Waterfront development entities are key to success

by Diane Euchenofer

Cleveland is not the first to embark upon the making of a revitalized waterfront. In fact, several cities across the country have begun and some have completed their development efforts.

Cleveland has an opportunity to utilize the experiences of others. Cleveland must tailor its waterfront management structure to its particular dynamic setting. Above all else, the forces that shape a waterfront strategy must be action and results oriented.

The information that follows describes various waterfront delivery systems designed to accomplish development in a particular cultural geographical, political and economic environment.

**Waterfront Management Councils**
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council

The management council is a special purpose governmental body formed to deal with coastal management. The councils receive their authority to control land use and development through state enabling legislation. Members represent business, government, and citizen groups. As a part of their management responsibilities, the council assumes a regulatory function. Before a landowner can alter waterfront property a permit must be obtained from the council. This is a powerful device to ensure waterfront development proceeds according to pre-determined plans.

**Quasi-Public (non-profit) Development Corporation**
- Charles Center - Inner Harbor Management Corporation
  Baltimore, Maryland

The quasi-public development corporation is established through a contractual agreement between the city and the organization. It receives the authority to manage the planning and execution of a project from the arrangement. The degree of autonomy granted to the corporation will vary with the nature of the project and state enabling legislation. It acts as a third party mechanism by which joint ventures are negotiated between the city and private development.

**Private (profit-making) Development Corporation**
- LaClede's Landing
  St. Louis, Missouri

Private development corporations are established by the local government through special enabling legislation. Once the legal basis is achieved, the special corporation can be formed between private developers and financial interests. The planning area is defined and action can begin. Studies are completed for redevelopment, public opinion is sought, designs fin-

ished and financing secured. The final proposal is reviewed by government agencies and the public. Approval by the government agencies is obtained after public hearings.

Two vital documents created by the private development corporation are the Parcel Development Agreement and Urban Design Guidelines. The first one sets the terms and conditions under which a property owner can proceed with plans to develop land properties. The plans must be approved before a tax abatement contract is signed. The second document explains in greater detail the development plan.

**Public-Private Development Venture**
- Freeman Harbour Project
  Norfolk, Virginia

Under a public-private development venture a new management structure is not created, instead, the public sector takes a new approach to waterfront development within the established institutional framework. Public and private sectors work as partners under a contractual agreement to contribute specific elements to the development project. Public and private resources, especially financial ones, are pooled so that a project can be implemented.

The different forms of management structure explained above demonstrate the number of approaches which can be used to make waterfront lands productive. Not all structures are ideal for Cleveland. Cleveland's system of government, economic conditions, political environment and the role of the private sector will determine which structure will be most effective.
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In April, 1984, a steering committee was formed under the chairmanship of William E. MacDonald, to supervise the development of a plan for the target area. On March 12, 1985, the MacDonald Lakefront Steering Committee released their recommendations for the development of the area from the mouth of the Cuyahoga to East 55. The results of the study are as follows:

1) The Port - generally will remain in port activities;
2) The Stadium/Inner Harbor Area - will be redeveloped for more utilization;
3) Burke Lakefront Airport - will remain as an airport through the year 2005 and,
4) Lakeside Yacht Basin/55 Street - will continue under the auspices of public ownership (with the exception of Nicholson Terminal which should be redeveloped into residential uses).

The Lakefront Concept calls for people-oriented uses to serve the cultural, recreation and retailing needs of all citizens of Cleveland. It focuses on a 50-acre land mass on the Cleveland waterfront in the Inner Harbor Area. The Concept is broken into two phases with phase I consisting of four stages.

**Phase I**

**Stage 1** A new 7.4 acre lake, called Erie Street Landing extending from the Pier 32/34 basin.
- A 40 slip marina
- A promenade around Erie Street Landing
- A special event site at Pier 34
- A festival Park for summer activities
- Two new restaurants

**Stage II** A world class aquarium with 70,000 square feet of space, revealing aquariums in Baltimore and Boston, and attracting as many as 800,000 visitors per year.
- A new parking garage for 1,500 cars built over existing railroad tracks to offer pedestrian traffic to the waterfront.
- A 16,000 square foot Wintergarden—a lush, glass-enclosed, public garden in which people can meet the year round.

