 (See FEIS Appendix C).</p> <p>Based on the certified traffic projections, it is anticipated that through traffic would remain on the boulevard, and local access points would predominantly serve traffic to and from local residences, industries and commercial establishments. This is based on the low proportion of turning traffic when compared to the through traffic volumes.</p> <p>The only notable exceptions would be at Cedar and Euclid avenues, where there would be increased traffic turning onto these roadways from East 105th street to head east toward University Circle. Another exception would be at East 93rd Street, where there would be increased traffic turning north to cross the GCRTA Red Line.</p> <p>However, none of these areas are currently residential. Therefore, the project is not expected to increase traffic through residential areas.</p> <p>(See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012, revised June 2012) which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| B-6 | Baszuk, Mr. | B-6-1 | Traffic Operations | What will be done to accommodate the change in traffic pattern in the North Broadway/Hyacinth neighborhood for the increase of amount of commercial and automobile traffic on the neighborhood streets? | An increase in commercial and automobile traffic on streets in the Broadway/Hyacinth neighborhood is not anticipated to result from the construction of the preferred alternative. See the response to Comment B-5-1. |
| B-7 | Baumann, Chris | B-7-1 | General Support | The project would bring many benefits to the area. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| | | B-7-2 | Mitigation Measures | The mitigation measures would all be beneficial and should be done. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|-----------|-------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-8 | Baur, Joe | B-8-1 | General Opposition | I find the Opportunity Corridor to be an incredible waste of tax dollars, prioritizing suburban commutes over the needs of the city's residents. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-8-2 | Existing Roadways | The project prioritizes new road construction in a city already overrun with crumbling roads. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-8-3 | Transit | Why not use these funds to better our already drastically underfunded public transportation system to serve the car-free community? | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-8-4 | Transit | RTA has said they would not make service a priority on this road, therefore the residents that are supposed to benefit from this project wouldn't even have access to it. | See the response to Comments B-2-3. |
| B-9 | Baur, Joe | B-9-1 | Existing Roadways | We absolutely do not need a new road in Cleveland. We have plenty that need attention as is. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-9-2 | Project Funding | I question the funding for the upkeep of already existing roads. Federal funding, regardless of the government shutdown, is waning. What is ODOT's plan once this money goes away? | The Opportunity Corridor would be designated as State Route (SR-10). ODOT would build the roadway, and the City of Cleveland would maintain it. Making the new boulevard a State Route would make it eligible for State funding sources for future construction and maintenance. |
| | | B-9-3 | Transit | This road is going through a part of town where people largely rely on public transportation. How can ODOT honestly say this project is about them and not suburban commuters when many neighborhood residents won't even be able to access the road? RTA has already said the proposed corridor would not be a priority for them. | See the response to Comments B-2-3. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-----|-----------|-------|---------------|---|---|
| B-9 | Baur, Joe | B-9-4 | Roadway Width | ODOT is trying to sell this project as a boulevard, not a highway. But wide lanes will encourage faster speeds. | <p>In response to comments received on the DEIS and at the public hearing, the following updates have been made to the design of the preferred alternative to reduce the overall width of the Opportunity Corridor roadway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third eastbound lane from Woodland Avenue to East 93rd Street and also at Cedar Avenue was be eliminated; • The width of thru-lanes was reduced from 12-foot to 11-foot effective width; and • The width of turn lanes was reduce from 11-foot to 10-foot effective width. <p>These changes, as well as several other minor updates to the design of the preferred alternative in response to comments received, are described in FEIS Section 3. 4.</p> |
| | | B-9-5 | Noise | Proposed sound barriers will make the road seem more like a highway than a boulevard. | <p>Noise studies for the project identified impacts from predicted increases in traffic noise. According to federal regulations and state policy, noise barriers are considered when noise impacts are predicted to result from the construction of a roadway project. Noise walls were found to be reasonable and feasible in three areas to mitigate increased traffic noise.</p> <p>The final decision about whether to build the noise walls will not be made until the project is in its final design stage. In accordance with its noise policy, ODOT will gather input from residents and property owners who would be affected by the noise walls. ODOT will decide whether to build the noise walls based on the desires of the affected people.</p> <p>If noise walls are desired, the people who are affected will help decide how the walls will look on their side of the wall. This could include using transparent materials to increase visibility, as well as other alternative materials to improve the look of the barriers.</p> <p>The three proposed noise barriers would only be 500-feet, 540-feet and 609-feet in length, which is less than 6-percent of the length of the Opportunity Corridor boulevard. Adding aesthetic elements will also help to incorporate noise walls into the community. Given their limited length and aesthetic elements, noise walls - if desired - should not detract from the boulevard "feel" of the Opportunity Corridor.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would traffic noise levels change?" on pages 4-23 through 4-25 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Noise Analysis Report</i> (December 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|--------------|--------|----------------------|---|---|
| B-10 | Beach, David | B-10-1 | Impacts and Benefits | Where will the project have the greatest impact? Who will benefit the most? | <p>The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will improve system linkage and mobility within the area between I-77 and University Circle by providing an east-west arterial street between I-77 and University Circle that connects to the existing transportation infrastructure. Given this, the project is anticipated to benefit travelers outside of the immediate project area by making it easier to get to University Circle.</p> <p>ODOT recognizes that the project must also provide benefits to the communities that will bear the greatest impacts. As a result, the project team is using a context sensitive solutions (CSS) design process to coordinate the roadway design with the interests and concerns of the community. As part of the CSS process, the project team has completed extensive coordination with residents, business owners and the public.</p> <p>Construction of the preferred alternative is anticipated to benefit the local communities in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving access for emergency responders; • Providing easier access to public places such as parks, schools and libraries; • Improving overall bicycle and pedestrian connections, access and safety by building features for these users; • Maintaining and, in some cases, improving bicycle and pedestrian connections to existing transit facilities; and • Improving water quality. <p>In addition, the following features will be included in the project to encourage the feel of the community: benches; mast arm traffic signal supports; combined street and pedestrian lighting; grass tree lawns (parkways); street trees; grassy roadway median with stormwater treatment measures; retaining walls and bridge abutments with form-liner surfaces and colored surface sealer; trash receptacles and bike racks.</p> <p>(continued)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|----------------------|--|--|
| B-10 | Beach, David | B-10-1 | Impacts and Benefits | Where will the project have the greatest impact? Who will benefit the most? | <p>(continued)</p> <p>Furthermore, several measures will be implemented and funded as part of the project to mitigate impacts and provide added benefits to the local community. These include building two pedestrian/bike bridges, implementing a voluntary residential relocation assistance program (VRAP), working to provide replacement housing with similar access to public transit, funding a portion of the planned expansion of the Kenneth L. Johnson Recreation Center, helping to create a new entrance into the St. Hyacinth neighborhood, constructing enhanced bus shelters, and funding on-the-job training that will target training opportunities for individuals in the immediate vicinity of the project.</p> <p>The project could also have the indirect effect of generating economic activity and job opportunities, as well as supporting the infill development needed to strengthen and improve existing communities. The cumulative effect of several other programs in the area – including the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project - should improve the quality of life and livability of the area. See FEIS Section 4. 7 for a detailed description of mitigation measures incorporated into the preferred alternative.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How has public and stakeholder feedback changed the study?" on page 3-3 and Chapter 4. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment Technical Memorandum</i> (July 2012) and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Environmental Justice Technical Memorandum</i> (April 2013), which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|--------------|---------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| B-10 | Beach, David | B-10-2 | Future Development | Will the project facilitate the redevelopment of distressed east side neighborhoods? | <p>The project's purpose and need states that the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor must provide a transportation system that supports planned economic development. The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will meet the project's purpose and need by creating the infrastructure to support planned revival and redevelopment in and around the "Forgotten Triangle," which is bordered by Kinsman Road, Woodland Avenue and Woodhill Road.</p> <p>However, several other things need to happen for the City to realize its future land use and economic vision. See also the response to Comment B-1-1.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2, "How will the preferred alternative meet the project purpose and need?" on page 3-9 and "How could the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project influence the future of the area?" on page 4-41. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment Technical Memorandum (July 2012)</i>, which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.</p> |
| | | B-10-3 | Context Sensitive Solutions | Will the Opportunity Corridor help to create a vibrant place where people want to be or a corridor to pass through? | See the response to Comment B-1-2. |
| | | B-10-4a | Roadway Width | The current design, with its wide road right-of-way and sound walls, certainly does not seem inspired by good place making. | See the response to Comment B-9-4. |
| | | B-10-4b | Noise | The current design, with its wide road right-of-way and sound walls , certainly does not seem inspired by good place making. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|--------------|--------|--------------------|---|---|
| B-10 | Beach, David | B-10-5 | Other | Does Cleveland want to increase the number of people driving in an out of the city or the number of people living in the city? If the latter, then it's better to constrain highway access so more people will move close to jobs and urban activities. | <p>Increasing the number of people driving in and out of the city is not an element of the project's purpose and need. Increasing the number of people living in the city is also not an element of the purpose and need either.</p> <p>The project's purpose and need states the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor must provide improved access between I-77 and University Circle. The project must also provide improved mobility and better levels of service for existing and projected traffic traveling to, from and within the area between I-77 and University Circle.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2, FEIS Chapter 2 and the Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-10-6 | Alternatives | Will the Opportunity Corridor reduce overall demand for transportation by car? | <p>The Opportunity Corridor will not reduce demand for travel by car. This is consistent with the project's purpose and need, which is to improve system linkage, improve mobility and support economic development.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement (May 2011)</i>, which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-10-7 | Traffic Operations | What will the project do for the gridlock and parking shortages that exist already in University Circle? | <p>Addressing traffic congestion and parking concerns in University Circle are not elements of the project's purpose and need, which is to improve system linkage, improve mobility and support economic development.</p> <p>However, based on traffic analyses completed for the project and referenced below, the Opportunity Corridor would help the existing roadway network (including some roads providing access to University Circle) to better handle traffic volumes. For example, when the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor is built, traffic on several neighboring roadways and intersections is expected to shift to the new boulevard. With less traffic, these other roadways and intersections will operate better. (See FEIS Appendix C for certified traffic plates.)</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and "How would the existing roadway network be affected?" on pages 4-22 and 4-23. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement (May 2011)</i>, the <i>Opportunity Corridor Certified Traffic Plates (June 2012)</i> and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum (May 2012, revised June 2012)</i> which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|--------------|--------|----------------------|--|--|
| B-10 | Beach, David | B-10-8 | Mitigation Measures | Mitigation measures are not enough to offset the negative impacts of a road that will induce more driving in Cleveland. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| | | B-10-9 | Alternatives | Perhaps the biggest procedural failing of the Opportunity Corridor planning process was that no real alternatives were studied. Alternatives should have included transportation demand management strategies in University Circle, transit improvements in the Forgotten Triangle area, transit-oriented development strategies around the RTA Rapid stops in the area, and improvements to existing roads. | <p>Numerous alternatives including Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, transit alternatives and improving/utilizing existing roadways were considered before the preferred alternative for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project was identified.</p> <p>The DEIS provides a general discussion of these alternatives and refers to several detailed documents, including:</p> <p><i>Cleveland Innerbelt Strategic Plan</i> (July 2004);</p> <p><i>Opportunity Corridor Draft Strategic Plan</i> (September 2006);</p> <p><i>Opportunity Corridor Conceptual Alternatives Study</i> (October 2010);</p> <p><i>Early Analysis of West Alternates</i> (March 2011);</p> <p><i>Analysis of Central Alternates</i> (June 2011); and</p> <p><i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012; revised June 2012).</p> <p>No decisions regarding the alternatives to be dismissed or carried for further study were made prior to gathering the public's input.</p> <p>Based on the nature of the comments received following the publication of the DEIS and at the public hearing, the project team decided to further elaborate on the numerous alternatives that were studied over the approximate 14 year time period. See FEIS Section 3.3 for a detailed summary of the alternatives development, including how the public was involved in the decision-making process. Section 3.3 also includes extensive text excerpts from previously completed planning reports which were listed above, are on the CD included with the DEIS, and were incorporated by reference into the DEIS and FEIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that no new alternatives were analyzed as part of the combined FEIS/ROD document.</p> <p>The Opportunity Corridor project will not determine future development, including Transit Oriented Development (TOD). See the response to Comment B-1-1.</p> <p>(See DEIS "What other alternatives were studied but are no longer being considered" on pages 3-4 through 3-7.)</p> |
| B-11 | Beach, David | B-11-1 | Impacts and Benefits | Where will the project have the greatest impact? Who will benefit the most? | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|--------------|---------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| B-11 | Beach, David | B-11-2 | Future Development | Will the project facilitate the redevelopment of distressed east side neighborhoods? | See the response to Comment B-10-2. |
| | | B-11-3 | Context Sensitive Solutions | Will the Opportunity Corridor help to create a vibrant place where people want to be or a corridor to pass through? | See the response to Comment B-1-2. |
| | | B-11-4a | Roadway Width | The current design, with its wide road right-of-way and sound walls, certainly does not seem inspired by good place making. | See the response to Comment B-9-4. |
| | | B-11-4b | Noise | The current design, with its wide road right-of-way and sound walls , certainly does not seem inspired by good place making. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |
| | | B-11-5 | Other | Does Cleveland want to increase the number of people driving in an out of the city or the number of people living in the city? If the latter, then it's better to constrain highway access so more people will move close to jobs and urban activities. | See the response to Comment B-10-5. |
| | | B-11-6 | Alternatives | Will the Opportunity Corridor reduce overall demand for transportation by car? | See the response to Comment B-10-6. |
| | | B-11-7 | Traffic Operations | What will the project do for the gridlock and parking shortages that exist already in University Circle? | See the response to Comment B-10-7. |
| | | B-11-8 | Project Funding | The state must change its transportation funding policy so the opportunity can be reallocated to help build a truly more sustainable city. | The Opportunity Corridor project is one of the projects that was recommended for funding in Governor Kasich's Jobs and Transportation Plan (see www.dot.state.oh.us/news/Pages/Ohio-Jobs-and-Transportation-Plan-MORE-PROJECTS--FASTER.aspx). Most of the identified project funds have limitations on how the money can be spent. Most - if not all - of the funding identified to build the Opportunity Corridor must be spent on transportation infrastructure projects. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-12 | Beckwith II, Winston | B-12-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | What will be the alternative routes for traffic going across from Woodhill to 105th to Quincy? | The project would close Quincy Avenue between E. 105th Street and Woodhill Road. Although Quincy Avenue would be closed to vehicular traffic, access for bicycles, pedestrians and emergency services would be maintained. The alternative route for traffic traveling from Woodhill Road to E. 105th Street via Quincy Avenue would be to use Woodland Avenue and E. 93rd Street to access the new boulevard and continue to E. 105th Street. The travel distance for the existing and new routes would be nearly equivalent. (See DEIS "How would existing roads and access points be changed?" on page 4-22.) |
| | | B-12-2 | Mitigation Measures | Will ODOT be accountable for its actions regarding mitigation measures? | ODOT, on behalf of FHWA, will implement or will coordinate with other agencies as needed to confirm that the environmental commitments and mitigation measures are implemented. Failure to comply with the project's commitments would result in the loss of federal funding for the project. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-13 | Bonacci, Chuck | B-13-1 | Existing Roadways | I don't understand the need for any of the project that is currently underway or the Opportunity Corridor as the roads that are currently there seem under traveled for the most part. I think an easier solution could be better sequencing of stoplights and using roundabouts. | Sequencing traffic signals and using roundabouts alone would not support the project purpose and need. Specifically, these measures would not improve system linkage by providing the missing east-west arterial street between I-77 and University Circle or provide the transportation infrastructure to support planned economic development in and around the Forgotten Triangle. (See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011) which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| | | B-13-2 | Schedule | How long will this project take? | The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project likely will be built in phases. ODOT has developed a preliminary phasing plan of two sections, but that could be changed during final design or as funding becomes available. Section 1 will be the East 105th Street Corridor. Section 2 will be from I-490-East 55th Street to Quincy Avenue. Right now, construction on Section 1 is expected to begin in 2014 and finish in 2016. Construction on Section 2 is expected to begin in 2015 and finish in 2018. (See DEIS "When would the project be built?" on pages 3-9 and 3-10.) |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-13 | Bonacci, Chuck | B-13-3 | Traffic Operations | How will this project benefit people traveling from the southeast? | <p>Improving system linkage and mobility to and from the southeast is not part of the project purpose and need, which is to provide improved access between I-77 and University Circle. However, the Opportunity Corridor will include a signalized intersection at Kinsman Avenue, which attracts traffic from Cleveland's southeast side and would provide a connection to the Interstate system.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the Opportunity Corridor <i>Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| B-14 | Brown, Larry | B-14-1 | Street Closures | If the streets will be closed off, will I still be able to play piano at church on Sunday if no busses are able to take me? | Based on the information provided, it appears that the proposed street closures would impact one of the potential travel routes (East 89th Street) between the referenced home and the Manna Church (8019 Cedar Avenue). However, two other alternative routes exist (East 79th Street and East 105th Street). In the worst case scenario, these alternative routes would add 0.1 miles (528 feet) to the travel distance. |
| B-15 | Bryan, Andre | B-15-1 | Future Development | Please provide detailed information on development plans after the corridor (roadways) are completed. | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| B-15 | Bryan, Andre | B-15-2 | Workforce Development | What is the plan to include residents in work during construction? | <p>ODOT will provide, at a minimum, \$500,000 to be utilized for on-the-job training. Federal-aid transportation funds will not be utilized for this mitigation measure.</p> <p>This mitigation measure would target training opportunities for individuals in the immediate vicinity of the project. These could include, but would not be limited to, opportunities related to the Opportunity Corridor construction contract(s). By targeting a diverse range of training opportunities, the program will maximize benefits to the impacted communities. For instance, long term benefits would be maximized if individuals who are trained can find permanent jobs.</p> <p>Workforce development and job training are discussed in FEIS Section 4. 7.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-16 | Caja, Daniel | B-16-1 | Existing Roadways | Money should be spent on re-timing traffic lights and repairing existing roads. | <p>See the response to Comment B-2-2. Re-timing traffic signals would not support the project purpose and need. Specifically, signal timing would not improve system linkage by providing the missing east-west arterial street between I-77 and University Circle. Sequencing signals also would not provide the transportation infrastructure to support planned economic development in and around the Forgotten Triangle.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011) which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-16-3 | Transit | Money should be spent on better transit infrastructure. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-16-4 | Bicycles | Money should be spent on a citywide bicycle infrastructure. | <p>Improvements to bicycle infrastructure alone would not meet the purpose of and need for the Opportunity Corridor project, which is to improve system linkage, improve mobility and support economic development.</p> <p>The Opportunity Corridor project has a stated goal of improving infrastructure for pedestrians and bicycles. To accomplish that objective, the project will include a 10-foot pedestrian/bike path on the south side of the roadway which will improve the City's bikeway network.</p> <p>It would also improve connections between existing bikeways located at East 55th Street, East 79th Street, Quincy Avenue, and Chester Avenue, as well as the Euclid Avenue Corridor bike lanes. The project will also improve bicycle movements that are currently blocked by the Kingsbury Run Valley and the Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) Cleveland Main Line.</p> <p>For additional details of how the proposed project will affect bicyclists, see FEIS Section 4. 4.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2, "How would bicycles and pedestrians be affected?" on pages 4-19 through 4-22, and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| B-17 | Carroll, David | B-17-1 | General Opposition | I do not want the highway coming through my neighborhood because it will be killing the neighborhood and will hurt the people in the area. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|-----------------------|--|---|
| B-18 | Cartto, Wendy | B-18-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | <p>The Opportunity Corridor will cul-de-sac a major North-South connection at East 105th Street & Quincy. This will cut off RTA bus routes and those traveling by car or foot. East 105th Street & Quincy Avenue is a major thoroughfare. I'm asking that ODOT seriously consider not taking such action as closing this important access route.</p> | <p>Based on the preliminary engineering, it is not possible to connect Quincy Avenue to the proposed Opportunity Corridor boulevard and meet necessary design standards without incurring excessive costs for the reconstruction of multiple roadway and railroad bridges.</p> <p>Therefore, Quincy Avenue would be closed between East 105th Street and Woodhill Road. As requested by the City of Cleveland, access for bicycles, pedestrians and emergency service providers would be maintained via a drive on Quincy Avenue to mitigate the impacts of the closure. See FEIS Section 4. 5 for a more detailed description of the design constraints associated with connecting Quincy Avenue to the proposed Opportunity Corridor boulevard.</p> <p>The closure of Quincy Avenue would impact approximately four bus stops on GCRTA Bus Route 11 and one bus stop on GCRTA Bus Route 10. GCRTA will modify bus routes as necessary to maintain access for the transit dependent public housing populations located east of Woodhill Road and north of Woodland Avenue. All modifications to existing public transportation services will be made in accordance with GCRTA's Title VI Program.</p> <p>See FEIS Section 4. 6 for further information related to impacts to public transportation.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would existing roads and access points be changed?" on page 4-22.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|-------------|---|--|
| B-18 | Cartto, Wendy | B-18-2 | Noise | Traffic noise may cause impacts. | <p>Traffic noise impacts were evaluated during the project's development. The noise studies identified impacts from predicted increases in traffic noise. According to federal regulations and state policy, noise barriers are considered when noise impacts are predicted to result from the construction of a roadway project.</p> <p>Noise walls were found to be reasonable and feasible in three areas to mitigate increased traffic noise. The final decision about whether to build the noise walls will not be made until the project is in its final design stage.</p> <p>In accordance with its noise policy, ODOT will gather input from residents and property owners who would be affected by the noise walls. ODOT will decide whether to build the noise walls based on the desires of the affected people. If noise walls are desired, the people who are affected will help decide how the walls will look on their side of the wall. This could include using transparent materials to increase visibility, as well as other alternative materials to improve the look of the barriers.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would traffic noise levels change?" on pages 4-23 through 4-25 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Noise Analysis Report</i> (December 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-18-3 | Air Quality | Pollution from the emission of fumes from vehicles coming through the neighborhood will have a negative impact. | <p>Substantial air quality impacts are not anticipated to result from the project. All project-level air quality analyses and conclusions were coordinated with Ohio EPA, who concurred with the conclusions. The USEPA also concurred that the Opportunity Corridor project was not a project of air quality concern and has met the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act.</p> <p>(See DEIS "Would air quality be affected?" on pages 4-25 and 4-26. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor CO Hot-Spot (Microscale) Analysis Report</i> (November 2012) and <i>Opportunity Corridor Qualitative Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) Analysis Report</i> (November 2012) which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|-----------------------|--|---|
