



**Advisory Committee Meeting at NOACA
February 1, 2007**

Agenda

1. Meeting called to order at 9:23 a.m. – Craig Hebebrand (ODOT District 12)
2. Bridge selection/design/aesthetic enhancements – Skip Smallridge (CSS)
3. Traffic Modeling – Paul Dorothy (B&N)



**The following were in attendance
February 1, 2007, Advisory Committee Meeting at NOACA**

Mahmoud Al-lozi - NOACA
Paul Alsenas – Cuyahoga County Planning Commission
David Beach – EcoCity Cleveland
William Beckenbaugh - Quadrangle
Sherry Botner
Robert Brown – City of Cleveland - Planning
Millie Caraballo – Cleveland Industrial Retention Initiative
Mark Carpenter - ODOT
Neil Chase – B&N
Joseph Cimperman – Cleveland City Council, Ward 13
Ronald Eckner - NOACA
Scott Frantz – City of Cleveland - Planning
Sheri Fointno – Greater Cleveland Partnership
Bob Gardin - BCCA
Cory Grayburn – URS
Ed Hauser - Citizen
James Haviland - Quadrangle
Craig Hebebrand - ODOT
Lora Hummer - ODOT
Claire Kilbane – Cuyahoga County Planning Commission
Dave Lastovka - ODOT
Howard Maier - NOACA
Valarie McCall – City of Cleveland
Susan Miller - Citizen
John Motl – ODOT
Brian Newbacher – Ohio Motorist Association
Michael Schipper - GCRTA
Skip Smallridge - CSS
Tom Starinsky – Historic Warehouse/Historic Gateway
Lester Stumpe – Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District
Timothy Tramble – Burten Bell Carr
JoMarie Wasick – City of Cleveland
Ned Whelan – Whelan Communications
Tom Yablonski – Historic Warehouse/Historic Gateway



Summary

Craig Hebebrand began the PowerPoint presentation – Questions made during the presentation follow

Bob Brown: With regards to the E 55th Street Bridge over the Shorway, ODOT did give us in the community a chance to enhance the visual image –we’re working with ODOT on a design that will put the word Cleveland on the bridge as you approach from the skyline east. We shared this with community groups and will share with groups before that part of the contract gets let.

Craig Hebebrand: Unfortunately, this took longer than we like, so we forwarded the latest concept to FHWA yesterday, but there will be a change order to install that. Wish we had graphics of that, but waiting for FHWA for approval.

Question: What kind of inflation rate do you use? What percentage do you use for 15 years?

Craig Hebebrand: Look at our website; we track commodities, sales, asphalt, etc. We saw a surge in inflation in the last few years. Oil prices moderate a little. Rate of inflation flattening out. The compound rate is basically 100% for the final year of the project. The first couple years we used slighting higher – but now 4% annually.

Question: Starting in about 5 years, we’re having major construction at the same time with E 55. When will we talk about maintenance of traffic and maintenance of access?

Craig Hebebrand: We’ve looked at that in concept up to now, which is part of the reason we’ve done phasing that way. We will stagger them, to do phase construction. We have a concept but this will be detailed out in detail as construction design contract are underway.

Lester Stumpe: We’re aware of a memo of understanding, but there is this list of issues that came out of that work of this group, after Step 4, that people said, “okay we agree this process should go forward and we want you guys to keep us informed.” We raised that at the last meeting a year ago and you said yes, we should. You said you would put something on the web – I looked last night and there is nothing on that. Did I miss it? Where is that list of issues?

Craig Hebebrand: This question leads into my next slide. Let me say this first, an urban design initiative will get underway. Skip will do a presentation but we will conduct that in similar format as bridge aesthetics treatments. We have two technical reports coming out. The Access Modification Study (AMS) and is going through iterations and the City has a draft and ODOT has draft. We'll be going through another iteration and ultimately it is going to FHWA in Washington. That's a detailed traffic analysis. That really is the technical document. It is not widely distributed. If Midtown and the Quadrangle want copies, we can provide them. They're large binders with 4 - 6" notebooks of technical data but we can make that available.

Lester Stumpe: When the scoping committee was still in existence, there were hundreds of issues identified as concerned to the scoping committee. I do not think it is okay to say you will give us these stacks of documents. Someone needs to say we identified and this is how it's handled.

Craig Hebebrand: The first technical report, the AMS is very technical. As I indicated, because the 2 CDC's have expressed interest in the technical analysis I would give copies to them. The other study due out in the spring is the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will ultimately include analysis of that. The DEIS will be widely distributed. We would reconvene this committee and walk through, rather than hand the document, in presentation format our responses to all issues raised and tracked.