**Stage III** A 45,000 square foot Maritime Museum, to house a significant collection of maritime artifacts and information.
- A rail link to Public Square

**Stage IV** A Festival Retail Market, comprising 120,000 square feet of restaurants and specialty shops.

**Phase II**
- 500 residential units
- A major hotel
- Expanded retail and parking facilities

Besides the obvious aesthetic improvements to our lakefront, the economic benefits over a projected 25-year study period for phases I and II are expected to result in $118 million for the City. The revenue will come in the form of property and income taxes, Urban Development Action Grant repayments, land lease payments and project participation. In addition, approximately 1,300 men years of construction employment and a permanent annual employment of approximately 1,380 (represen-
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ating an annual payroll in excess of $19 million) individuals.

Estimated Phase I costs are approximately $103 million. $22 million for parking facilities, $21 for the aquarium, $20 million for the festival retail marketplace, $10 million for the maritime museum, $5 million for the inner lake and $25 million for two restaurants, a wintergarden, marina, festival park, etc.

Phase II costs are approximately $165 million including hotels, residential units, expanded aquarium

Below is a survey which is being conducted as part of a class project for a graduate student at Cleveland State University. The results of the survey concerning the Lakefront Concept will be tabulated so that your voice can be heard through the Waterfront Coalition. Thanks for participating. Your contributions are appreciated.

(PLEASE PRINT)
Your Name ___________________________ Phone No. ___________________________
Address _________________________________________________________________
City ___________________________ Zip ___________________________

If you live in Cleveland, what is the name of your Neighborhood? ___________________________

Please check the age grouping in which you fall.

- Under 18
- 18 - 25
- 26 - 34
- 35 - 49
- 50 - 64
- 65 +

Please check one ethnic group in which you fall.

- Black
- Hispanic
- Other
- White
- Oriental

What is your Gender? (Please check one)

- Male
- Female

Do you visit the Lakefront Parks? (Circle one)

Yes
No

If yes which one(s)? __________________________________________

Would you use Cleveland’s Waterfront if the following facilities were available? (Please circle the answer which best describes your feelings.)

Boating? Yes Not Sure No
Fishing? Yes Not Sure No
Walking/Jogging Paths Yes Not Sure No
Bikeway? Yes Not Sure No
Recreation Areas? Yes Not Sure No
Restaurants Yes Not Sure No
Shopping? Yes Not Sure No
Aquarium? Yes Not Sure No
Maritime Museum? Yes Not Sure No
Concerts? Yes Not Sure No
Wintergarden? Yes Not Sure No
Sports Events? Yes Not Sure No
Plaza? Yes Not Sure No
Festivals? Yes Not Sure No

A variety of funding sources would be utilized to fund the lakefront development project. Approximately $47 million or 45 percent of Phase I costs are proposed to be borne through the private sector through supportable debt and equity. The State of Ohio will be asked to contribute approximately $24 million. Approximately $19 million of Federal Government assistance, primarily through Urban Development Action Grants, and approximately $8 million in local (City and County) funds.

Would you use the following services if they were available on Cleveland’s Waterfront? (Please circle one)

Sailing School? Yes Not Sure No
Canoe School? Yes Not Sure No
Arts & Craft Classes? Yes Not Sure No
Environmental Classes? Yes Not Sure No

Please check the income bracket in which your family falls.

- Below $6,000 per year
- $6,000 to $12,999 per year
- $13,000 to $24,999 per year
- $25,000 to $49,999 per year
- $50,000 or above per year

Would you support the Concept? (Please circle one.)

Yes
Not Sure
No

Before reading about the Lakefront Concept in the Waterfront News, did you know about the Concept? (Please Circle one.)

Yes
No

If yes, through what medium (e.g. Newspaper, Television, etc.) did you learn of the Lakefront Concept? (Please rank the following mediums in succession; placing the number 1 on the line preceding the medium which informed you first, the number 2 on the line preceding the medium which informed you second, the number 3 for the third source and so on...only number those sources which gave you information about the Concept; if you received no information from a source, leave the line blank).