| B-18 | Cartto, Wendy | B-18-4 | 89th Street Closure | Dead ending and closing of East 89th Street at Woodland will force transit dependent people to walk further to access the #10 RTA bus service. Currently there is no RTA bus service for Woodland Avenue. | <p>The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will not require transit dependent individuals to walk further as a result of the closure at East 89th Street.</p> <p>To mitigate the impacts of the closure, the project will build a pedestrian/bike bridge over the NS Nickel Plate/GCRTA Red Line at East 89th Street to maintain bike and pedestrian connectivity. The proposed bridge will be maintained by the City of Cleveland and will include lighting to enhance safety. The construction of the pedestrian/bike bridge means that walking and biking distances for those who currently use the East 89th Street Bridge will not substantially change.</p> <p>South of Woodland Avenue, East 89th Street will be cul-de-sac'd to avoid adding a fifth leg to the proposed intersection of Woodland Avenue and the Opportunity Corridor boulevard. In this area, the sidewalk will be extended to the new roadway to maintain pedestrian connections. See FEIS Sections 4. 4 and 4. 5 for additional information on impacts to bicycles and pedestrians, as well as changes to existing roads and access points.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would existing roads and access points be changed" on page 4-22 and "Would low-income and minority populations be affected?" on pages 4-17 through 4-31).</p> |
| | | B-18-5 | Impacts and Benefits | The true beneficiaries of this \$331 million project are the commuters who don't live in the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-18-6 | Workforce Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding job creation and viable-expedited training programs that will assist residents in obtaining jobs at the onset of construction of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-18-7 | Future Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding business development and enhancements for economic growth for all of the neighborhoods impacted. | <p>ODOT is not the land use authority within the study area. Therefore, ODOT cannot provide guarantees regarding business development and other related issues such as economic growth issues.</p> <p>See the responses to Comment B-1-1 and Comment B-10-2.</p> |
| | | B-18-8 | Workforce Development | Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project's implementation. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-18 | Cartto, Wendy | B-18-9 | Relocation Process | <p>ODOT must provide fair compensation and relocation funds to owners of properties that are in the direct path of the corridor.</p> | <p>The purchase of private property and cost of moving residents, businesses and churches to build the project would be regulated by state and federal laws, including the <i>Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act</i> (Uniform Act).</p> <p>These laws provide for the fair and equal treatment of all persons affected by the project. These laws include several specific measures to address the financial concerns identified by residents.</p> <p>As part of the property-buying process, a relocation agent would help everyone required to move because of the project. The agent helps with finding replacement housing, contacting lending agencies and moving companies, processing claims for payment and processing appeals.</p> <p>Information about the federal-aid relocation process was included as part of the presentations for every public meeting held for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project since 2010. FEIS Section 4. 3 provides additional details regarding the relocation process.</p> <p>(See DEIS "Would any homes businesses or churches be relocated?" on pages 4-6 through 4-18.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------------|--------|------------------------|--|---|
| B-19 | Cheairs, Wyonette | B-19-1 | 89th Street Closure | Maintain local access on E. 89th St and Woodland Road. | <p>The preferred alternative would build a traffic signal at Woodland Avenue. If 89th Street is extended to the Opportunity Corridor boulevard, it would create a 5-legged intersection at this location. This would introduce traffic operational and safety concerns.</p> <p>Therefore, East 89th Street would be closed between Woodland and Nevada avenues. To mitigate the impacts of this closure, ODOT would resurface Frederick Avenue and convert East 86th Street to a two-way roadway between Frederick and Woodland avenues. This will allow vehicular access to/from East 89th Street to be maintained via Woodland Avenue.</p> <p>South of Woodland Avenue, East 89th Street will be cul-de-sac'd to avoid adding a fifth leg to the proposed intersection of Woodland Avenue and the Opportunity Corridor boulevard. However, vehicular access will be maintained via Buckeye Road and the new Opportunity Corridor boulevard. In this area, the sidewalk will also be extended to the new roadway to maintain pedestrian connections. See FEIS Section 4. 5 for additional information on changes to existing roads and access points.</p> <p>Finally, the project will build a pedestrian/bike bridge over the NS Nickel Plate/GCRTA Red Line at East 89th Street to maintain bike and pedestrian connectivity. The proposed bridge will be maintained by the City of Cleveland and will include lighting to enhance safety.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would existing roads and access points be changed" on page 4-22 and "Would low-income and minority populations be affected?" on pages 4-17 through 4-31.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-19 | Cheairs, Wyonette | B-19-2 | Relocation Process | Provide sufficient funding for those being displaced. Fair market value in this depressed economy is insufficient to relocate. | <p>According to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act), in addition to receiving just compensation for any property acquired to construct the project, displaced property owners and tenants would also receive relocation assistance.</p> <p>There are also provisions to ensure that decent, safe, and sanitary comparable replacement housing is within the financial means of the displaced person. When such housing cannot be provided using replacement housing payments within the statutory limits, the Uniform Act provides "housing of last resort" to provide agencies with the flexibility necessary to respond to difficult or unique displacement conditions.</p> <p>ODOT also uses Rental Assistance Entitlements to provide additional payments when the monthly cost of rent and utilities of the agency selected comparable replacement dwelling exceed the current costs at the displacement site. This program is also used to provide rental assistance payments to low-income households.</p> <p>An additional benefit ODOT offers to all tenants is a Down-Payment Assistance payment.</p> <p>The U. S. Department of Transportation has issued a temporary waiver to deal with situations of negative equity which exist in some localized real estate market conditions. This waiver, which expires December 31, 2014, was issued to minimize hardship caused when residents are forced to relocate to accommodate a public improvement project. If the USDOT negative equity waiver expires before the project is complete, ODOT will continue to offer these benefits through the conclusion of the project</p> <p>In addition, ODOT will make Increased Interest Payments to any residential owner-occupant who loses their existing favorable financing rate due to displacement by our project.</p> <p>ODOT will also pay for all closing costs normally paid by the residential owner-occupant in the purchase of their replacement dwelling.</p> <p>Finally, ODOT will pay for all moving expenses of anyone displaced by our highway project.</p> <p>The programs listed above will be used by ODOT on a case-by-case basis to assure that relocations would not be a financial hardship to the affected owners and tenants. FEIS Section 4. 3 provides additional details regarding the relocation process.</p> |
| | | B-19-3 | Public Involvement | Provide more time for planning necessary to address community concerns. | This FEIS addresses all of the comments received on the DEIS. See FEIS Chapter 5 for a summary of the comments received and how they were addressed. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-20 | Cheairs, Wyonette | B-20-1 | Impacts and Benefits | The major benefactor will be commuters from outside the impacted community. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-20-2 | Quincy Avenue Closure | Closing Quincy Avenue will create barriers for the thousands of people who travel this street and rely on public transportation. This is the route for the #10 bus line which is one of GCRTA high volume buses. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-20-3 | 89th Street Closure | Creating a cul-de-sac on East 89th will adversely affect local travel patterns. | See the response to Comment B-19-1. |
| | | B-20-4 | Street Closures | Creating cul-de-sacs on nine streets does not improve mobility, nor does it improve the system linkages with the community, but it does the opposite by creating barriers for stakeholders. | <p>Multiple local residential streets would be closed or cul-de-sac'd to provide for safe and efficient traffic operations on the proposed boulevard. The impacted streets are relatively short roadway sections that do not provide much benefit in terms of overall network connectivity.</p> <p>The preferred alternative includes commitments to address the impacts related to street closures. These include extending sidewalks to maintain pedestrian connections; building two bike/pedestrian bridges; helping to create a new entrance to the St. Hyacinth neighborhood; maintaining access to/from East 89th Street via Frederick Avenue and East 86th Street and maintaining access for bicycles, pedestrians and emergency service providers at Quincy Avenue.</p> <p>Based on an evaluation of the street closures and the incorporated mitigation measures, the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project is anticipated to have minor negative impacts on local connectivity and mobility. Furthermore, the improved vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and mobility resulting from the construction of the project are expected to outweigh these minor impacts. An expanded discussion of the effects of street closures is included in Section 4. 5 of the FEIS.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would existing roads and access points be changed?" on page 4-22.)</p> |
| | | B-20-5 | Relocation Process | Ensure stakeholders are fairly compensated for being displaced. Fair market value in this economy is insufficient and will not adequately compensate people for being displaced. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-20 | Cheairs, Wyonette | B-20-6 | Pedestrian Mobility | Roads are not pedestrian friendly with wide turn radius, and numerous blocks in between stop lights. | <p>The project team evaluated if it would be possible to reduce curb return radii to further lessen the distance pedestrians would have to cross at intersections.</p> <p>After further coordination with City of Cleveland and the local CDC's, it was decided to keep the larger curb return radii. This would allow trucks and busses to safely turn corners within the roadway area rather than hopping the curbs or blocking opposing movements. It was determined that the safety benefits of this design outweighed the benefits of reduced intersection areas.</p> <p>See the response to Comment B-3-1 for a discussion of block lengths. See also FEIS Section 4. 4.</p> |
| | | B-20-7 | Air Quality | This corridor will cause more pollution from the vehicle emissions. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-20-8 | Mitigation Measures | The measures being proposed to "mitigate the unavoidable impacts" are unacceptable. Some of the impacts are avoidable if more time is spent to find acceptable solutions. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| | | B-20-9 | Workforce Development | Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project implementation. Training need to start as soon as possible to ensure residents can work on the project | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| B-21 | Chimileski, Ms. | B-21-1 | General Support | I'm all for the project due to continued decline in the area. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-21a | Cissell, Rich | B-21a-1 | Future Development | This project does not improve the underserved, economically depressed area in the City of Cleveland. | See the responses to Comment B-1-1 and Comment B-10-2. |
| | | B-21a-2 | Transit | The project does nothing to provide or improve any transit options for any of the people living in the neighborhood. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-21a-3 | Street Closures | There are going to be 19 new dead-end streets as a result of the project. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-21a | Cissell, Rich | B-21a-4 | Existing Roadways | If we can't take care of the roads already down here, it doesn't make much sense to start building new ones. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| B-22 | Cole, Ms. | B-22-1 | Project Funding | This corridor, in my opinion, seems to be here to please the Big C, which is Cleveland Clinic and the juvenile detention center; not the kids, but the judges. Some of this really is a waste because they can really be using this money to help our kids if they really wanted to change this community. | The funds allocated to this project can be utilized for transportation projects only. Funding for neighborhood programs aimed at helping kids must be secured from other sources. See the response to Comment B-11-8. |
| B-23 | Collins, Walter | B-23-1 | Workforce Development | My concern is minority participation (training and DBE program). | Funding for on-the-job training is included as a mitigation measure in the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project (see the response to Comment B-15-2). Increasing the DBE goal to a specific target was not included as a final mitigation measure. ODOT will establish the DBE goal for the construction contract(s) according to its standard policy, which considers the engineer's estimate for construction cost, scope of work items, project location and DBE contractors available to complete the work. ODOT will maximize the DBE goal for the construction contract(s) to the greatest extent possible under its policy. |
| | | B-23-2 | DBE Goal | Somebody should monitor minority participation (DBE requirements) with good faith effort. | ODOT will establish the DBE goal for the construction contract(s) according to its standard policy, which considers the engineer's estimate for construction cost, scope of construction work items, project location and DBE contractors available to complete the work. ODOT will maximize the DBE goal for the construction contract(s) to the greatest extent possible. ODOT will monitor the construction contract(s) to assure that DBE goals are being met to the greatest extent possible. Increasing the DBE goal to a specific target was not included in the project as a final mitigation measure. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-24 | Conner, Yvonne | B-24-1 | Relocation Process | Consider providing fair market value for properties that will become part of eminent domain. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-24 | Conner, Yvonne | B-24-2 | Mitigation Measures | Mitigation measures are helping to make the project more bearable for those neighbors and businesses that will be displaced. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-25 | Conway, Nichelle | B-25-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | The Opportunity Corridor will cul-de-sac a major North-South connection at East 105th Street & Quincy. This will cut off RTA bus routes and those traveling by car or foot. East 105th Street & Quincy Avenue is a major thoroughfare. I'm asking that ODOT seriously consider not taking such action as closing this important access route. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-25-2 | Noise | Traffic noise may impact neighborhoods. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-25-3 | Air Quality | Environmental issues such as pollution from the emission of fumes from vehicles coming through the neighborhood will have a negative impact. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-25-4 | 89th Street Closure | Dead ending and closing of East 89th Street at Woodland will force transit dependent people to walk further to access the #10 RTA bus service. Currently there is no RTA bus service for Woodland Avenue. | See the response to Comment B-18-4. |
| | | B-25-5 | Impacts and Benefits | The true beneficiaries of this \$331 million project are the commuters who don't live in the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-25-6 | Workforce Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding job creation and viable-expedited training programs that will assist residents in obtaining jobs at the onset of construction of the corridor. Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project's implementation. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-25 | Conway, Nichelle | B-25-7 | Future Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding business development and enhancements for economic growth for all of the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-18-7. |
| | | B-25-8 | Relocation Process | ODOT must provide fair compensation and relocation funds to owners of properties that are in the direct path of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-26 | Crosby, Donna | B-26-1 | 89th Street Closure | If 89th street is closed off, it would make it harder for us to get to our church on Cedar Avenue. We travel from Bedford three times a week. | To access destinations near the intersection of East 89th Street and Cedar Avenue from Bedford, there are several alternative north-south routes available in the area of the proposed boulevard including East 79th Street, East 83rd Street and East 93rd Street. In the worst case scenario, it is estimated that these alternative routes would add approximately 0.5 miles to the travel distance, resulting in a total travel distance of 12.9 miles. However, it is estimated that using East 93rd Street between Buckeye Road and Cedar Avenue would result in almost no change to the current overall travel distance (approximately 12.4 miles). See also the response to Comment B-19-1. |
| B-27 | Crosby, Darrel | B-27-1 | 89th Street Closure | I live in Bedford. I do work in the area, which I help senior citizens, who are members of our church on Cedar Avenue. If the street or any for this reason is closed it would be very hard to help them. Our community needs all access to east 89th street open. | See the response to Comment B-26-1. |
| B-28 | Danzy, Mark | B-28-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | The Opportunity Corridor will cul-de-sac a major North-South connection at East 105th Street & Quincy. This will cut off RTA bus routes and those traveling by car or foot. East 105th Street & Quincy Avenue is a major thoroughfare. I'm asking that ODOT seriously consider not taking such action as closing this important access route. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------|--------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| B-28 | Danzy, Mark | B-28-2 | Noise | Traffic noise may impact neighborhoods. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-28-3 | Air Quality | Environmental issues such as pollution from the emission of fumes from vehicles coming through the neighborhood will have a negative impact. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-28-4 | 89th Street Closure | Dead ending and closing of East 89th Street at Woodland will force transit dependent people to walk further to access the #10 RTA bus service. Currently there is no RTA bus service for Woodland Avenue. | See the response to Comment B-18-4. |
| | | B-28-5 | Impacts and Benefits | The true beneficiaries of this \$331 million project are the commuters who don't live in the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-28-6 | Workforce Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding job creation and viable-expedited training programs that will assist residents in obtaining jobs at the onset of construction of the corridor. Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project's implementation. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-28-7 | Future Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding business development and enhancements for economic growth for all of the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-18-7. |
| | | B-28-8 | Relocation Process | ODOT must provide fair compensation and relocation funds to owners of properties that are in the direct path of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-29 | Fedarko, Micheal | B-29-1 | General Opposition |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------|--------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-30 | Fletcher, Ronald | B-30-1 | Workforce Development | I would like to be at the front table for employment for Fairfax residents. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| B-31 | Fletcher, Ronald | B-31-2 | Workforce Development | I would like to be at the front table for employment for Fairfax residents. | See the response to Comment B-30-1. Residents of Fairfax would be able to apply for on-the-job training. |
| B-32 | Fowler, Avon | B-32-1 | 89th Street Closure | Blocking off 89th Street will lead to increased crime and will impact existing bus routes. | <p>Constructing a cul-de-sac on East 89th Street south of the proposed boulevard is not expected to increase crime because of its proximity to the signalized intersection at Buckeye Road and the boulevard. The level of traffic at this location, as well as the proximity of the Kenneth L. Johnson Recreation Center, could help to deter crime. Also, the remaining residential structures in this area will be relocated by the project. As a result, there will not be increased isolation in this area.</p> <p>Constructing a cul-de-sac on East 89th Street north of the proposed boulevard also is not expected to increase crime. Although through-traffic on East 89th Street will be eliminated, access to the existing residential areas will remain off of East 93rd Street and Buckeye Road, thus maintaining local traffic volumes. In addition, no relocations are required in the area of the East 89th Street cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The NS Nickel Plate Line and the GCRTA Red Line currently serve as barriers to this area, a condition that will not be altered by the project. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to create further isolation that could lead to increased crime.</p> <p>The project will build a pedestrian/bike bridge over the NS Nickel Plate/GCRTA Red Line at East 89th Street to maintain bike and pedestrian connectivity. The proposed bridge will include lighting to enhance safety. The Opportunity Corridor boulevard, sidewalks and multi-purpose path will also include lighting.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-18-4 regarding access to bus routes.</p> |
| B-33 | Garth, Gwendolyn | B-33-1 | Impacts and Benefits | What are the opportunities associated with the project? And who are the opportunities for. . . really? | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|--------------|---|--|
| B-34 | Gelfand, Marty | B-34-1 | Alternatives | <p>The preferred alternative hasn't been and isn't always the right way to go. I suggest that instead of an Opportunity Corridor, we use existing roads through existing economic corridors. Designate I-490 as the I-90 business bypass. I-490 connects with East 55th Street, which provides a straight line to the Shoreway and connects I-490 with I-90. We also can use existing roads such as Woodland Avenue, East 105th Street, I-490 and the Shoreway at Eddy Road. It connects more neighborhoods, it does what the folks want this road to do, which is connect downtown with University Circle. But I think it's does more. Call it the I-90 business bypass.</p> | <p>Improving and/or utilizing existing routes between I-490 and University Circle would not support the project purpose and need of improving access and mobility within the Forgotten Triangle area and supporting redevelopment.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-10-9.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2, FEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------|--------|--------------------|---|---|
| B-35 | Gilliam, AJ | B-35-1 | Relocation Process | Please re-draw Lisbon Road to be taken. I would like to be relocated due to continued decline and isolated residences in the area. | <p>Residences located on Lisbon Road would not be directly impacted by the project and therefore are not eligible for relocation as part of the project.</p> <p>As part of the project, ODOT will implement a voluntary residential relocation assistance program (VRAP). This program will allow some residents whose homes are not directly impacted by the project to apply for assistance to relocate to another area. The residences located on Lisbon Road were evaluated to determine if they would be eligible for the voluntary residential relocation program. However, the residences were not found to be eligible for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These residences would not have direct access to the boulevard, nor would they be located in the an intersection influence area. • Several residences would remain in this area. The remaining residents would benefit from improved multi-modal system linkage and connectivity provided by the project. <p>Specifically, new crossings of the Kingsbury Run Valley, the GCRTA Blue and Green Lines, and the NS Cleveland Line would be constructed. Additionally, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be constructed as part of the boulevard. These crossings and multi-modal options would make it easier for residents to access key goods, services, and community facilities.</p> <p>Should baseline conditions change prior to the start of land acquisition, ODOT will complete a reevaluation of the properties eligible for the VRAP. The VRAP is discussed in Section 4. 7 of the FEIS.</p> <p><i>(See also the Opportunity Corridor Environmental Justice (EJ) Mitigation Residential Voluntary Relocation Assistance Program (VRAP) Technical Memorandum (May 2013), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</i></p> |
| | | B-35-2 | Relocation Process | How does it work if you are upside down on your mortgage? The question people really want to know without asking is how much are they going to get for their homes? | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| B-36 | Gilliam, Blanch | B-36-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | The Opportunity Corridor will cul-de-sac a major North-South connection at East 105th Street & Quincy. This will cut off RTA bus routes and those traveling by car or foot. East 105th Street & Quincy Avenue is a major thoroughfare. I'm asking that ODOT seriously consider not taking such action as closing this important access route. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-36-2 | Noise | Traffic noise may impact neighborhoods. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-36-3 | Air Quality | Environmental issues such as pollution from the emission of fumes from vehicles coming through the neighborhood will have a negative impact. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-36-4 | 89th Street Closure | Dead ending and closing of East 89th Street at Woodland will force transit dependent people to walk further to access the #10 RTA bus service. Currently there is no RTA bus service for Woodland Avenue. | See the response to Comment B-18-4. |
| | | B-36-5 | Impacts and Benefits | The true beneficiaries of this \$331 million project are the commuters who don't live in the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-36-6 | Workforce Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding job creation and viable-expedited training programs that will assist residents in obtaining jobs at the onset of construction of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| B-36 | Gilliam, Blanch | B-36-7 | Future Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding business development and enhancements for economic growth for all of the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-18-7. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|--------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-36 | Gilliam, Blanch | B-36-8 | Workforce Development | Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project's implementation. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-36-9 | Relocation Process | ODOT must provide fair compensation and relocation funds to owners of properties that are in the direct path of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-37 | Gillon, Jacqueline | B-37-1 | Impacts and Benefits | As a resident of Slavic Village and a member of Elizabeth Baptist Church, it is important that our neighborhood is treated with the quality that a suburban neighborhood that is impacted by major construction would be treated. | The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project is being developed according to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and many other state and federal policies, regulations, laws, guidance documents and executive orders. Furthermore, the alternatives for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project were developed through the ODOT's Project Development Process (PDP), which uses environmental and engineering studies to find solutions for transportation problems. ODOT's PDP and many of the policies, regulations and laws that have governed the project's development are designed to assure that every project is evaluated in an objective manner, regardless of its geographic location. Likewise, mitigation for potential impacts is evaluated and incorporated into every project, as appropriate. See the response to comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-37-2 | Workforce Development | Every effort should be made to hire individuals that live in the impacted zip codes. | See the responses to Comment B-15-2 and Comment B-30-1. Individuals who live in the impacted zip codes would be able to apply for on-the-job training. |