Lester Stumpe: If issues are listed out and you state what the ODOT stance is on that. What if there are still two opposite ends of the spectrum?

Craig Hebebrand: Ultimately in 2008, FHWA will have to determine if we adequately addressed concerns raised, not if we answered each, but took an appropriate course of action.

Bob Brown: There will be a vote by city council, etc., other organizations which will vote to approve or not, or with conditions and then there is the question of what all that means. Where the final authority is and those issues will be addressed.

Question: We were asking for some kind of schedule. When you had the meeting on January 19th (with Cleveland City Planning Commission) did you present the list of the 100 issues, and will we get a schedule on how they'll review these? All those things ripe for public input to the council.

Bob Brown: Commission members were given informational binders and were able to ask questions of ODOT. There were questions and answers and not full agreement. We left the commission meeting, but there were issues where they did not agree. A formal vote does not come until the end of the process. The Planning Commission will decide which issues they want to be advocates for. Each one has its own set of issues and questions. Each group has to function that way. This group needs to give input to ODOT and the Planning Commission too. Each one needs to be informed of their issues.

Joe Cimperman: We welcome and invite those issues: Planning and City Council share equal or more concerns than you and Paul Alsenas pointed out. There is disagreement about this. One thing I think is we have change in Columbus. What does the Governor think...there were more questions left unanswered that the Planning Commission had. I am not guessing what the votes would be. We would welcome a joint meeting – we're going to talk about aesthetics and haven't gotten a basic skeleton yet

Craig Hebebrand: Thank you. Draft environmental statement will walk you through the findings and will make copies available and available for public review. A public hearing will be held in summer and other meeting with the Planning Commission and City Council will be scheduled. ODOT will, in the fall, take those comments and make changes to documentation and submit to FHWA and look for a recommendation from FHWA some time in early 2008.

Craig Hebebrand: Much like we did with the bridge, we will convene a subcommittee to discuss the Urban Design of the project. We went out of sequence to do the bridge type selection this early in the project; however it was apparent from a community standpoint that the look and feel of this bridge was important. Moving forward, when we get into implementing all of this as you enter and exit neighborhoods, has been raised as being very important. Skip will walk you through how to look at these areas. First, in general and secondly focusing on specific areas as we go forward. ODOT's TRAC construction funding commitment includes 2% for use in enhanced aesthetics. Total TRAC: \$668 million - 2% of TRAC: \$13 million – above and beyond typical enhancements, bridge decks and roadways, providing color and texture to bridges. This is above and beyond ODOT's commitment for a signature bridge. Some things it could be used for – gateway treatments as you enter and exit neighborhoods, business districts. For example the Quigley Road roundabout when finished this summer will have a lot of landscaping and higher end aesthetics. (Some paid by the private sector.) Roundabout becomes the southern gateway into Tremont.

Skip Smallridge began a presentation on the upcoming Aesthetics investigations

Craig Hebebrand: Thank you Skip. Again we wanted him to lay out the process. Process continues after this initial work by Skip's group as the individual section designers continue.

Craig Hebebrand: This graphic is one we used 14 months ago as a common graphic. It showed the level of detail available at the time. Cartoonish perhaps. Blue for interstate, etc. It showed basic connections but did not show anything as far as level of detail. Current drawings look like this, but we'll zoom in on these because these drawings do include considerable details. These are not final or preliminary drawings, but early design drawings. First set of real engineering drawings will come from section designers at a future date. ...Craig (Hebebrand) describing what is on the map.

Second map: Access to/from SR 2 WB to south marginal – Craig (Hebebrand) continues to describe

Lakefront interchange: Craig (Hebebrand) further describes.

Question: Explain why the roadway has to go through that facility [mounted police], what's changing to make that happen?

Craig Hebebrand: explaining... In order to flatten this curve (Innerbelt Curve), we shift the entire interchange to east and required the acquisition of the mounted police.

Paul Dorothy discussed signal coordination at Superior Ave.

Paul Dorothy: Essentially, using a strategy modified from what we would use with a diamond style. Phasing where we would store the traffic, because we have short pieces of traffic, coordinated strategy for all signals instead of 4 independent signals at that locations. Storage outside of that 4 signal system and then we move traffic into the system and process. We've looked at this in detailed traffic model as well as in HCS runs required for the interchange justification study and we're seeing acceptable levels of service, D or better. Volume to Capacity ration (V/C) nothing greater than 1.0. We meet that criteria at these locations. Operate only as a system of four.

