

Name	Comments	Disposition of Comments
GCRTA	<p>Thank you the opportunity to comment on the draft eNEO2050 Plan. The eNEO2050 Plan is grounded on high-level data utilizing the regional transportation model and statistical analysis methods. Its organization into scenario based planning allows the region to determine funding allocations. As a conduit for federal funds, strategic targeting of these dollars is an effective method to meet the transportation needs of the region.</p> <p>Public Transit is a vital mode of transportation that strengthens equity and inclusion of our region. Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority would like to comment on the following themes found throughout the eNEO2050 Plan:</p> <p>MAINTAINING INFRASTRUCTURE It must be recognized that the implementation of the Maintain Scenario will require additional funding for public transit infrastructure. The present-day infrastructure that GCRTA operates requires re-investment. Historically, public transit infrastructure has been underfunded, with a current backlog of \$344 million of unfunded capital projects. Transit must achieve additional funding to be an equitable solution for other auto centric infrastructure and for the largest regional transportation system to operate at a state-of-good repair.</p> <p>RAIL EXTENSIONS The inclusion of the extensive rail transit expansion should be a balanced approach given density and population trends of the region. The county's density, population, employment, transit ridership, and length of transit trip have all substantially decreased over the past decades and will experience little-to-no growth by 2050 (as shown in Table 9-1: Population Forecasts). The Ohio Statewide Transit Needs study showed inter-county transit trips are also decreasing. We believe the Transit Scenario should prioritize existing rail infrastructure and reinvestment within the 30-year period.</p> <p>TRANSIT SERVICE FREQUENCY Increasing the frequency of service on existing transit routes should be considered in the plan as a cost effective strategy to shift trips to transit, support transit oriented development in established communities, and increase job access equitably. The GCRTA 2020 Strategic Plan proposed increasing GCRTA bus service by 25% in the Expanded Funding Concept. This was projected to make 17,000 more jobs accessible by transit in 60 minutes to the average resident of Cuyahoga County. Increased frequency reduces overall travel times and makes the option to ride a bus instead of driving a car more competitive. Providing operational and capital funds to increase transit services in priority corridors, such as bus purchases and facility improvements, should be incorporated in this plan.</p> <p>TRANSIT RIDERSHIP AND MODE SHIFT TO TRANSIT The eNEO2020 plan should set goals for mode shift to transit and other non-single occupancy vehicle modes that reflect community climate change mitigation plans and community Vision Zero goals. This may result in more ambitious mode-shift goals than noted in the Congestion Management Objectives. The plan should identify strategies for meeting these goals, such as increased transit service on existing routes, and investing in bus priority corridors.</p> <p>PRIORITY TRANSIT CORRIDORS Developing the regional priority transit corridors as BRT systems should be a priority for equitable transit in the region. The GCRTA priority corridors as shown in the GCRTA 2020 strategic plan should be acknowledged. Some discussion of potential improvements to these corridors to improve speed, reliability, and pedestrian safety and convenience, such as bus priority signalization, dedicated bus lanes, improved transit waiting environments, and TOD planning, should be included. Aggregation of transit investment in these corridors can be catalytic to the community through focused resource allocation. Providing funds in priority transit corridors to increase transit services should be prioritized.</p> <p>STREET ARTERIAL NETWORK RT A believes in a well-maintained arterial street network in order to efficiently run public transit. Arterials that serve transit corridors within the region should be prioritized for street improvements. Communities that lack resources to implement street construction projects need NOACA to play a vital role in designing and implementing street projects that are safe for buses, bikes, and pedestrians. NOACA has resources to coordinate cities, counties, and other stakeholders to focus on the condition of streets critical to the region's transportation network. These projects should expand to include signal prioritization technology and safe, accessible, well-lit transit stops and sidewalks. Transit streets should connect to nearby bike facilities for a connected multi-modal system.</p> <p>TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT eNEO2050 needs to incorporate and expand upon findings of the NOACA TOD Scorecard Study. NOACA could play a vital role in the development of funds, programs, and resources to aid in development of TOD projects throughout the region. Such deployment of resources would aid in equitable distribution of resources to communities in need. The plan would benefit from a more robust discussion and implementation plan for TOD, discussing aspects such as zoning incentives and funding incentives, design for walkability, parking considerations, and the importance of equitable housing.