| | | B-37-3 | Mitigation Measures | The mitigation measures proposed for the St. Hyacinth neighborhood are a real opportunity to enhance the quality of life in St. Hyacinth and to remove the air and noise pollution that has impacted this neighborhood for years. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-38 | Gliha, Charles | B-38-1 | Existing Roadways | Clevelanders and Ohioans need their tax dollars spent wisely, not recklessly. I am tired of having to spend money to repair my car damaged by poorly maintained roads. Please fix Cleveland's streets! | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|---------------------|---|---|
| B-38 | Gliha, Charles | B-38-2 | Mitigation Measures | Proposed mitigation measures are "sweeteners" to sway a skeptical citizenry and are pathetic. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-39 | Gonzalez, Ms. | B-39-1 | General Support | I'm all for the project due to continued decline in the area. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-40 | Gray, Bobbie | B-40-1 | General Opposition | You want to give us one-way streets, dead-end streets, fence us out and fence us in. This project is wrong. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-41 | Gray, Ms. | B-41-1 | Other | I've lived in the area for 62 years. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-42 | Gray, Mr. | B-42-1 | General Opposition | I have a problem with spending \$331 million on a roadway when all they're really trying to do is connect 490 at 55th Street to get people out to the Cleveland Clinic or what they want to call, the University Circle area. I'd rather see them spend the money in schools. | See the responses to Comment B-70-2 and Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-42-2 | Alternatives | As far as the roadway, if they create HOV lanes, they can move a lot of traffic safely through the area. | HOV lanes were evaluated as part of the Cleveland Innerbelt study but dismissed because they did not have a major impact on bus ridership nor any real congestion impact in the peak hour as measured in vehicle hours of delay. The alternatives considered as part of the Cleveland Innerbelt study are described in FEIS Section 3.3. See also the response to Comment B-10-9. |
| | | B-42-3 | Schedule | You know, when I worked for Dalton & Dalton architectural firm, we worked on the Burke Lakefront airport expansion. Now they're down there doing the work. It takes a long time, like it did with this project. | See the response to Comment B-13-2. |
| | | B-42-4 | Other | I'm only here because of my mom. She wants to get away from the place the road is going to come through. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-43 | Gruber, Chris | B-43-1 | Pedestrian Mobility | Provide tree lawns for an extra barrier between the sidewalk and street. | The Opportunity Corridor boulevard would have tree lawns, except on bridges. (See DEIS Figure 4-22 on pages 4-20 and 4-21.) |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|-----------------------|--|---|
| B-43 | Gruber, Chris | B-43-2 | Pedestrian Mobility | Provide better lighting on the street and sidewalk to help drivers as well as pedestrians. | Combined street and pedestrian lighting would be included along the Opportunity Corridor boulevard. The bike/pedestrian bridges at East 59th Street and East 89th Street will also include lighting to enhance safety. See FEIS Section 4.4. (See DEIS "How would the project visually affect neighborhoods?" on pages 4-27 and 4-28.) |
| | | B-43-3 | Pedestrian Mobility | Install audible crosswalks at all intersections. | Crosswalk treatments will be determined during the final design of the project. Coordination with the project stakeholders, including the Cleveland Sight Center, will be on-going during final design. |
| | | B-43-4 | Pedestrian Mobility | Install tactile surfaces at all crosswalks. | See the response to Comment B-43-3. |
| | | B-43-5 | Pedestrian Mobility | Brightly paint (high contrast) lines where there are transitions in pavement especially is a step up or down. | The inclusion of paint in pavement transition areas will be determined during the final design of the project. Coordination with the project stakeholders, including the Cleveland Sight Center, will be on-going during final design. |
| | | B-43-6 | Pedestrian Mobility | Consistently place support poles at the four street crossings and linear placement of curb cut outs with each other (will not be an issue if brick is used.) | The placement of signal supports and curb ramps will be determined during the final design of the project. Coordination with the project stakeholders, including the Cleveland Sight Center, will be on-going during final design. |
| B-44 | Gwin, Gail | B-44-1 | Workforce Development | I am concerned that the ward 5 community will get few if any jobs out of this project! What are our guarantees concerning jobs that our community is qualified for? Provide job training so that we will be qualified for future employment. | See the responses to Comment B-15-2 and Comment B-30-1. Individuals who live in the ward 5 community would be able to apply for on-the-job training. |
| | | B-44-2 | Air Quality | Will our community be further polluted by the project? What will be the pollution levels? | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-44-3 | Impacts and Benefits | What will the real environmental impact of this project on our community? | When combined, the DEIS, FEIS and technical reports that are incorporated by reference describe - to the greatest extent possible - the direct and potential indirect and cumulative effects of the project. The information is based on the best data available at this stage of the project's development and is sufficient in detail to support the decision-making for the proposed project. See also the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-44-4 | Noise | What will be the noise levels? | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|--------------------|---|---|
| B-44 | Gwin, Gail | B-44-5 | Traffic Operations | What amount of increased traffic will be present? | <p>See the response to Comment B-5-1.</p> <p>Based on the results of traffic analyses completed for the project and referenced below, the Opportunity Corridor would help the existing roadway network (including some roads providing access to University Circle) to better handle traffic volumes. For example, when the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor is built, traffic on several neighboring roadways and intersections is expected to shift to the new boulevard. With less traffic, these other roadways and intersections will operate better. (See FEIS Appendix C for certified traffic plates.)</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and "How would the existing roadway network be affected?" on pages 4-22 and 4-23. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), the <i>Opportunity Corridor Certified Traffic Plates</i> (June 2012) and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012, revised June 2012) which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| B-45 | Hall, William | B-45-1 | Noise | The current plan of the Opportunity Corridor calls for noise barriers which will block the residents of the neighborhood from accessing the rest of the city. | <p>The noise studies for the Opportunity Corridor project identified noise impacts north and south of the boulevard at East 73rd Street. If noise walls are built at these locations, they would prevent sidewalks from being connected to the boulevard. If the noise walls are not built, sidewalks would be connected.</p> <p>According to ODOT's noise policy, the decision to build the noise walls will be made by the impacted residents who would also be the primary users of the sidewalk connections. Pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular movements would not be restricted by any other noise barriers included in the project. Section 4. 4 of the FEIS provides a discussion of bicycle and pedestrian mobility, including the potential effects of noise walls.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would traffic noise levels change?" on pages 4-23 through 4-25 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Noise Analysis Report</i> (December 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-45-2 | General Opposition | This is nothing more than a quick way to the Cleveland Clinic for suburban drivers. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|------------------|---------|---------------------|--|--|
| B-45a | Hamilton, Eileen | B-45a-1 | Transit | Please don't obliterate the East 55th rapid station overflow parking along Bower or pedestrian entrance to station from Bower/E 57th/E. 59th for walkers in Slavic Village/North Broadway. | The preferred alternative would close the Bower entrance to the East 55th Street transit station. Vehicular access to the GCRTA transit station will be provided off of East 55th Street. Impacts to the East 55th transit station have been coordinated with GCRTA. The preferred alternative will include a bike/pedestrian bridge at East 59th Street to maintain access to the transit station. (See DEIS Figure 3-2, page 3-3.) |
| | | B-45a-2 | Mitigation Measures | Give tax credits for light industry locating at Opportunity Corridor intersections so we have better chances for mandatory employment slots with training opportunities incorporated in those tax credits. | Tax credits for industry were not considered as a mitigation measure, because it is not a program that ODOT would be able to directly monitor. Workforce development and job training was included as a mitigation measure in the FEIS. See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-45a-3 | Transit | Get a firm plan from RTA about how to replace the #10 bus route you are cutting off at Quincy. | See the response to Comment B-51-2. |
| | | B-45a-4 | Mitigation Measures | All the mitigation measures are great. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-46 | Heard, Robert | B-46-1 | Pedestrian Mobility | Has anyone taken a look at the impact, if any, on the walking routes of kids as they come and go to school? | Overall, no impacts to student walking routes are expected occur as a result of the proposed project. The area surrounding the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor includes the attendance areas for nine Cleveland Metropolitan School District (CMSD) schools. Students wishing to walk to/from school may need to cross intersecting roadways which would be widened and/or are projected to have increased traffic volumes as a result of the project. However, pedestrian signals and crosswalks will be provided at every traffic light. The signals will be timed so that students will have enough time to cross the entire street. In areas where streets would be closed, sidewalks would be extended to the new roadway to maintain pedestrian connections. (See Section 3.3.4.2 of the <i>Opportunity Corridor Conceptual Alternatives Study</i> (October 2010), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-46 | Heard, Robert | B-46-2 | Workforce Development | In regard to employment opportunities. We have a trade school in Cleveland that probably graduates a couple 100 kids every year, Max Hayes High School, with kids who are interested in this type of work. So that's a good place to start. | See the responses to Comment B-15-2 and Comment B-30-1. Graduates of Max Hayes High School would be able to apply for on-the-job training. |
| | | B-46-3 | Quincy Avenue Closure | When you shut off Quincy at 105th, the homes on Woodhill will be isolated. It was mentioned that the driving distance around it is about the same in terms of feet or miles. A lot of those people don't have cars, so when you cut them off from access, I don't know how they're going to get to 105th. | Although Quincy Avenue would be closed to vehicular traffic between East 105th Street and Woodhill Road, access for bicycles, pedestrians, and emergency service providers would be maintained via a drive on Quincy Avenue. Therefore, travel distances for pedestrians and bicyclists traveling between Woodhill Road and East 105th Street would not change. The closure of Quincy Avenue would impact approximately four bus stops on GCRTA Bus Route 11 and one bus stop on GCRTA Bus Route 10. GCRTA will modify bus routes as necessary to maintain access for the transit dependent public housing populations located east of Woodhill Road and north of Woodland Avenue. All modifications to existing public transportation services will be made in accordance with GCRTA's Title VI Program. See FEIS Section 4. 5 for a more detailed description of the design constraints associated with connecting Quincy Avenue to the proposed Opportunity Corridor boulevard. See FEIS Section 4. 6 for further information related to impacts to public transportation. (See DEIS "How would existing roads and access points be changed?" on page 4-22.) |
| B-47 | Heard, Robert | B-47-1 | Pedestrian Mobility | Has anyone looked at the impact, if any on the walking routes of kids going to school. | See also the response to Comment B-46-1. |
| | | B-47-2 | Workforce Development | Can Cleveland Municipal School Students keep some employment opportunities (Look to Max Hayes graduates). | See the responses to Comment B-15-2 and Comment B-30-1. Graduates of the Cleveland Metropolitan School District and Max Hayes High School would be able to apply for on-the-job training. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-47 | Heard, Robert | B-47-3 | Quincy Avenue Closure | Closing Quincy isolates the public housing "Woodhill Homes." Most of those people have no cars. What happens to those people who need to go north to the Cleveland Clinic. | <p>Access for individuals who live in the public housing "Woodhill Homes" and use public transportation would be maintained (See the response to Comment B-46-3).</p> <p>Individuals who live in "Woodhill Homes" and own automobiles would be able to travel north to the Cleveland Clinic by using Woodland Avenue and East 93rd Street to access the Opportunity Corridor, which will run along existing East 105th Street. The existing and proposed travel distances will be nearly equivalent.</p> |
| B-48 | Hendon, Korolla | B-48-1 | Future Development | I am a small business and want a guarantee of business from this project that is coming to my neighborhood. | See the response to Comment B-18-7. |
| | | B-48-2 | Quincy Avenue Closure | The Opportunity Corridor will cul-de-sac a major North-South connection at East 105th Street & Quincy. This will cut off RTA bus routes and those traveling by car or foot. East 105th Street & Quincy Avenue is a major thoroughfare. I'm asking that ODOT seriously consider not taking such action as closing this important access route. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-48-3 | Noise | Traffic noise may impact neighborhoods. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-48-4 | Air Quality | Environmental issues such as pollution from the emission of fumes from vehicles coming through the neighborhood will have a negative impact. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-48-5 | 89th Street Closure | Dead ending and closing of East 89th Street at Woodland will force transit dependent people to walk further to access the #10 RTA bus service. Currently there is no RTA bus service for Woodland Avenue. | See the response to Comment B-18-4. |
| | | B-48-6 | Impacts and Benefits | The true beneficiaries of this \$331 million project are the commuters who don't live in the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|--|---|
| B-48 | Hendon, Korolla | B-48-7 | Workforce Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding job creation and viable-expedited training programs that will assist residents in obtaining jobs at the onset of construction of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-48-8 | Future Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding business development and enhancements for economic growth for all of the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-18-7. |
| | | B-48-9 | Workforce Development | Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project's implementation. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-48-10 | Relocation Process | ODOT must provide fair compensation and relocation funds to owners of properties that are in the direct path of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-49 | Hill, Carolyn | B-49-1 | Street Closures | There would be utter chaos to bring a freeway through these streets to disconnect and make dead end streets where they have been easily accessible for decades. | The Opportunity Corridor project is not a freeway. The preferred alternative involves building an urban boulevard with traffic lights at intersections from the I-490-East 55th Street intersection to the East 105th Street-Chester Avenue intersection (see DEIS page 3-7). See also the response to Comment B-20-4. |
| | | B-49-2 | Relocation Process | There is a fear that homes will be taken from the very poor and they would not be given 100-percent fair compensation. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-49-3 | General Opposition | I am not in favor of this project. I strongly suggest that it be relocated to some other area. This project will hurt our inner city and disrupt our neighborhood and community. | Locating the project in another area will not meet the basic purpose, which is to improve the roadway network within a historically underserved, economically depressed area (the "Forgotten Triangle") in the City of Cleveland. See also the response to Comment B-10-1. (See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------|--------|----------------------|---|--|
| B-50 | Hughes, Joseph | B-50-1 | Impacts and Benefits | The project will increase crime and vacancies in the surrounding neighborhoods. | <p>The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will result in the demolition of abandoned structures, which residents have noted as high-crime locations. This could reduce crime within the project area. Crime could also be reduced through traffic and pedestrian-generated human presence.</p> <p>The project could also have the indirect effect of generating economic activity and job opportunities, as well as supporting infill development, which would further decrease vacancies and related crime.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would study area neighborhoods be affected?" on pages 4-18 and 4-19 and "Would low-income and minority populations be affected?" on pages 4-27 through 4-31. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Environmental Justice Technical Memorandum</i> (April 2013), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-50-2 | Alternatives | To access the Cleveland Clinic or University Circle, use Martin Luther Boulevard to E. 105th Street or Chester Avenue to E. 105th Street or Carnegie Avenue to E. 105th Street. | See the response to Comment B-34-1. |
| B-51 | Jacobs, Cereatha | B-51-1 | Street Closures | This project is making it very hard for me and my family. Street closures will require me to drive further as I go to family houses, work and shopping. Gas is too expensive to have to reroute. The bus #10 and #11 were quick ways to get up the hill and a good way to downtown Cleveland. | <p>Based on the information provided, it is unclear which travel routes are most frequently used. Therefore, it is difficult to quantify how the closure and changes to existing streets will impact this specific individual.</p> <p>See the response to Comment B-20-4 for a general discussion of street closures.</p> <p>See the response to Comment B-18-1 for a discussion of Bus Routes #10 and #11.</p> |
| | | B-51-2 | Transit | The project will affect my son who rides the bus to school. It will affect the GCRTA #10 and #11 bus lines. | The closure of Quincy Avenue would impact approximately four bus stops on GCRTA Bus Route 11 and one bus stop on GCRTA Bus Route 10. GCRTA will modify bus routes as necessary to maintain access for the transit dependent public housing populations located east of Woodhill Road and north of Woodland Avenue. All modifications to existing public transportation services will be made in accordance with GCRTA's Title VI Program. See FEIS Section 4. 6 for further information related to impacts to public transportation. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-52 | Janik, Debra | B-52-1 | General Support | The Greater Cleveland Partnership (GCP) fully supports the Opportunity Corridor Project, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the preferred alternative route as proposed by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT). | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| | | B-52-2 | Mitigation Measures | The GCP fully supports the additional mitigation measures being considered by ODOT. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-53 | Johnson, Joy | B-53-1 | Street Closures | Eliminate as many dead ends as possible. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |
| | | B-53-2 | Pedestrian Mobility | Create pedestrian/bike friendly opportunities, especially for youth. | <p>It is a stated goal of the Opportunity Corridor project to improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists (see DEIS page 2-6).</p> <p>To accomplish that goal, the project would include a 10-foot multipurpose walking/biking path on the south side of the roadway and a 6-foot sidewalk on the north side of the roadway. These facilities would help improve bicycle and pedestrian movements that are currently blocked by the Kingsbury Run Valley and the Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) Cleveland Main Line (see DEIS page 4-19).</p> <p>The project would also build two pedestrian/bike bridges, one at East 59th Street and one at East 89th Street (see DEIS page 4-28).</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2, "How would bicycles and pedestrians be affected" on pages 4-19 to 4-20 and "Would low-income and minority populations be affected?" on pages 4-27 to 4-31.)</p> |
| | | B-53-3 | Workforce Development | Please make sure construction workers reflect the community. | <p>See the responses to Comment B-15-2 and Comment B-30-1.</p> <p>Members of the impacted communities would be able to apply for on-the-job training.</p> |
| | | B-53-4 | Transit | Please involve and consider RTA routes. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| B-54 | Jolly, Willie Mae | B-54-1 | Existing Roadways | I think they should take this money and use it to repair all the dilapidated roads from here to University Circle. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|--|---|
| B-55 | Jones, Bemba | B-55-1 | Workforce Development | I'd like to see us prepare the community outreach program that's visible, that people in the community can see, can go there with the hope of getting some type of work or some type of training. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. The on-the-job training that will be funded as part of the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will be provided to the impacted Community Development Corporations (CDCs) to share with their membership. |
| B-56 | Kanner, Carlton | B-56-1 | Existing Roadways | Tell ODOT to do their jobs and maintain our existing roads first. That five minutes saved by this new road could be saved by timing the lights better, or repaving Cedar, Woodland, Quincy and 55th. | See the responses to Comment B-2-2 and Comment B-16-1. |
| | | B-56-2 | Alternatives | University Circle already has three separate ways to get to the highway, MLK, Chester/Carnegie/Euclid or Woodland to 55th. Why are we spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a redundant road that will save a maximum of five minutes on a commute for people who do not pay property taxes into our community. | See the responses to Comment B-34-1 and Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-56-3 | Transit | Look at every successful city and you'll see that the priority is pedestrian traffic/mass transit and never individual cars. Work on safety and cleanliness of our public transit system. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-56-4 | Future Development | If you want to create jobs and development in University Circle, you do it by making it more restrictive to cars not less. If you make it more difficult for people to drive to work, you force them to move out of the suburbs and into the surrounding communities of University Circle. This creates local jobs. This create local development. | Making the transportation network more restrictive to cars is not an element of the project's purpose and need. The project's purpose and need states the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor must provide improved access between I-77 and University Circle. The project must also provide improved mobility and better levels of service for traffic traveling to, from and within the area between I-77 and University Circle. See also the response to Comment B-57-3. (See DEIS Chapter 2, FEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------|--------|--------------------|---|---|
| B-57 | Karchmer, Dan | B-57-1 | General Opposition | This is a misguided and wasteful expenditure of state money. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| | | B-57-2 | Alternatives | I do not feel that complete due-diligence has been completed and that observations of parallel, existing routes have been wholly insufficient. If there is any chance of re-evaluating the corridor to vastly improve existing routes, which are more than sufficient to handle traffic volume with the enhancements noted above, I can assure you the project ROI would be much higher than building a new route through a depopulated neighborhood. We already have two primary arteries that could more than meet the objectives of this project for far less money: Woodland Ave and Carnegie Ave. The project's stated goals could be achieved with less expense by synchronizing traffic lights, eliminating unnecessary lights, and converting some intersections to no-turn or one-way. | See the responses to Comment B-34-1 and Comment B-10-9. |
| | | B-57-3 | Future Development | In the unlikely event that retail and other investment does occur along the proposed new route, it will do so by cannibalizing or diluting current investment along existing routes. | The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will not determine future development for the area. This is consistent with the project's purpose and need, which is to improve the transportation infrastructure to allow future planned economic development to occur. Future land use change both in the immediate project area and along existing transportation corridors would largely be determined by local plans and regulations. See also the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| | | B-57-4 | Project Funding | Since the proposed route will run through Cleveland, presumably the City will be responsible for maintenance - it can barely manage the roads it has and simply does not have the resources to maintain another major artery. | See the response to Comment B-9-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|---------------------|---|---|
| B-57 | Karchmer, Dan | B-57-5 | Mitigation Measures | Most of the proposed mitigation measures are either not transportation or should be completed through regional/local teams through their funding sources, not ODOT's funding. Job training, urban agriculture, neighborhood improvements, and enhanced bus shelters should not be funded with transportation dollars. | <p>Despite the benefits expected to result from the project, low-income and minority populations will be affected more than other populations. Because of this, the project was found to have a disproportionately high and adverse effect to low-income and minority populations.</p> <p>Several measures will be implemented and funded as part of the project to mitigate impacts and provide added benefits to the local community. These measures include job training assistance, neighborhood improvements and Enhanced bus shelters. A complete list of other mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD).</p> <p>(See DEIS "Would low-income and minority populations be affected?" on pages 4-27 through 4-31.)</p> |
| B-58 | Kayse, Jessica | B-58-1 | Public Involvement | I do not feel that people our neighborhood have had the opportunity to voice their opinions with the given amount of time necessary. | <p>In the early planning stages of the project, the project team had more than 50 meetings with people, businesses and organizations that could be affected by the project. The input received at these meetings helped the project team understand the problems, needs, goals and objectives for the study area. It also helped develop the project's purpose and need statement and evaluate alternatives.</p> <p>The project was then placed on hold between 2006 and 2009 due to a lack of funding. Since September 2009, 12 public meetings, more than 15 business coordination meetings, five neighborhood meetings, and six steering committee meetings have been held. See FEIS Section 3. 3 for a detailed summary of the alternatives development, including how the public was involved in the decision-making process.</p> <p>In addition to large-scale public meetings and small group meetings, the project team used other tools to reach out to potentially affected community members, including newsletters, community surveys, press releases, community and agency briefings, and project brochures. ODOT also actively maintained a project website throughout the study process to keep project stakeholders and the general public informed of public meetings and updated on the project.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 5 and the <i>Public Involvement Summary</i> (January 2013), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-58 | Kayse, Jessica | B-58-2 | Public Involvement | Because I didn't attend a public meeting, the only way I have to voice my opinion is through a survey on line, email or fax. No phone number. Many people in my neighborhood do not have access to this type of technology. | A phone number to call with questions regarding the project and a mailing address to submit comments were provided in the DEIS and on all advertising documents for the DEIS and public hearing. |
| | | B-58-3 | Relocation Process | Provide fair compensation to our property owners in the area as well as fair compensation for the task of relocation (especially for renters, seniors, and the disabled). | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-58-4 | Workforce Development | Provide jobs and job training, such as apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeships, for the communities most impacted by this project. I feel this is only relevant if you are willing to guarantee "actual jobs" pertaining to this project to individuals in the impacted area. If there are no jobs offered in the area - job training only goes so far. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. The job training that will be funded as part of the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will be on-the-job. This will assure that the training will apply to actual jobs. |
