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1 Introduction and Executive Summary

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report presents a transit-oriented development (TOD) planning and implementation study of Cleveland’s Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue Priority Bus Corridor. It was undertaken by the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA), the state- and federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Area (MPO) for Greater Cleveland. This Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue report is part of NOACA’s Regional TOD Scorecard and Implementation Plan, a two-phase regional initiative begun in 2015. NOACA’s consulting team was led by AECOM.

In Phase I, NOACA worked with its study partners—the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (RTA) and Cleveland Neighborhood Progress, Inc.—as well as the City of Cleveland and other stakeholders to develop a regional TOD framework. This framework began with a broad, flexible definition of TOD based on four foundational ingredients:

- Development that is compact and dense—not in uniform, absolute terms but in relative terms, compared to the surrounding area. This allows more people to live, work, shop, or go to school within walking distance of the station or stop.
- A rich mix of land uses, if not at each station then in each segment of a corridor. Mixed-use development helps create safe “24/7” places. When housing, jobs, and other uses are in close proximity, many daily activities can be reached by walking or biking. Mixed-use development also allows more efficient use of the transit system, by generating commuter trips both to and from the station in question.
- A safe, inviting, and interconnected public realm that “glues” land uses to each other and to the transit station. Transit-oriented development is also pedestrian-oriented development, and successful station areas include a grid of small, navigable blocks with ample sidewalks, active uses at street-level, attractive amenities, good lighting and way-finding, bicycle lanes and facilities, and uniform accessibility for seniors, the disabled, and people with baby carriages.
- A new approach to parking. TOD doesn’t mean “no cars”—even with an emphasis on transit, pedestrian, and bicycle use, successful TOD will generate car trips. But TOD does require less parking. It can afford lower parking ratios that take advantage of transit; shared parking facilities that take advantage of mixed uses; and location and design standards that blend into the district.

Notwithstanding these common ingredients, TOD is not a “one-size-fits-all” concept. It can occur in different shapes, sizes, and combinations. A key product of Phase I was the TOD Place Typology. The typology sorted the “universe of stations”—42 rail and bus rapid transit stations, 99 priority bus corridor segments, and 10 outlying town centers—into seven categories differentiated by location, connectivity, land use, urban form, and intensity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Core</th>
<th>Neighborhood Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Industrial/Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Special Destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Typology encapsulates the long-term vision for a station area, regardless of current conditions, and is thus aspirational as well as descriptive. Barring a fundamental change in the community’s vision for a neighborhood or district, a station’s Typology designation is not expected to change.
Since TOD does not happen overnight, a second analytic metric, the **TOD Readiness Scorecard**, measures how a station is doing relative to its TOD potential. The four Readiness scores—Long-Term; Emerging; Ready; and Arrived—are expected to change over time as conditions in a station area evolve.

Phase I also included a **TOD Program and Toolkit**, drawing on best practices nationally and in Northeast Ohio, and an **Aging-in-Place Strategy**, recognizing the important role that the retiring Baby Boomer generation could play in transit-oriented community revitalization.

Phase II consists of three pilot TOD studies, of which this Slavic Village plan is one. The study locations were selected to represent different parts of the region, different combinations of transit service, and a set of challenges and opportunities that could provide replicable examples of TOD strategies in Greater Cleveland. From a TOD Readiness perspective, all three selected locations ranked as “Emerging” or “Ready”—the “middle” scores providing the best opportunity to make a difference. Besides Slavic Village, the other two study locations are the E. 116th Street Station Area on Cleveland’s east side and the West Blvd.-Cudell Station Area on the west side. Those two reports are companions to this one.

NOACA’s intent in undertaking these pilot studies is not to “reinvent the wheel”—all three study areas have robust community development corporations, active development agendas, and strong support from their City Council members, Cleveland City Planning, and other agencies and institutions. Rather, these studies are meant to add value to on-going efforts through a combination of market analysis, targeted physical planning, and implementation strategies. To that end, NOACA and its TOD team consulted with Slavic Village Development, Inc. (SVD) and Cleveland City Planning in preparing this report.

### 1.2 Study Area Location

As shown in Figure 1, the Slavic Village Priority Bus Corridor is located on Cleveland’s east side. It is centered on Broadway Avenue, and rather than being depicted as a radius around a specific station, it is depicted as a quarter-mile “buffer” along this arterial. The corridor is near RTA’s E. 55th Street Station.

![Figure 1: Slavic Village Priority Bus Corridor Location](image-url)
Broadway Avenue is one of Cleveland’s historic radial streetcar corridors now served by buses and designated a Priority Transit Corridor by RTA. The #19 and #76 bus routes run the length of the study area, connecting Slavic Village to downtown Cleveland. The #2, #15, and #16 routes each cover a portion of the study area (see details in Section 4.6).¹

1.3 Study Area Overview

The Slavic Village Priority Bus Corridor, as defined in this report, extends along Broadway Avenue from the vacant St. Alexis Hospital site in the north to the Fleet Avenue intersection in the south—a distance of 1.35 miles. This corridor was designated a “Neighborhood Center” in NOACA’s TOD Place Typology. This reflects the role of the historic village center at the intersection of Broadway and E. 55th Street as a neighborhood commercial and institutional district, as well as the cluster of commercial, civic, medical, and residential activities between Aetna and Fleet Avenues centered on the Third Federal Savings and Loan headquarters. The northerly portion of the corridor was ranked as “Emerging” on the TOD Readiness metric; the southerly portion, where Third Federal is located, was ranked “Ready”.

Figure 2: Slavic Village Priority Bus Corridor Overview

¹ http://www.riderta.com/routes.
The key contextual features of the corridor, as shown in Figure 2, include the following:

- In addition to the key intersections noted above (the historic village center at Broadway and E. 55th Street and the Third Federal gateway at Broadway and Fleet), there is a potentially important crossroads at Broadway and Union Avenue, which is characterized today by disjointed land use and underutilized property.
- The St. Alexis Hospital site and the adjacent city-owned Velodrome property provide an 8.5-acre opportunity for transformative mixed-use development, including a regional cycling destination;
- A highly influential set of contextual features is located outside the Broadway Avenue “buffer” to the north. RTA’s E. 55th Street Station is served by the Red, Blue, and Green Lines. At this same location, the Opportunity Corridor roadway will emerge from the interchange of I-490 and I-77. The Hyacinth neighborhood, where Slavic Village Development, Inc. (SVD) has been designated to undertake transit-oriented residential development, is a “hinge” between the RTA station, the Opportunity Corridor, and the core of Slavic Village.
- Fleet Avenue, to the south of the Broadway Avenue corridor, has been rebuilt by the City of Cleveland and is a housing recovery and infill focus for SVD, including a scattered-site residential infill development centered on the intersection of Fleet and E. 65th Street.
- The Morgana Run Trail crosses the corridor on an abandoned rail spur. It is part of a larger planned east-side trail system connecting to downtown and is an important neighborhood asset.

1.4 Executive Summary

The remaining sections of this report may be summarized as follows:

- Section 2, Existing Conditions, uses GIS mapping to describe current land use within the station area by category, and to identify major parcels of vacant or publicly owned land.
- Section 3, Summary of Market Analysis, describes the TOD market analysis of the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue TOD Corridor performed for this study by 4ward Planning, Inc., a member of NOACA’s consulting team. This section concludes with an estimated five-year buildout forecast for the station area, including 190 residential units and 96,000 square feet of retail, restaurant, and office space. The complete market analysis is available as a stand-alone document.
- Section 4, Conceptual Plan, contains this report’s planning recommendations, the most detailed of which is a proposed catalyst project consisting of the multi-phase redevelopment of the City-owned former St. Alexis Hospital site on Broadway Avenue. This program consists of commercial, multi-family rental, and townhouse components on the St. Alexis parcel, and envisions the continued development of a regional cycling destination at the adjacent Cleveland Velodrome site, also owned by the City. In addition to the graphics included in this section, a full set of high-resolution 11” x 17” graphics describing the catalyst project is included in the Appendix to this report.

Section 4 also includes a description of other current development initiatives with strong TOD underpinnings in Slavic Village. These include the preservation and revitalization of the historic village center at Broadway Avenue and E. 55th Street; a long-term strategy to bring the influence of the Opportunity Corridor and the repositioned E. 55th Street Station into the heart of Slavic Village, beginning with a TOD initiative in the Hyacinth neighborhood; the current effort to create new residential and commercial vitality on Fleet Avenue and the potential to do the same on Union Avenue.
Section 4 concludes with a discussion of aging-in-place as a key TOD consideration in Slavic Village, and a series of proposed locations for enhanced RTA bus stops and amenities along Broadway Avenue in locations that would reinforce TOD efforts and would be consistent with any future enhancement of bus service to downtown.