</p> <p>JOB HUBS eNEO2050 has many elements relating to the current job hubs in the region. Job hubs are highlighted in the plan for autonomous shuttles, public transportation routes and other improvements. In addition to focusing on job hubs, the plan should also emphasize more equitable access to jobs in general. Job hub growth trends for the next 30 years should be researched and quantified before being the backbone of a multi decade regional plan. Excluding Downtown and University Circle, which are very accessible by transit, the "Major Regional Job Hubs" identified by NOACA accounted for just 8% of all regional jobs in 2016. Industrial and distribution centers have grown; however, service and data center facilities have decreased their size and have increased the number of home based employees. Previous studies data suggests that shuttle and transit routes that connect job hub to job hub do not serve many, as the primary destination of a transit rider is to a work site from home.</p> <p>EQUITY The plan does include definition, analysis and identification of transportation equity however, it never determines a comprehensive implementation plan. As a major funding agency, NOACA has the ability to prioritize projects and could develop equity indicators to assist with providing equitable distribution of transportation funding throughout the region. Equity planning for environmental justice (EJ) communities in the eNEO2050 plan centers around increased public transit access to job hubs. While GCRTA currently serves all job hubs in Cuyahoga County, job hubs that have developed near highway interchanges with low densities are relatively expensive, inefficient, and resource-consuming for transit to serve and inconvenient for transit riders. Improved multimodal access for EJ communities to jobs in core urbanized areas, through investment in infrastructure that supports walking, biking, and the existing transit network, should have a greater emphasis in the plan. The associated plan performance measures (and congestion management objectives) addressing EJ community transit access should be accordingly adjusted to reflect increased access to all jobs.</p> <p>AUTONOMOUS SHUTTLE FEEDER BUSES It is important to identify new and emerging modes of transit in a long-range plan. However, the level of detail for autonomous shuttles/vehicles may diminish other findings in the plan. There are currently no funding to plan or implement autonomous shuttles within this region by 2050. This plan should focus on identifying areas with specific metrics where autonomous technology can be deployed most effectively, including existing corridors with exclusive right-of-ways and capacity to dedicate such technology.</p> <p>TECHNOLOGY The technology detailed in the plan is primarily devoted to autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles and charging stations, and the Hyperloop. Technological advances have proven to be difficult to predict over time and this plan needs to be open to incorporate new emerging technologies. Smart City technology continues to develop. Smart City technology connects infrastructure and vehicles to improve safety and street operations. In addition, Smart City technology will require inter-governmental collaboration and will benefit from NOACA serving as a facilitator for these investments. As an example, traffic signalization has the ability to transmit and communicate with vehicles. The optimization of traffic patterns can increase throughput, safety, and frequency. It is also important to enable preemption, priority, or queue jumps for transit vehicles within this system. The funding of signal prioritization systems should be a priority as a way to increase transit ridership and lead the way to future automation. NOACA's regional approach would be key to deploying such systems across county and municipal lines.</p> <p>SAFETY + VISION ZERO Transportation safety needs to be fully developed and referenced within the plan. With fatalities at all-time highs and several key regional stakeholders, such as the City of Cleveland, ODOT, and University Circle, directing their energy on safety sensitive projects, it is imperative that the regional transportation plan identifies safety as a key issue and collaborates with Vision Zero. The eNEO2050 plan document accepts some traffic fatalities as a given, whereas Vision Zero has a goal of no traffic fatalities.</p> <p>PEDESTRIAN MOBILITY The first and last mile of transit trips involves walking in a pedestrian environment. The plan does not fully address all safety and connectivity concerns of pedestrians. While specific crossing improvements are mapped, other projects that support increased pedestrian mobility should be included and discussed, such as sidewalk widening, intersection improvements such as bumpouts, road diets, ADA accessibility improvements, and streetscape amenities such as trees, and benches. The NOACA ACTIVATE plan is referenced in eNEO2050, but the details of the ACTIVATE plan should be more fully integrated into the eNEO2050.</p> <p>These are our concerns and we encourage NOACA to take our comments and suggestions into consideration for the LRTP. This plan will be instrumental in directing our region forward into the next decades.