| | | B-58-5 | Transit | Maintain and improve transit service for individuals dependent on local transportation. Many of the bus routes will be changed or closed for those living, working and children going to school in this area. | See the response to Comment B-2-3 for a discussion of public transportation. See also the response to Comment B-51-2 for a discussion of Bus Routes #10 and #11. |
| | | B-58-6 | Existing Roadways | Maintain and improve local road quality to the Opportunity Corridor, and comply with ODOT 'Fix-it First' policy. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-58-7 | Noise | How do you plan to find out whether or not impacted owners/renters want the noise barriers? | See the response to Comment B-67-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|---------|---------------------|---|--|
| B-58 | Kayse, Jessica | B-58-8 | Urban Agriculture | Providing assistance to urban agriculture efforts - i.e. the Kinsman Innovation Zone- doesn't make much sense when you are building a 3.5 mile highway extension that will continue and further pollute the area. | One possible mitigation measure that was presented to the public in the DEIS and at the public hearing included providing financial aid to assist in the planning and development of sites previously identified as part of the Urban Agricultural Innovation Zone, which is located in the Kinsman neighborhood. Based on the strong preference for other mitigation measures such as workforce development and job training, the project team determined that mitigation funds would be best allocated to the other measures. Therefore, financial aid within the Urban Agriculture Innovation Zone was not included as a final mitigation measure. |
| | | B-58-9 | DBE Goal | DBE goal-What is the current goal and how will this be guaranteed? | See the response to Comment B-23-2. |
| | | B-58-10 | Mitigation Measures | What does enhanced bus shelters mean? | Enhanced bus shelters are enclosed bus shelters that provide a comfortable place for patrons to wait for buses. They can also provide vending and system maps and are designed to aesthetically fit into the community. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project, including enhanced bus shelters, is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| | | B-58-11 | Mitigation Measures | I do not feel that any of the mitigation measures that ODOT is considering truly provide any real improved health/economic outcomes for those living and working in this area. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-59 | Kermode, Dave | B-59-1 | General Support | I am hopeful that the plan will continue to evolve into a true neighborhood corridor. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| | | B-59-2 | Pedestrian Mobility | I would personally prefer to see greater incorporation of pedestrian and bike infrastructure (on both sides of the roadway). | See the response to Comment B-53-2. |
| | | B-59-3 | Transit | Better connectivity to the surrounding public transit (Rapid and Bus) street infrastructure should be considered. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|---------------------|---|--|
| B-59 | Kermode, Dave | B-59-4 | Noise | I am decidedly against noise barriers on the roadway. The Opportunity Corridor was sold as a non-freeway neighborhood road and anything that adds to barriers between surrounding blocks would go against that end. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |
| | | B-59-5 | Mitigation Measures | I am supportive of the mitigation measures, except for noise barriers. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-60 | Kibbey, Bobbie | B-60-1 | Alternatives | I don't see any information about what the "preferred alternative" is. | <p>The preferred alternative for the Opportunity Corridor project was described in detail in Chapters 1 and 3 of the DEIS. Several minor updates have been made to the design of the preferred alternative in response to the comments received after the DEIS was published. FEIS Section 3. 4 contains further details regarding these minor updates. FEIS Section 3. 5 includes the refined, detailed description of the preferred alternative.</p> <p>A brief description of the preferred alternative is included below for ease of reference: The preferred alternative involves building an urban boulevard with traffic lights at intersections from the I-490-East 55th Street intersection to the East 105th Street-Chester Avenue intersection. The proposed boulevard will have two westbound through-lanes, but the number of eastbound through-lanes will vary. The project includes three eastbound through-lanes between I-490 and Woodland Avenue. In general, the roadway will have two through-lanes between Woodland Avenue and Chester Avenue, but the roadway between Cedar Avenue and Euclid Avenue will include a third eastbound through-lane. Left-turn lanes will also be added at many of the intersections.</p> <p>The proposed boulevard will be approximately 3.6 miles long. Approximately 2. 4 miles will be built where no roads exist now. Approximately 1.2 miles – the stretch from Quincy Avenue to Chester Avenue – will be built on existing East 105th Street.</p> <p>The boulevard will include a low, grassy median between East 55th Street and Cedar Avenue. A raised median will be included between Quincy and Cedar avenues. However, the grassy median and tree lawns will not be included on the bridges. The proposed boulevard will also include a walking/biking path on the south side of the roadway, and a sidewalk on the north side.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| B-60 | Kibbey, Bobbie | B-60-2 | Context Sensitive Solutions | My preference is to beautify that neighborhood's existing infrastructure - roads, sidewalks, gardens and street lights. | See the response to Comment B-1-2. |
| | | B-60-3 | Existing Roadways | There are plenty of arteries between University Circle and I-490 now. We don't need more roads. We need better care of the roads we have. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| B-61 | King, Richard | B-61-1 | Impacts and Benefits | Clevelanders will not benefit whatsoever with this project. It's simply aimed at suburbanites to get to university Circle without driving pass the urban blight of E. 55th. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-61-2 | Other | If the Mayor focused on improving the impoverished areas of Cleveland, then this wouldn't be an issue. Instead he focuses on Tremont, Ohio City, University Circle and Downtown Cleveland neighborhoods who all cater to suburbanite commuters so they can come in and play and then hit the nearest highway. | Improving impoverished areas throughout the City of Cleveland is beyond the purpose and need for this transportation project. The project's purpose and need states that the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor must provide a transportation system that supports planned economic development. The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will meet the project's purpose and need by creating the infrastructure to support planned revival and redevelopment in and around the "Forgotten Triangle," which is bordered by Kinsman Road, Woodland Avenue and Woodhill Road. |
| | | B-61-3 | Stormwater Management | Let's not forget our Sewer system that's over 100 years old and needs updated, due to the frequent water main breaks. Why don't you guys work on that? | See the response to Comment B-3-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|------------------------|--|--|
| B-62 | Kittredge, Ms. | B-62-1 | Francis Avenue Closure | <p>The project will be closing Francis Avenue, which is a major entrance to the St. Hyacinth neighborhood. We need to have a much better mitigation of that closure, because Hyacinth runs all the way through the neighborhood. It goes ten blocks all the way through the heart of the neighborhood with the alternative entrances only going one to two blocks. We need some major design, mitigation or entryway features that will help draw the traffic through the neighborhood and highlight an alternative route.</p> | <p>Francis Avenue serves as the current entrance into the St. Hyacinth neighborhood and is located approximately 50 feet south of the proposed intersection of the quadrant roadway and East 55th Street. Allowing turning movements at both locations would introduce traffic operational and safety concerns. Therefore, the DEIS indicated that Francis Avenue would be closed between East 55th Street and East 57th Street (see DEIS page 4-22).</p> <p>Following the public hearing, the need to close Francis Avenue was further evaluated and coordinated with project stakeholders, including the City of Cleveland and the Slavic Village Community Development Coordination (CDC). Alternative design concepts were explored to keep Francis Avenue open to traffic. These concepts would either create additional impacts or create an undesirable situation in terms of traffic operations and safety. Therefore, the project team has confirmed the need to close Francis Avenue between East 55th Street and East 57th Street.</p> <p>To mitigate the impact of the closure, ODOT will help create a new entrance to the St. Hyacinth neighborhood by constructing enhancements along Maurice and Bellford avenues. These measures will include street trees, and sidewalk and pavement repairs or improvements within the existing right-of-way and will be coordinated with the project stakeholders through the Slavic Village Community Development Corporation (CDC) during final design.</p> <p>The project will also build a bike/pedestrian bridge at East 59th Street to maintain access to the GCRTA transit station at East 55th Street. See Section 4. 5 of the FEIS for additional information about changes to existing roads and access points.</p> <p>A list of the final environmental commitments and mitigation measures is included in Table A of the Record of Decision.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------|--------|------------------------|---|--|
| B-63 | Kittredge, Marie | B-63-1 | Francis Avenue Closure | Every effort should be made to maintain access to Francis Avenue, as this is the main gateway and access to the Hyacinth neighborhood. Creating more of a gateway at Bellford or Maurice is not helpful, as these streets are only a block or two long. I understand the issue is proximity to the OC access road, however this can this be addressed by pushing Francis a little south, using the vacant lot to the south, and/or by making Francis one way in, which would allow a narrower street and so more distance between Francis and the OC access road. | See the response to Comment B-62-1. |
| | | B-63-2 | Pedestrian Mobility | The Opportunity Corridor boulevard can be an asset if its connection to the St. Hyacinth neighborhood and its edge is well designed. This includes access for residents by vehicle as well as walking and cycling to neighborhoods to the east. | See the response to Comment B-53-2. The sidewalks and multipurpose path included in the preferred alternative will enhance connections to the St. Hyacinth neighborhood. In addition, the preferred alternative will include a pedestrian/bike bridge at East 59th Street to maintain connections to the St. Hyacinth neighborhood. |
| | | B-63-3 | Workforce Development | Job training is critical. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------|--------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| B-64 | Lamb, Keith | B-64-1 | Alternatives | The preferred alternative looks like a freeway with a few traffic lights and not enough like a boulevard. If a boulevard has to be built, it should connect the end of Shaker Blvd to the end of 490 and then just rebuild all the cross streets (55th, 79th, 93rd, 105th) so people can get up to the circle on them. | <p>The preferred alternative is not a freeway. The preferred alternative for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project involves building an urban boulevard with traffic lights at intersections from the I-490-East 55th Street intersection to the East 105th Street-Chester Avenue intersection. Traffic will access surrounding development via standard, signalized intersections.</p> <p>The beginning and end points of the project are addressed in the DEIS "Where will the project begin and end?" on pages 2-6 and 2-7. These locations have been agreed upon by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). They provide an area that is just the right size to meet the project purpose and need. This allows for, but does not require, future projects in the study area or in the region. It also assures that other transportation improvements are not needed for the project to be useful to the public.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-2-2.</p> |
| | | B-64-2 | Context Sensitive Solutions | The preferred alternative doesn't include enough trees. There should be trees in the median and between the sidewalk/bike path and the sound walls if you insist on building walls. | <p>The preferred alternative for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will include trees in the median and tree lawns (see DEIS Figure 1-3 on pages 1-3 and 1-4). If noise walls are desired, the people who are affected would help decide how the walls would look on their side of the wall. The public involvement effort and the final decision about whether to build the noise walls would happen during final design (see DEIS pages 23 through 25). If they are built, the appearance of the noise walls will be coordinated with the public through and in coordination with the affected Community Development Corporations (CDCs).</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-1-2.</p> |
| | | B-64-3 | Future Development | We need to have businesses facing the new road, not just somewhere hidden behind a wall facing a side street. | <p>Noise walls are recommended in three areas to mitigate increased traffic noise. The final decision about whether to build the noise walls will be made in accordance with ODOT's noise policy and based on input from those who would be affected by the walls. If built, the noise walls would be located in existing residential areas. The project would also include several retaining walls, which were designed to minimize impacts to existing roadways, transit infrastructure, residences and businesses. Therefore, neither noise walls or retaining walls are anticipated to obstruct future commercial development.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-1-1.</p> |
| | | B-64-4 | DBE Goal | I don't support the DBE goal. If a business can't competitively bid, this isn't a charity project. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-64 | Lamb, Keith | B-64-5 | Noise | I oppose noise barriers as they make this "boulevard" into a highway. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |
| | | B-64-6 | Urban Agriculture | I don't support urban agriculture projects. This is a city, why would we put farms in it? | See the response to Comment B-58-8. |
| B-65 | Lamb-Sutton, Kyle | B-65-1 | Street Closures | I do not agree with the closing off of any streets. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |
| | | B-65-2 | Relocation Process | I do not agree with the removal of any persons from their homes. | The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project would cause homes, businesses and a church to be relocated. These impacts are necessary to build a facility that meets the project's purpose and need and all pertinent design criteria. Property impacts and relocations have been avoided and minimized to the greatest extent possible through methods such as shifting the roadway alignment roadway, using retaining walls and reducing lane widths in some areas. |
| | | B-65-3 | General Opposition | I do not agree with the rerouting and extension of the I-490 freeway into our community. I don't agree with altering the lives of the residents in this community to make it more convenient for some of the businesses or others outside of the community to get to their destinations. | The proposed project is not a freeway. The preferred alternative for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project involves building an urban boulevard with traffic lights at intersections from the I-490-East 55th Street intersection to the East 105th Street-Chester Avenue intersection. A continuation of the I-490 freeway was studied early in the Cleveland Innerbelt Study, but a new freeway was not well received by the public, and it was eliminated from consideration. See also the response to Comment B-10-1. See FEIS Section 3. 3 for additional details related to the freeway concept that was eliminated from consideration. |
| B-66 | Lang, Andrew | B-66-1 | General Opposition | The project is nothing more than a limited access freeway that hacks its way through a poor section of the city while ignoring existing neighborhood assets. | See the response to Comment B-65-3. |
| | | B-66-2 | Transit | It would be ideal if the project could have incorporated RTA's red, blue, and green lines in the project, or at least enhanced the connections from the Opportunity Corridor to said lines. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-66-3 | Future Development | Also, a master plan for the area around the OC would be ideal. | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|---|--|
| B-66 | Lang, Andrew | B-66-4 | Mitigation Measures | Almost all of the mitigation measures sound great, except the noise barriers. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-67 | Lauer, Art | B-67-1 | Property Impacts | Will the scrap yard at E. 55th and 490 and Bower be relocated? If so, will it be a park or parking for RTA? | The scrap yard located at E. 55th Street and I-490 will be relocated as part of the project. It will be within the proposed right-of-way and replaced by the in-fill area located between the Opportunity Corridor boulevard and the proposed Quadrant Roadway. (See DEIS Figure 4-11, page 4-9.) |
| | | B-67-2 | Mitigation Measures | I would like a sound barrier with see through material on my street E. 59th. | If noise walls are built, the people who are affected will help decide how the walls will look on their side of the wall. This could include using transparent materials to increase visibility, as well as other alternative materials to improve the look of the barriers. The public involvement effort and the final decision about whether to build the noise walls would happen during final design. ODOT will contact affected residents in areas where noise walls are warranted to solicit their viewpoints on whether to implement the recommended noise barriers as part of the proposed project. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). See also the response to Comment B-9-5. (See DEIS "How would traffic noise levels change?" on pages 4-23 through 4-25.) |
| | | B-67-3 | Mitigation Measures | I would like street trees and sidewalk improvements in my St. Hyacinth area. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-68 | Leak, Christopher | B-68-1 | General Opposition | I do not agree with this project. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-69 | Lefkowitz, Marc | B-69-1 | Alternatives | In the DEIS, the agency explains what alternatives, such as improving existing streets, it was required to study. But, the DEIS falls short of explaining why those alternatives were ruled out in favor of a new road. | See the response to Comment B-10-9. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|--------------------|---------|--------------------|---|---|
| B-69 | Lefkowitz, Marc | B-69-2 | Traffic Operations | One environmental impact missed by the DEIS is the FHWA-recognized impact of how much the new road will 'induce' travel. More cars will be siphoned away from other roads on the east side while this new one fills up until traffic slows, defeating the purpose. | <p>An analysis was conducted to determine the number of lanes needed on the Opportunity Corridor boulevard and how the intersections would operate.</p> <p>First, the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency's (NOACA's) Travel Demand Model (TDM) was updated to incorporate the new boulevard, planned development anticipated to occur independent of the proposed boulevard and complementary development anticipated to occur in conjunction with the proposed boulevard. After the TDM was updated, traffic volumes were generated for both the design year Build and No Build scenarios for the years 2020, 2030 and 2040. The traffic projections were certified by ODOT's Office of Technical Services on April 11, 2012. Finally, the projected traffic volumes were analyzed for the year 2020, which had the highest volume of projected traffic.</p> <p>The analyses concluded that the Opportunity Corridor would operate at acceptable levels through the year 2020. In addition, the Opportunity Corridor would help the existing roadway network to better handle traffic volumes. For example, when the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor is built, traffic on several neighboring roadways and intersections is expected to shift to the new boulevard. With less traffic, these other roadways and intersections will operate better.</p> <p>(See FEIS Appendix C for certified traffic plates.)</p> <p>(See the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012, revised June 2012) which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-69-3 | Transit | If Opportunity Corridor is intended to improve the conditions of a historically underserved community, the situation for pedestrians and transit users should, at least, be made no worse. | <p>See the response to Comment B-2-3 for a discussion of public transportation.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-70-1 for a discussion of pedestrian mobility and access.</p> |
| | | B-69-4a | Noise | Barriers to mobility include sound and retaining walls , a sidewalk on only one side of the road, longer crossing distances at intersections, a wider "suburban style" bike path instead of bike lanes and cul-de-sacs or closings for nine neighborhood streets and Quincy, a main artery. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--|--|
| B-69 | Lefkowitz, Marc | B-69-4b | Other | Barriers to mobility include sound and retaining walls , a sidewalk on only one side of the road, longer crossing distances at intersections, a wider “suburban style” bike path instead of bike lanes and cul-de-sacs or closings for nine neighborhood streets and Quincy, a main artery. | The project would include several retaining walls, which were designed to minimize impacts to existing roadways, transit infrastructure, residences and businesses. However, none of the retaining walls will restrict bicycle or pedestrian mobility in the project area. A detailed discussion of the project's impacts to bicycles and pedestrians is included in FEIS Section 4. 4. (See DEIS "How has public and stakeholder feedback changed the study? on page 3-3.) |
| | | B-69-4c | Pedestrian Mobility | Barriers to mobility include sound and retaining walls, a sidewalk on only one side of the road, longer crossing distances at intersections, a wider “suburban style” bike path instead of bike lanes and cul-de-sacs or closings for nine neighborhood streets and Quincy, a main artery. | <p>The preferred alternative would only include a sidewalk on the north side of the road. However, a walking/biking path, would be included on the south side (see the response to Comment B-53-2).</p> <p>Following the publication of the DEIS, the following updates were made to the preferred alternative: the width of thru-lanes was reduced from 12-foot to 11-foot effective width; the width of turn lanes was reduced from 11-foot to 10-foot effective width; the third eastbound lane between Woodland Avenue and East 93rd Street and also at Cedar Avenue was eliminated; A curbed median was added along East 105th Street between Quincy and Cedar avenues to facilitate pedestrian crossings; and Medians, where present, will be used as pedestrian refuges where possible. These updates would generally reduce the width of the Opportunity Corridor boulevard and would allow pedestrians to cross shorter distances in less time. The medians, in particular, would provide pedestrians a safe place to pause while crossing traffic traveling in different directions.</p> <p>The project team coordinated with the City of Cleveland and the local Community Development Corporations (CDC's) regarding providing on-road bike lanes instead of a multipurpose path for bicycle traffic. The City and the CDC's stated a clear preference for the multipurpose path as it was perceived as a safer alternative to on-road bike lanes. FEIS Section 4. 4 contains additional information about the project's effects to pedestrian mobility.</p> |
| | | B-69-4d | Street Closures | Barriers to mobility include sound and retaining walls, a sidewalk on only one side of the road, longer crossing distances at intersections, a wider “suburban style” bike path instead of bike lanes and cul-de-sacs or closings for nine neighborhood streets and Quincy, a main artery . | <p>See the response to Comment B-18-1 for a discussion of the Quincy Avenue closure.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-20-4 for a general discussion related to street closures.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|--------------|---|---|
| B-69 | Lefkowitz, Marc | B-69-5 | Alternatives | Is it possible to remove the bottlenecks around I-490 and E. 55th and fix the 'five points' intersection where E. 55th, Kinsman, Woodland collide and introduce a modern traffic lighting system that improves connectivity at far less cost? | <p>The existing Level of Service (LOS) at the I-490/East 55th Street intersection is LOS F (see DEIS page 2-3). The design year traffic analysis shows that the proposed project would improve the Level of Service to LOS C/B (AM peak/PM peak) at the East 55th Street/quadrant roadway intersection and LOS C/B (AM peak/PM peak) at the intersection of the proposed boulevard/quadrant roadway.</p> <p>This information, as well as the traffic operational analysis completed for the remainder of the study area, is contained in the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012, revised June 2012) which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into the DEIS and the FEIS.</p> <p>The DEIS discusses the potential impacts of the preferred alternative on the existing roadway network (see DEIS "How would the existing roadway network be affected?" on pages 4-22 and 4-23). The proposed boulevard would help the existing roadway network to better handle traffic volumes. For example, when the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor is built, traffic on several neighboring roadways and intersections (e. g. , the "five points" intersection) is expected to shift to the new boulevard. With less traffic, these other roadways and intersections will operate better.</p> <p>Detailed information about the Opportunity Corridor's effects on the transportation network is also provided in the <i>Opportunity Corridor Certified Traffic Plates</i> (June 2012) and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012, revised June 2012). These reports are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into the DEIS and the FEIS.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-34-1.</p> |
| | | B-69-6 | Alternatives | A significant portion of the funding for this project should be directed toward demand management strategies. For example, ODOT can build the infrastructure for a transit oriented development in the E. 79th Street area around the Red Line Rapid Station and support multi-modal connectivity within the study area both east-west and north-south. | <p>Transportation Demand Management strategies would not meet the project's purpose and need, which is to improve system linkage, improve mobility and support economic development. See also the response to Comment B-10-9.</p> <p>The Opportunity Corridor project will not determine future development, including Transit Oriented Development (TOD). See the response to Comment B-1-1. However, the project will improve connectivity among transit facilities such as GCRTA stations provide the infrastructure to support redevelopment plans that could increase patronage within the transit system.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|---------------------|---|--|
| B-69 | Lefkowitz, Marc | B-69-7 | Urban Agriculture | The project can support the burgeoning development of urban agriculture by purchasing and setting aside some of the vacant land in the study area for an expansion of local food production. | See the response to Comment B-58-8. |
| | | B-69-8 | Noise | Noise barriers should be reconsidered. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| B-70 | Lefkowitz, Marc | B-70-1 | Pedestrian Mobility | I have concerns about the project's impact to neighborhoods, the barriers, the way it sort of is bisecting and creating a serious inconvenience for pedestrians and people coming to and from through the neighborhood. | <p>The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project is expected to maintain and, in some cases, improve overall pedestrian connections, access and safety by building features for these users.</p> <p>The preferred alternative would include a 10-foot multipurpose walking/biking path on the south side of the roadway and a 6-foot sidewalk on the north side of the roadway. These facilities would help improve bicycle and pedestrian movements that are currently blocked by the Kingsbury Run Valley and the Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) Cleveland Main Line (see DEIS page 4-19).</p> <p>The project would also build two pedestrian/bike bridges, one at East 59th Street and one at East 89th Street (see DEIS page 4-28) to maintain pedestrian connectivity. Furthermore, pedestrian signals and crosswalks will be provided at every traffic light. The signals will be timed so that pedestrians have enough time to cross the entire street before the opposing light turns green. Also, a curbed median will be included along East 105th Street between Quincy and Cedar avenues to facilitate pedestrian crossings; and medians, where present, will be used as pedestrian refuges where possible.</p> <p>In areas where streets would be closed, sidewalks would be extended to the new roadway to maintain pedestrian connections. The only exception would be at East 73rd Street. If noise walls are built at this location, they would prevent sidewalks from being connected to the boulevard. If the noise walls are not built, however, sidewalks would be connected. According to ODOT's noise policy, the decision to build the noise walls will be made by the impacted residents who would also be the primary users of the sidewalk connections. Pedestrian movements would not be restricted by any other retaining walls or noise barriers included in the project. See FEIS Section 4. 4.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|---|--|