Craig Hebebrand: Tonight at the public meeting we'll have live video of running traffic. We have a couple snippets for this meeting. Another thing before next slide, was extending 30th street north to Hamilton... Craig (Hebebrand) continues explanation...

Joe Cimperman: Traffic folks at Midtown identified 12 intersections that are failures and you admit 6. Nobody wants failures. What's the amendment to that?

Craig: one is that at this level of engineering and access mod goes hand in hand. And this level of engineering ...

Question: If you're driving this, what notification or signs and where will they be located – a major thing for drivers.

Craig Hebebrand: We don't have detailed placements – Superior Ave around the curve you'll be told it's so far ahead, etc. Likewise in opposite direction, you'll be told what's coming up, etc. So it should be easier because ramps are spaced farther apart and signing will be more in advance. Particularly coming into 22nd and Carnegie sign can be made on the other side of the river. Under this improved system, lane assignments will be more consistent and less change of lanes than today.

Bob Brown: By your analysis, every intersection overall works, but there are 2 movements total that don't work. That compares to Midtowns. And you said you agreed with them that those 12 or so didn't work.

Paul Dorothy: Yes, in the first pass, since we had not done a lot of work with the intersection, we only had a single left turn pocket. Their consultants agreed that improvements could be made and allow them to function at their full capacity.

Jim: Haviland: there were 12 intersections that had problems.

Paul Dorothy: It was individual movements within those movements that were failures.

Craig Hebebrand to Bill Beckenbaugh: We are willing to sit down and walk through when we give you copies. Again you were looking at previous level of detail and now we have more refined. We can walk you through the analysis.

Bob Brown: City's traffic engineer, 2 traffic engineers, have been doing just that. If Midtown's consultants and city traffic engineers could meet together.

Craig Hebebrand: I agree

Jim Haviland: Our consultants said they can be fixed. Remaining concern is that improvements to East 30th street need to be made. Our question is how will you make those improvements? East 30th and Woodland is another identified problem. I would welcome that meeting, looking at nuances together and walk away with a better understanding.

Craig Hebebrand: There will be time over the summer to review and deal with issues. Then we'll make any necessary corrections. We will facilitate those meeting.

Joe Cimperman: Make sure notice is proper! Over communication and a 2 week notice would be appreciated!

Craig Hebebrand: We'll work with Jamie Baker to reach out to people that chose to attend.

Question: Step 5 report statement: the upgrade of the city street system into major thoroughfares

Craig Hebebrand: Context was that the concept was priority corridor which redesigned city street grid. Very extensive redesign. Direction we received was we don't want you to come in and rebuild the city street grid. It was looking at very aggressive changes.

Bob Brown: We all agree that concerning the city street grid, where this project failed is where it needs to be adjusted.

Craig Hebebrand: Original concept was optimizing street grid.

Question: There is some process, not a complete redesign, but some process.

Bob Brown: Our concerns relate to the loss of Carnegie...can you explain how traffic from the south on the city street grid will come into this intersection or coming on or off. It's the diversion of traffic from Prospect and Carnegie to here.

Paul Dorothy: The problem with the existing condition is a weave right here between Chester and Prospect fails. In addition to that, south Prospect and I-77 and Carnegie curve itself is failing. In existing condition those 3 mainline failures all pile up quickly and create a backup in pm peak. When backup occurs it backs traffic up and begins to break down these intersections with traffic and work their way onto the city street grid. With the mainline freeway operating at level service D, what we see is the arterial is free to operate and operation of that is based on operation of individual intersections. Closely spaced signals that are tied to each other. We have the ability to access Chester from multiple locations now. Under current condition...Applied Industrial Technologies employee's for example... We get full use of street grid because nothing is shutting down.

Bob Brown: East 30th at Chester during the PM peak, the Southbound right turn will be at a level of service that is unacceptable.

Paul Dorothy: The critical element here is when the light turns green; all vehicles will not be able to turn.

Bob Brown: What is the approximate of delay time? Two light cycles, or what percentage will sit and wait? How bad is the failure?

Paul Dorothy: I have project delay for this movement and I can get you that.

Craig Hebebrand: Our interpretation is that it isn't ever enough to justify two additional property acquisitions. Some cars will have to wait for a second cycle, but drivers can use another north south street, and they have a lot of options and will not be forced to stay in that queue. Too minor of a problem to take two buildings there.

Bob Brown: Do you know what current traffic flow situation with that movement. How much of a difference is it.