- Newspaper
- Television
- Radio
- Magazine
- Friends
- Family
- Other (explain) ___________________________

Please write any suggestions and/or concerns about the Lakefront Concept below. If you need more space, please use a blank sheet of paper.

__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Please use the envelope enclosed in this issue to return the survey.
“Cleveland Aquarium Update”

It’s been referred to as the “jewel” in the Stadium-Inner Harbor development. Studies have suggested that greater Clevelanders consider it one of the top three attractions in the waterfront development, and that it should draw over 800,000 visitors yearly. The recipient of all these positive comments? Cleveland’s proposed world class aquarium, proudly predicted to rival those in Baltimore and Boston.

Yet until its completion, the city has good reason to be proud of the waterfront facility’s predecessor: The Cleveland Aquarium. For over 30 years, the Gordon Park site has welcomed visitors with live marine and freshwater exhibits from the world over. Opened to the public on Labor Day 1954, the (then) new aquarium was drawing standing room only crowds within a year. And more recently—last year, to be exact—over 114,000 people viewed and explored the Cleveland Aquarium’s offerings.

Although the aquarium building is city-owned, the facility has been operated since its inception by the Cleveland Museum of Natural History. In part due to this arrangement, the Cleveland Aquarium was forced to close its doors to the public in mid-June of this year. The closing occurred as the Museum faced the immediate cost of correcting various structural problems (most notably a bad roof), as well as a continuing, mounting operating deficit. Then, on July 30, Museum President David S. Ingalls Jr. notified the city that the Museum would not renew its operating contract after year end 1985.

In a Plain Dealer article published August 1, Museum Director Harold D. Mahan stated that the city’s yearly $34,000 subsidy was inadequate to help meet the $20,000 monthly costs for the care of animals and the continued on page 2
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salaries of key employees. An additional $65,000 subsidy has been requested from the city so that the aquarium operations simply break even. Lest anyone question the Aquarium’s current fiscal management abilities, the insight of Richard Segedi, former curator of the Cleveland Aquarium, is meaningful. In a July 29 letter to the Plain Dealer, Segedi writes:

“...the Cleveland Aquarium exhibits compare well with those of other major city aquariums. I would add that the Cleveland Aquarium does this on a budget that is minuscule in comparison to those other institutions. I remain convinced, after my 15 years on the staff, that no other institution can squeeze more out of a budget dollar than can the Cleveland Aquarium.”

For the past two months, representatives of the City, the Museum, and the Aquarium have met and discussed how to improve their already-perfected budgetary squeeze tactics so as to repair, reopen, and continue operations of the Aquarium. Although reluctant to increase the $34,000/year subsidy, Mayor George V. Voinovich has repeatedly assured the community that the Aquarium’s future is safe. The Aquarium’s plight has also received sympathetic press coverage, both in print and on television. But the solution won’t be that easy. “The City can’t be expected to come up with several hundred thousand dollars out of its hip-pocket just like that,” agreed Daniel H. Moreno, Director of the Cleveland Aquarium.

As a first step, however, proposals for operating expense assistance have been submitted to a number of Cleveland foundations. Although corporate and foundation supporters have suggested that the Cleveland Metroparks could be offered control of the Aquarium, Moreno wonders what kind of organization would accept such a “gift,” burdened as it is with a potential $500,000 repair bill.

While awaiting a city-minded Good Samaritan to step forward, the aquarium staff is fully occupied with normal animal care routines, plus a number of minor renovations. Within budget constraints, tank fronts are being repainted, and selected exhibits are being “aquascape,” or landscaped under water. Both these tasks were impractical when the aquarium was open to the public. And although previously-published reports stated an October 1 start date for selling the exhibits and animals, no such sales have been arranged. “We’re going ahead with our normal planning,” said Moreno. “No one is out looking for other jobs.”

Most observers would agree that’s just as well. With the promise on the horizon of an expanded, new aquarium as part of the Inner Harbor development, it makes little sense to dissolve the nucleus of exhibits, and more importantly, the experienced personnel of the current Cleveland Aquarium. “It’s taken over two decades to assemble the current staff, many with talents quite specialized,” remarked Moreno, himself a 31-year veteran. “And they’re at least as good as, if not the best, in the country. I just hope we’ll have a brand new aquarium some day soon.”

