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What is the Eastern Corridor?

- Mega project
- Multiple modes
- Multiple jurisdictions - 19
- Land use planning - home rule state
- Green infrastructure plan
- Advanced mitigation strategy
- Economic and fiscal impact analysis
- Extensive public involvement program
- Alternative financing
- Tiered EIS
Who is the Eastern Corridor?

- The City of Cincinnati
- Hamilton County
- Clermont County
- Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority
- OKI Regional Council of Governments
- Ohio Department of Transportation
Where is the Eastern Corridor?
Study Area
When Eastern Corridor?

- MIS 1999
- LUVP 2002
- Tier 1 DEIS 2004
- Tier 1 FEIS 2005
- Tier 1 ROD 2006
- Tier 2 Scoping 2007
Why Eastern Corridor?

- 40 year old problem
- Isolated suburbs detached from regional economy and amenities
- Environmental consequences of unplanned development and circumferential travel
- Region experiencing significant population growth
Why Eastern Corridor?

- Congestion and delay
- Safety
- Lack of mode choice
- Poor routing and connectivity
- Inefficient freight movement
- Limited number, capacity and poor location of river crossings
CSS Approach
Four Planning Goals

• Create effective and comprehensive solution for the transportation problem
• Support the regional economy, providing efficient movement of the labor force and goods and services
• Enhance the rich mix of natural and built environmental features in the area
• Consider land use in structuring the transportation solution
Compatibility with Natural Environment

- Green Infrastructure Plan
- Advanced Mitigation Strategy
Green Infrastructure Plan

- Addresses all assets including: streams, wetlands, uplands, hillsides, watersheds, landforms, viewsheds, cultural resources, brownfields, farmlands . . .
- Enhancement, restoration, preservation and mitigation
- Results in net benefit to important resources compared to no-build
Little Miami Scenic River
Advance Mitigation Strategy

- Opportunity to reestablish wooded riparian corridors
- Connect ecological habitat areas
- Address land use threats
ADDITIONAL ACTION ITEMS – River Plains Focus Area:

The recommendations for the River Plains were incorporated into the General Recommendations and the Recommendations of the other Focus Areas

A. It was deemed important to reestablish forests along the Little Miami River in this area to act as a buffer and enhance water quality. Current land uses within this region are primarily recreational and agricultural.
Compatibility with Human Environment

- Community Involvement
- Land Use Planning
- Multi Modal Solution
- Economic Analysis
Public Involvement Plan

- Active and continuous
- Award winning website containing project documentation, surveys and comment forms
- Project office and information center located in corridor
- Public workshops and forums
Land Use Vision Approach

- Citizen planner education
- Six focus areas
- Workshops and charrettes
- Coordinating committee
- Larger public forums
- Integrated local land use plans and community goals with regional perspective
Land Use Planning
Land Use Planning

- Unanimous approval and adoption by participating counties, townships and municipalities
- Home Rule Communities Communicating
- Based in market realities
- Recognizes role of transportation in advancing community goals and provides context for implementation
- Balances community goals and creates a template for environmental stewardship
Multi Modal Components
Multi Modal Context

- Understanding the unique role of each mode and how it can best support other modes
- Modal linkages
- Purpose of networks – distribution and capacity
- Alternatives – rail transit where highway is not possible
Multi Modal Hierarchy

• TSM
  – Local network upgrades
  – Access management
  – Operational improvements – ITS & Bus Use of Shoulders
  – Bike trails and pedestrian walks

• Expanded bus service and bus/transit hubs
• Rail transit
• New highway capacity and connections
Economic Analysis

- LUVP subjected to market absorption study (ERA) + 8,000 jobs
- Benefit/cost analysis of net transportation benefits 2:1
- Economic Impact Analysis (REMI) + $23 M GRP (24.8% accrues to city)
- Fiscal Impact Study (revenue translation less cost of service – EDGE)
- Financial Plan
Tiered EIS

- Transition from Planning to NEPA
- Evolving Policy, innovative financing and environmental stewardship
- Complex problem with a comprehensive solution
- Need to integrate modes
- Coordination of multiple jurisdictions
- Better use of resources – reduce duplication of effort
- Concentrate on issues ripe for decision making at appropriate level of study
Tiered EIS Results

- Better public understanding of program
  - Transportation needs
  - Resource protection needs
- More efficient agency coordination
  - All agency scoping and coordination meetings
  - Agencies agreed to appropriate level of detail for Tier 1 data collection
  - Identified issues ripe for decision making in Tier 1
- Balanced decision making
Project Challenges

- Program vs. project level perspective
- Precedent and risk management
- Transient opportunity, costs associated with indecision
- Volume of information
Project Challenges

• Elimination of Alternatives during planning
  – Fatal geometric, design standard or environmental flaw
  – Violate public policy
  – Conflict with published and adopted land use plans
  – Conflict with another federal action
  – Otherwise violates co-planning efforts
  – Does not significantly contribute of P&N
  – Could not be fiscally constrained
  – Would exceed air-quality SIB
  – Decision included agency coordination
Linking Planning and NEPA

A federal agency’s independent obligation to evaluate planning products incorporated into the NEPA process must be performed in a way that is consistent with the congressional direction that NEPA does not apply to local transportation planning and consistent with court decisions recognizing sovereignty in local governments making local transportation decisions.
Project Challenges

- Evolving Policy
  - CSS
  - Linking Planning and NEPA
  - Green Infrastructure
  - Advance Mitigation
  - Environmental Stewardship
  - Scenario Planning
  - Visualization
  - Exemplary Ecosystems
  - Eco-logical
  - Innovative financing
  - PPP
CSS Successes

- Tier 1 ROD
- Statement of Intent - Enlightened self interest driving collaboration
- LUVP – adoption, integration and market action
- Green Infrastructure Plan
- Public Awareness
CSS Successes

• Cooperation of TID and ODOT
  – TID can embark on Green Infrastructure actions contractually
  – ODOT has environmental expertise and agency relationships
• Allows ODOT to get feet wet with ecosystem approach, but preserve policy and precedent
• Possible that locals can obtain easements cheaper on their own
• Project contributes to better alternative future environment because transportation project is catalyst for citizens to make better investment decisions
CSS Successes

- Balanced decision making
  - Power (large and small communities)
  - Interests (regional and local)
- Tested assumptions and conclusions
- Market driven
- Good planning, well communicated, makes its own opportunities
CSS Bottomline

• How were our actions different?
• How was our attitude different?
• How was our decisionmaking different?
• How did our customers respond as partners? Was there buy-in from all?
Contact Information

- Diana N. Martin, ODOT project manager; diana.martin@dot.state.oh.us
- Richard L. Record, Consultant project manager; rrecord@fuse.net
- Ted B. Hubbard, HCTID project manager; ted.hubbard@hamilton-co.org
- Project Website; www.easterncorridor.org