| B-70 | Lefkowitz, Marc | B-70-2 | Future Development | I think we could take the money, invest it right into this neighborhood, take \$331 million and take it back to Kinsman where there is a lot of development already happening on the east side. | The funds allocated to this project can be utilized for transportation projects only. Funding for local developments must be secured from other sources. See also the response to Comment B-11-8. |
| B-71 | Lewis, Paul | B-71-1 | Other | Initially I had concerns regarding East 86th Street and East 89th Street by Quincy on the south, and currently in discussions with the individuals here in charge; my concerns were answered in that time. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-72 | Lohr, Christopher | B-72-1 | Project Funding | The "preferred alternative" will create an unfunded liability to the City of Cleveland and its residents for the foreseeable future, adding to the number of main streets that require maintenance and repair. | See the response to Comment B-9-2. |
| | | B-72-2 | Future Development | I have concerns with whether there are viable tenants for any proposed space that becomes available, and whether it is appropriate to create a suburban or exurban style office and manufacturing district in the city. | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| | | B-72-3 | Pedestrian Mobility | Current trends point to walkable and transit-friendly districts as promoting the highest levels of economic development. | See the response to Comment B-53-2. |
| | | B-72-4 | Existing Roadways | USDOT, ODOT and NOACA all have a "fix it first" policy. Since the existing road network currently handles the traffic, upgrading said network should have been an alternative presented. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. Upgrading existing roadways was considered during the alternatives development for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project. See the response to Comment B-10-9. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|---|--|
| B-72 | Lohr, Christopher | B-72-5 | Roadway Width | The use of 12 foot lanes, despite the fact that 11 foot lanes are permitted on urban arterials, indicates that design speed for the roadway will far exceed the legal limit. ODOT should design the roadway with a target design speed of approximately 35 mph. | See the response to Comment B-9-4. The design speed of the proposed boulevard is 40 miles per hour. The posted speed limit along the boulevard will be 35 miles per hour. |
| | | B-72-6 | Bicycles | A better choice for bicycles would be an on-road facility, preferably a buffered bike lane or cycle track | Several comments received on the DEIS and at the public hearing asked ODOT to provide on-road bike lanes instead of a multipurpose path for bicycle traffic. Following the public hearing, this issue was coordinated with the City of Cleveland and the local Community Development Corporations (CDC's) to confirm the design of the preferred alternative. The City and the CDC's stated a clear preference for the multipurpose path as it was perceived as a safer alternative to on-road bike lanes. FEIS Section 3. 4 contains additional information about this and other updates to the preferred alternative that were incorporated or considered following the publication of the DEIS and public hearing. |
| | | B-72-7 | Noise | No typical boulevard should not require noise barriers. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |
| | | B-72-8 | Traffic Operations | Why are there three lanes on part of the corridor as it heads northeast, but only two the entire way as it heads southwest? I have serious doubts that there would be significant flow differences that would require an additional lane in one direction. | An analysis was conducted to determine the number of lanes needed on the Opportunity Corridor boulevard during the times with the highest traffic volumes. The traffic projections were determined based on the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency's (NOACA's) Travel Demand Model (TDM) which was updated to incorporate the new boulevard, planned development anticipated to occur independent of the proposed boulevard and complementary development anticipated to occur in conjunction with the proposed boulevard. The traffic projections were certified by ODOT's Office of Technical Services on April 11, 2012. In the northeast direction, the highest traffic volumes occur during the morning commute. There is a concentrated peak during this time, and three lanes are needed in some areas to provide acceptable operations through the year 2020. In southwest direction, the highest traffic volumes occur during the evening commute. However, these volumes are less because the traffic is spread out over more time, and only two lanes are required. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------------------|---------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-72 | Lohr, Christopher | B-72-9 | Alternatives | Where is the proposal to convert the existing section of I-490 into a boulevard as well thus providing a new E-W bike route from Tremont to University Circle. This would also remove the cost of having to create an overpass/ interchange at E 55. | Converting I-490 into a boulevard and creating a new bike route from Tremont to University Circle would not meet the project's purpose and need to improve access and mobility within the Forgotten Triangle area and supporting redevelopment. (See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| | | B-72-10 | Alternatives | A better idea perhaps would have been to create a "parkway" like MLK - then you have the connection that is desired, the lack of at-grade intersections that is also desirable (and not present in the OC), and a verdant landscape that provides Metropark style recreational opportunities in an area that is underserved in that respect. This would have meshed well with existing urban agriculture zones, and provided the opportunity for focused transit oriented development around rapid stations. | Eliminating the intersections along the Opportunity Corridor would not support the project purpose and need of improving access and mobility within the Forgotten Triangle area and supporting redevelopment. The Opportunity Corridor project will not determine future development, including Transit Oriented Development (TOD). See the response to Comment B-1-1. However, the project will improve connectivity among transit facilities such as GCRTA stations provide the infrastructure to support redevelopment plans that could increase patronage within the transit system. (See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| B-73 | Lucas, Coach Robert B. | B-73-1 | Alternatives | Devise a shuttle monorail from E. 55 to Univ. Circle area. | Building a shuttle monorail would not support the project purpose and need of improving access and mobility within the Forgotten Triangle area and supporting redevelopment. (See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| | | B-73-2 | Future Development | There's no big industrial parkway coming to this dead zone. | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| | | B-73-3 | DBE Goal | What black construction company is getting the bid to start this Opportunity Corridor? | See the response to Comment B-23-2. |
| | | B-73-4 | Street Closures | We don't want our streets cut up into cul-de-sacs. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|------------------------------|---------|----------------------|---|--|
| B-73 | Lucas, Coach Robert B. | B-73-5 | Impacts and Benefits | The University Circle employees that live on the West Side of Cleveland will benefit best. The local residents are still in the forgotten zone of Cleveland. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-73-6 | Public Involvement | You need some residents that live in this area on your steering committee for best interest and input. | <p>In the early planning stages of the project (late 2004 to 2006), the project team had more than 50 meetings with people, businesses and organizations that could be affected by the project. The input received at these meetings helped the project team understand the problems, needs, goals and objectives for the study area. It also helped develop the project's purpose and need statement and evaluate alternatives.</p> <p>The project was placed on hold between 2006 and 2009 due to a lack of funding. When the project's development resumed in 2009, residents of neighborhoods in the study area were added to the steering committee. No decisions regarding the alternatives to be dismissed or carried for further study were made prior to gathering the public's input in 2009.</p> <p>See FEIS Section 3. 3 for a detailed summary of the alternatives development, including how the public was involved in the decision-making process.</p> |
| B-73a | Lucas, Robert B. | B-73a-1 | Property Impacts | Our block has only nine houses and one house of the nine is unoccupied. If entrance and or exit ramps are to exist, them what will happen with our block (located on Kinsman Road south of the GCRTA Blue and Green lines) or at least the remainder of the houses not deemed for demolition? | This location is outside of the Opportunity Corridor project area. No project-related impacts would occur. |
| | | B-73a-2 | Other | A traffic signal is definitely needed at the corner of Sideway Avenue and Kinsman Road. | The Sideway Avenue/Kinsman Road intersection is located outside of the Opportunity Corridor project area; therefore, it will not be addressed as part of this project. This comment has been communicated to the City of Cleveland. |
| B-74 | McCrary, Andrew | B-74-1 | Traffic Operations | It is a basic fact in urban planning that more roads equal more traffic. | See the response to Comment B-69-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|--|---|
| B-74 | McCrary, Andrew | B-74-2 | Transit | The Opportunity Corridor copies the path of the Red Line rapid, something that will not benefit those who live on the Near East Side of Cleveland. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-74-3 | Existing Roadways | Simply improve the streets of E. 55th and Woodland Avenue (Carnegie and Chester as well) with timed lights, streetscape and the urban renewal of business that you've been talking about. Re-paving and re-planning and re-development of East 55th Street, Woodland, Carnegie and Chester Avenues would be the best sustainable call if you're not going to be able to create a parkway without traffic lights. | See the responses to Comment B-2-2 and Comment B-16-1. |
| B-75 | McGraw, Mike | B-75-1 | Transit | Please include median right-of-way space for a rail transit element that could be added now or later. | Wide medians are included along much of the proposed Opportunity Corridor. However, future rail transit in median areas is not likely because existing transit service is currently provided parallel and adjacent to the proposed boulevard via the GCRTA Red Line and portions of the Blue-Green line. See also the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-75-2 | Mitigation Measures | Bus shelters are ok mitigation measures. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-76 | McQuillin, Steven | B-76-1 | Alternatives | The discussed bike path is of particular interest and need. It should also connect in some way with Mill Creek Trail and the trail leading to the Canalway Visitors Center and have some link into downtown and the Shaker Heights area. | The preferred alternative would include a 10-foot bicycle and pedestrian path on the south side of the roadway, and a 6-foot sidewalk on the north side of the roadway. The proposed bicycle and pedestrian path would improve the City's bikeway network. It would also improve connections between existing bikeways located at East 55th Street, East 79th Street, Quincy Avenue, and Chester Avenue, as well as the Euclid Avenue Corridor bike lanes. The project would also improve bicycle and pedestrian movements that are currently blocked by the Kingsbury Run Valley and the Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) Cleveland Main Line. Connections to other bikeways outside of the project area, including the Mill Creek Trail and the trail leading to the Canalway Visitors Center, would not be included. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-76 | McQuillin, Steven | B-76-2 | Historic Resources | It would be great to document nearby historic properties and include some means by which historic residences, factories, and commercial/institutional buildings can be rehabilitated. | Historic resources in the project area were documented as part of the project development process. The project would result in minor impacts to the Kenneth L. Johnson (Woodland) Recreation Center (9206 Woodland Ave.) and the Wade Park Historic District. In a letter dated Nov. 29, 2012, FHWA determined that the Opportunity Corridor project would not adversely affect the historic integrity of these resources. On-going historic preservation activities will be governed by applicable federal, state and local regulations. (See DEIS "How would cultural resources be affected?" on pages 4-32 through 4-34. See also the <i>Phase I History/Architecture Survey Report for the Opportunity Corridor Project</i> (January 2010); the <i>Phase I Archaeological Literature Review, Prehistoric Context, and Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment for the Opportunity Corridor Project</i> (February 2010) and the <i>Phase I Archaeological Resource Review and Disturbance Assessment for the Proposed Opportunity Corridor Project</i> (November 2012). These reports, as well as agency coordination, are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| B-77 | McShane, Laura | B-77-1 | General Opposition | The project is a colossal waste of taxpayer dollars - meant to benefit the real estate schemes that have intentionally cleared the "forgotten triangle. " | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-78 | Metcalf, Mandy | B-78-1 | Transit | Forty-percent of the households in the project area do not have cars and rely on public transportation or bicycling. Public transportation components were added as goals for the project, but only as evaluation factors, not for transportation needs. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-78-2 | Relocation Process | The proposed mitigation measure fall short. Negative impacts to the projects of local residents include home seizure , increased noise and significant impacts to local air quality in an area of high asthma rates. Environmental Health Watch's concern is that a particular pollution hot spot study was not done. | See the response to Comment B-65-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|---|---|
| B-78 | Metcalf, Mandy | B-78-2b | Noise | The proposed mitigation measure fall short. Negative impacts to the projects of local residents include home seizure, increased noise and significant impacts to local air quality in an area of high asthma rates. Environmental Health Watch's concern is that a particular pollution hot spot study was not done. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-78-2c | Air Quality | The proposed mitigation measure fall short. Negative impacts to the projects of local residents include home seizure, increased noise and significant impacts to local air quality in an area of high asthma rates. Environmental Health Watch's concern is that a particular pollution hot spot study was not done. | A CO Hot-Spot (Microscale) Analysis was completed for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project in November 2012. Substantial air quality impacts are not anticipated to result from the project. All project-level air quality analyses and conclusions were coordinated with Ohio EPA, who concurred with the conclusions. The USEPA also concurred that the Opportunity Corridor project was not a project of air quality concern and has met the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act. (See DEIS "Would air quality be affected?" on pages 4-25 and 4-26. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor CO Hot-Spot (Microscale) Analysis Report</i> (November 2012) and <i>Opportunity Corridor Qualitative Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) Analysis Report</i> (November 2012) which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| | | B-78-3 | Future Development | The project could encourage disinvestment in the inner city. As designed, the roadway will serve as an obstacle in the district. | The Opportunity Corridor will not serve as an obstacle in the area. Rather, the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will improve system linkage and mobility within the area between I-77 and University Circle. It will achieve this by providing an east-west arterial street between I-77 and University Circle that connects to the existing transportation infrastructure. Additionally, the proposed boulevard would provide a way for multi-modal traffic to cross man-made and natural features that currently serve as barriers to mobility, including the Kingsbury Run Valley, the GCRTA Blue/Green rapid transit line, and the NS Cleveland Mainline (See DEIS "How will the preferred alternative meet the project purpose and need?" on page DEIS page 3-9 and DEIS "How would the existing roadway network be affected?" on page 4-22.) |
| B-79 | Middleton, Magraret | B-79-1 | 89th Street Closure | Please don't block 89th Street. | See the responses to Comment B-19-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|----------------|--------|---------------------|--|--|
| B-80 | Moavero, Tracy | B-80-1 | Existing Roadways | We already have more roads than we can manage for our population size. We need funding for existing infrastructure. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-80-2 | Transit | We need funding for developing public transit, which is what residents of the affected neighborhoods really need, as many can't afford cars. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-80-3 | Mitigation Measures | The mitigation measures are fine, but they are being stuck onto a project that is fundamentally flawed and that runs counter to what development needs to look like to really help these struggling neighborhoods. | Without the Opportunity Corridor project, the mitigation measures would not be implemented. The funds allocated to this project can be utilized for transportation projects only. The mitigation measures are eligible for project funding because they have been identified as necessary measures to minimize harm that could result from the construction and operation of the proposed boulevard. As stand-alone actions not tied to a transportation project, the mitigation measures would not be eligible for transportation funding. A complete list of other mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-81 | Mogren, Diane | B-81-1 | Existing Roadways | The hundreds of millions of dollars proposed for this could be spent to improve the existing street grid and timing of lights: E 55th, Woodland, Quincy, Cedar, Carnegie. | See the responses to Comment B-2-2 and Comment B-16-1. |
| | | B-81-2 | Transit | The funding could be invested in better public transit (more frequent trips on a route, more routes). | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-81-3 | Bicycles | The funding could be invested in better accommodations for increasing bicycle traffic. Add bike lanes to lessen existing auto congestion. | See the responses to Comment B-16-4 and Comment B-72-6. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-81 | Mogren, Diane | B-81-4 | Future Development | The proposed boulevard has only 13 at-grade crossings along its length, creating large industrial areas which will divide the city, cutting off the parts to the South. | The Opportunity Corridor will include thirteen signalized intersections spaced between 650 feet and 2,300 feet apart. Providing access via signalized intersections would support the project purpose and need of improving access and mobility within the Forgotten Triangle area and supporting redevelopment. The locations of the proposed intersections were selected based on the existing street grid, existing traffic patterns and need to provide acceptable traffic flow along the roadway. See also the response to Comment B-1-1 (See DEIS Chapter 2, FEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011) which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| B-82 | Mohorich, Phillip | B-82-1 | Existing Roadways | I stand firmly against this project, considering it to be waste of money that would be better off spent improving the existing infrastructure in the area. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. For a discussion of the project's funding, see the response to Comment B-11-8. |
| | | B-82-2 | Future Development | I disagree with the plan for "super-blocks" of vacant land ready for development that assumes that these spaces will magically fill up with companies and jobs. | The blocks along the Opportunity Corridor will be between 650 feet and 2,300 feet long and will be defined by the locations of the signalized intersections. The locations of the proposed intersections were selected based on the existing street grid, existing traffic patterns and need to provide acceptable traffic flow along the roadway. See also the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| | | B-82-3 | Mitigation Measures | Mitigation measures are all good as stand-alone efforts, not tied to the construction of an un-needed project. | See the response to Comment B-80-3. |
| B-83 | Moody, Carla | B-83-1 | 89th Street Closure | I would rather E. 89th Street not be cut off. | See the response to Comment B-19-1. |
| | | B-83-2 | Workforce Development | I would like to see recruitment of Fairfax residents trained and employed for this project and knowledge thereof in a public location. | See the response to Comment B-55-1. |
| | | B-83-3 | DBE Goal | Verify that the DBE goals are being met. | See the response to Comment B-23-2. |
| B-83a | Moton, Shirlean | B-83a-1 | Relocation Process | You are stealing my people's homes and property. | See the responses to Comment B-19-2 and Comment B-65-2. |
| | | B-83a-2 | Existing Roadways | Repair our streets and make them safe. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-83a | Moton, Shirlean | B-83a-3 | Transit | Put back all of our buses you took, give us transportation on Woodhill Road and Buckey Road. Repair the 79th red line rapid station, don't shut it down. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. The Opportunity Corridor project will not impact bus routes on Woodhill and Buckeye roads. Past and future decisions about bus routes on these roadways are the responsibility of the GCRTA. The project will not impact GCRTA rapid transit routes such as the GCRTA Red Line. |
| | | B-83a-4 | Workforce Development | People get the training but they don't get the jobs. | See the response to Comment B-58-4. |
| B-84 | Muhammad , Debrah | B-84-1 | Transit | I would prefer mass transit vs. auto route. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-84-2 | Transit | I recommend keeping the 79th Street rapid transit route to the airport open. | The Opportunity Corridor project will not impact GCRTA rapid transit routes such as the GCRTA Red Line, which provides access to Cleveland Hopkins International Airport. |
| | | B-84-3 | Bicycles | I want bike lanes. | See the response to Comment B-72-6. |
| | | B-84-4 | Relocation Process | Residents deserve \$100K per home to move or build an affordable neighborhood for residents who want to stay in the area. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-85 | Muhammad , Debrah | B-85-1 | Future Development | Some reports show where the area is going to turn into a mini industrial complex; that's not a neighborhood. We don't have any guarantees from the city that there will be any additional planning efforts for this area, such as affordable housing for the residents who wish to remain in this area. | The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will not determine future development for the area. This is consistent with the project's purpose and need, which is to improve the transportation infrastructure to allow future planned economic development to occur. Land use change, including future residential development, would largely be determined by local plans and regulations. See also the response to Comment B-1-1. As part of the adopted long-term plans, the City and CDCs are focusing their efforts on consolidating dispersed residents into a few areas that have been slated to remain or are currently residential. These efforts—and planned infill development—will ultimately strengthen the communities. Those residents that need to be relocated as part of the project will have the opportunity to move to these areas, if they choose. |
| | | B-85-2 | Relocation Process | People have been in this area for over four generations and they would like to stay here, other than being given a minimum package to move. | See the responses to Comment B-19-2 and Comment B-65-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-85 | Muhammad , Debrah | B-85-3 | Impacts and Benefits | And lastly, the east side neighborhoods would be displaced permanently, and changing the leadership over and taking the residents from the neighborhood will take away this east side voting. | <p>The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will not displace entire neighborhoods. The project also will not determine future land use in the area. This is consistent with the project's purpose and need, which is to improve the transportation infrastructure to allow future planned economic development to occur.</p> <p>Future land use change would largely be determined by local plans and regulations. The City of Cleveland has developed a <i>Connecting Cleveland 2020 Citywide Plan</i>, which envisions consolidating local neighborhoods to provide the necessary in-fill to strengthen, improve, and protect communities in and around the Opportunity Corridor.</p> <p>Given this, the Opportunity Corridor project is not anticipated to result in any changes to the overall representation of area neighborhoods at the local, state or federal level.</p> <p>(See the <i>Opportunity Corridor Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment Technical Memorandum</i> (July 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| B-86 | Murray, Lavitta | B-86-1 | Other | The project development does not satisfy current laws, regulations and executive orders. | The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project is being developed according to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and many other state and federal policies, regulations, laws, guidance documents and executive orders. Furthermore, the alternatives for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project were developed through the ODOT's Project Development Process (PDP), which uses environmental and engineering studies to find solutions for transportation problems. |
| | | B-86-2 | Relocation Process | Provide fair compensation for properties. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-87 | Odens, Lynn | B-87-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | My sister lives on Woodland Avenue, and it will be very hard for me to get to her if it's an emergency because I use Quincy Avenue to get to Woodland Avenue. | <p>The east-west connectivity of Woodland Avenue will not be impacted by the construction of the proposed project. Therefore, based on the information provided, it appears the most direct route to the referenced home on Woodland Avenue should not be impacted by the proposed project.</p> <p>The alternative route for traffic traveling from the north and west to Woodland Avenue to via Quincy Avenue would be to use the new boulevard and East 93rd Street to reach Woodland Avenue. The travel distance for the existing and new routes would be nearly equivalent.</p> <p>See FEIS Section 4. 5 for a more detailed description of the design constraints associated with connecting Quincy Avenue to the proposed Opportunity Corridor boulevard.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|---------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-88 | Olsavsky, John | B-88-1 | General Support | With this new project it would be so exciting to bring life to an old but very venerable neighborhood. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-89 | Ottoson-Deal, Sasha | B-89-1 | Street Closures | I am concerned about the number of streets that will be turned in to dead-ends/cul-de-sacs. This is directly in opposition with the goal of increasing connectivity and transportation options in the neighborhood. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |
| | | B-89-2 | Relocation Process | I am concerned about the number of homes and business that will be demolished. I would like to see a creative solution that allows impacted residents to receive well above and beyond the required minimum compensation. | See the responses to Comment B-19-2 and Comment B-65-2. |
| | | B-89-3 | Environmental Justice | I am concerned about the environmental justice aspect of this project and I do not feel that the proposed mitigation strategies are effective or sufficient. | See the response to Comment B-112-1. |
| | | B-89-4 | Future Development | I do not believe the expected economic benefit to the impacted neighborhoods is realistic. | See the response to Comment B-1-1 and Comment B-10-2. |
| | | B-89-5 | Mitigation Measures | I support enhancements to the entrance into the St. Hyacinth area and the enhancement of bus shelters. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-90 | Pallotta, Ann | B-90-1 | Pedestrian Mobility | I think this road could degrade quality of life in neighborhoods by serving as a major barrier to those on foot and bike. | See the response to Comment B-70-1. |
| | | B-90-2 | Noise | Traffic noise will be added to the area. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-90-3 | Air Quality | Pollution will be added to neighborhoods that already suffer from serious air pollution problems. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|------------------------|--------|---------------------|--|--|
| B-90 | Pallotta, Ann | B-90-4 | Existing Roadways | Please improve the viability of the neighborhoods and spend money to improve existing roadways. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. For a discussion of the project's funding, see the response to Comment B-11-8. |
| B-91 | Pascal, Tarra | B-91-1 | Street Closures | I do not support the opportunity corridor. I would have a hard time getting to the hospital with my health conditions. | Based on the information provided, none of the proposed improvements or changes to existing roads would occur in the area the referenced residence. It is unclear how the proposed project would affect this individual's travel route to the hospital. |
| B-92 | Petraitis, Kestutis A. | B-92-1 | Existing Roadways | Provide funding to resurface existing roadways | See the response to Comment B-2-2. For a discussion of the project's funding, see the response to Comment B-11-8. |