Soulds, Skins, and Sovereignty

George Ryan, President of the Lake Carriers’ Association, spoke to an interested group of 35 last month on a particular topic of Great Lakes history. His talk was titled “Souls, Skins, and Sovereignty—the French Exploration of the Great Lakes,” and included some fact-filled discussion of a bygone era.

Did you know, for example, that Lake Michigan was discovered in 1634 by Jean Nicolet while searching for a route to China? Finding the easy passage to China’s riches was the goal of many during the period. The mode of transportation? Birch-bark canoe, of course.

Ryan carried the audience through the “modernization” of canoes to the point where huge fur-loaded canoes with several men on board would keep an extensive trade system in operation throughout the Great Lakes. It was the beaver that was much sought-after, and quite simply this creature was the real catalyst in opening up the Great Lakes region. The British and the French, along with allied Indian groups, competed for many years in the fur trade, sometimes peacefully and sometimes not so peacefully. By 1755 the British were building warships on Lake Ontario and soon thereafter established their control over the Great Lakes.

George Ryan, with an extensive background in naval and shipping matters, treated the audience to a showing of some slides on the shipping industry today. Knowledgeable in so many areas of Great Lakes history, he answered questions on everything from navigating the Cuyahoga to finding the meaning of the Cat Indians who once lived not far from here.

This informative public meeting was organized by Emeline Clawson, and was co-sponsored by the Waterfront Coalition and the Lakefront Great Lakes Commit.
North Cuyahoga Valley Corridor Group Has Bold Plan to Link Flat

The identification of the Waterfront as a priority area for re-development in Cleveland is the beginning of a change in our collective community vision. Through the efforts of concerned citizens, (i.e. groups like the Waterfront Coalition), Clevelanders are beginning to restore and reinvigorate key community assets. Since I moved from Cleveland in 1977 and returned in 1983, the developments of the six years inbetween gave enough evidence of changed attitudes. Since then, the Arcade and the Terminal Tower have been restored as the focus of downtown activity. Tower City Center and The Sohio project will provide additional regeneration.

“Clevelanders are beginning to restore and reinvigorate key community assets.”

The continuing restoration of Edgewater Park and Playhouse Square also give support to the thesis that Cleveland is on the verge of a major civic renaissance. There are other developments that can be included—the zoo, the Flats, the International Exposition Center at the Airport. I do not wish to exclude any major new initiatives.

The point is that because of new initiatives and changing visions, Clevelanders can become even bolder in their actions. The North Cuyahoga Valley Corridor Project is one example of what vision can help accomplish if we allow ourselves to make dreams a reality. Perhaps a little background is needed.

The Cleveland/Akron area is one of only a handful of cities that has an urban National Park at its doorstep. Just seven (7) miles from Downtown Cleveland is the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area (CVNRA). The CVNRA is one of our least known local treasures. Part of the reason for this is the incredible presence of the Metropark System, which rings Greater Cleveland with an Emerald Necklace. (The Bedford and Brecksville Metropark Reservation are part of the CVNRA). In addition, the first ten (10) years of the CVNRA were primarily concerned with acquisition, planning, and other groundwork which lay the foundation for what is to come.

“Just 7 miles from Downtown Cleveland is the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area...one of our least known local treasures...”
ith Urban National Park

The position of the north Cuyahoga Valley Corridor Inc. is that we have two major focal points of new activity and development. Both are in Cuyahoga County but at opposite ends of the Cuyahoga Valley. Perhaps both can build upon each other, improving not only the success of both developments, but allowing for major change in the seven (7) mile corridor between the North end of the CVNRA and the Flats. The bold vision is to link these two developments so that:

1. The National Recreation Area becomes more accessible to Cleveland neighborhoods such as Slavic Village, Tremont, Old Brooklyn, and Archwood-Denison.
2. Important public lands within the Corridor such as Washington and Tremont Parks can be restored.

3. The Flats can increase its attraction for further mixed-use development i.e. housing, advanced industry, and historic preservation of Cleveland’s industrial valley.