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o GCRTA Priority Corridor: "eNEO 2050 includes GCRTAs priority corridors as shown in GCRTA 2020 strategic plan as Bus-Rapid-Transit systems. NOACA will continue to work with GCRTA on improving speed, reliability, pedestrian safety and convenience, dedicated bus lanes, and improved transit waiting environments along these corridors." o Transit Asset Management: eNEO 2050 prioritizes \$2.2 billion in funding for transit preservation projects that are classified into two categories: vehicle replacements and non-vehicle capital maintenance. eNEO 2050 advocates to ensure adequate funding is available to maintain the rail system, which would cost \$4 billion to build today and is a lifeline for many people to access jobs, particularly for EJ communities. o Transit-Oriented Development: eNEO 2050 includes transit-oriented development (TOD) as a mechanism to better connect land uses and transportation investments. NOACA has been actively working with the City of Cleveland and GCRTA to advance specific TOD sites. NOACA will continue to facilitate the development of TOD based on the TOD study and scorecard. o Transit mode share: eNEO 2050 promotes a mode shift towards improved transit usage across the region by providing access to the transit system and mobility within the transit system. The following transit solution make transit more competitive and desirable as a mode: Low cost traffic engineering solutions at identified arterial bottleneck locations on transit routes, more park-and-ride locations throughout the region, highway lanes to express buses and car pooling, more bike lanes and side walks to access major transit stations, and bike racks adjacent to transit stops. o Transit-Oriented Development: eNEO 2050 includes transit-oriented development (TOD) as a mechanism to better connect land uses and transportation investments. NOACA has been actively working with the City of Cleveland and GCRTA to advance specific TOD sites. NOACA will continue to facilitate the development of TOD based on the TOD study and scorecard.

<p>City of Cleveland Heights</p>	<p>On behalf of the City of Cleveland Heights, the purpose of this letter is to commend you and your staff for creating a clear process and a draft plan that is detailed, based upon a tremendous amount of analysis and research, relies upon best long-range transportation planning practices that are in line with Federal standards, is aspirational in its vision for the region over the next 30 years, has well thought-out policies, recommendations, and action items. Based upon consultation with the City of Cleveland Heights' Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), Police Department, Department of Public Works, and others, we offer the following observations and comments that we feel will make the Plan even better. These range from overarching general observations to some very specific comments.</p> <p>1. In 2018 the City of Cleveland Heights adopted its Complete and Green Streets Ordinance, which went on to be recognized as one of the top complete streets ordinances in the United States. Although the City is grateful that a number of road resurfacing projects within Cleveland Heights have been included, these should all fulfill the goals and objectives of our Complete and Green Streets Ordinance. Each of the projects should be done in conjunction with green infrastructure, improvements to transit stops, upgraded or improved bicycle facilities, new or improved sidewalks, synchronization of signals, and should, wherever possible, be coordinated with other infrastructure maintenance, upgrades, or replacement projects. Further, full roadway lengths should be improved as opposed to segments within a community (for example in Appendix 10-4, the Lee Rd project(s) extend from North Park Boulevard to Superior Road, but not to Monticello Boulevard and beyond within the City limits). Also, consideration should be given for improvements to the full length of roadways that cross through multiple jurisdictions (for example, in Appendix 10-4, the Warrensville Ctr. Road (CR 4) Resurfacing project should include the Cleveland Heights side of the roadway as well; the Taylor Road Resurfacing and Streetscape project should incorporate the Cleveland Heights side of the roadway).</p> <p>2. There is a natural synergy between the City of Cleveland Heights and University Circle. Not only do many of the students and workers live in Cleveland Heights, but many City residents go to University Circle for medicine, arts and culture, and restaurants, while Cleveland Heights' unique mix of restaurants and local retail attracts many University Circle residents and workers to enjoy our amenities. Further, there is a direct land use and transportation connection. This synergy should be highlighted in the Plan and there should be additional projects that enhance the connection. Not only is this holistic, but would represent a truly regional effort. Roadway surfacing projects that are occurring in University Circle should be continued to and through Cleveland Heights; non-motorized projects such as bike lanes should be amplified; signals should be coordinated; transit services should be improved.