| | | B-92-2 | Bicycles | Add additional funds for cycling. | <p>The Opportunity Corridor project has a stated goal of improving infrastructure for pedestrians and bicycles. To accomplish that objective, the project will include a 10-foot pedestrian/bike path on the south side of the roadway which will improve the City's bikeway network. It would also improve connections between existing bikeways located at East 55th Street, East 79th Street, Quincy Avenue, and Chester Avenue, as well as the Euclid Avenue Corridor bike lanes. The project will also improve bicycle movements that are currently blocked by the Kingsbury Run Valley and the Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) Cleveland Main Line.</p> <p>The bicycle features of the preferred alternative will be fully funded as part of the project's construction. For additional details of how the proposed project will affect bicyclists, see FEIS Section 4. 4.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2, "How would bicycles and pedestrians be affected?" on pages 4-19 through 4-22, and the Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-92-3 | Transit | Provide additional funds for public transportation. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-92-4 | Mitigation Measures | What is the length of time for funding the mitigation measures? | The funding for mitigation measures will be available until the particular initiative is complete (i.e. construction of the pedestrian bridges) or the funding commitment has been met (i.e. on-the-job training). A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-----------------|--------|--------------------|--|---|
| B-93 | Pleasant, Joyce | B-93-1 | General Opposition | I do not agree that putting a highway through designated areas would be positive for the community and do not support the need for relocations. | See the responses to Comment B-10-1 and Comment B-143-1. |
| B-94 | Rajki, Stephen | B-94-1 | Other | Looking at the profiles and the cross sections of these roadways, most of it hasn't been developed yet completely. I have concerns that the entire roadway will need to be elevated. | <p>The DEIS and FEIS summarize the major design features of the preferred alternative and its potential impacts. The information is based on the preliminary engineering design. As the project moves toward final design and construction, the engineering design will be refined even more</p> <p>Based on the preliminary engineering completed to date, much of the Opportunity Corridor will be built at the same elevations as the existing street network and access will be provided at signalized intersections. The project will include these bridges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East 55th Street over the proposed boulevard; • Pedestrian/bike bridge over the proposed boulevard at East 59th Street; • Proposed boulevard over the Kingsbury Run Valley (two bridges); • Proposed boulevard over the GCRTA Blue and Green lines (two bridges); • Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) Cleveland Mainline over the proposed boulevard (two bridges); Pedestrian/bike bridge over the NS Nickel Plate/GCRTA Red Line at East 89th Street; and • Proposed boulevard over the NS Nickel Plate/GCRTA Red Line. <p>A description of the preferred alternative is included in FEIS Section 3.5.</p> |
| B-95 | Range, Tamika | B-95-1 | Alternatives | I don't see projects like this impact areas where people have larger incomes. | <p>Locating the project in another area will not meet the basic purpose, which is to improve the roadway network within a historically underserved, economically depressed area (the "Forgotten Triangle") in the City of Cleveland.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-10-1.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-95 | Range, Tamika | B-95-2 | Public Involvement | This project should have been on the news to let people know about it. | The public hearing for the Opportunity Corridor project was advertised in the <i>Cleveland Plain Dealer</i> and the <i>Cleveland Call and Post</i> . Hearing invitations were sent to the project mailing list. Furthermore, several organizations such as the local CDC's distributed the hearing advertisements to their constituents. Lastly, aspects of the project were reported in several print and television outlets in the weeks leading up to the public hearing. |
| | | B-95-3 | Public Involvement | I hope that you can all take the feedback from all the people that are in this community, from the youngest to the oldest. | See the response to Comment B-19-3. |
| | | B-95-4 | Bicycles | I want my son to have the opportunity to be able to ride his bike back and forth to school. If you go through Beachwood and Shaker right now, they have bike paths that they put down. Are we creating an environment like that? | See the response to Comment B-92-2. |
| B-96 | Render III, R. L. | B-96-1 | Relocation Process | I am greatly concerned about how persons who must be relocated will be processed. Money but be provided to fairly compensate these families, seniors and business owners. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-96-2 | Future Development | Aspects of this project have promoted the economic development potential for the entire corridor, yet there has not been one developer who has signed up to locate in the area. | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| | | B-96-3 | Public Involvement | Listen to the voice of those who have brought forth good ideas that should be incorporated or integrated into your overall plan. If you listen and get the buy-in from the community, this becomes a win-win situation for everyone | See the response to Comment B-19-3. FEIS Section 3. 4 includes a summary of the minor updates that have been incorporated into the design of preferred alternative in response to comments received since the DEIS was published. |
| B-97 | Ridgeway, Jan | B-97-1 | Workforce Development | We understand the need to create a transportation corridor that would bring people in for jobs, but we need to also have those jobs. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| B-98 | Russ, Adam | B-98-1 | Existing Roadways | Personally, I find the entire project to be a waste of money, as streets like Carnegie could be updated first to alleviate any perceived traffic issues. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-98-2 | Mitigation Measures | I endorse the urban agriculture and St. Hyacinth measures. | This comment has been noted in the project record. See the response to Comment B-58-8. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| | | B-98-3 | Context Sensitive Solutions | Other aesthetic considerations should be done as a matter of course. | See the response to Comment B-1-2. |
| B-99 | Russell, Rosetta | B-99-1 | Transit | I don't approve of this construction plan because it would hurt the communities transportation needs that a lot of people in the communities depends on, including GCRTA rapid transit. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-99-2 | Street Closures | A lot of dead ends are to be added that can be harmful at night. | Many of the proposed cul-de-sacs would occur immediately adjacent to the proposed boulevard. To enhance safety, the proposed boulevard will include lighting for the roadway, as well as the sidewalk and multipurpose biking/walking path. In most areas, sidewalks will also be extended to the new roadway to maintain pedestrian connections. |
| | | B-99-3 | Existing Roadways | If anything we don't want this work done just our streets smoothed out and not so uneven. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| B-100 | Sadock, Juliana | B-100-1 | Relocation Process | Dislocating 64 or 76 households is no small thing. | See the response to Comment B-65-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|---------|-------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|
| B-100 | Sadock, Juliana | B-100-2 | Alternatives | For traffic coming from the southwest into University Circle, taking to it the heart of University Circle doesn't make sense, on its face. If anything, the western border of the Hough neighborhoods, the western area of the Clinic should be the destination for those cars. | <p>The project will begin at I-490-East 55th Street in the west and end at Chester Avenue/East 105th Street in the east. These roads are logical endpoints for goods, employees, patients, students, residents and tourists who travel in the area. After reaching I-490/I-77/East 55th Street, people can drive to I-77, I-71 and I-90 and connect to western and southern suburbs, or the Cleveland Hopkins International Airport. When people reach East 105th Street/Chester Avenue, they can go on to the University Circle area or other eastern suburbs.</p> <p>The beginning and end points of the project have been agreed upon by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). They provide an area that is just the right size to meet the project purpose and need. See FEIS Chapter 2.</p> <p>(See also DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-100-3 | Transit | I would suggest that more transit orientation needs to be made. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-100-4 | Street Closures | The project, with the cul-de-sacs, will make getting north and south more difficult especially for the people that live south of University Circle. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |
| | | B-101 | Savino, Juliana | B-101-1 | Existing Roadways |
| B-101-2 | Transit | It would be better to build decent park/shuttle options on the western reach of University Circle/Hough/Fairfax, say around E 79th and Cedar Avenue. | | See the response to Comment B-2-3. | |
| B-101-3 | Noise | The fact that noise barriers are even a consideration shows this project is about commuters and very little about the neighborhood. | | See the response to Comment B-9-5. | |
| B-101-4 | Urban Agriculture | Glad to see urban agriculture mentioned. This whole area should be considered a food enterprise zone and be planned accordingly. | | See the response to Comment B-58-8. | |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|---|---|
| B-101 | Savino, Juliana | B-101-6 | Street Closures | The proposed route decreases the number of north-south routes for residents on each side of the boulevard. Cleveland does not lack for east-west routes and can ill afford to lose north-south streets. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |
| B-102 | Schaerfl, Mr. | B-102-1 | Traffic Operations | What kind of a traffic, scientific traffic management system are you going to have so that I don't have to stop at every one of those 13 traffic lights? | During final design and after construction of the project, the signals along the Opportunity Corridor roadway will be coordinated to minimize delays to the traveling public. |
| B-103 | Schiavoni, Dale | B-103-1 | General Support | I support the preferred alternative. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-104 | Schmitt, Angie | B-104-1 | Other | ODOT has set the design speed of the road at 40 mph, and admits the real speed will be 45 miles per hour. | The design speed for the Opportunity Corridor is 40 mph, and the posted speed limit along the boulevard will be 35 mph. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| B-104 | Schmitt, Angie | B-104-2 | Roadway Width | Design elements that will discourage multi-modal use of the "Opportunity Corridor" include: Wide intersections with large turning 'radii'. No mid-block crosswalks. 12- and 13-foot lane widths, designed for highway speeds. No pedestrian refuges in the center median. A sidewalk confined to the north side of the road. Instead of on-road bike lanes, a suburban-style bike path | <p>The preferred alternative would only include a sidewalk on the north side of the road. However, a walking/biking path would be included on the south side.</p> <p>Following the publication of the DEIS, the following updates were made to the preferred alternative: the width of thru-lanes was reduced from 12-foot to 11-foot effective width; the width of turn lanes was reduced from 11-foot to 10-foot effective width; the third eastbound lane between Woodland Avenue and East 93rd Street and also at Cedar Avenue was eliminated; a curbed median was added along East 105th Street between Quincy and Cedar avenues to facilitate pedestrian crossings; and medians, where present, will be used as pedestrian refuges where possible.</p> <p>These updates would generally reduce the width of the Opportunity Corridor boulevard and would allow pedestrians to cross shorter distances in less time. The medians, in particular, would provide pedestrians a safe place to pause while crossing traffic traveling in different directions.</p> <p>The project team also evaluated each block along the proposed boulevard to determine if midblock crossings should be included to help pedestrians more easily move through the area. Based on the results of these analyses, no midblock crossings were included as part of the project.</p> <p>Following the public hearing, the project team coordinated with the City of Cleveland and the local Community Development Corporations (CDC's) regarding providing on-road bike lanes instead of a multipurpose path for bicycle traffic. The City and the CDC's stated a clear preference for the multipurpose path as it was perceived as a safer alternative to on-road bike lanes.</p> <p>Following the public hearing, the project team evaluated if it would be possible to reduce curb return radii to reduce the size of the intersection areas. After further coordination with City of Cleveland and other stakeholders, it was decided to retain larger curb return radii. This would allow trucks and busses to safely turn corners within the roadway area rather than hopping the curbs or blocking opposing movements. It was determined that the safety benefits of this design outweighed the benefits of reduced intersection areas. See FEIS Section 4. 4.</p> |
| | | B-104-3 | Street Closures | Ten neighborhood streets will become dead ends at Opportunity Corridor, including Quincy Avenue, which is a bus route that serves public housing | <p>See the response to Comment B-18-1 for a discussion of the Quincy Avenue closure.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-20-4 for a general discussion related to street closures.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------|---------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-104 | Schmitt, Angie | B-104-4 | Noise | Sound walls are being considered to separate the road from the neighborhood | See the response to Comment B-45-1. |
| | | B-104-5 | Traffic Operations | A barrier at E. 55th Street blocks entry and egress to the Red Line Rapid Station (but a very expensive on-ramp will be built to help motorists coming north on E. 55th from Slavic Village) | <p>The preferred alternative would maintain access to East 55th Street via a quadrant roadway – a new two-way street that will be built south of the new boulevard and near East 59th Street. It will have traffic lights at both East 55th Street and the boulevard, and it will allow cars to access both roadways.</p> <p>Traffic analyses conducted for the project have shown that the intersections for the quadrant roadway will operate at acceptable levels in the design year (see the response to Comment B-69-2).</p> <p>The quadrant roadway was added based on the community’s desire to keep full access to and from East 55th Street. It will also help make accessing the East 55th Street transit station safer and easier for pedestrians.</p> <p>Finally, the preferred alternative will include a bike/pedestrian bridge at East 59th Street to maintain non-vehicular access to the transit station from the St. Hyacinth neighborhood. Pedestrian and vehicular access to the GCRTA transit station will be provided off of East 55th Street.</p> <p>(See DEIS Figure 3-2, page 3-3.)</p> |
| | | B-104-6 | Traffic Operations | The study does not consider “induced demand,” additional vehicles miles that will result from this tremendous investment undertaken for the convenience of drivers. | See the response to Comment B-69-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------|---------|---------------------|---|---|
| B-104 | Schmitt, Angie | B-104-6 | Mitigation Measures | The inclusion of a “voluntary relocation program” as a “mitigating factor” will further weaken the existing neighborhoods. | <p>Residents would have to meet specific criteria to be eligible for the voluntary relocation assistance program (VRAP).</p> <p>These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proximity to the project - residential uses with direct access to the boulevard, as well as those located within the intersection influence areas (within areas occupied by turn lanes); and 2. Project-induced isolation – locations where the project would create a single remaining (isolated) residential land use on a block or in a general area. <p>Generally speaking, areas with multiple remaining residential land uses in proximity to one another were determined to not qualify for the VRAP program.</p> <p>Fifteen residences within the project area were determined to be eligible for the VRAP. The decision to relocate would be voluntary, and the residents would be afforded the same benefits as those directly impacted by the project. Due to the nature of the program and its eligibility criteria, further impacts to community cohesion are not anticipated. The VRAP is discussed in Section 4.7 of the FEIS.</p> <p>(See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Environmental Justice (EJ) Mitigation Residential Voluntary Relocation Assistance Program (VRAP) Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2013), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-104-7 | Air Quality | This project will worsen localized air quality in very vulnerable neighborhoods with very severe health disparities. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-104-8 | Alternatives | A more prudent investment might be a more ‘market based’ strategy that involves lots of new housing in University Circle to reduce the demand for an urban highway. | <p>The funds allocated to this project can be utilized for transportation projects only. Funding for local developments must be secured from other sources. See the response to Comment B-11-8.</p> <p>See also the responses to Comment B-10-6 Comment and B-10-9 for information regarding the alternatives development.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------|----------|--------------------|---|--|
| B-104 | Schmitt, Angie | B-104-9 | Existing Roadways | University Circle and ODOT could invest a small portion of the funds on improvements to the existing roadway network between. Instead of one road, multiple existing roads in University Circle such as Stokes, MLK, Cedar and Chester Avenue could get long-needed improvements. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-104-10 | Future Development | Opportunity Corridor is premised on an economic development study that Greater Cleveland Partnership paid Allegro Realty Advisors to produce. | <p>While other entities - including the Greater Cleveland Partnership and the City of Cleveland - have completed independent planning efforts for future economic growth, the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project's purpose and need was not borne out of those planning studies.</p> <p>ODOT began studying the Opportunity Corridor during the Cleveland Innerbelt study, which began in 2000. One of the major concerns that was raised as part of the initial public involvement for the Cleveland Innerbelt study was that there is no convenient access to University Circle from I-71, I-90, or I-77. Due to the findings and conclusions of the Cleveland Innerbelt study, ODOT began studying the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor as a separate project in late 2004.</p> <p>Creating the transportation infrastructure to support planned economic development was added to the project's purpose and need at that time. See FEIS Section 3. 3 for a detailed history of the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project.</p> |
| | | B-104-11 | Alternatives | An alternative to Opportunity Corridor would be to infuse University Circle with a massive infrastructure investment with the purpose of attracting mixed-use development that builds on the vacant areas around campus and the Euclid Corridor. | <p>Infrastructure improvements in University Circle would not support the project purpose and need of improving access and mobility within the Forgotten Triangle area and supporting redevelopment.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------|----------|---------------------|--|---|
| B-104 | Schmitt, Angie | B-104-12 | Relocation Process | Opportunity Corridor will use eminent domain to seize the homes of impoverished families, and offer them 'fair market value' in return. Current appraised values for the homes that will be demolished are around \$6,000. How will 'fair market' translate to 'making whole' the little old lady who has lived here for decades so that she bears the loss, the pain of displacement and the expense of moving and finding a decent home? | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-105 | Schmitt, Angie | B-105-1 | Transit | The City of Cleveland should not invest so much money in a project that's for single occupancy vehicles. Many other cities are focused on transit. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-105-2 | Pedestrian Mobility | The project should focus on walk-ability. The intersections on the boulevard have wide-turn radii. They have no pedestrian features, and they're potentially dangerous for residents that are vulnerable. | See the response to B-69-4c. |
| B-106 | Schnell, Julia | B-106-1 | Existing Roadways | We need to focus our roadway construction and renovation efforts on repairing the infrastructure we already have. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-106-2 | Pedestrian Mobility | We need to focus our roadway construction and renovation efforts on making our streets more accessible for pedestrians. | See the responses to Comment B-3-1 and B-69-4c. |
| | | B-106-3 | Bicycles | We need to focus our roadway construction and renovation efforts on making our streets more accessible for cyclists. | See the response to Comment B-16-4. |
| | | B-106-4 | Mitigation Measures | The mitigation measures are all nice, but they could be established in other ways without the construction of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-80-3. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|---------------------|---|--|
| B-107 | Seikel, Oliver | B-107-1 | Bicycles | Will there be a bike/walk lane? If so, how wide will it be? | The preferred alternative for the Opportunity Corridor project will include a 10-foot walking/biking path on the south side of the roadway, and a 6-foot sidewalk on the north side. Along East 105th Street, the sidewalk will be on the west side, and the walking/biking path will be on the east side. North of Euclid Avenue, the project will have sidewalks on both sides, as the walking/biking path will end at the Euclid Avenue bike lanes (see FEIS Section 3.5). |
| | | B-107-2 | Bicycles | Will there be a bike/walk lane E105th? Will this connect with MLK/HD? | The preferred alternative for the Opportunity Corridor project will include a 10-foot walking/biking path on the south side of the roadway, and a 6-foot sidewalk on the north side (see DEIS pages 3-7 and 4-19). The 10-foot walking/biking path on East 105th Street will extend between Quincy Avenue and Chester Avenue. The proposed walking/biking path would be indirectly connected to Martin Luther King Jr. Drive through existing east/west bike and pedestrian facilities. |
| | | B-107-3 | Other | What are speed limits? | The posted speed limit along the Opportunity Corridor will be 35 mph. |
| | | B-107-4 | Traffic Operations | Will traffic signals be coordinated? | See the response to Comment B-102-1. |
| | | B-107-5 | Traffic Operations | Will this increase traffic burden on MLK? | The traffic analyses for the Opportunity Corridor project did not include Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, as it is located outside of the study area. However, based on the traffic patterns analyzed, the Opportunity Corridor would help the existing roadway network to better handle traffic volumes. For example, when the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor is built, traffic on several neighboring roadways and intersections - such as MLK Drive - is expected to shift to the new boulevard. With less traffic, these other roadways and intersections will operate better. (See FEIS Appendix C for certified traffic plates.) |
| | | B-107-6 | Alternatives | Will it eventually be extended to I-90 to relieve MLK burden? | There are no current plans to extend the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project to I-90. |
| | | B-107-7 | Traffic Operations | Left turn for south bound E. 55th St. traffic will be a road block during peak use. | See the response to Comment B-69-2. |
| | | B-107-8 | Mitigation Measures | Why are the noise barriers so ugly? | See the response to Comment B-67-2. |
| | | B-107-9 | Transit | What will be the impact on use of RTA rapid transit? | The Opportunity Corridor project will not impact GCRTA rapid transit routes such as the GCRTA Red Line. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|------------------|----------|------------------------|---|---|
| B-107 | Seikel, Oliver | B-107-10 | Alternatives | I agree that traffic should be brought to the periphery not to the center of University Circle. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| | | B-107-11 | Pedestrian Mobility | Has adequate consideration been given to pedestrian crossings of the boulevard? | See the response to Comment B-3-1. |
| B-108 | Seikel, Meredith | B-108-1 | Mitigation Measures | This project should increase high speed internet access availability to aid in economic development. | The infrastructure for high speed internet access is currently available in the project area. As a result, it was not considered as a mitigation measure for this project. |
| B-109 | Sickora, Mr. | B-109-1 | Noise | They did not take into account the noise pollution it will create. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-109-2 | Transit | It's going to also affect my access to the RTA station that we just had moved over to the east side of the East 55th Street bridge so we can get access to it. | The proposed project will construct a bike/pedestrian bridge at East 59th Street. This bridge will maintain a similar level of access to the GCRTA rapid transit station at East 55th Street for residents of the St. Hyacinth neighborhood. The proposed project will reconfigure the parking lot at the East 55th Street transit station, but access will be maintained off of East 55th Street. |
| | | B-109-3 | Traffic Operations | I don't think it's a good thing. It's going to just create more traffic headaches. | See the response to Comment B-69-2. |
| | | B-109-4 | Future Development | I don't believe it's going to create enough economic development in our area to warrant such a building of a road. I believe the money can be better used in other places in other aspects of the city. | See the response to Comment B-1-1, Comment B-11-8, and B-70-2. |
| B-110 | Sickora, James | B-110-1 | Maintenance of Traffic | The proposed detouring within the I-490/I-77 interchange will create a real hardship for my family. | Traffic along I-490 between East 55th Street and I-77 would be closed during construction. Traffic would be detoured to East 55th Street using the I-77 Interchange at Woodland Avenue/East 30th Street for about 12 to 18 months. The total detour length is approximately 1.5 miles. Given the temporary duration and short length of the detour, no substantial hardships to the traveling public are expected. (See DEIS "What would be done to keep traffic and people moving during construction?" on page 4-40 and Figure 4-35 on page 4-40.) |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------|---------|------------------------|--|--|
| B-110 | Sickora, James | B-110-2 | Traffic Operations | The Francis Avenue loop (quadrant roadway) would create a traffic nightmare for truckers looking to get to the Bessemer Avenue extension from I-490/I-77. | The preferred alternative would maintain access to East 55th Street via a quadrant roadway – a new two-way street that will be built south of the new boulevard and near East 59th Street. It will have traffic lights at both East 55th Street and the boulevard, and it will allow cars to access both roadways. The quadrant roadway will also maintain access between I-490/I-77 and the Bessemer Avenue extension. Traffic analyses conducted for the project have shown that the intersections for the quadrant roadway will operate at acceptable levels in the design year (see the response to Comment B-69-2). (See DEIS Figure 3-2, page 3-3.) |
| | | B-110-3 | Mitigation Measures | Living on E. 61st between Maurice and Bellford, I am not against improvements on those streets. However, there are other streets in the immediate area that need just as much attention, if not more so. | Improvements on Maurice and Bellford avenues are included to help create a new entrance into the St. Hyacinth neighborhood to mitigate the impacts related to closing Francis Avenue. Improvements to other roadways would not be directly related to creating a new entrance for the St. Hyacinth neighborhood and are not included. |
| B-111 | Sickora, James | B-111-1 | Maintenance of Traffic | My mother has to use the I-77/I-490 interchange to get to work. If they reroute that area, that interchange, she has no way of getting there except to go through Broadway Avenue to get onto I-490. That's going to create much more of a headache for her. | See the response to Comment 110-1. |
| | | B-111-2 | Traffic Operations | Truckers use I-490 and I-77 to get to E. 55th to go to Bessemer Avenue. If you cut off that extension, you'll have to loop to 55th from the corridor. It's going to create much more truck headaches than it's worth. | See the response to Comment 110-2. |