Obviously, this stretch of the Cuyahoga River Valley cannot be as pristine and park-like as the Chagrin and Rocky River Valleys. Also, this land is critical to the industrial base of the County, and retention of advanced manufacturing needs to be encouraged.

"...because of new initiatives and changing visions, Clevelanders can become even bolder in their actions."

However, the nature of industrial firms is changing. Water quality and air quality have dramatically improved. Cleveland in the mid-1970’s has 260 days a year or non-attainment of clean air standards. For the past five (5) years, this total has shrunk to one (1) day per year.

For water quality, although the improvement is not as dramatic, the continuing out-of-towner sneers about the Cuyahoga River are a sure sign of someone who has not visited Cleveland for some time.

Because of industrial and environmental change, as well as the two activity centers—the CVNRA to the south and the Flats-Oxbow area to the north, a public accessway for rail transportation, canal restoration, and all-purpose hiking and biking trails can be a good long-range development, a development which can line this area’s great park heritage—Metroparks, CVNA and the Lakefront State Park.

The vision which created the Metroparks in the earliest part of the 20th Century as well as the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area ten years ago can be rekindled. As a trustee for the North Cuyahoga Valley Corridor Inc., I welcome the support of enthusiastic citizens.

"...a development which can link this area’s great park heritage..."

Tom Yablonsky is President of North Cuyahoga Valley Corridor. He works as a senior planner at Planning Resources, Inc. and serves on the Advisory Board of the Cleveland Waterfront Coalition.

For more information on NCVCI he can be reached at 687-0055 (work) or 651-9366 (home).
Governor Richard F. Celeste today announced plans to provide $8.4 million for the creation of a state park as part of the Cleveland Waterfront Development Project. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources funds will provide for excavation of the 7.4 acre Inner Harbor lake which will become part of the Cleveland Lakefront State Park System.

Governor Celeste pointed out the cooperation which has moved the project along since it was unveiled by the Waterfront Steering Committee on March 12, 1985. "It has been a pleasure working with Mayor Voinovich and the City, the State Representatives from the area and the private sector on a project of such importance to all Northeastern Ohio. The final outcome of this effort is that we are helping spur development that will put Ohioans to work," said Governor Celeste.

Construction of the Inner Harbor is expected to begin in 1986 and should be completed within two years. The state funds, which are awaiting approval of the State Controlling Board, will be used to begin construction of the first phase of the project. Phase one includes the excavation of the inner harbor as well as the planned construction of a public garden, a world-class aquarium and adjacent retail market areas, restaurants, a marina and rail links to Public Square and existing parking facilities. It is scheduled for completion by 1990 at a total cost of $103 million.

Phase two of the project is open-ended and is targeted to include residential units and a major hotel over the next 25 years.

Other funding for the project is expected to come from a variety of public and private sector sources including debt, equity, and city and federal loans and grants. The public sector contributions are expected to provide seed money for the development which will draw private investment to the project area.

William E. MacDonald, Chairman of The North Coast Development Corporation noted that the financial benefits to the city from the two-phased development could total $118 million in property and income taxes, land-lease payments, UDAG loan repayments and revenues from project operating receipts. In addition, it is estimated that the development will provide more than $89 million in labor expenditures, 1,300 man years of construction employment, 1,380 permanent jobs and a permanent annual payroll of $19 million.

“Waterfront News” is the official publication of the Cleveland Waterfront Coalition. It is published six times per year: January, March, May, July, September and November. The opinions expressed by the authors of articles published in the "Waterfront News" are not necessarily those of the Cleveland Waterfront Coalition.

EDITORIAL STAFF
Luwanne C. Bolle-Becker
Paul Svedersky

TRUSTEES
Ralph Voverka, President
Diane Eisenhauer, Vice President
Virginia Benson
Thomas Evans
George Hayward
William Ondrey Gruber
John R. Wolfe
Susana Cerny
Edmund M. Ciolek Jr.
Eunice B. Clawson
A.M. Daniels
James W. Day
James V. Fuller
Robert C. Gaede
Helen Hora
Norma S. Huey
James S. Kastellec
David L. Lehmer
Stacy Mandel
Albert H. Parker
Peter R. Pucher
Robert Reeves
Alan G. Shuttten
David Stites
Thomas J. Yabonsky

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Paul Svedersky
THE CUYAHOGA RIVER
HOW CLEAN IS IT?