- Section 5, Implementation Strategies, references the NOACA TOD Program and Toolkit that was developed in Phase I of this initiative and identifies strategies specific to Slavic Village in several areas: more detailed planning studies, supported by NOACA’s Transportation for Livable Communities Initiative (TLCI) program; zoning; infrastructure funding; and TOD finance.

- Finally, Section 6, Community Engagement, outlines an on-going program of stakeholder and general public involvement to support the continued advancement of TOD through the efforts of Slavic Village Development, Inc., the City, NOACA, and others. This program was developed by BrownFlynn, Inc., the community engagement member of NOACA’s consultant team.

2 Existing Conditions

Existing demographic and economic conditions in the Slavic Village study area are described as part of the Market Analysis, which is summarized in Section 3 below. This section addresses existing land use conditions. Land use by category is displayed in Figure 3, which provides a birds-eye view of how the Broadway Avenue corridor, its quarter-mile buffer, and its immediate outskirts are composed.

- Broadway Avenue stands out as a commercial “main street”. North of Union Avenue, it is lined with traditional neighborhood commercial and mixed-use properties (apartments-over-storefront), at varying levels of physical and economic viability. South of Union Avenue it is dominated by larger commercial assemblies—the Third Federal complex and the strip retail area to its north.

- While there are only a few small industrial uses in the Broadway Avenue buffer, the corridor is nestled between two large expanses of legacy industrial land—north of the railroad tracks and Bessemer Avenue; and west of I-77 in the industrial valley. During Cleveland’s metallurgical manufacturing era, the proximity of steel mills and other major employers supported Slavic Village as a multi-generational blue-collar community.

- The Morgana Run Trail, a former rail spur, is lined with current and former industrial properties between Union Avenue and Broadway Avenue. On one large tract, Slavic Village Development, Inc., and Zaremba Homes, Inc., are collaborating to build Trailside Slavic Village, a neighborhood of 95 “starter” homes between the Trail and Aetna Road.2

- The residential neighborhoods of Slavic Village lie on either side of Broadway Avenue, making up a majority of the land area within the quarter-mile buffer. The loss of population in general and the 2007 foreclosure crisis in particular left some 15% of house lots vacant or dilapidated.

- Fleet Avenue, which lies mostly outside the Broadway Avenue buffer, is a commercial arterial flanked by residential neighborhoods with significant vacancy and demolition.

- With the demise of St. Alexis Hospital in 2003, there are no large city-wide medical institutions in the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue corridor. The MetroHealth Broadway Clinic is a comprehensive neighborhood-level medical facility. There are several churches and schools, including Cleveland Central Catholic High School and the new Mound Elementary School.

Figure 3: Slavic Village, Existing Land Use
Figure 4, which highlights vacant and publicly owned land, identifies two key vacant sites owned by the City of Cleveland: the 5.25-acre St. Alexis Hospital site and the recently cleared 4.1-acre Union...
Within the quarter-mile buffer, there are also two expanses of vacant former railroad or industrial land: along the Norfolk Southern tracks, and between the Morgana Run Trail and the Third Federal development. Much of the latter area is the site of the on-going Trailside single-family development.

### 3 Summary of Market Analysis

A basic premise of NOACA’s TOD strategy, and particularly of these three station area pilot studies, is that planning be grounded in market expectations that are data-based and realistic. This is especially true of early catalytic efforts which might be undertaken in the next five years. While the intent of a TOD strategy is to influence the market and not merely assume that current trends will continue indefinitely, in the near term—with Cleveland’s population still declining—market analysis is essential.

NOACA’s market analysis was performed by 4ward Planning, Inc., a firm specializing in TOD land use economics. For each of the three pilot study areas (Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue, West Blvd.-Cudell Station, and E. 116th Street Station), 4ward Planning analyzed the half-mile radius around the station or corridor; the ten-minute drive time contour (a key measure of a location’s effective market), and the City of Cleveland. Their complete technical report, covering all three pilot study areas, is available as a separate stand-alone document. Its highlights relative to the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue study area are summarized in the pages that follow.

#### 3.1 Socio-Economic and Labor Market Conditions

The half-mile buffer along Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue has an estimated 2016 population of 4,348. Like Cleveland as a whole, the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue corridor continued to lose population between 2010 and 2016, and its population is projected to decline further, although at a slower rate, between 2016 and 2021. The study area’s rate of decline is greater than that of the City, reflecting the lingering effects of the foreclosure crisis. (In the larger Slavic Village neighborhood, the population has declined from a post-war high of about 70,000 to a current population of about 22,000.) Absent major investment and in-migration, population growth and household formation is expected to remain relatively flat through 2021.

Table 2 summarizes several key socio-economic metrics with relevance to transit-oriented development. Compared to the City of Cleveland as a whole, or the area within a ten-minute drive of Slavic Village, the half-mile TOD study area has a some higher density of population and housing units. It also has a lower median household

---

3 The Union Elementary School site is owned primarily by the Cleveland School District, with several contiguous
5 Ibid., p. 24. Note that for market analysis purposes, a buffer of one-half mile rather than one-quarter-mile was used.
7 Ibid., p. 19 and p. 24. Flat growth is defined as an annualized rate of between +0.75% and -0.75%.
income, a higher percentage of households without a car, and a higher percentage of workers who commute by transit. These characteristics are indicative of transit-supportive land use and of potential conduciveness to TOD.

Table 2: Key Socio-Economic Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>City of Cleveland</th>
<th>Slavic Village Half-Mile Buffer</th>
<th>Slavic Village 10-Minute Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population per square mile</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Age 16+ per square mile</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units per square mile</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$27,560</td>
<td>$21,480</td>
<td>$22,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Households with No Car</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Workers Taking Public Transit</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The labor market was measured by using a five-mile radius around Broadway Avenue (an approximation of a ten-minute drive). In 2014, the six largest industries by employment, listed in Table 3, together employed 65% of all workers living in this five-mile circle. Health Care & Social Services constitute the largest and fastest-growing sector, both here and in Greater Cleveland as a whole. Manufacturing, although continuing to lose jobs, is the fifth-largest employment sector in the five-mile circle around Slavic Village, and the second largest in Cleveland and Greater Cleveland. Overall, the five-mile job shed will see growth in “eds and meds”, professional/technical services, and food/accommodation services. An influx of mid- to high-paying jobs is expected across a diversity of occupations. The on-going decline in manufacturing, on the other hand, will result in a notable loss of high-paying jobs.

Table 3: Six Largest Industries by Employment, Five-Mile Radius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>70,623</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15,795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin., Support, Waste Management</td>
<td>24,005</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>17.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Technical</td>
<td>23,940</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td>17.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>22,919</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>18,039</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-1,325</td>
<td>-7.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>16,637</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-398</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Real Estate Market Projections

Residential. To estimate demand for new housing, 4ward Planning performed the demand and supply analysis summarized in Table 4. Focusing on the ten-minute drive primary market area, the analysis takes into account:

---

8 See the full table at ibid., p. 47. 4ward Planning, Inc., used data from Esri and from the 2014 American Communities Survey.
9 Ibid., p. 49.
10 Ibid., p. 71.
11 Compiled from ibid., pp. 56-57.
- households living in the market area;
- a conservatively estimated pent-up demand from workers who live outside the market area but work within it and might seek to trade their commute for a home closer to their jobs;
- vacancies and obsolescence.

A net demand of approximately 1,900 units between 2016 and 2025 is estimated for the ten-minute primary market area. If the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue corridor captured 10% of this demand, it would secure about 190 units.  

Table 4: Residential Demand/Supply Analysis, Slavic Village (10-Minute Drive)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Demand Metrics</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households (each household represents demand for one housing unit)</td>
<td>36,470</td>
<td>36,150</td>
<td>35,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Workers within 10-Minute Drive</td>
<td>53,780</td>
<td>53,308</td>
<td>52,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Workers Residing Outside 10-Minute Drive (92%)</td>
<td>48,560</td>
<td>49,044</td>
<td>48,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Pent-Up Housing Unit Demand from Commuting Area Workers (10%)</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>4,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturally Occurring Vacant Housing Units (7% average vacancy rate)</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>2,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Aggregate Housing Unit Demand in 10-Minute Drive</td>
<td>44,280</td>
<td>43,992</td>
<td>43,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office. By 2025, there is a projected net new demand for 2.3 million square feet of office space within the ten-minute drive contour surrounding the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue corridor. The demand is led by 1,084,000 square feet for Health Care & Social Assistance and 545,000 square feet for Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services. On paper, the office-submarket area’s current vacancy of 3.2 million square feet (including the Cleveland CBD) would appear more than ample to accommodate all the projected net new office space demand, if users did not require the most modern features and amenities. However, it is likely that some of the projected net new demand will require Class A office space (a new or substantially rehabilitated office building with modern amenities and finishes, in a superior location). Further, it is probable that a number of the buildings currently vacant may be in great disrepair and/or economically obsolete to the extent that they will likely not attract new office users, absent significant rehabilitation.  