Paul Dorothy: If we did nothing, it's a critical failure today. As far as East 30th street is concerned. Can't capture how bad the delay is. The current delay is so bad that people disregard the signal and don't keep the intersection clear.

Bob Brown: If you at some future point can get us level of service projections for all 12 movements for East 30th and Chester today and for the proposed work to see what the change is.

Craig Hebebrand: If you analyze the intersections today it's not a signal coordination problem, it's the interstate fails. If you resolve the interstate issue in the Carnegie Curve,

then traffic now attempting to come to East 30th now has a much better chance to get to the Interstate.

Craig Hebebrand: When we deliver AMS, we can go through the whole list of intersections one by one and walk through how they'll operate with updated information to make sure you're comfortable with our analysis.

Paul Dorothy - Continues presentation:

Joe Cimperman: If suddenly the Juvenile Court building were to go away, what would happen to this simulation of traffic? If it disappeared, how would it affect us?

Craig Hebebrand: The question would be 1) to build a secondary ramp passing underneath 22nd street coming up near Cedar and Carnegie. In which case we would have to find a different solution for Cedar. It means somebody exiting under our proposal would make a left on East 22nd and right on Carnegie. Person in other scenario would go underneath East 22nd and exit directly onto Carnegie. Travel distance is almost the same with either scenario. The ramp underneath East 22nd would allow you to miss 2 red lights. Two red lights aren't sufficient reasons to remove that building.

Bob Brown: What if County Commissions made a decision on their own to demo the building...

Craig Hebebrand: You can't keep the ramp open as it is today because it is one of the problems.

Paul Dorothy: FHWA still takes a look at it and it must be considered a part of the change as though it was there.

Bob Brown: If the building were somehow not there, legally, it is physically possible to bring a ramp to Carnegie. Physically, it is possible to make that link between the interstate and Carnegie if the Juvenile Court wasn't there, apart from 106 issues.

Craig Hebebrand: If it isn't there, you can exit at East 22nd and Carnegie but you could have a frontage road along south side of East 22nd and Central, to Carnegie and frontage road. Going through one additional red light, and figure how to connect Central and Cedar in that system. Is that savings in one red light worth it?

Joe Cimperman: If you look at it, engineering wise – the answer is no. Economically wise – yes. If there is a sense that the ramp would be possible...where would you feel comfortable asking FHWA for exemptions? When will ODOT come to us and go with us to ask FHWA for exemptions?

Craig Hebebrand: As long as that building is standing, we will not take that building. Alternatives exist that are very convenient.

Jim Haviland: This conversation is important that Carnegie access is an issue critical to the community. Issue of Juvenile Court being removed to provide access to Carnegie remains important. We will need for it to be considered. There will be some discussion if it makes a difference and whether East 22nd Street is adequate. Expanded to include University Circle. It needs to be addressed. East 30th and Chester – there is a master plan for expansion of ASIA town that will increase activity on Payne and St. Clair and will put more demand on East 30th than exists today. This needs to be more than an engineering consideration on this. Significant economic development mode for Cleveland's signature China Town. We need to talk about...

Bob Brown: I agree they're critical, but don't see anything we've discuss that affects failure on southbound East 30th.

Jim Haviland: If you go back to issues in our meetings, you are putting significant demand on Chester.

Bob Brown: From what we saw here, Chester is flowing much better than today. It's subject to debate, but it shows any movements will be better than what it is now.

Question: Follow up with what you're taking about Craig – is there the ability to move the main lanes under East 22nd 30 or 40 feet.

Craig Hebebrand: It's the Walker Weeks building, no. It's snaked between the Juvenile Justice Center and Walker Weeks.

Paul Dorothy: We end up already having to reconstruct half the retaining wall at the Juvenile Justice Center. Any movement hits the building.

Craig Hebebrand: We'll sit down and go over in detail with latest refinements. And will have Skip (Smallridge) look at gateway treatments.

Question: When you look at the central interchange and you have the ramp to 22nd and Central, if there were a way for a lane of that to get under 22nd Street bridge, you could tie into Carnegie.

Paul Dorothy: It takes out the retaining wall and building

Bob Brown: As long as you take out one of the two buildings, it would work

Question: I would just say that maybe part of that needs to look at how I-77 comes in. If there is a way to tighten all this stuff up. I think that might need extra effort – for what Midtown and Council are looking for. Other comments I have is, when I was involved in scoping committee, last time I was here, I have a design concept...there's only one little piece of frontage road and all rest is glorified ramps. Whole street network grid stuff, works better than traditional braided ramps. I have a hard time looking at all the turn movements introduced because of discontinued roads, and all this green space, particular

north way. I have a hard time with design concept about what it does to street network grid.