The Cuyahoga River is certainly one of America's unique rivers. Not many rivers, after all, have had the distinction of catching fire and drawing national attention. Flames were as high as a 5-story building, and did some $50,000 worth of damage to railroad property. The real damage, however, was what the fire did to the image of the city.

Used in testimonies throughout the nation as an example of just how bad water pollution could get, the event at least served a purpose of reversing the trend of using waterways as dumping sites. The Cuyahoga River has come a long way since 1969, and Bob Wysenski of the Ohio EPA shared some recent water quality news at a meeting of the North Cuyahoga Valley Corridor, Inc. on Thursday, November 28th. With a film called "The Cuyahoga," Wysenski covered the river's history, beginning with the desires of Benjamin Franklin in 1765 to build a fort where the lake and river meet. (General Washington agreed that this was a good idea.) From the early days of Moses Cleaveland and the settlers that followed, the Cuyahoga River was hardly given a moment's rest. The river was indeed a "working river" from the very beginning.

By 1863, 20 oil refineries were producing in Cleveland, making this area the oil refining center of the world for the time. In the late 1860's the river was a golden color with its oil covering. This was viewed as a sign of progress. In later years Theodore Roosevelt called Cleveland "a city of progress" for making the river work for the benefit of man. The chocolate-brown river didn't flow, as some reports had it, it "oozed."

In the late 1960's a flood of pollution control equipment was on the market, and what better place to try some of it out than on the Cuyahoga. In 1970 the City devised a plan of action whereupon any spill into the river could be cleaned up
quickly by the Coast Guard, Fire Department, and other "team" members. The defined plan of action is still in use today.

Today much of the visible pollution on the river is not due to blatant dumping by the industries along the river, according to Wysenski. Heavy rainfall carries with its run-off much of the debris and pollutants from non-specific sources. Everything seems to end up in the river, whether it be from natural causes (fallen tree limbs) or not-so-natural causes (litter and debris that finds its way into the river system.) Because the river winds its course for 80 miles, there are many points of entry. Everything turns up at the mouth of the river, and eventually the lake.

Water quality is a variable that has many dimensions. Is a river that looks clean really clean in substance? Will a water quality sample at one point speak for other points along the river? Will a winter sampling be the same as one in the summer? The EPA does an assessment in two ways, and tries to take these and other considerations into account.

Wysenski spoke of both the chemical and biological assessments that the EPA undertakes. With the chemical analysis, the EPA takes a "snapshot" look at water quality—what is in the water right then and there. With the biological study, the EPA examines the number of fish as well as the variety of species found, giving a more long-range look at water quality.

The 1984 study results of the Cuyahoga River are still being written up today, but the initial conclusions are promising. Wysenski noted the "miraculous improvements" over the last 20 years, and the trends are continuing. The "weak" point in the entire Cuyahoga River today is found near the Akron sewage system where only one specie of fish could be found in the sample and could be found in the sample areas and they numbered very few. Near the Cleveland sewage treatment plant, 12 species of fish were found, and they were much more numerous. Even near the steel mills, water quality tests showed much improvement. The EPA is now beginning to investigate the problem in the Akron area.

While the water quality of the Cuyahoga River continues to improve, Wysenski concluded that the river was still not good enough to recommend full-body contact. "Canoeing, recreational boating, and similar activities are fine," he said, "but not swimming." As one member of the audience added, "Not yet."

---

ENGINEERING AND DESIGN FIRMS HIRED FOR INNER HARBOR STATE PARK

On November 18th, The State Controlling Board released $630,500 through the Ohio Department of Natural Resources to hire two firms to develop final project designs for the downtown inner harbor state park. Governor Celeste applauded the action as a significant step forward, saying development of the lakefront was a priority for his administration.

Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff, along with William Behnke & Associates have already begun looking into the project which Celeste has promised and the legislature has appropriated to the tune of $8.45 million.

Ground breaking will take place early next summer.