12 Ibid., pp. 112, 114, 116.
13 Table is ibid., p. 113.
14 Ibid., p. 94 and p. 102.
Retail. According to data provided by Esri, the half-mile radius area surrounding the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue corridor is experiencing a “surplus” in most of neighborhood retail categories—that is, customers are coming to shop from outside the area. Only modest retail space, appropriate for the ground level of mixed-use buildings, is proposed.\(^{15}\)

Across the three residential, retail, and office sectors, 4ward Planning derived the following five-year buildout estimate for the half-mile station area:

![Figure 5: Slavic Village Estimated Buildout Through 2022](image)

### 4 Conceptual Plan

#### 4.1 Overview

There are multiple revitalization efforts underway in Slavic Village, spearheaded by Slavic Village Development, Inc. (SVD). These include initiatives to restore and sell individual houses; to develop infill housing on lots where abandoned homes needed to be demolished; to maintain and preserve for reinvestment key properties in the historic village center; to promote City investments in the reconstruction of Broadway and Fleet Avenues; and to assemble and “land-bank” property for future development. The goal of this report is to add value to those efforts through a focus on TOD.

In NOACA’s discussions with SVD, several strategic goals were emphasized:

- to recover from the “hollowing out” that has accompanied the decline in Slavic Village’s population from 70,000 to 22,000. SVD stressed the need to retain ethnic and racial diversity, attract the “creative class”, preserve existing homes and commercial buildings wherever possible, and build new ones where strategically important;
- to exploit the Opportunity Corridor, a potential surge of regional energy, investment, and connectivity less than a mile away;
- to use transit—five RTA bus routes; the Red, Blue, and Green Lines at a single nearby station; direct service to downtown, University Circle, the industrial valley, the airport, the lakeshore, and Shaker Heights—as a strategic market advantage for households and businesses.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., pp. 85-91.
The market study outlined in the previous section shows a finite and modest demand for residential, retail, and office development. A market analysis prepared for SVD in 2015 showed considerably more commercial space available on Broadway and Fleet Avenues than current market demand. While the long-term aspiration is that success will beget more success, the data suggest a need to target:

- diverse markets, by seeking not only conventional retail and office uses but food manufacturing and catering; “maker” space, and other sectors that may be attracted to an urban setting, convenient transit, and lower costs;
- multiple places in Slavic Village—by not focusing exclusively on any one site for an indefinite period of time, and by recognizing that initiatives can advance in parallel if realistically phased.

The redevelopment the St. Alexis Hospital site is identified as a catalyst project because of its size, its strategic location relative to both the village core and the Opportunity Corridor, and its good transit connections. But St. Alexis should not in any way displace SVD’s other strategic projects. On the contrary, the St. Alexis redevelopment concept described below is a multi-phase project whose initiation can reinforce those other efforts without monopolizing market demand or financing incentives.

4.2 Catalyst Project: the St. Alexis Hospital Site

The former St. Alexis Hospital site is owned by the City of Cleveland. The hospital, a 140-year old community institution, closed in 2003 and was subsequently demolished, leaving a parcel of 5.25 acres fronting on Broadway Avenue just a quarter-mile from the core of Slavic Village. Figure 7 shows the site’s proximity to the intersection of Broadway Avenue and E. 55th Street and its potential influence on the intervening commercial frontage. A highly visible example is the former Elgin Furniture building, located directly across McBride Avenue from the St. Alexis site. St. Alexis is also connected by McBride Avenue to E. 55th Street (a mere 500-foot walk) and could support the long-term effort to reposition that arterial.

As shown in Figure 8, the non-profit Cleveland Velodrome is adjacent to the St. Alexis site, located on a 3.2-acre parcel leased from the City of Cleveland. The Velodrome opened in 2012 and is Ohio’s only velodrome. As a city- and even region-wide destination, it benefits from the nearby Morgana Run trail and from significant additions to Cleveland’s growing bicycle network. The Velodrome could be connected, via Pershing Avenue, to the proposed downtown bike trail connection alongside I-77 (identified in Figure 7); and via E. 55th Street to the bike trail which will run the length of the Opportunity Corridor. The St. Alexis plan outlined below assumes that the Velodrome will continue to lease the site and evolve as a destination.

---

17 http://ech.case.edu/cgi/article.pl?id=SMH1.
18 http://clevelandvelodrome.org/history/.
The proposed redevelopment plan is illustrated in the next several figures. Its underpinnings are:

- the opportunity to create a substantial mixed-use development that fills a glaring gap on Broadway Avenue and acts as a northern gateway to Slavic Village;
- the ability to divide this large site into sub-blocks framed by an attractive, urban-scale public realm and suitable for phased implementation, consistent with market demand.
The program components on the St. Alexis property include:

- a pair of multi-story mixed-use commercial buildings fronting on Broadway Avenue (buildings A1 and A2);
- two blocks of townhomes in the interior of the site along McBride Avenue (buildings B1-B4), facing the two-family homes and lots across the street;
- two blocks of multi-family rental apartments in the interior of the site along Fowler Avenue, facing the Velodrome (buildings C1-C4).

For the corner of the Velodrome site facing the St. Alexis development, a small commercial building containing a bicycle shop is envisioned. As shown in Figure 10, the Velodrome frontage could also accommodate a bicycle-themed transit plaza reinforcing the TOD quality of the entire program; a smaller plaza across the street could serve out-bound passengers.

The program is summarized in Table 5. While detailed, it should be understood as conceptual and illustrative. For example, one of the mixed-use buildings fronting on Broadway Avenue (A1 and A2) could have housing on its upper floors rather than offices. Also, the division between general and medical office space could vary under actual market conditions.

The conceptual program is consistent with the five-year buildout forecast in this study’s market analysis. If executed all at once, the St. Alexis program would account for nearly all of the five-year forecast in the residential, office, and retail sectors; since that forecast is for the entire Slavic Village study area, a plan to “use it up” in one location would be unrealistic, not to mention incompatible with other efforts already underway. However, the St. Alexis program is designed to be implemented in phases; a robust first phase or two is supported by the market analysis and would leave market capacity for other near-term initiatives. In particular, a phased approach to the St. Alexis residential program will leave capacity for the continued buildout of SVD’s Trailside Homes, its proposed Hyacinth TOD (see Section 4.4 below), and its planned Slavic Village Green homes on Fleet Avenue (Section 4.5).

Table 5: St. Alexis and Velodrome, Conceptual Development Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Gross SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4-story multi-family rental</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3, C4</td>
<td>136 @ 900 sf</td>
<td>122,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3-story town houses</td>
<td>B1, B2, B3, B4</td>
<td>36 @ 1,100 sf</td>
<td>39,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service &amp; convenience retail</td>
<td>A1, A2</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited service dining</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Office: Professional</td>
<td>A1, A2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Office: Medical</td>
<td>A1, A2</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Commercial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>172 units</td>
<td>261,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Surface behind buildings</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Below-grade (final phase)</td>
<td>C3-4: 100, B1-4: 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Townhouses (in each unit)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Curbside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 shows one possible phasing strategy, with an initial phase consisting of Broadway building A2 and the two apartment buildings directly behind it. Phase 2 would add building A1 and the two rows of townhouses directly behind it. A final phase would complete the housing at the rear of the parcel, farthest...
from Broadway Avenue. The final phase of apartment construction (buildings C3-4) would require a level of below-grade parking, but until that point, development would rely on surface parking, located behind each building and on the then-unused portion of the site. At completion, the program would include approximately 126 interior surface spaces and 100 below-grade spaces.

In addition, each townhouse would have its own single-car garage at street level within the unit footprint. Finally, both McBride and Fowler Avenues could be widened into the site by a few feet to create a lane of curbside parking, and short-term retail curbside spaces could be created on the Broadway frontage.

Actual phasing will be driven by market conditions, but the phasing plan described here illustrates the basic advantages of this large rectangular site: the ability to create a block structure consistent with logical and flexible building phases; to deliver at least one of the high-visibility Broadway buildings in Phase 1; and to avoid the need for structured parking until the final phase. The phasing concept assumes that the City will solicit a master developer with the financial and management capacity to undertake a full multi-phased project.