| | | B-111-3 | General Opposition | I don't think the project is worth the trouble of spending \$331 million. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|--------------|---------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-112 | Singh, Ashai | B-112-1 | Environmental Justice | <p>ODOT has identified numerous environmental justice concerns. My group does not believe they are fully studied or fully outlined or catalogued and that there are more impacts to neighboring communities than are being outlined.</p> | <p>The DEIS addresses impacts to environmental justice populations on pages 4-27 - 4-31, "How would low income and minority populations be affected?"</p> <p>Despite the benefits expected to result from the project, low-income and minority populations will be affected more than other populations. Because of this, the project was found to have a disproportionately high and adverse effect to low-income and minority populations.</p> <p>Several measures will be implemented and funded as part of the project to mitigate impacts and provide added benefits to the local community. These mitigation measures include building two pedestrian/bike bridges, implementing a voluntary residential relocation assistance program (VRAP), working to provide replacement housing with similar access to public transit, funding a portion of the planned expansion of the Kenneth L. Johnson Recreation Center, helping to create a new entrance into the St. Hyacinth neighborhood, constructing enhanced bus shelters in select locations, and funding on-the-job training.</p> <p>See FEIS Section 4. 7 for a detailed description of these mitigation measures.</p> <p>(See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Environmental Justice Technical Memorandum</i> (April 2013), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-112-2 | Quincy Avenue Closure | <p>To cut off Quincy Avenue would impact number 10 and 11 bus users that serve the Woodhill homeowners. There is no guarantee that transit is going to be left intact, but it's actually impeded under the contract. That's a disproportionate cost being put on people who are trying their hardest to make it and use transit as their primary mode of transportation.</p> | <p>See the response to Comment B-18-1.</p> |
| | | B-112-3 | Workforce Development | <p>There needs to be a community benefits agreement to provide guarantees that there will be workforce inclusions.</p> | <p>ODOT does not anticipate developing any community benefits agreements (CBAs) in conjunction with the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project. However, as a project commitment of the Opportunity Corridor project, ODOT will provide, at a minimum, \$500,000 to be utilized for on-the-job training that will target training opportunities for individuals in the immediate vicinity of the project.</p> <p>See the responses to Comment B-12-2 and Comment B-15-2.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|--------------------|---|---|
| B-112 | Singh, Ashai | B-112-4 | Air Quality | A full study of air quality is needed. You cannot add 10,000 heavy construction equipment and cars without impacting local air quality. | <p>Detailed studies of air quality impacts associated with the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project were completed and documented in the <i>Opportunity Corridor CO Hot-Spot (Microscale) Analysis Report</i> (November 2012) and <i>Opportunity Corridor Qualitative Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) Analysis Report</i> (November 2012) which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.</p> <p>These reports concluded that substantial air quality impacts are not anticipated to result from the project. All project-level air quality analyses and conclusions were coordinated with Ohio EPA, who concurred with the conclusions. The USEPA also concurred that the Opportunity Corridor project was not a project of air quality concern and has met the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act.</p> |
| | | B-112-5 | Future Development | This project is being tallied on the basis of economic development. There needs to be guarantees on the front through benefits agreements that this is a fair deal, we have a full line of benefits for people most impacted. | See the response to Comment B-1-1 and Comment B-18-7. |
| B-113 | Sleasman, Jeffrey | B-113-1 | Alternatives | I'm confused by the rationale: if the idea is to alleviate traffic congestion, actually improving areas like Hough and Fairfax would be a far better solution. | <p>Improvements in Hough and Fairfax would not support the project purpose and need, which is to improve system linkage, improve mobility and support economic development.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-113-2 | Traffic Operations | I highly doubt the project will improve congestion. Plans for making long-distance commutes easier just induce more people to choose living long distances from University Circle. The Opportunity Corridor itself will become just as congested as the current routes. | See the responses to Comment B-69-2 and Comment B-132-4. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-113 | Sleasman, Jeffrey | B-113-3 | Mitigation Measures | Surely the secondary and tertiary elements (such as brownfield cleanup, urban agriculture and job training) can be pursued without creating an oversized urban thoroughfare that disconnects the community. | See the response to Comment B-80-3. |
| B-114 | Sleasman, Jeff | B-114-1 | Mitigation Measures | Some of the ancillary measures are reasonable (brownfield cleanup, park investment), but none require the Opportunity Corridor project, which is harmful for various reasons. | See the response to Comment B-80-3. |
| | | B-114-2 | Traffic Operations | By basically extending I-490 to University Circle, the Opportunity Corridor project actually places an incentive for people to live farther from the Circle and drive more. The Opportunity Corridor will actually induce more traffic over time and not solve congestion problems in the long run. | See the responses to Comment B-69-2 and Comment B-132-4. |
| | | B-114-3 | Future Development | A better option would be to invest funding on the neighborhoods surrounding University Circle to create incentives for more people to be there, rather than travel through. That would actually reduce traffic in the long run. | See the response to Comment B-70-2. |
| | | B-114-4 | Environmental Justice | It cannot be ignored that the people being forced out of their homes are low income and mostly black, while the long-distance commuters benefiting are mostly higher income and mostly white. | See the response to Comment B-112-1. |
| | | B-114-5 | Pedestrian Mobility | A huge boulevard kills pedestrian access. So does the idea of "superblocks" by making neighborhood residents walk blocks and blocks out of their way. | See the response to Comments B-3-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|--------------------|--|---|
| B-114 | Sleasman, Jeff | B-114-6 | Future Development | \$350m (or indeed much less) would create much more value if used more effectively in Buckeye/Shaker, Central, Hough, Kinsman, and Fairfax. There's lots of unused land that can be developed very productively, if it's just given proper infrastructure incentives. | See the response to Comment B-70-2. |
| | | B-114-7 | Future Development | The Opportunity Corridor plan calls for light manufacturing to be moved in--yet we have no companies signed up. How do we know they will? What further tax incentives will we have to give them? How long will they stay? Would they be in Cleveland anyway--if so, why spend tons of money to just move them here instead of elsewhere? | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| B-115 | Smiley, Raymond | B-115-1 | Property Impacts | Yes I live very close to this project and was interested in knowing the direct impact it will have on my current residence. | No address was given. Therefore, a specific response is not possible. Figures 4-10 through 4-19 on pages 4-8 to 4-17 in the DEIS show the preferred alternative and all residential impacts. This information was also available at the public hearing. |
| B-116 | Smith, Dr. Jerome | B-116-1 | Relocation Process | How does the opportunity corridor compensate our organization (Poise Entertainment) (payment) for all of our dollars and the work which has been put into our project? We are business owners on this East 79th property. I would also like to add, our project will impact the community and youth and bring tens of thousands of careers as well as thousands of jobs to the youth and to the community. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-117 | Smith, Jerome | B-117-1 | Relocation Process | How does the Opportunity Corridor compensate our organization (payment) for all of our dollars and work which have been put into Poise Entertainment's Art-Entertainment Educational Center. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-118 | Smith, Gwendolyn | B-118-1 | 89th Street Closure | I go to Rudy's Sunoco on Buckeye at 89th when I come and go and get my gas there. It would be a great inconvenience if it was cut off. | In general, the project will not affect access to Buckeye Road. To access the Sunoco gas station located at the intersection of Buckeye Road and East 89th Street, several alternative north-south routes are available including East 79th Street and 83rd Street. In the worst case scenario, it is estimated that these alternative routes would add approximately 0.1 miles to the travel distance from your home to the Sunoco station. See the response to Comment B-19-1. |
| | | B-118-2 | Quincy Avenue Closure | I take both Quincy and Woodland to my property. I don't feel that closing Quincy is fair to us to make it convenient for others | See the response to Comment B-87-1. |
| | | B-118-3 | Relocation Process | I don't feel that this project is fair to us to make it convenient for others and uproot us and take our businesses like Rudy's and Bruder's. | The preferred alternative would require Bruder's, Inc. to be relocated. However, Rudy's Buckeye Beverage would not require relocation. See the response to Comment B-65-2. |
| B-119 | Smith, Rebecca | B-119-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | Cutting off the 11 bus and creating dead end streets in my community will greatly affect me. It will create more crime in the community and eliminating the bus line will inconvenience those who catch the 11 bus. | See the response to Comment B-18-1 for a discussion of bus routes in the vicinity of Quincy Avenue. See the response to Comment B-50-1 for a discussion related to crime. |
| B-120 | Smith, Eleanor | B-120-1 | Transit | I do not agree with the bus cut off. People depend on the bus for shopping, school, and work. This would have a devastating effect. | The project will only impact five bus stops. The closure of Quincy Avenue would impact approximately four bus stops on GCRTA Bus Route 11 and one bus stop on GCRTA Bus Route 10. GCRTA will modify bus routes as necessary to maintain access for the transit dependent public housing populations located east of Woodhill Road and north of Woodland Avenue. All modifications to existing public transportation services will be made in accordance with GCRTA's Title VI Program. See FEIS Section 4.6 for further information related to impacts to public transportation. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-121 | Smith, Valerie | B-121-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | The Opportunity Corridor will cul-de-sac a major North-South connection at East 105th Street & Quincy. This will cut off RTA bus routes and those traveling by car or foot. | The project will continue to provide the major north-south connection at East 105th Street and Quincy Avenue via Woodland Road, East 93rd Street and the new boulevard. The existing and proposed travel distances will be nearly equivalent. See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-121-2 | Noise | Traffic noise may impact neighborhoods. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-121-3 | Air Quality | Environmental issues such as pollution from the emission of fumes from vehicles coming through the neighborhood will have a negative impact. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| | | B-121-4 | 89th Street Closure | Dead ending and closing of East 89th Street at Woodland will force transit dependent people to walk further to access the #10 RTA bus service. Currently there is no RTA bus service for Woodland Avenue. | See the response to Comment B-18-4. |
| | | B-121-5 | Impacts and Benefits | The true beneficiaries of this \$331 million project are the commuters who don't live in the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-121-6 | Workforce Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding job creation and viable-expedited training programs that will assist residents in obtaining jobs at the onset of construction of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-121-7 | Future Development | There need to be some guarantees or concessions by ODOT regarding business development and enhancements for economic growth for all of the neighborhoods impacted. | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| | | B-121-8 | Workforce Development | Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project's implementation. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|---------------------|--|---|
| B-121 | Smith, Valerie | B-121-9 | Relocation Process | ODOT must provide fair compensation and relocation funds to owners of properties that are in the direct path of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-122 | Stanley, Walter | B-122-1 | Project Funding | Turn the corridor into a toll road so the residents can reap the benefits of the road. | ODOT has identified several potential sources to pay for the project, including local, state and federal funds, as well as private funding through a public-private partnership. Tolling is not under consideration as a funding source. Tolling an urban boulevard with signalized intersections would not be feasible. (See DEIS "How would the project be funded?" on page 3-10.) |
| B-123 | Staunton, Patrick | B-123-1 | Noise | If this is truly a boulevard, there should be no noise barriers. Noise barriers are for freeways. If noise is an issue, use landscaping to absorb sound. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |
| | | B-123-2 | Pedestrian Mobility | Please keep pedestrian access in mind when making decisions. Have crosswalks at lights, and for the roads that will be turned into cul-de-sacs/dead ends for autos, please keep pedestrian and possibly bike access. | See the response to Comment B-70-1. |
| | | B-123-3 | General Support | I love this project, if it is executed as it is sold. Reignite the industrial areas, and strengthen the residential ones. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-124 | Stocking, Chris | B-124-1 | Transit | I worked at the VA and that's a lot of concern, especially Veterans who use public transportation to get off there in the red line as well as the blue and green line down on Woodhill. So I'm not sure how those bus lines are going to work. | The Opportunity Corridor project will not impact GCRTA rapid transit routes such as the GCRTA Red Line and the Blue Green Line. See the response to Comment B-51-2 for a discussion of bus routes that provide access to the VA facility. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| B-124 | Stocking, Chris | B-124-2 | Relocation Process | Instead of eminent domain to obtain these houses, there has been a housing crash. A lot of these houses aren't worth a lot, but they've paid a lot on their mortgage. You should spend some extra money and give these people fair money for their property, not just what the market asked, but \$100,000 for moving, for finding a new house, because some of these new houses' market value is only worth \$6,000. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-124-3 | Quincy Avenue Closure | If the project goes through, the number 10 and 11 buses will no longer be able to run. It would be a dead-end at Quincy and Woodhill. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------------|---------|---------------------|---|--|
| B-124 | Stocking, Chris | B-124-4 | Mitigation Measures | Brownfields were industrial lands that have chemicals. They're not good land to build on. It wouldn't cost that much to clean up the land, another 10 million or more at an already 331 million project. Why not do that and at least clean up the land so people can use it? | <p>Polluted soil and groundwater from current and former land uses will be studied through Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs), which will be completed during final design. The results of those ESAs and any requirements for material handling and disposal and worker protection will be included in the design plans for the project.</p> <p>ODOT will address polluted soil and groundwater only for the properties needed to build the project. This may not include the entire parcel. Other funding sources would be required to complete remediation of residual parcels or properties not impacted by the project.</p> <p>As part of a separate project, the City of Cleveland received a grant from EPA to develop a plan to assess, clean up, and reuse existing brownfield sites in the study area. This grant is part of a partnership between the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), USDOT and EPA. This partnership, called the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, helps communities meet their housing, transportation and environmental goals.</p> <p>The City's plan for brownfields redevelopment is being coordinated closely with the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project. This coordination would continue during final design. Specific details of this coordination will be determined during final design of the project.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How would land from industrial properties be addressed?" on pages 4-37 and 4-38. See also the <i>Environmental Site Assessment Screening</i> (November 2009) and the <i>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Opportunity Corridor Project Area</i> (April 2011) which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-124-5 | Future Development | I would like to know how the proponents of this project plan will make it so that it will not be taken over by fast food and Dollar Stores. | See the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| B-125 | Stocking, Christopher | B-125-1 | Relocation Process | Houses obtained under eminent domain will receive 'market value,' which is very little in some areas. Why not negotiate with residents for a fair and agreeable price. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-125-2 | Mitigation Measures | Clean up the land, most are brownfields and need a few million to make it usable. | See the response to Comment B-124-4. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-125 | Stocking, Christopher | B-125-3 | Transit | Many households do not own a car, how does this project directly benefit public transit users? | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-125-4 | Quincy Avenue Closure | Veterans use the #10 bus to get to the VA, how will this work when Quincy is a dead end? | Access to the VA facility will be maintained. See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-125-5 | Street Closures | The project may actually disadvantage those who don't own a car by creating dead end roads. | See the response to Comment B-70-1. |
| | | B-125-6 | Existing Roadways | Why not evaluate cheaper alternatives such as widening E. 55 and Woodland Ave? | <p>A range of alternatives was studied during the project's development, including improving existing streets – such as East 55th Street and Woodland Avenue – as well new roadways both north and south of the Norfolk Southern (NS)/Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (GCRTA) rail trench.</p> <p>The alternative that widened East 55th Street and Woodland Avenue was removed from further study because the transportation benefits it would provide were not enough to justify the relatively high impacts to community facilities, cemeteries and churches. See FEIS Section 3. 3 for a detailed summary of the alternatives development, including how the public was involved in the decision-making process.</p> <p>(See DEIS "What other alternatives were studied but are no longer being considered" on pages 3-4 through 3-7. See also the <i>Cleveland Innerbelt Strategic Plan</i> (July 2004), the <i>Opportunity Corridor Draft Strategic Plan</i> (September 2006), and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Conceptual Alternatives Study</i> (October 2010) which are on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| B-126 | Stocking, Mr. | B-126-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | I just wondered about the intersection at Quincy and Woodhill. Right now the plan is, it's proposed to be a dead end, but that's a pretty major intersection, and there's two RTA lines that use that main road, the number 10 and the number 11 buses. A lot of veterans use public transportation to get to their appointments at the VA. How they will get there if that intersection is closed? | Access to the VA facility will be maintained. See the response to Comment B-18-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|--------------------|---------|------------------------|--|---|
| B-126 | Stocking, Mr. | B-126-2 | Relocation Process | A lot of these people have been paying mortgages into their houses for 30 years back when they were worth a lot more money than they are today, and so giving them the market value of today doesn't seem fair because they paid into the house for 30 years. Some of these houses are only worth \$6,000, and so if we were giving the person \$6,000 for the house, what do we expect them to do when they already paid off their house that you're taking away from them? | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-126-3 | Mitigation Measures | A lot of the land that they are proposing is brownfield land that needs to be cleaned up, and it would only cost, you know, a few more million dollars to do that work properly. | See the response to Comment B-124-4. |
| | | B-126-4 | Transit | The project should also be addressing those people in the neighborhoods that don't own cars and that rely on public transportation. The 10 and 11 bus routes will be cut off. Also, the East 55th rapid and the blue and green train service would be walled up, and there will actually need to be a pedestrian bridge just where anyone can walk up from all directions. | The preferred alternative will not impact GCRTA rapid transit routes such as the GCRTA Red Line or the Blue Green Line. Although pedestrian/bike bridges are included to maintain existing access, the travel distances for these users will be nearly equivalent to those that currently exist. See the response to Comment B-51-2 for a discussion of Bus Routes #10 and #11. See the response to Comment B-2-3 for a general discussion of the project's effects to public transportation. |
| B-127 | Talley, Michael | B-127-1 | Street Closures | I will be forced to detour from 93rd and Woodland. | The intersection of E. 93rd Street and Woodland Avenue would remain open as part of the project (see DEIS Figure 3-6 on page 3-8). |
| | | B-127-2 | Relocation Process | It's unfair to relocate my friends and family, and not paying them enough to sell out. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-128 | Taylor, Lester | B-128-1 | Relocation Process | I was offered \$8,000 for my building which I believe is worth far greater than this amount. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. As of the date of this comment, ODOT had not made any offers on any of the land to be acquired for the project. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|--------------------|--|--|
| B-128 | Taylor, Lester | B-128-2 | General Opposition | In my opinion this corridor is only a gateway for people to use to get through the neighborhoods which they will not stop in and shop. It creates barriers for the existing stakeholders and greater access for commuters. | <p>The Opportunity Corridor will not serve as an obstacle in the area. Rather, the Opportunity Corridor will meet the project's purpose and need of improving system linkage and mobility within the area between I-77 and University Circle. It will achieve this by providing an east-west arterial street between I-77 and University Circle that connects to the existing transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed boulevard would provide a way for multi-modal traffic to cross man-made and natural features that currently serve as barriers to mobility, including the Kingsbury Run Valley, the GCRTA Blue/Green rapid transit line, and the NS Cleveland Mainline.</p> <p>The project's purpose and need also states includes providing a transportation system that supports planned economic development. The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will meet the project's purpose and need by creating the infrastructure to support planned revival and redevelopment in and around the "Forgotten Triangle," which is bordered by Kinsman Road, Woodland Avenue and Woodhill Road. However, several other things need to happen for the City to realize its future land use and economic vision.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-1-1.</p> <p>(See DEIS Chapter 2, "How will the preferred alternative meet the project purpose and need?" on page 3-9 and "How could the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project influence the future of the area?" on page 4-41. See also the Opportunity Corridor Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment Technical Memorandum (July 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| B-129 | Taylor, Lynne | B-129-1 | General Support | I really want this to happen I think it would be wonderful for the University Circle area where I live. I know people that wouldn't move to this area because it is so hard to get to the interstates. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-130 | Todese, Abdusemih | B-130-1 | Existing Roadways | How can we talk about building a whole project that costs a million dollars, but we have these roads in these areas that have been abandoned for many years. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------------|---------|----------------------|---|---|
| B-130 | Todese, Abdusemih | B-130-2 | Impacts and Benefits | There is no way in the world you can have this kind of money being spent in this neighborhood and the residents and those being impacted most to not benefit at the very last part of the process. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| B-131 | Toomer, Winston | B-131-1 | Relocation Process | Will I still be able to receive my 4. 5-percent rate if forced to move and my rate was fixed for entirety of mortgage . If my property is marked for removal for project, when do I start looking for a new home and how long do I have to wait for the funding to relocate my family? Being in today's market most property owners have paid more for their property than its value, how will ODOT restore my living conditions? Does ODOT provide realtor help in placement or some good referral that works with this situation? | <p>The purchase of private property and cost of moving residents, businesses and churches to build the project would be regulated by state and federal laws, including the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act). These laws provide for the fair and equal treatment of all persons affected by the project. Under the provisions of the Uniform Act, ODOT will make Increased Interest Payments to any residential owner-occupant who loses their existing favorable financing rate due to displacement by our project. This program will be used by ODOT on a case-by-case basis to assure that relocations would not be a financial hardship to the affected owners and tenants. Information on the relocation process was provided in handouts and in the presentation at the public hearing for the DEIS.</p> <p>ODOT will begin the process of buying property needed for the project in 2014, although some properties will be bought as late as 2015. For necessary relocations, ODOT will follow the requirements of the Uniform Act as well as other standard ODOT policies and procedures. In general, the relocation process will include the following:</p> <p>ODOT will determine the fair market value of the property, which is the amount of money a property will bring if offered for sale on the open market. This usually takes 3 to 6 months.</p> <p>ODOT will present a written offer based on the fair market value. This takes about 1 month. · The impacted party will be able to negotiate a final settlement with ODOT. This can take 1 to 3 months.</p> <p>There will be a “closing” phase in which ODOT will formally buy the property and file all the paperwork. This usually takes up to 2 months.</p> <p>The impacted party will find a new place to buy or rent. This can take 3 to 12 months.</p> <p>ODOT can provide advice on the moving process during this time. See also the responses to Comments B-18-9 and B-19-2. The relocation process is described in detail in Section 4. 3 of the FEIS.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------|----------|--------------------|---|--|
| B-132 | Turnbull, Kessa | B-132-1a | Roadway Width | Although this project is described as a 35mph boulevard, the wider lanes , sound walls, straight-aways , emphasis on commuters to University Circle, and exits designed for warehouses that we are hoping will get built in the forgotten triangle sounds a lot more like a thoroughfare. | See the response to Comment B-9-4. |
| | | B-132-1b | Noise | Although this project is described as a 35mph boulevard, the wider lanes, sound walls , straight-aways, emphasis on commuters to University Circle, and exits designed for warehouses that we are hoping will get built in the forgotten triangle sounds a lot more like a thoroughfare. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |
| | | B-132-1c | Traffic Operations | Although this project is described as a 35mph boulevard, the wider lanes, sound walls, straight-aways, emphasis on commuters to University Circle , and exits designed for warehouses that we are hoping will get built in the forgotten triangle sounds a lot more like a thoroughfare. | See the response to Comment B-81-4. |
| | | B-132-1d | Future Development | Although this project is described as a 35mph boulevard, the wider lanes, sound walls, straight-aways, emphasis on commuters to University Circle, and exits designed for warehouses that we are hoping will get built in the forgotten triangle sounds a lot more like a thoroughfare. | The preferred alternative for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project involves building an urban boulevard with traffic lights at intersections from the I-490-East 55th Street intersection to the East 105th Street-Chester Avenue intersection. Traffic will access surrounding development via standard, signalized intersections. Freeway-style entrances and exits are not an element of the project's design. See also the response to Comment B-1-1. |
| | | B-132-2 | Existing Roadways | We would be better off building more vertical streets and repaving the surrounding ones. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|---|--|