Craig Hebebrand: It was continuous from St. Clair to Carnegie. Two things happened early, stakeholders at north end didn't want to get off at Carnegie and others not at St. Clair. Couldn't handle both St. Clair and Route 2 – too close. We started stepping that back. Ran from Superior south, discussion was we need more redundancy – so we braided ramps... comment received was we liked the character of Payne, don't want additional traffic, pull back the way they were...that was the evolution of frontage road.

Craig Hebebrand: Only difference you have between what was shown 14 months ago was frontage between Payne and Chester was shown Fall of 2005. That's the only revision in the trench that occurred then.

Bob Brown: And this was done because St. Clair/Superior community said we want Payne to remain a local street and not an access street.

Jim Haviland: Making Payne be your northern part – made it worse. This was a change they made based on opposition.

Question: Maybe we still have no Payne options, but connect Chester and Superior and take the load off East 30th. Cars that are here...

Craig Hebebrand: Reminds him this is pm peak – no one is getting off at city streets. In the morning this is full.

Joe Cimperman: Why is Juvenile Justice Center not being removed?

Bob Brown: It's an historic building. Federal regulations don't allow you to remove with federal funds.

Craig Hebebrand: It's eligible and protected. If you attempt to remove it...there isn't enough options to avoid all three.

Joe Cimperman: Juvenile Court building will be vacant. Life of city is what's thriving. Juvenile Court is gone. That this is the constraining item that's most frustrating. We live here and know that, but we say FHWA says this and we can't go for the exemption. This is another attempt to look at this stuff and go away.

Question: I'm a member of the consulting 106 committee. Historical buildings have no significance in this process. Phase 2 study is done. Broadway Mills and gas station, cold storage is eligible for national register. How do you designate one building more significant than the other?

Bob Brown: They're all significant.

Statement: Section 106 process that takes these into account which consider alternatives and that hasn't been done.

Craig Hebebrand: A decision on our part that that resource ...the alternative was worse.

Joe Cimperman: What was alternative, why more critical?

Craig Hebebrand: Goes through a Tremont building.

Joe Cimperman: What buildings does it take in Tremont?

Craig Hebebrand: Depends. Could take out the church, or properties on north side.

Woman identified herself as just a taxpayer: If you look at the southern alternative, we are looking at fixing the old bridge and then replacing. Why would you want to take out Tremont...

Craig Hebebrand: Single 5-lane bridge can fit between two bridges.

Joe Cimperman: Historic process seems to be flawed.

Bob Brown: I'm not convinced...with the whole issue of saving money, lobby state for more funds. Consider not such a significant bridge...if church was an issue, I'm wondering, I hear from architects, that it's not that significant, offers could be made to relocate. Is there a conflict of interest in holding public meetings at that church? I'm not so sure. Too many benefits...My views are that people are too afraid to approach that.

Bob Brown: With my earlier comments, I don't see anything being done in the Innerbelt plan making left movement in PM any worse than now. If it fails in this projection, it fails equally now. (East 9th at Carnegie – southbound left turn)

Gateway District comments: Have you contacted Indians about this? – Response yes

Bob Brown: If the last statement was true, that's what would have to be put to the Indians. But improving intersection.

Question: You tell us we can't plan for the days where there are multiple events. This intersection seems worse when you have multiple events.

Paul Dorothy: Level of service F currently exists, but will be a D.

Question: I've heard Ontario lost an add lane. You've shuffled some things around – and how does that all work?

Craig Hebebrand: FHWA asked us to look at the E 14th, East 9th, and Ontario entrance ramps. FHWA asked us would changing that provide service through there. So that's one

thing we did look at. At this point our preferred alternative does have East 14th street as add lane, East 9th as a merge with adequate acceleration and Ontario as an add lane. FHWA asked us to optimize.

Bob Brown: Have the Indians been informed of that?

Craig Hebebrand: No

Joe Cimperman: What else does FHWA ask you to do? I am officially requesting that we understand. It's not enough to say something has improved.

Question: What happens on multiple event days? It affects perception of people coming downtown.

Craig Hebebrand: We did not model event days. We have made overall improvements.

Bob Brown: No doubt that any change affects Jacobs's Field.

Craig Hebebrand: Those changes aren't final. Until FHWA goes to Washington, it's simply what we originally proposed. Any other questions on modeling?