**Figure 11: St. Alexis and Velodrome, Illustrative Phasing Scenario**
The “before and after” of this transformative TOD opportunity are shown in Figure 12 and Figure 13.

Figure 12: St. Alexis and Velodrome, Before

Figure 13: St. Alexis and Velodrome, After
4.3 The Village Center

The core of Slavic Village is the historic district surrounding the intersection of Broadway Avenue and E. 55th Street. This five-leg intersection (the fifth being Hamlet Avenue) is a traditional mixed-use neighborhood center, with commercial buildings (many featuring apartments above store fronts) fronting the main streets. One of only two intersections in Cleveland with pre-World War I buildings on all of its corners, this crossroads has 50 businesses and institutions, a post office, the offices of Slavic Village Development, Inc., and several churches, including the landmark Our Lady of Lourdes. 19 The historic Olympia Building, in the “V” of E. 55th Street and Hamlet Avenue, contains 19 affordable apartments above a row of shops and offices (at the left in Figure 14). The City recently completed a street, sidewalk, and bicycle improvement project on Broadway Avenue, including a plaza at the site of the former streetcar turnaround next to the SVD building (at the right in Figure 14).

![Figure 14: E. 55th Street Looking North Across Broadway Avenue](image)

Yet the hollowing out that struck Slavic Village as a result of the loss of industrial jobs and the foreclosure crisis is evident. Clusters of vacant house lots in City or Land Bank ownership lie within a block or two of the village center, and in the center itself, many of the “fabric” storefront buildings are in distressed economic or physical condition.

In addition to its own office building, Slavic Village Development owns several other properties at this intersection. Occupied but in fair to poor condition, their redevelopment or selective demolition and replacement, with a mix of retail, offices, and apartments, is a strategic priority. In 2015, SVD tested the market with a Request for Qualifications for two sets of properties, one in the northeast quadrant of the intersection (at the center of Figure 14) and the other in the southwest quadrant. 20 While the market was not ready to respond, this historic intersection remains key to the identity of Slavic Village as a transit-oriented neighborhood center. As noted previously, the idea of the St. Alexis redevelopment as a catalyst project for Slavic Village reflects its very close proximity to the historic village center and their mutual proximity to the Opportunity Corridor.


4.4 E. 55th Street, the Opportunity Corridor, and the Hyacinth TOD Initiative

The E. 55th Street RTA station and the E. 55th Street entrance to the Opportunity Corridor lie outside the Broadway Avenue buffer on which this report is generally based. However, these regional transportation facilities will have a profound influence on Slavic Village’s potential for economic recovery and growth. The station, renovated by RTA in 2011 and serving both the Red Line and the main trunk of the Blue and Green Lines, is nine-tenths of a mile from the village center at E. 55th Street and Broadway Avenue, and just three-quarters of a mile from the St. Alexis site via McBride Avenue. As part of its Opportunity Corridor planning, the City of Cleveland has delineated a “Slavic Village TOD” area of approximately 45 acres straddling E. 55th Street. It is shown in the heavy yellow dashed line in Figure 15.

Figure 15: The Opportunity Corridor and E. 55th Street

Immediately southeast of the station is the Hyacinth neighborhood. The neighborhood contains many sound homes, and there have been important investments by Elizabeth Baptist Church and the City. Hyacinth Lofts, a live-work adaptive reuse, was built 15 years ago. But there are many vacant parcels owned by the City, its Land Bank, the Cuyahoga County Land Bank, and the State of Ohio. SVD is assembling several of these parcels for a neighborhood TOD housing and retail initiative, centered at E. 61st Street and Francis Avenue; a planning, market, and financial analysis is underway.\(^{21}\)

Wrapped around the Hyacinth neighborhood is a concentration of industrial lands and buildings. In addition to smaller industrial businesses in the neighborhood itself, there are four large expanses of

industrial land west and south of it, fronting on E. 55th Street and totaling nearly 60 acres. This acreage is a mix of active industrial operations, vacant parcels, and lower-end industrial uses like junk yards and storage.

It is important to retain and increase industrial jobs served by transit and also to make E. 55th a more pedestrian-, bus-, and bicycle-friendly urban street connecting the core of Slavic Village to the Opportunity Corridor and the RTA station. This requires a two-part strategy:

- Zoning modifications to accommodate and protect industrial jobs, neighborhood TOD, and a degree of urban form along the E. 55th Street frontage. Zoning is addressed in Section 5.2.
- A “complete street” treatment of E. 55th to serve this complex set of uses, including a circulation plan for trucks and industrial employees that works for everyone. The recent Bessemer Avenue Extension, which allows trucks to service the industrial businesses east of E. 55th Street without having to use residential streets, was a key step. Are further circulation improvements needed on the east side of E. 55th Street, and is a similar concept needed on the west side?

### 4.5 Other Opportunities

**Fleet Avenue.** Fleet Avenue is a focus for SVD and the City. A “complete street” makeover of the avenue was completed in 2016, providing ample sidewalks and bike lanes. The #16 bus route connects to Broadway Avenue, E. 55th Street Station, the lakeshore, and the industrial valley.

The foreclosure crisis hit particularly hard on either side of Fleet Avenue. SVD’s Slavic Village Recovery Program, which acquires salvageable homes from the Cleveland and Cuyahoga Land Banks and renovates them for sale, is centered on Fleet Avenue. In the vicinity of Fleet and E. 65th Street, SVD is undertaking its Slavic Village Green I project—the development of 37 single-family infill homes on lots acquired from the Land Banks where the original homes had to be demolished. SVD also envisions strengthening the commercial and retail space along Fleet Avenue by encouraging food processing and distribution businesses along with restaurants.

**Union Avenue.** Union Avenue, one of the east side’s principal east-west arterials, begins in Slavic Village at Broadway Avenue. The half-mile stretch between Broadway and E. 74th Street represents a long-term TOD opportunity because of a concentration of vacant land, in public and SVD ownership, at the nexus of multiple bus routes. At this time, SVD’s Trailside Homes development is underway on the south side of the Morgana Run Trail; along with the amenity of the trail itself and direct RTA bus service to downtown, this will help position Union Avenue for development in the future.

As shown in Figure 17, the site of the recently demolished Union Elementary School is on the north side of Union Avenue; the school property (owned by the Cleveland Board of Education) and several contiguous parcels owned by the Cleveland Land Bank amount to 3.5 acres of vacant land. On the south

---

22 Ibid.
side of Union Avenue, Slavic Village Development, Inc., has acquired a parcel of roughly 1.9 acres and another of 1.7 acres. There are also numerous individual house lot parcels and clusters of such parcels, owned variously by the City, its Land Bank, and the Cuyahoga County and Bank, on the north frontage of Union Avenue and in the blocks north of the school site.

Figure 17: Union Avenue, Broadway Avenue, and Morgana Run Trail

In the existing traffic pattern, E. 65th Street is interrupted at the “V” formed by Union Avenue and Broadway Avenue; this forces northbound traffic headed for Union Avenue to make an extra turn, and north-south through traffic to make three extra turns. With future development potential in mind, the City should evaluate whether this traffic pattern should be left as is or be modified to make E. 65th Street continuous—either for pedestrians and bicyclists only or for vehicles as well. This evaluation should also consider a gateway park amenity and public art feature in the “V”, identifying the Union Avenue neighborhood and the Morgana Run Trail.

4.6 Aging in Place

In Phase I of NOACA’s Regional TOD Initiative, aging-in-place was identified as an integral component of TOD planning in Greater Cleveland’s neighborhoods and town centers. The linkage is two-fold:

- Seniors represent a growing share of the population, in Greater Cleveland as in most of the nation. People aged 65 and above are projected to increase from 16.7% of Greater Cleveland’s adult population to 29.3% in 2030. Retiring baby boomers and millennials together constitute nearly half of the region’s population, and are the cohorts most associated with lifestyle preferences related to TOD.

- Aging-in-place is not limited to the traditional paradigms of senior housing, elder services, nursing care, and paratransit. These are obviously important for many seniors, and the confidence that these services and living options will be available if and when needed is an important consideration in deciding where to live in retirement. But aging-in-place is a broader idea, involving the ability of seniors who can and wish to do so to live a multi-faceted life as part of a
whole community. As the aging-in-place population grows, their need for more accessible transportation and amenities will increase as well. These include grocery stores, drug stores, banks, and specialty retail. The more these destinations are within walking distance, the better, but active seniors also need access to bus stops, Rapid stations, and paratransit services to reach these destinations as well as senior centers, doctors’ offices, and recreation facilities.

Slavic Village Development, Inc., offers a senior home repair program that demonstrates this basic point about aging-in-place. With grant funding from the McGregor Foundation, SVD works with seniors to identify and implement repairs that could make all the difference in an individual or couple feeling confident that they can stay in their own house.