| B-132 | Turnbull, Kessa | B-132-3 | Transit | This does not look like a transit-focused development, it looks like a completely typical street. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-132-4 | Future Development | Not only will the project not bring jobs to the area, but it will make it even easier for more people to live further away from University Circle and get there easier. | <p>The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project will improve system linkage and mobility within the area between I-77 and University Circle. It will achieve this by providing an east-west arterial street between I-77/I-490 and University Circle that connects to the existing transportation infrastructure. Given this, the project is anticipated to make it easier for travelers to get to University Circle easier.</p> <p>It is not possible to predict if improved system linkage and mobility might have the indirect effect of encouraging some people to move further away from University Circle. However, the project could also have the indirect effect of generating economic activity and job opportunities, as well as supporting the infill development needed to strengthen and improve local communities.</p> <p>As a separate project, the City of Cleveland received a grant from EPA to develop a plan to assess, clean up and reuse existing brownfield sites in the area. This grant is part of a partnership between the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), USDOT and EPA. The City's plan for brownfields redevelopment is being coordinated closely with the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project.</p> <p>Also, the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEORS) Green Infrastructure Plan would provide opportunities for reuse of vacant land and economic development. The cumulative effect of these efforts – including the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project - should improve the quality of life and livability of the area.</p> <p>(See DEIS "How could the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project influence the future of the area?" on page 4-41. See also the <i>Opportunity Corridor Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment Technical Memorandum</i> (July 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.)</p> |
| | | B-132-5 | Noise | Noise barriers are not necessary on a properly designed boulevard. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-132 | Turnbull, Kessa | B-132-6 | Mitigation Measures | The mitigation measures (except for enhanced noise barriers) should not be optional inclusions, they should be the main priorities of the development, and the entire thing should be designed to make these mandatory. | See the responses to Comment B-12-2, Comment B-67-2 and Comment B-80-3. |
| B-133 | Wallace, Aaron | B-133-1 | Transit | I rely on buses almost every day. | See the response to Comment B-120-1. |
| B-134 | Weaver, Herman | B-134-1 | General Opposition | I prefer that the project be cancelled in its present form because it interrupts physical, social and business in the community. | This comment has been noted in the project record. |
| B-135 | Wells, Krissie | B-135-1 | Impacts and Benefits | I am against this project, considering that it seems to be planned with only drive-through traffic in mind with little consideration of actual east side Cleveland residents. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-135-2 | Transit | The project has no bus line and reroutes other bus lines. | See the response to Comment B-2-3 for a general discussion of public transportation. See the response to Comment B-51-2 for a discussion of impacted bus routes. |
| B-136 | Wheadon, A. Wendell | B-136-1 | Workforce Development | Make more emphasis on the job training as an integral part of this program. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| B-137 | Whitfield, Anthony R. | B-137-1 | Alternatives | There should be a grass, tree-lined median on E. 105th Street between Cedar Avenue and Quincy Avenue. | The preferred alternative will include a curbed median to replace the two-way left-turn lane along East 105th Street between Quincy Avenue and Cedar Avenue. This design feature was added at the request of project stakeholder to facilitate pedestrian crossings of the roadway. Several other minor updates have been made to the design of the preferred alternative in response to the comments received after the DEIS was published. FEIS Section 3. 4 includes a detailed listing and description of the minor updates. |
| | | B-137-2 | 89th Street Closure | I disagree with termination of through traffic, both north and south, along E. 89th Street. | See the response to Comment B-19-1. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|--|
| B-137 | Whitfield, Anthony R. | B-137-3 | Quincy Avenue Closure | I disagree with termination of through traffic, both east and west, on Quincy Avenue east of E. 105th Street. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| B-138 | Williams, Tiah | B-138-1 | Relocation Process | I know it's not right to uproot the majority to satisfy or to make easy travel for the few. | See the responses to Comment B-65-2 and Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-138-2 | Workforce Development | They say the project will provide jobs. Jobs for who? | See the responses to Comment B-15-2 and Comment B-30-1. Members of the impacted communities would be able to apply for on-the-job training. |
| B-139 | Williams, Pastor John & Min Sandra | B-139-1 | Property Impacts | We see that we are impacted, but not directly? Did you send a letter? What are we to expect, please notify us. Our church Pine Grove Missionary Baptist Church is historical. | The Pine Grove Missionary Baptist Church is located on East 79th Street and would not be relocated by the Opportunity Corridor project nor any of the proposed street closures. Invitations to the public hearing were sent to the project mailing list, which included all known property owners and residents in the project area. |
| | | B-139-2 | Mitigation Measures | Job training assistance is a desired mitigation measure. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-140 | Williams, Carrye W. | B-140-1 | Impacts and Benefits | From what I see and read about the corridor, there is no direct benefit of the residents in the area. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-140-2 | Transit | This project will isolate the community and inconvenience those using public transportation. | See the response to Comment B-2-3 for a discussion of public transportation. See also the response to Comment B-20-4 for a discussion of connectivity and mobility associated with the preferred alternative. |
| | | B-140-3 | Existing Roadways | What about improved housing, and roads? | See the response to Comment B-2-2. Most--if not all--the funding identified to build the Opportunity Corridor cannot be transferred to address the need of improved housing in the study area (see the response to Comment B-11-8). |
| | | B-140-4 | Workforce Development | Provide job training for non-existent and/or low paying jobs. | See the responses to Comment B-15-2 and Comment B-58-4. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|--------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------|--|---|
| B-140 | Williams, Carrye W. | B-140-5 | Mitigation Measures | Mitigation measures are not enough for the disruption the project is causing. | This comment has been noted in the project record. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-141 | Williams, Jean | B-141-1 | Transit | I am a senior citizen and my main mode of transportation is RTA. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| B-141a | Willsey, Samuel | B-141a-1 | Impacts and Benefits | The preferred alternative has little or no interaction with the communities around it. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-141a-2 | Noise | The preferred alternative is considering noise barriers which would be a prohibitively expensive and unnecessary amenity for this "urban highway" or connector. | See the response to Comment B-9-5. |
| | | B-141a-3 | Bicycles | Preferred alternative has no on-street bicycle infrastructure. | See the response to Comment B-72-6. |
| | | B-141a-4 | Transit | The preferred alternative has no transit elements. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-141a-5 | Pedestrian Mobility | There are not enough traffic calming elements to make this pedestrian friendly or even viable as a pathway for pedestrians to get from point to point. | To date, traffic calming elements have not been studied for the Opportunity Corridor Roadway. See the response to Comment B-3-1. |
| B-142 | Wilson, Debra | B-142-1 | Quincy Avenue Closure | The Opportunity Corridor plans to cul-de-sac the intersection of East 105th Street and Quincy Avenue. This will cut off a major thoroughfare for those traveling by foot, car or bike. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-142-2 | Noise | Traffic Noise will impact neighborhoods. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-142-3 | Air Quality | The project will cause environmental issues such as pollution from the emission of fumes from vehicles passing through the neighborhood. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|---------------|---------|-----------------------|--|--|
| B-142 | Wilson, Debra | B-142-4 | 89th Street Closure | Closing or dead ending East 89th is unacceptable for those who depend on public transportation and the businesses that serve the community. This will force transit dependent people to walk further to access the #10 RTA bus service. Currently there is no RTA bus service for Woodland Avenue. | See the response to Comment B-18-4. |
| | | B-142-5 | Impacts and Benefits | The true beneficiaries of this \$331 million project are the commuters who don't live in the neighborhoods most impacted. | See the response to Comment B-10-1. |
| | | B-142-6 | Future Development | The corridor will provide a way for commuters to bypass the neighborhoods providing no economic impact. | See the response to Comment B-81-4. |
| | | B-142-7 | Workforce Development | Expedited job training programs must coincide with the project's implementation. Training should begin as soon as possible seeing that the construction will start sometime early 2014. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| | | B-142-8 | Relocation Process | ODOT must provide fair compensation and relocation funds to owners of properties that re in the direct path of the corridor. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| B-143 | Wilson, Fred | B-143-1 | Impacts and Benefits | How can you justify displacing whole families and taking away businesses for people who have been in this community all their lives, just to accommodate outsiders, to be more convenient for them not to drive through our black neighborhoods? | The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project would cause homes, businesses and a church to be relocated. These impacts are necessary to build a facility that meets the project's purpose and need and all pertinent design criteria. Property impacts and relocations have been avoided and minimized to the greatest extent possible through methods such as shifting the roadway alignment roadway, using retaining walls and reducing lane widths in some areas. See also the Response to B-10-1. |
| | | B-143-2 | Street Closures | How can you justify blocking streets? | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|--------------|---------|-----------------------|--|---|
| B-143 | Wilson, Fred | B-143-3 | 89th Street Closure | The Kuramu house is a black landmark this been there for years and you guys want to stop 89th Street right there. | <p>The preferred alternative would build a traffic signal at Woodland Avenue. If 89th Street is extended to the Opportunity Corridor boulevard, it would create a 5-legged intersection at this location. This would introduce traffic operational and safety concerns. Therefore, East 89th Street would be closed between Woodland and Nevada avenues.</p> <p>To mitigate the impacts of this closure, ODOT would resurface Frederick Avenue and convert East 86th Street to a two-way roadway between Frederick and Woodland avenues. This will allow vehicular access to East 89th Street to be maintained via Woodland Avenue.</p> <p>Alternative vehicular routes include other parallel routes such as East 79th Street, East 93rd Street and the proposed Opportunity Corridor boulevard. These alternative routes would provide alternative access to destinations such as Karamu House without a substantial increase in drive time or distance. See FEIS Section 4. 5 for additional information on changes to existing roads and access points.</p> |
| | | B-143-4 | Mitigation Measures | Mitigation measures should include helping to build my boxing gym. | Mitigation measures were generally selected to provide broad benefits to the impacted communities as a whole. A complete list of mitigation measures for the project is included in Table A of the Record of Decision (ROD). |
| B-144 | Wilson, Elle | B-144-1 | Street Closures | Careful consideration should be given to streets ODOT has proposed to close that affect residents' ability to access public thoroughfares and transportation. | See the responses to Comment B-2-3 and Comment B-20-4. |
| | | B-144-2 | Workforce Development | Create sustainable jobs for residents and viable business opportunities for established businesses. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| B-145 | Wilson, Fred | B-145-1 | Impacts and Benefits | How can you justify displacing whole families and taking away businesses for people who have been in this community all their lives, just to accommodate outsiders, to be more convenient for them not to drive through our black neighborhoods? | See the response to Comment B-143-1. |
| | | B-145-2 | Street Closures | How can you justify blocking streets? | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------------------|----------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| B-145 | Wilson, Fred | B-145-3 | 89th Street Closure | The Kuramu house is a black landmark this been there for years and you guys want to stop 89th Street right there. | See the response to Comment B-143-3. |
| B-146 | Various Petitions | B-146-1 | Transit | Maintain and improve transit service for transit-dependent people. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-146-2 | Street Closures | Do not cut off public access to streets that serve as ingress and egress points for commuters and community residents. | See the response to Comment B-20-4. |
| | | B-146-3 | Existing Roadways | Maintain/improve local roads and comply with ODOT's "Fix it First" policy. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-146-4 | Relocation Process | Provide fair compensation to property owners when purchasing their homes or businesses and for the task of relocation (especially for renters, seniors and the disabled). | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |
| | | B-146-5 | Workforce Development | Provide a significant proportion of jobs and fast-track job training opportunities that includes pre-apprenticeships and apprenticeships for communities impacted. | See the response to Comment B-15-2. |
| B-147 | Environmental Health Watch | B-147-1a | Relocation Process | The proposed mitigation measures fall short. Negative impacts to local residents include home seizure , increased noise and significant impacts to local air quality in an area of high asthma rates. | See the response to Comment B-19-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------|---|--|
| B-147 | Environmental Health Watch | B-147-1b | Noise | The proposed mitigation measure fall short. Negative impacts to local residents include home seizure, increased noise and significant impacts to local air quality in an area of high asthma rates. | See the response to Comment B-18-2. |
| | | B-147-1c | Air Quality | The proposed mitigation measure fall short. Negative impacts to local residents include home seizure, increased noise and significant impacts to local air quality in an area of high asthma rates. | See the response to Comment B-18-3. |
| B-147 | Environmental Health Watch | B-147-2 | Air Quality | <p>A particulate pollution hotspot study was not done as part of the EIS. The EIS documentation states: "Design year (2020) traffic ranges from the 48,230 average daily traffic (ADT) at the western terminus to 14,640 ADT at the northern terminus. The diesel truck percentage at the west end of the project would be 6.5%, while at the northern terminus the percentage would be 4.5%. Based on these percentages, diesel truck volumes would range from 3,135 per day at the west end to 659 per day at the north end. These volumes, ADT and truck, are below ODOT's PM2.5 conformity Process Flow chart criteria of 87,500 ADT and 7,000 diesel trucks.</p> <p>Based upon a review of the project, the FHWA, USEPA, ODOT, and Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) have determined that the proposed Opportunity Project improvement project, PID 77333, "is not a project of air quality concern" under 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1).2.</p> <p>(continued)</p> | <p>USEPA determined that the Opportunity Corridor project was not a project of air quality concern and that no PM 2.5 hot spot analysis was required in October 2010. The determination was based on the traffic projections available at the time.</p> <p>In 2011, the traffic projections for the project were updated to include traffic associated with future development. As a result, the project team updated the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency's (NOACA's) Travel Demand Model (TDM) to incorporate planned development anticipated to occur independent of the proposed boulevard and complementary development anticipated to occur in conjunction with the proposed boulevard.</p> <p>After the TDM was updated, the resulting traffic assignments were post-processed to develop traffic plates for the design year Build and No Build scenarios. The traffic plates were certified by ODOT's Office of Technical Services on April 11, 2012. (See the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012, revised June 2012) and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Certified Traffic Plates</i> (June 2012.))</p> <p>The traffic volumes utilized in the <i>Opportunity Corridor CO Hot-Spot (Microscale) Analysis Report</i> (November 2012) reflected the revised traffic volumes, which were lower than those projected in the October 2010 coordination with USEPA. Furthermore, a PM 2.5 hot spot analysis is required if the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) is greater than or equal to 125,000 vehicles per day AND the diesel truck volume is greater than or equal to 10,000 trucks per day (which is eight-percent of 125,000).</p> <p>(continued)</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| B-147 | Environmental Health Watch | B-147-2 | Air Quality | <p>(continued)</p> <p>Therefore, a hot-spot analysis was not required since the Clean Air Act and 40 CFR 9. 116 requirements were met without a hot-spot analysis. " However, the correspondence [with USEPA dated 09/27/2010] provided has different numbers.</p> <p>The diesel truck percentage in the design year is stated as 11% and the diesel truck volume at 7,050, which is over the stated standard for doing a hotspot study. Since the Brownfields Area Wide Plan calls for build out of the warehousing facilities at year 2039, it is unclear why 2020 was selected as the design year. It is unclear whether the truck numbers include those from the expected economic development which has been attributed to the corridor.</p> | <p>(continued)</p> <p>Because the recent traffic projections were lower than those coordinated with USEPA and did not meet the thresholds required for a hot spot analysis, the determination that the project is not a project of air quality concern remains valid.</p> <p>According to the <i>Opportunity Corridor Operational Analysis Technical Memorandum</i> (May 2012, revised June 2012), The anticipated Opening Year of the project is 2020, therefore, traffic assignments were generated for 2020 and 2040. Because anticipated development was estimated for ten year periods, traffic assignments were also generated for 2030.</p> <p>To determine the most appropriate design year, the volumes were analyzed to establish which year will require the largest roadway footprint to provide acceptable traffic operations. To do so, the AM and PM peak traffic volumes at each intersection were compared using the following measures: 1. Total volume by approach 2. The magnitude of conflicting movements Although the variation between 2020, 2030 and 2040 was no more than one-percent (1%), each comparison showed 2020 as the year with the highest volumes and most conflicting movements. Therefore, 2020 was designated as both the Opening Year and Design Year for the purposes of the traffic analysis.</p> |
| | | B-147-3 | Indirect and Cumulative Effects | <p>While the proposed economic development is cited as a benefit of the corridor in the EIS, impacts from the economic development, including additional environmental pollution and displacement of residents, are not included in the EIS.</p> | <p>The indirect and cumulative effects of the project from future land use change are addressed in the DEIS "How could the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project influence the future of the area?" on pages 4-41 through 4-33. More detailed information is provided in the <i>Opportunity Corridor Indirect and Cumulative Effects Assessment (ICEA) Technical Memorandum</i> (July 2012), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS. The ICEA addressed impacts to air quality, water quality and a number of other resources. The ICEA also addressed impacts to communities, including relocations.</p> |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-147 | Environmental Health Watch | B-147-4 | Other | The EIS did not study the impacts of the corridor on climate change. The corridor is likely to result in increased greenhouse gases due to sprawl and disinvestment in the core city. | <p>Unlike criteria air pollutants, no national regulatory thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions or concentrations have been established through law or regulation. Greenhouse gases are quantitatively and qualitatively different from other motor vehicle emissions, and their magnitude and breadth appear to require a different approach to address their potential climate impacts.</p> <p>First, hydrocarbon (HC) and other criteria pollutant emissions are of concern, and thus regulated, in individual metropolitan or smaller areas. The climate impacts of CO2 emissions, on the other hand, are global in nature. From a NEPA perspective, it is analytically problematic to conduct a project level cumulative effects analysis of greenhouse gas emissions on a global-scale problem.</p> <p>Secondly, criteria pollutant emissions last in the atmosphere for perhaps months; CO2 emissions remain in the atmosphere far longer - over 100 years - and therefore require a much more sustained, intergenerational effort.</p> <p>Finally, due to the interactions between elements of the transportation system as a whole, project-level emissions analyses would be less informative than ones conducted at regional, state, or national levels.</p> <p>Because of these concerns, CO2 emissions cannot be usefully evaluated in the same way as other vehicle emissions. The NEPA process is meant to concentrate on the analyses of issues that can be truly meaningful to the consideration of project alternatives, rather than simply "amassing" data. In the absence of a regional or national framework for considering the implications of a project-level greenhouse gas analysis, such an analysis would not inform project decision-making, while adding administrative burden.</p> |
| | | B-147-5 | Stormwater Management | ODOT should coordinate and finalize their plans with the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEOSRD) then present them to the public. | See the response to Comment B-3-2. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|----------------------------|---------|---------------------|---|---|
| B-147 | Environmental Health Watch | B-147-6 | Transit | Forty-percent of the household projects do not have cars and rely on public transportation or bicycling. Public transportation components were added as goals for the project, but only as evaluation factors, not for transportation needs. No GCRTA bus service is currently planned along the route, although it may be in the future. No funding is being provided to GCRTA for needed renovations to the E. 79th Street Station, which is in danger of being closed. Community transportation needs should be elevated to the same importance as the transportation needs of suburban commuters and future industrial development. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. |
| | | B-147-7 | Pedestrian Mobility | The project as designed will serve as an obstacle to pedestrians. | See the response to Comment B-70-1. |
| | | B-147-8 | Future Development | The project could encourage sprawl and disinvestment in the inner city. | See the response to Comment B-132-4. |
| B-148 | Sierra Club | B-148-1 | Existing Roadways | Instead of using its own 'fix-it first' approach to system improvements, ODOT has planned for \$330 million in new road capacity. | See the response to Comment B-2-2. |
| | | B-148-2 | Transit | The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately study the overall impacts to the local transit-dependent population, or the 40% of the households without automobile access. Impacts to Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority bus routes such as the #10 and 11 go unmentioned. | See the response to Comment B-2-3 for a discussion of public transportation. See also the response to Comment B-51-2 for a discussion of Bus Routes #10 and #11. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------|---------|-----------------------|---|---|
| B-148 | Sierra Club | B-148-3 | Quincy Avenue Closure | The 10 and 11 would face reroutes due to closure of Quincy. These bus routes serve residents in low-income housing at Woodhill Estates. Cutting off key access for low-income drivers and Eastside drivers is unacceptable. Plans must be reworked to keep Quincy open to Woodhill, and make up for any service lost for residents. | See the response to Comment B-18-1. |
| | | B-148-4 | Transit | The GCRTA station at East 79th requires upgrades to be in compliance with the ADA. Local funding is inadequate to cover this \$16 million upgrade. ODOT is able and responsible to keep this station open. TRAC funds may be spent on public transportation within non-attainment areas, and between ODOT's 'fix-it first' policy, reasons of transit-oriented development, and compensating the community for environmental justice offenses, this transit station must remain open. Workers and residents must be able to reach East 79th's Red Line station. | See the response to Comment B-2-3. GCRTA is currently studying the viability of the E. 79th Red Line station to determine if it will be upgraded, relocated or closed. A final decision regarding this station will be made by the end of 2014. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------|---------|--------------------|--|---|
| B-148 | Sierra Club | B-148-5 | Public Involvement | Given that most residents are still unaware of the project, it is worthwhile to extend public comment period as well as hold new public meetings to reopen discussion of the Woodland Alternative. | <p>Three alternates for the Central Section of the Opportunity Corridor, which includes Woodland Avenue, were presented to the public in October 2010. Based on the public input, two alternates were carried for further study. One alternate would create a series of turns along Woodland Avenue to continue travel in an east-west direction. This would result in a gap along Woodland Avenue, called the discontinuity of Woodland Avenue. The other alternative would maintain Woodland Avenue as a continuous roadway with no gaps.</p> <p>The alternative that included the discontinuity of Woodland Avenue was eliminated from further study because a continuous Woodland Avenue would better meet the project's purpose and need. Woodland Avenue is an east-west main route that connects to areas within and next to the project study area. It is an important part of improving traffic flow and connections among roadways, and it also directly links neighborhoods southeast of the Central Business District, including several located right next to University Circle. In addition, the City of Cleveland, the Buckeye Area Development Corporation, and the majority of the general public preferred to keep Woodland Avenue as a continuous roadway.</p> <p>The inclusion of a continuous Woodland Avenue was presented to the public as part of the recommended preferred alternative in July 2011 and at the public hearing on the DEIS in October 2013. Very few comments have expressed opposition to a continuous Woodland Avenue.</p> <p>See also the response to Comment B-10-9.</p> <p>See FEIS Section 3. 3 for a detailed summary of the alternatives development, including how the public was involved in the decision-making process.</p> |
| | | B-148-6 | Traffic Operations | With Woodland, Quincy, and Cedar in a state of good repair and providing full service, the Opportunity Corridor should not be more than 4 lanes, and should be more pedestrian friendly in its designs (for example, at East 105th). | See the responses to Comment and B-69-2 and Comment B-69-4c. |

Public Comment Summary and Responses

| ID | NAME | NO. | TOPIC | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|-------|-------------|---------|----------------------|--|---|
| B-148 | Sierra Club | B-148-7 | Impacts and Benefits | At such a high cost, the road requires more justification in the DEIS, but never even provides figures for travel time saved for commuters compared to the status quo. This basic justification must be in the EIS. | Reductions in travel time are not an element of the project's purpose and need, which is to improve system linkage, improve mobility and support economic development. (See DEIS Chapter 2 and the <i>Opportunity Corridor Purpose and Need Statement</i> (May 2011), which is on the CD included with the DEIS and incorporated by reference into both the DEIS and the FEIS.) |
| | | B-148-8 | Other | Impacts on climate change-causing emissions must be included within the final EIS. | See the response to Comment B-147-4. |
| | | B-148-9 | Other | Auto-dependent transportation limits active transportation and recommended daily exercise through walking or cycling, and induces increased rates of asthma (due to pollution), obesity, diabetes, and heart disease. Impacts on local health must be included within the final EIS. | Project-level analyses of health issues such as asthma, obesity, diabetes and heart disease would be less informative than ones conducted at regional, state, or national levels. Because of these concerns, local health issues cannot be usefully evaluated in the same way as other community resources. In the absence of a regional or national framework for considering the potential project-level implications to local health, such an analysis would not inform project decision-making. |

(this page left intentionally blank)