Joe Cimperman: Plus or minus in terms of accuracy? Is this verifiable?

Bob Brown: It is

Paul Dorothy: We have a process in place called certified traffic.

Bob Brown: Regardless, any project isn't 100% accurate.

Question: What is plus and minus on model?

Paul Dorothy: It's not that simple. How accurate are your models?

Question: 30 or 40 – big and broad.

Paul Dorothy: What I'm trying to explain is that it's just not the traffic model, but 3 things: first is traffic model itself, NOACA model. 2-extensive count program. We have a ground count at every one of the intersection locations where we are studying operation for this project. So we know what's going on at this location today and that's used to help adjust the model in areas where the model is having trouble. 3- That we have skilled analysts who work on and interpret the results. Those analyses occur at many levels. Those coding the work, those QA/QC before out the door, and analysis's both at ODOT's Office of Technical Services in Columbus as well as FHWA Ohio and Washington, who eventually look at what's been done and sign off on it. It's as good as the tools and people we have available. Is it perfect? It never will be!

Question: Those reviewers review it as if it were accurate. Output was analyzed as 100% correct. When we argued the validity of the modeling, we didn't get anywhere with our federal oversight...process is rigid. Only good as people and amount of data you have.

Bob Brown: Answer is technically there is not a range to be specified No projection is perfect and there is a margin of error.

Joe Cimperman: What is the margin of error? If it does become something that tips things to fit and it takes a very slight change in variation to cause the perfect storm. That could be a medical mart downtown, if Indians start to win, or a million things and you're asking us to go with our gut...the system we have which may be perfect Bob, is it level of if we get used to it?

Bob Brown: Better is still better.

Joe Cimperman: Kind of like the city has grown around this system now. Forgive me for not trusting the model all the time and thinking if 50 years from now will it be better than the system.

Response: Probably today the model is fairly accurate. Model in future you could have a wide diversion results based on assumptions for that model. Like trying to forecast inflation. So, it's the same things in these models. My problem is you lug in assumption of continual growth and that may not pan out. What happens if gas goes to \$10 a gallon?

Bob Brown: You are right. There are some guesses.

Craig Hebebrand: NOACA model is consistent for all projects. We apply that to different networks. This model is the best approximation of the city of Cleveland today.

Bob Brown: There could be society changes which may make that wrong.

John Motl: We can only go with what we have today. Every so often NOACA has to readjust their models based on conditions.

Bob Brown: Often we say NOACA models don't have enough cars. Maybe the model shows more traffic than it should.

Craig Hebebrand: From a growth of this region, it's unfortunate that we are not projecting a lot of growth in this region. Our estimates are a little more accurate because of it. We have a consistent region, from an economic standpoint we wish it were growing more robustly. It's a clearer picture.

Joe Cimperman: It's a self-fulfilling prophesy. Versus if we have more opportunities for access and roadwork, you say if the climate changes, we can accommodate it. I see what we are doing here with this proposal is that we believe the growth is the growth. That's

against what I'm sworn in to do, which is growth to the City. I am grateful to this meeting because of this public dialog.

Bob Brown: If you accept the projections ODOT has come up with, it's increasing the capacity to accommodate more growth. Because the congestion on the streets is less in this scenario today. There is some disagreement whether the streets will function properly. This proposal is accommodating more growth.

Craig Hebebrand: When we look at growth in the downtown area, many people are working downtown and are not getting off the highway, they are reverse commuting. From transportation capacity they are using excess capacity that's in the system.

Bob Brown: What we are seeing in recent years is more housing and fewer jobs. That's what we're seeing now and we hope it changes.

Question: Can we see the traffic model for the new bridge with existing bridge and then new bridge and existing bridge.

Craig Hebebrand: We don't have it live here today.

Craig Hebebrand: Come tonight it will be up and running.

Question: You don't have a projection of what the future two bridges will look like?

Craig Hebebrand: We have traffic west bound on the new five lane bridge, and east bound on the existing 5 lane bridge.

Bob Brown: It should be the same, but same number of lanes as existing.

Question: What are traffic interruptions on that?

Craig Hebebrand: Interruptions will only be as you make cut-ins. Short term. Lane by lane.