The strategies described in NOACA’s Aging-in-Place TOD report fall into four categories: land use, mobility, pedestrian design, and outreach. Table 6 briefly describes the first three and identifies corresponding assets and challenges in Slavic Village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Slavic Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Alexia Manor and Lourexis Apartments (see below) are within walking distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote mixed-use development in</td>
<td>of the village center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which elder housing, services,</td>
<td>Broadway Elder Apartments (see below) are within walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other aspects of seniors’</td>
<td>distance of banking (Third Federal), the Public Library, Stella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily life are within easy walking</td>
<td>Walsh Recreation Center, the Broadway MetroHealth Center, and the ALDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance.</td>
<td>grocery store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slavic Village’s churches are within walking distance or bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>connections to most parts of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Four senior living facilities in the community:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase senior transit ridership</td>
<td>• Alexia Manor and Lourexis Apartments, with a total of 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by locating all of the above in</td>
<td>units, are located on Hector Street directly behind the St. Alexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD centers and corridors.</td>
<td>site, within easy walking distance of bus stops on broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avenue and E. 55th Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broadway Elder Apartments, with 42 units, is on Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avenue at a bus stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Harvard Village, with 49 units, is located about .75 miles from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway Avenue at a bus stop on the #2 route, which connects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Broadway Avenue near the MetroHealth Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slavic Village’s library, health center, and retail shops are well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>served by transit, making them relatively accessible to seniors living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in their own homes or apartments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Complete streets/pedestrian design | St. Alexia Manor and Lourexis Apartments are separated from Broadway       |
| Design the public realm—streets,  | Avenue by the vacant St. Alexis Hospital site. While E. 55th Street (with  |
| sidewalks, crossings, plazas,     | bus connections to the Rapid) is a short walk away, it requires walking    |
| parks—with seniors in mind,       | past vacant lots in an isolated area.                                       |
| including lighting, wayfinding,   |                                                                              |
| paving materials, and ice and snow |                                                                              |
| removal.                          |                                                                              |

The fourth strategy—on-going outreach—applies both to seniors directly, to gain their input about transit, TOD, pedestrian design, and their overall sense of a livable community; and to elder housing developers and service providers. For seniors, a mix of social media and traditional media (such as stories in the newspaper and mailings to residences) will help keep them informed, included, and valued. According to
the Pew Research Center, 82% of adults ages 65+ view their smartphone as a means to freedom; 56% of online seniors indicated that they use Facebook; and internet use continues to climb. Based on this research, an effective engagement tactic would be to create a group or page on Facebook that specifically discusses TOD in the aging and retirement context. This page can act as an online discussion forum to pose questions to aging-in-place residents about what they want to see in their communities. With regard to more traditional engagement tactics, holding open meetings at senior centers and housing facilities is an effective way to meet seniors where they are and ensure that their input is heard.

4.7 Enhanced Bus Service or Facilities

Slavic Village is defined in no small part by its frequent, multi-route bus service. As an RTA Priority Bus Corridor, Broadway Avenue could receive consideration in future planning for enhanced bus amenities or conceivably for an enhanced level of service to downtown Cleveland, as was implemented recently on the west side’s Clifton Boulevard. With or without a future service enhancement, the continued revitalization of Slavic Village would be reinforced by improved stops, shelters, and amenities at key locations.

Broadway Avenue is served by five bus routes:

- The #19 originates in downtown Cleveland and runs on Broadway Avenue the length of the study area. South of the study area, the route turns eastward onto Miles Avenue to Bedford Heights.
- The #76 originates in downtown Cleveland and runs on Broadway Avenue the length of the study area. South of the study area, the route continues onto Turney Avenue in Garfield Heights.
- The #15 also originates in downtown Cleveland and runs on Broadway Avenue as far as Union Avenue, where it turns eastward to Warrensville Heights.
- The #16 originates on the lakeshore and runs on E. 55th Street through the E.55th Street station and Slavic Village. It runs down Broadway from E. 55th Street to Fleet Avenue, where it turns westward, eventually terminating west of the Cuyahoga River.
- The #2 is a long circumferential route that originates near the lakeshore and runs through several east side neighborhoods before turning west to the industrial valley. In Slavic Village, it runs down E. 65th Street to Union and Broadway and runs south on Broadway for several blocks before turning south on E. 71st Street.

In sum, within the study area all segments of Broadway Avenue are served by three bus routes, and the segment between E. 55th Street (the village center) and Union Avenue is served by four.

Figure 18 illustrates potential locations for enhanced station stop facilities; these locations would support TOD with traditional bus service and, at one-quarter to one-third mile apart, they are spaced compatibly with enhanced service or bus rapid transit should that be introduced in the future. On Broadway Avenue, the suggested enhanced bus locations are at:

---


- Pershing Road, serving the St. Alexis Hospital development site and the Cleveland Velodrome; as described in Section 4.2, this stop could be a bicycle-themed transit plaza integrated with the velodrome park on the north side of Broadway Avenue and future development on the south side;
- the historic village center at Broadway and E. 55th Street, where service to downtown, E. 55th Street Station, and other points in Slavic Village all converge;
- the intersection of Broadway Avenue, Union Avenue, and E. 65th Street, where a plaza could be created as part of a modified traffic pattern or ped-bike plan;
- Morgana Park, serving the Third Federal complex, the nearby MetroHealth Broadway Health Center, Central Catholic High School, and SVD’s Trailside Homes development;
- the intersection of Broadway and Fleet Avenues.

Bus service is also an integral part of the strategy for connecting the core of Slavic Village to E. 55th Street Station and transforming the character of E. 55th Street between the station and the railroad underpass; this segment is served by the #16 bus. A key amenity location is the corner of E. 55th and McBride Avenue, which offers a direct pedestrian route to the St. Alexis site. The graphic also suggests a future high-amenity stop in the potential redevelopment area between the station and the railroad.

Figure 18: Potential Enhanced Bus Locations

Figure 18 identifies two additional locations where enhanced bus amenities would support future TOD:
- the intersection of Fleet Avenue and E. 65th Street; this intersection on the #16 bus route is a retail crossroads and the center of SVD’s Slavic Village Green affordable housing initiative;
- the intersection of Union Avenue and E. 70th Street, near the eastern end of the stretch of vacant and underutilized properties along Union Avenue beginning at Broadway. This enhanced stop would also serve Trailside Homes, located just across the Morgana Run Trail.

5 Implementation Strategy

In Phase I of its Regional TOD Initiative, NOACA developed a TOD Program adaptable to a variety of settings and jurisdictions. The program articulated a role for NOACA as a TOD convener, advocate, and partner, as well as a TOD implementation “toolkit” with components representing zoning, TOD infrastructure, financing for equitable TOD, and marketing. Table 7 was originally developed in Phase I of the initiative to summarize NOACA’s TOD Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Element</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOACA Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A Regional Framework</td>
<td>• NOACA to convene and maintain regional TOD conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NOACA TOD webpage to include TOD Program, Typology, Readiness Scorecard, other regional materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regional Transportation Funding</td>
<td>• NOACA will add a Regional Transportation Investment Goal of supporting TOD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TOD Opportunity Districts</td>
<td>• Districts will be locally proposed, approved by NOACA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Once designated, priority access to certain funding and technical assistance programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An Expanded TLCI Program</td>
<td>• Grants available for select follow-up studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased funding for Implementation Grants, targeted to designated TOD Opportunity Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TOD Technical Assistance</td>
<td>• Staff-to-staff support in zoning, infrastructure, financing, marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On-line tools, such as a Model TOD Zoning Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The TOD Toolkit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOD Zoning (Best Practices)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriate Density</td>
<td>• FAR appropriate to TOD Place Typology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highest FAR and height in core, closest to station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Density bonuses for affordable housing, ground-level activation, public amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mixed Use Development</td>
<td>• Allowed, Conditional, and Prohibited Uses reflect TOD principles, as appropriate for the jurisdiction in question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed-use allowed by right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New stand-alone, low-density, automobile uses prohibited, especially closest to station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable housing policy adopted by local jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Urban Form</td>
<td>• Sidewalk design standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationship of building façades to sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standards for street grid, bike lanes, block size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking</td>
<td>• Reduced parking ratios appropriate for the TOD Place Typology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shared parking allowed and encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Design and location standards for parking facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOD Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Three distinct levels of investment</td>
<td>• TOD planning recognizes the need for: corridor-scale projects; district infrastructure; and first-mile/last-mile connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Federal Transportation Grants</td>
<td>Through the TIP, NOACA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allocates MPO-directed FHWA programs (Surface Transportation Program, CMAQ, Transportation Alternatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advises ODOT on other highway funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approves FTA grant spending for RTA and the county systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. New Federal TOD Loans

- Fast Act expanded eligibility of TIFIA loans for local TOD infrastructure; applicable to all rail and HealthLine station areas.
- RRIF eligibility extended to TOD infrastructure and development finance near “passenger rail” stations (Cleveland and Elyria).

4. Tax Increment Financing

- Ohio Incentive District TIF broadly applicable to infrastructure.
- Several US transit markets use TIF for TOD “district infrastructure”.

**Financing for Equitable TOD**

1. Cleveland’s Non-Profit Network

- 27 CDCs and similar organizations cover virtually the entire city.
- Cleveland Neighborhood Progress: technical support, capacity building, financing intermediary for foundations and other partners.
- This network is a national model.

2. Cuyahoga Land Bank and Cleveland Land Reuse Program

- Acquire and land-bank abandoned properties.
- Sell properties for reuse or redevelopment as affordable housing.

3. New Market Tax Credits

- Key federal program induces private equity and/or debt capital on below-market terms.
- Widely used in Cleveland through subsidiaries of Greater Cleveland Partnership and Enterprise Community Partners.

4. Affordable Housing Programs

- OHFA runs its own programs and allocates the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit.

5. Ohio Brownfields Funding

- ODSA offers a menu of state and federal programs.

**Outreach and Marketing**

1. NOACA TOD Webpage and Brand

- Available to technical audience as well as general public.

2. Community Engagement

- Communities undertaking local TOD initiatives: internal stakeholder discussions, general public outreach.

3. External Marketing and Branding

- Marketing local TOD districts to regional businesses and consumers (e.g., Ohio City, University Circle, Slavic Village).

**TOD Investment Criteria**

1. Macro Criteria

- Steer public and private investment to TOD in general.
- Use the TOD Readiness Scorecard and database to identify high-leverage investment opportunities.
- Stations scoring “Ready”: target “but-for” missing pieces.
- Stations scoring “Emerging”: target strategic “go-forward” investments.

To adapt this program to the specific opportunities of Slavic Village, the following implementation actions are recommended.

### 5.1 NOACA’s Role

NOACA has selected Slavic Village as one of the three pilot locations for its Regional TOD Initiative and will continue to treat it as a focus of attention. To that end, NOACA will work with the affected Councilpersons, Slavic Village Development, Inc., RTA, Cleveland City Planning, Cleveland
Neighborhood Progress, and other key stakeholders to advance the TOD ideas presented in this report and others that may arise from this partnership. With respect to specific actions, NOACA anticipates that:

- The City of Cleveland, RTA, and SVD may apply for a Transportation for Livable Communities Initiative (TLCI) grant to study in detail:
  
  a. the “complete street”, access, and circulation improvements required to transform E. 55th Street into a corridor that supports both industrial jobs and mixed-use TOD, connecting the center of Slavic Village to the Opportunity Corridor and the RTA station;
  
  b. the potential change in traffic pattern at the intersection of Broadway Avenue, E. 65th Street, and Union Avenue, described in Section 4.5;
  
  c. the enhanced bus stop locations and amenities suggested in Section 4.7.

- NOACA is prepared to support SVD in developing a Slavic Village TOD marketing and branding initiative, which would add transit and TOD to the core messaging about community revitalization;

- If NOACA establishes a program of TOD Opportunity Districts, it would anticipate that Slavic Village would, upon the City of Cleveland’s request, be so designated.

5.2 Zoning

Figure 19 shows the existing zoning in the northern part of the study area, including the St. Alexis site, the village core, and E. 55th Street. Figure 20 covers the southern part of the study area, including Union Avenue and the Third Federal development. The zoning is generally supportive of the plans discussed in Section 4:

- The St. Alexis site is zoned General Retail, a district that allows a wide range of uses including those contemplated in this plan: retail, offices, apartment buildings, and rowhouses. The “2” at the end of the district designation (GR-C2) allows an as-of-right height of up to 60 feet.

- The Broadway Avenue frontage other than St. Alexis is zoned Local Retail, either LR-B1 (35-foot maximum height) or LR-C2 (60-foot). Local Retail allows a similar range of “main street” and TOD-type uses. The entire Third Federal site, including their extensive surface parking area, is zoned LR-C2, as is the strip retail center where ALDI and the MetroHealth clinic are located.

- The north side of Union Avenue is also zoned Local Retail, and the south side is zoned Semi-Industry, which allows a similar range of uses.

- The Trailside homes site between Morgana Run Trail and Third Federal has been zoned One-Family to accommodate and protect that development.

- E. 55th Street between the village center and the railroad tracks is zoned General Retail and Multi-Family, consistent with the existing and generally sound fabric of residential and commercial uses along this “spoke” of the Village’s main intersection.

---

29 The zoning map is at http://planning.city.cleveland.oh.us/gis/cpc/basemap.jsp.
These districts broadly reflect the historic and existing built environment of the Broadway Avenue corridor and are consistent, in use and height, with the types of infill and reinvestment contemplated by SVD as well as the more transformative redevelopment of St. Alexis. Where there may be hurdles is in the areas of setback, Floor Area Ratio (FAR), and parking.

These can be dealt with flexibly through the application of the City’s Urban Form Overlay (§348.04), which includes TOD-supportive features such as minimal lot line setbacks; active street frontages in terms of use, entrances, glazing, articulation, and amenities; no maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR); the ability to reduce parking by right to 65% of the amount otherwise required, and, in the case of affordable housing or the reuse of an existing building, 25%; and a prohibition of off-street surface parking in front of a building or visible from the street. The parking requirement can be further reduced by variance. 30

It is on E. 55th Street, from the tracks north to the Opportunity Corridor and the RTA station, that the underlying zoning should be revisited. Today, the entire west side of E. 55th Street and a portion of the east side are zoned Residence-Industry, a district created to accommodate industrial uses that can operate near residential streets with appropriate controls. The remaining area on the east side of E. 55th Street is zoned General Industry. Technically, these two districts allow the full range of TOD uses including housing, and the maximum heights range from 35 feet to 115 feet.

While it might be possible to apply the Urban Form Overlay to the existing zoning along E. 55th Street, the long-term planning objective described in Section 4.4—to sort this large land mass into viable employment and mixed-use areas—would be better served by rezoning, perhaps into General Retail,

---

30 The Cleveland Zoning Code is at http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/Ohio/cleveland_oh/partthreeandusecode/partiiblandusecode-zoningcode/titleivzoningcode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:cleveland_oh. For descriptions of the relevant districts, see: Local Retail §343.01; General Retail §343.11; Residence-Industry §345.01-02; Semi-Industry §345.03; General Industry §345.04; One-Family §337.02; Multi-Family §337.08; Off-Street Parking §349.04. Also, the village center at Broadway Avenue and E. 55th Street, and E. 55th Street from Broadway to the Norfolk Southern tracks, constitute the Broadway Local Landmark District (http://planning.city.cleveland.oh.us/maps/jpg/clc_broadway.jpg).
Semi-Industry, and Residence-Industry districts, with the Urban Form Overlay applied to the E. 55th Street frontage where appropriate.

Figure 20: Existing Zoning, Union Avenue and Third Federal

5.3 Infrastructure Funding

The public infrastructure components of the TOD plan consist of streetscape, sidewalk, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements, as well as the enhanced bus facilities or service suggested in Section 0, should RTA choose to pursue this. These improvements could be funded in a number of ways:

- **The TIP.** NOACA allocates Federal Highway Administration funds through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The highly flexible Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) and its Transportation Alternatives component are particularly applicable to proposed infrastructure improvements on and near Detroit Avenue, such as pedestrian and bicycle projects; safe routes projects that help older persons, children, and those with disabilities access daily needs; and transit capital projects.

- **TLCI Implementation Grant.** In 2015, NOACA began making TLCI grants available for implementation as well as planning. While these grants are modest in scale, they have been used for items like bike lanes, bike racks, street and sidewalk improvements, transit shelters, and wayfinding—all of which are potentially in play on Broadway, E. 55th Street, and Union Avenue.

- **Tax Increment Financing.** Ohio’s TIF enabling act (Ohio Revised Code §5704.40-43) allows local jurisdictions to form two different types of TIF district. A General Purpose TIF consists of a single parcel or group of parcels involved in a development project; an Incentive District TIF consists of up to 300 acres of contiguous land, involving multiple projects and a program of public improvements. A TIF can capture 75% of the incremental tax value of the subject properties for up to 10 years or, with the approval of the affected school board and county, 100% of the increment for 30 years—sufficient to amortize a TIF revenue bond.