Jim Haviland: I do want everyone to know the concerns of the community; we need to represent the people using the exits. No one has said they will adjust. There will be a new position statement signed off on by the group...and when you see I've signed off they've... If you survey Cleveland clinic employees, in the modeling when you have a chance to make assumptions on the modeling run. Problem of nuances is there is going to be a usage of the traffic patterns as predicted. People on Carnegie are more concerned than ever and are informed. We need a conversation with the city, ODOT, the new Governor, it's not going away and it's the same old thing you're looking at. There is more sophisticated thinking how it will impact us and opposed thinking. You need to think about some compromise coming down the pike. That's why Juvenile Detention Center is important. We've spoke with Restoration Society which would not necessary oppose. We need to discuss in the next month of two. Nobody believes the modeling.

Craig Hebebrand: We appreciate the scrutiny. Most of what people are making their decisions on is 12 month old information. We want to educate everybody on the most current information available to make an important decision. New administration once on board, will want to be briefed and understand thoroughly as well.

Joe Cimperman: Based on info more than 12 months old. I came to thinking it was the same thing, and unfortunately it's the truth. You haven't budged on ramps and neither have we. And we want Juvenile Justice Center down, but you don't. We are getting to, we want to work with you, but we have 2 pieces of legislation to approve, there wouldn't be one vote for approval. How do we get ODOT and the city and begin to move this thing. It's getting harder now, not easier.

Bob Brown: Consultants hired by the CDC group need to go over the new data with city engineers involved. Stakeholders need to be involved in detailed meetings, not just community meetings. Other thing is Craig, with respect to Juvenile court building and assumed response of FHWA, you can't take it down given reasonable alternative, how formally can it be presented to FHWA and put to them this is an option we want a formal response to. Juvenile court building will be vacated by such a date. The County willing to take building down. FHWA wants to see one alternative and not multiple options, but it would help to formally put to FHWA the facts about the Juvenile court building and here is an alternative and have FHWA with some explanation give an answer.

Craig Hebebrand: I would offer that when new administration, ODOT is on board, that the City makes a request to discuss the decision. I don't anticipate a different solution.

Joe Cimperman: We're going to divorce court. I want a settlement before the judge decides. We have 12 months maybe before we are at a do or die point. Could there be a settlement we agree upon and then take it to the judge.

Bob Brown: Largely the city and county coming up with a consensus proposal. The option exists.

Joe Cimperman: If we haven't been doing enough, we're prepared to energize that conversation.

Craig Hebebrand: I wanted to touch on a few things. The idea of meeting with council and the Planning Commission was to share refinements being made. Existing ramps now have been restored on new design at I-77 south. East 14th and East 18th, currently somewhat a balance how traffic flows, focus on East 14th, with option to East 18th. Working with city traffic and FHWA, we've refined proposal closer to existing. This allows traffic to come in and out of Playhouse Square area... Somewhat a hybrid of what was there.

Craig Hebebrand: East 9th and Ontario. Primary is ramp south bound to Ontario Street to I-90 left shifted to west leg. Craig points to map and narrates...

Question: Triangle, is there any property take in that?

Craig Hebebrand: No

Bob Brown: I can add I don't think this proposal will improve traffic flow on city streets in that area, but ...

Craig Hebebrand: I-71 Southbound at SR 176 Southbound – Deceleration lane: Craig (Hebebrand) says important improvement. I-77 Southbound Broadway to Pershing frontage road...Craig points and elaborates. We propose to reconfigure 490 entrance and bring on and replace Broadway bridge...take existing Broadway entrance to Pershing before entering I-77 SB...Other thing I wanted to show is the bridge alignment. Yellow shows new westbound, etc.

Joe Cimperman: Any vertical issues...Bulk heading needs attention

Craig Hebebrand: Some property we need to purchase. Bulk heading does need to be looked at. We assumed we had to do something.

Joe Cimperman: Was the price included?

Craig Hebebrand: Yes, we assumed we needed to do something.

Craig Hebebrand: Tonight's meeting at the Greek Orthodox Church, March 5th cutoff for public comments. For publication of first draft, that's the date we need them in and address and put into that document. Can comment publicly or go to website, which is most common use, or sending us written comments., We'll meet with you and your consultant Bill and Jim, and welcome comments on that.

Lester Stumpe: Can we talk about water quality? I am concerned about the Step 5 report. TRANSWACC committee asked that specific studies be done on water quality impact. My concern is that it informs the need to do Step 6 and informs the need to do Step 7. Because Step 5 has nothing in it regarding water quality – we may not have done the studies. I'm surprised that Step five hasn't made any comment on that and am wondering what scope is happening in the Step 6 process, that's on-going and will look at specific impacts of this.

Craig Hebebrand: I'll let Dave (Lastovka) respond.

Dave Lastovka: We hope to have a meeting in the next 60 days, and will look at BMP's for the entire corridor.