The more inclusive and flexible Incentive District TIF can be formed in an area determined to be blighted, or where any of several indicators of urban distress are documented. Within an Incentive District TIF, residential development projects can be deemed a public purpose and financed with the captured tax increment revenues. In either form of district, TIF proceeds can be used for a wide variety of items common to TOD, including streets, transit, utilities, remediation, and land acquisition and clearance when necessary for economic development.\textsuperscript{32}

Tax increment financing is difficult to use in a distressed corridor where only infill and building-by-building reinvestment are contemplated; the potential for revenue growth is simply too limited. But in a case like St. Alexis or the vacant lands on Union Avenue, where the entire value of future development would be incremental, or the long-term repositioning of E. 55\textsuperscript{th} Street, with its potentially significant infrastructure needs, TIF may have some merit.

\textbf{Federal TIFIA Loan.} TIFIA (the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act) is a loan program administered by the US Department of Transportation; it offers state and local jurisdictions direct treasury loans, on highly favorable terms, for a wide range of highway and transit projects. In the Fast Act of 2015, Congress expanded the eligibility of the TIFIA program to include TOD projects consisting of public infrastructure within walking distance of a “fixed guideway transit facility” (like E. 55\textsuperscript{th} Street Station). For these TOD projects, the minimum eligible project size is reduced to $10 million, rather than the standard $50 million.\textsuperscript{33} A TIFIA loan can used as the borrowing mechanism for tax increment financing, under terms more favorable in a number of ways than conventional revenue bond debt. While applicable only to E. 55\textsuperscript{th} Street and the blocks on either side of it within walking distance of the station, this new TOD financing method could be valuable in just this type of setting.

- \textbf{TIGER Grant.} TIGER (Transportation Infrastructure Generating Economic Recovery) is a discretionary and highly competitive US Department of Transportation Grant program. It has now been through seven funding rounds. TIGER is well-aligned with transit, ped-bike, and roadway improvements that enhance TOD, and has often been for complete street and bus rapid transit projects. The City of Cleveland, NOACA, and RTA are all eligible applicants. Average construction awards are in the $10-20 million range, with local match ranging from 20\% to 50\%. Given the TIGER program’s exceptionally competitive nature, a “Plan B” is always in order; but for projects of appropriate size and impact, a TIGER grant can be decisive. Cleveland has received three TIGER grants, all of them transit- and TOD-related.\textsuperscript{34}

\section*{5.4 TOD Financing}

As part of the market analysis developed for this report, the firm 4ward Planning, Inc., prepared a high-level \textit{pro forma} feasibility analysis of the residential, retail, and office buildout that they estimated for the Slavic Village/Broadway Avenue corridor (see Figure 5 on page 11). This \textit{pro forma} analysis used current Cleveland market data to estimate construction and operating costs, rent levels, and vacancy rates, and took market risk into account in making assumptions about required capitalization rates and return on equity. The results indicate that development of the type and scale envisioned “appear[s] to have financial viability”, but must be understood only as a “general starting point” for making that assessment. In

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{32} https://development.ohio.gov/bs/bs_tif.htm and http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/5709.40.\textsuperscript{32}
  \item \textsuperscript{33} The FAST Act (114HR22), §2001 (a)(5)(C) and §2001 (b)(1)(B).
  \item \textsuperscript{34} These include grants for modernization of the University Circle/Cedar Road Red Line station (RTA, 2010); relocation of the Mayfield Road/Little Italy Station (RTA, 2011); and the E. 93\textsuperscript{rd} Street/E. 105\textsuperscript{th} Street TOD Corridor Plan (City of Cleveland, 2014).\textsuperscript{34}
\end{itemize}
particular, the *pro forma* analysis was not site-specific and thus did not account for land acquisition, clearance, infrastructure, reuse of existing buildings, or other premium costs.\(^{35}\)

The public, non-profit, and business leadership of Cleveland and Slavic Village has collaborated successfully to assemble funding, financing, and property for challenging, high-risk projects, from Third Federal’s office and mixed-use investments to Trailside Homes and the recently funded Fleet and Hyacinth residential projects described earlier. A similar commitment will be needed to advance the redevelopment of the St. Alexis site, the revitalization of the village center, the repositioning of E. 55\(^{th}\) Street, and future development on Union Avenue.

**Public Land.** The City and its Land Bank, the Cuyahoga County Land Bank, and the State of Ohio are working with SVD to assemble parcels for the Hyacinth and Fleet Avenue neighborhood housing initiatives. When market conditions warrant, the City of Cleveland, as owner of the St Alexis site, should work with SVD to make this strategic parcel available for development (through a competitive master developer procurement) on the most favorable terms reasonably possible.

**New Market Tax Credits and other community investment funds.** With respect to the broader financing challenges, the use of below-market financial incentives will be critical. Greater Cleveland has made extensive use of the federal New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) program to support both commercial and residential development. NMTC uses the tax code to induce individuals or corporations to invest in low-income communities through local bodies called Community Development Entities (CDEs) which apply to the US Treasury for tax credit allocation authority. Once awarded, a CDE uses its tax credits to attract private equity capital to an investment fund. The investors receive a tax credit equal to 39\% of their investment. The CDE then invests the fund in specific community development projects, either through equity participation or through debt financing. The intent of the program is to increase the *availability* of capital in distressed communities and, where possible, to reduce the *cost* of that capital by giving the initial investors a meaningful return just for participating (in turn allowing the CDE to accept a below-market interest rate or return on equity).\(^{36}\)

The principal local CDE is Cleveland Development Advisors, an arm of the Greater Cleveland Partnership, which has received five allocations, the most recent for $60 million in 2016. Since 2003, Cleveland Development Advisors has closed on 36 NMTC projects, generating $796 million in private investment. Their larger portfolio, including NMTC as well as other investment funds, includes 5.9 million square feet of development, $2.9 billion of total investment, 5,300 housing units, and over 3,000 permanent jobs created or retained. These projects are found throughout the city, including two on the edges of Slavic Village—the Hyacinth Lofts live-work development and, in collaboration with SVD, Dave’s Slavic Village Supermarket.\(^{37}\) Cleveland’s other principal CDE is ESIC Realty Partners, a subsidiary of The Enterprise Social Investment Corporation and an affiliate of Enterprise Community Partners of Columbia, Maryland.\(^{38}\)

**Low-Income Housing Tax Credit.** The LIHTC, allocated by the Ohio Housing Finance Agency, is the largest driver of affordable housing production in Ohio. Recent awards include a number of family and

---


\(^{36}\) The NMTC website: https://www.cdfifund.gov/programs-training/Programs/new-markets-tax-credit/Pages/default.aspx. The State of Ohio has its own NMTC, a companion to the federal program (http://development.ohio.gov/cs/cs_onmtcredit.htm).


\(^{38}\) http://www.enterprisecommunity.com/financing-and-development/nmte/portfolio-and-approach/part-two#ohio
senior projects in transit locations, including Slavic Village Green Homes, SVD’s scattered-site infill program in the Fleet Avenue neighborhood. SVD is working with the Cleveland Housing Network, a city-wide non-profit affordable housing developer that collaborates with CDCs, and with Enterprise Community Investors, another affiliate of Enterprise Community Partners, as syndicator of the tax credit equity. SVD is also seeking a LIHTC allocation for its Hyacinth neighborhood initiative.

Other incentives. Private reinvestment in historic village center may be able to take advantage of historic tax credits, depending on the extent to which the buildings can be preserved and reused rather than replaced.

The long-term effort to rationalize land use along E. 55th Street, separating viable industrial land from mixed-use TOD, may require brownfield remediation. The State of Ohio offers a robust series of programs in brownfield remediation and redevelopment. These are coordinated, and in the case of several key programs directly administered, by the state’s economic development department, the Ohio Development Services Agency (ODSA). Several specific programs are offered under the umbrella of the Ohio Brownfield Development Fund. The largest is the Clean Ohio Fund, which consists of two grant programs—an Assistance Fund and a Revitalization Fund—which have together awarded over $400 million in grants to 386 projects, helping to remediate 7,600 acres of contaminated industrial lands and leveraging over $4 billion in redevelopment, a 10:1 ratio. ODSA also administers the Brownfield Revolving Loan Fund, capitalized by the U.S. EPA, and makes project selections for the Brownfield Loan Fund of the Ohio Water Development Authority. Among the specialized programs within ODSA’s brownfield portfolio is an Auto Legacy fund, addressing the particular remediation issues at former automobile and related manufacturing facilities.

In short, there is a wealth of experience in successfully using federal tax code-based incentives for commercial and residential development—not only in Cleveland generally, but in Slavic Village. Any or all of the TOD concepts outlined in this report may need the support of the community development investment network and the availability of incentive-based capital.