Lester Stumpe: The difference between BMP's and TRANSWAC is that NOACA looked at specific impacts to water quality to the facility. Out of Step 4 process that they look at that. Point would be Step 5 should be raised for public comment...nothing in document in Step 5 about water impacts or that issue. TRANSWAC letter isn't even on the website

as document or public comment, Issue doesn't come up here.

Dave Lastovka: Our opinion is that run off is typical of urban runoff. BMP's will be installed to address water quality.

Lester Stumpe: My question is are there going to be any specific studies ongoing that will inform what question what is likely impact on water quality?

Dave Lastovka: Nothing project specific. We're going to study what typical roadway BMP's are appropriate for this facility.

Lester Stumpe: I would have thought Step 5 would have made that for possible future Step 6 work.

Dave Lastovka: Best management practices were identified in Step 5

Craig Hebebrand: BMP and devices that will take care to the extent of BMP. ODOT is spending \$1 Million dollars of research on BMP's

Lester Stumpe: Consider this, the region may because of the value of the water front, may have a different standard than may be appropriate. May be a violation of water standards and not simply compliance with BMP's, which is only the first step minimum and doesn't comply with standards. We have tried to raise early for the need for studies to access that. I want to do this early, to keep identifying. ODOT says they'll design BMP's. TRANSWAC says look at water quality impacts. We ask one thing, get responses different. We don't want to be in conflict on this and don't want to come up on conflict on this and have inappropriate data. We can only continue to try to raise this issue.

Question: Off topic: other studies Opportunity Corridor. Where are they and are they moving forward or being on hold?

Bob Brown: I can update you on the Opportunity Corridor. We've had a recent meeting with stakeholders and ODOT and getting re-energized and met last week and agreed on new data. It's alive and well and not funded but there is good progress in the past month on that.

Question: Who are some of the stakeholders on that?

Bob Brown: ODOT, FHWA, Chairs of the committees – Terry Hamilton Brown, Jamie Ireland, Expanded quickly to CDC's, etc.

Craig Hebebrand: Our consultant submitted a purpose and need and we set up a meeting in order to discuss their comments.

Millie Caraballo: Is there info on line?

Craig Hebebrand: Yes. Cuyahoga Valley intermodal study: on hold. In and out of port, we are waiting for port action to complete their study.

Craig Hebebrand: The other Study that spun off was Lakefront and Lakefront west, thru Edgewater. It's much farther along with a committee meeting coming up a week from today. Down to one issue and then go to Planning Commission and then have consensus.

Joe Cimperman: Thanks for that. It was a phenomenal process. It was awesome how it worked out. People feel it will be a lot better.

Ed Hauser: For the record my concerns are as a stakeholder. You don't have to be a CDC. I represent myself as a citizen or taxpayer. I want to express a deep concern, disappointment, frustration in participating in this. This is the process and my overall experience with this. It's getting misinformation - a church will be taken. Removing a certain alternative, a church will not be taken. Information lacking. November 17th stakeholder letter... in the meantime all these decisions are made...bridge alignments...mayor Jackson meeting on Jan 23rd. public records show handwritten letters unauthorized - and ODOT says oh, it's been endorsed. It's not in the scheduled; you can't be doing behind the door decisions like that. It was all based on a power point presentation. Mayor Jackson signs a press release, trench and bridge in stone. Still waiting on public comment. Since I did not get a response to eastbound bridge for over a year, I did calculations myself...at 13% inflation rate, I came up with 1.5 billion dollars added to west bound and existing, that's about 2 billion dollars. We need to know that.

Craig Hebebrand: We showed today 1.2 billion dollars... I showed you that today. In 2023 Remember future other bridge will drop into all the other work we're going to do. It's almost exclusively a bridge project. Building everything from I-90 to Carnegie curve to 71 and 90 and also doing all the work on Carnegie Avenue.... A lot more than a bridge over the river.

Ed Hauser: Historic section 106 process: we're running through this decisions are made, and alignments and we got phase 2 that these are the buildings we find eligible. You have no detailed alternatives to save these buildings. Details on this to complete the section 106 and 4F seems inadequate. These decisions have been made 2 years ago. Cleveland here we are losing landmarks in the Flats and Coast Guards station's in jeopardy, etc., we need to pay specific attention to these buildings. Just a frustrating experience. I 'm not pointing a finger to you, but it's gotten out of control in the last couple years.

Craig Hebebrand: Thank you. Feel free to include any comments for the draft DEIS...