6 Community Involvement

6.1 Stakeholder Input to this Report

In the fall of 2016, Slavic Village Development, Inc., hosted two stakeholder meetings in its offices at 5620 Broadway Avenue. The meetings were held on September 30, 2016, and December 1, 2016, and were attended by SVD’s Executive Director and Neighborhood Development Officer; Councilwoman Cleveland; NOACA’s TOD Project Manager and consulting team; RTA’s Director of Programming and Planning; and Cleveland City Planning. The background, perspective, and suggestions provided at these meetings were indispensable to the preparation of this report, and the key ideas presented here were initially discussed at the December 1 session.

6.2 An Involvement Strategy Going Forward

To advance TOD in Slavic Village, NOACA, SVD, the City, and RTA will need to engage the community on an on-going basis—as SVD already does on a variety of issues and initiatives. BrownFlynn, Inc., the community engagement member of NOACA’s TOD consulting team, has

developed a framework for an on-going TOD effort, which is presented here. Its goals are two-fold and mutually reinforcing:

- to build support for the proposed catalyst project at the former St. Alexis Hospital site (see Section 4.2 of this report) and for the long-term rezoning and repositioning of E. 55th Street (Section 4.4);

- to make transit and TOD an integral part of how the Slavic Village community and the development market understand the effort to enhance the community’s well-being through new investment, housing, and jobs; population retention, diversification, and growth; revitalization of the historic village; more convenient and affordable work commutes; and an enhanced ability for residents entering retirement to age in place.

With support from public, private, and community leaders, NOACA, SVD, the City, and RTA can broaden the audience to include community members who will be directly affected by the catalyst project and by other TOD that can arise as a result. Their voices are arguably the most important, as their everyday activities and accessibility will be impacted by these changes.

Community engagement takes many forms, but should always be an ongoing, cumulative process. In addition to receiving feedback to move forward on a particular project, it also builds relationships and trust among the many interests involved. There are both traditional and non-traditional strategies that can be employed as NOACA continues to engage with the community around TOD; these are described in the Approach section below.

To begin the public engagement process, NOACA could work with SVD, the City, and RTA to create and disseminate a neighborhood-specific TOD brand and logo. This should be made public and recognizable throughout Slavic Village and be woven into social media, such as web pages, Instagram and Twitter handles, and surveys, or on posters and placards that can be placed at restaurants, stores, libraries, community centers, and RTA stations.

**Audiences.** Slavic Village is one of the most historic and diverse neighborhoods in Cleveland. Its population is relatively bifurcated in age. Fifty-two percent of Slavic Village residents are under 35, and the median age of 33 is measurably lower than that of the City as a whole; on the other hand, as the population ages, the mostly retired (75+) age group is the only one experiencing positive growth. Slavic Village has suffered the effects of the foreclosure crisis and the decline of the vast industrial areas that frame it on the west and north. Its rate of population decline in recent years surpasses that of the City, and 24% of its housing units are vacant.

Based on our market analysis, the community demographic focus should be on three groups: families, commuters, and seniors (aging-in-place). Slavic Village has a significantly higher percentage of daily transit commuters than the City as a whole—16% versus 10%; since commuters rely mostly on RTA buses, TOD, especially along Broadway Avenue, would be attractive to them. As the aging-in-place population grows, there will be an increased demand for small residences and accessible retail. Finally, families seeking a change in or needing housing, or seeking to move into Slavic Village, will be affected by a TOD project.\textsuperscript{41}

A successful TOD strategy will have the largest impact on the following three groups: families, commuters, and seniors (based on our market analysis). Housing will likely appeal to families and

\textsuperscript{41} Aaward Planning, Inc., NOACA TOD Market Analysis (February 3, 2017).
College-age residents; medical offices and more diverse retail will likely appeal to all populations; and all residents who commute or regularly take public transit (including high-schoolers) will be affected by development with convenient RTA bus connections and/or proximity to E. 55th Street Station. The following represent potential partners and locations with which to engage these key stakeholder groups:

### Table 8: Community Engagement Partners and Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Stella Walsh Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroHealth Broadway Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Public Library—Fleet Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Public Library—Union Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club of Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA Bus stops: Broadway Ave., Union Ave., E. 55th St., Fleet Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 55th Street Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mound Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Central Catholic High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stanislaus School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland College Preparatory School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Head Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Academy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Residences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexia Manor and Lourexis Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Elder Apartments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Organizations and Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slavic Village Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approach.** Because of the wide range of community stakeholder groups, successful engagement will require a mix of strategies to reach these groups effectively.

**Establishing an Understanding of TOD.** An essential early step is to “demystify” TOD and explain its benefits. Once NOACA, SVD, the City, and RTA have developed a TOD brand and established links to online resources, a general flyer and community newsletter should be created and distributed around the neighborhood, either as a stand-alone document or as part of SVD’s Village Voice. This provides an opportunity to inform the public about TOD and how it might affect their neighborhood. In addition to public spaces, newsletters to residences (targeting the three growing populations) and informational pamphlets given to students to take home to their guardians (where permitted) can also be considered. NOACA and its partners should plan an initial engagement session and include it on the flyer/newsletter/pamphlet before dissemination. The ultimate goal should be for neighborhood residents to see and discuss the information, then choose to attend the engagement workshops.

When holding meetings or disseminating information, an introduction should include an overview of TOD and its benefits. NOACA, SVD, the City, and RTA can use the comprehensive TOD summary created by NOACA’s consultant team in Phase I of this regional TOD initiative. This summary also can...
be used for messaging about the TOD agenda, talking points for presentations at community meetings, and information for the website and social media platforms.

**Engaging with the Community.** As previously mentioned, there are many traditional and non-traditional strategies that can be employed during this ongoing engagement process.

Table 9: Community Engagement Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hold community meetings or other informational/social events such as luncheons or dinners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distribute information via traditional media such as newspapers and community newsletters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Traditional Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a webpage to disseminate information and engage the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize social media platforms (e.g., Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use interactive message boards in public spaces for targeted feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where permitted, disseminate information to families through schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hold special events within the community to demonstrate the benefits of TOD and solicit feedback, such as workshops with an artistic or open discussion format (listening sessions, drawing boards, gallery walks, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At a series of initial meetings/workshops with the community, general feedback, risks/issues, opportunities, and opinions should be shared and received. NOACA, SVD, the City, and RTA should engage their audience in discussing how TOD can enhance the revitalization efforts already underway in Slavic Village. Collateral materials could include “visual preference” images for the potential redevelopment of the St. Alexis Hospital site and for E. 55th Street. Further, there should be special focus on engaging the aging-in-place population, since this group is growing and the viability of the neighborhood will rest, in no small part, on the extent to which they want to continue living in the neighborhood, as opposed to leaving for the suburbs or another region entirely. This special focus will help NOACA, SVD, their institutional partners, and the development community shape what successful TOD can look like in this neighborhood.

Meetings and workshops should be held in a variety of community settings and should include an organized strategy for receiving comments, concerns, and suggestions. People may not feel comfortable speaking in front of others, so an alternative strategy could include distributing paper and pens for them to list ideas or a “gallery walk” where participants walk around to posters, writing their comments down and discussing in small groups. Another approach could involve prepared questions to poll participants or topic cards to start small group discussions. It is good practice to provide a survey at the end of each session for participants to summarize their experiences.

Another tactic that has worked well for other community engagement projects involves displaying interactive boards in public spaces (libraries, community centers, stores, barbershops, etc.). This allows community members to use stickers or write down their opinions on the board over the course of a week or two. It can be an accessible form of quantitative and qualitative data collection in which participants can provide input without having to change their schedules.

**Ongoing Engagement.** Once information from the community meetings and workshops has been consolidated, it will be important to revisit the original planning concepts or project plans to see how they align with community suggestions. NOACA and SVD should keep the website and other social media updated regularly and give TOD updates at Ward meetings. All relevant stakeholders, including existing
community businesses, should be engaged and have their opinions and concerns heard before moving forward on a finalized project.

**Measurement.** NOACA and SVD can build trust in the community, keep accurate data, and measure progress over the long term by utilizing multiple forms of engagement and by recording information from every engagement process. This could include summary notes, photos, collection of any physical documents, and social media data sets. NOACA could make the results of the engagements public through their website so that interested stakeholders can see what happened at meetings and the outcomes. NOACA should also keep track of metrics such as number of unique stakeholders engaged, number of dialogues, events, etc. as another tangible way to measure impact.

Finally, NOACA and SVD should set goals for attendance at public meetings, followers on social media, visits to the website, and other similar activities to ensure they are reaching an increasing number of people over time.