</p> <p>3. The Plan should place greater emphasis and focus on non-motorized modes of travel. The COVID-19 pandemic has taught us that people have a need and desire to engage physically with the built environment. However, many if not most communities lack sufficient infrastructure and facilities to accommodate those activities. While road construction, reconstruction, and resurfacing are needed throughout our region, greater diversity of projects to focus more on trails, pathways, bike lanes, shared streets/woonerfs, etc. would be valuable as a way to combat climate change. Specific to the City of Cleveland Heights, especially since transit options are limited to bus, non-motorized elements should be integrated into proposed projects and stand-alone non-motorized projects should be emphasized.</p> <p>4. Beyond getting out of one's car to walk or bike for recreational purposes, micro-mobility has risen in its importance, especially for millennials, "Generation Z", and college-aged individuals who prefer the convenience, flexibility, and "coolness" of e-scooters, e-bikes, and shared mobility devices for trips over automobiles or transit. While the Plan does discuss micro-mobility, there should be greater emphasis on it as a mode of transportation. This should be reflected in the long-range projects, including dedicated facilities for micromobility, as well as the necessary infrastructure. As an example, the Plan and projects could include expanding the Cuyahoga County and the City of Cleveland's regional shared e-scooter program beyond the First Suburbs to create an expansive micro-mobility network.</p> <p>5. The Plan touches on emerging technologies, but does not place much emphasis on those technologies in terms of actual projects. In fact, recently CityLab noted that innovation and advances in technology in the transportation sector lags significantly behind other sectors. The Hyperloop would be transformative and the City of Cleveland Heights is supportive of NOACA's continued development of the project. Similarly, the City supports the inclusion of Connected and Autonomous Vehicles (CAVs) within the Plan and encourages NOACA to continue to apprise itself of emerging technologies. Electric vehicle charging stations are needed throughout the region and could significantly help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions; 2. It is hard to tell from the maps in Chapter 9, but the City of Cleveland Heights suggests that the Plan include DC Fast Charging (DCFC) stations at the following locations within the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Severance Town Center (at City Hall) b. Cedar-Lee business district c. Along Mayfield Road near the Coventry business district d. In the vicinity of Mayfield Road and Warrensville Center Road e. Noble Road corridor, including at the Noble Road/Monticello Boulevard <p>Consideration for Workplace (L2) locations should also be considered within Cleveland Heights.</p> <p>6. The COVID-19 pandemic has severely impacted our local businesses. Many communities in the region and throughout the United States opened up their rights-of-way for outdoor activities and dining on a temporary basis. For many communities, including Cleveland Heights, we are now looking to make that a permanent option in the community, much like the City of Dayton has done. NOACA's Street Supplies program is great for temporary transportation projects. Consideration should be given within the Plan to expanding the program to actually provide permanent supplies to communities for "parklets" and "pedlets" to help with placemaking and supporting local businesses.</p> <p>1 https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-05-17/stop-funding-transportation-like-it-s-the-1980s 2 https://rhg.com/research/build-back-better-transportation/</p> <p>7. The City of Cleveland Heights continues to be supportive of the Transportation for Livable Communities Initiative (TLCI). It is a major source of funds for community projects, is an incredibly popular program, and has a proven record of success. Recently the Taylor Road TLCI project occurred and the City recommends that the program be funded to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>8. Given the potential for perhaps once-in-a-generation Federal infrastructure spending, the Plan should reflect that potential funding and recognize projects that would benefit from that Federal funding. Those projects that would likely not be eligible for Federal funding should be discussed separately and/or other sources of funding should be identified.</p> <p>9. Although NOACA is charged with considering a constrained funding stream and scenario, the City of Cleveland Heights urges NOACA to continue to pursue the most extensive and impactful projects possible, even if it means addressing projects in the last decade (2040-2050) of the Plan. Timing of projects within Cleveland Heights should re-examined with the City to line up with local priorities and redevelopment opportunities.</p> <p>10. The City's signal infrastructure is antiquated and in need of upgrade. The Plan should include revamping the signals along the following roadways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Cedar Road b. Lee Road c. Coventry Road south of Euclid Heights Boulevard <p>11. The Plan does not provide much discussion on Vision Zero. A regional Vision Zero commitment will be important to improving safety and decreasing pedestrian and cyclist injuries.</p> <p>12. The Plan refers to NOACA's in progress pedestrian and bicycle plan (ACTIVATE). Cleveland Heights support the development of the ACTIVATE plan. As footnote 13 on page 120 of the PDF indicates, the status of the plan is unclear and the link may not be correct. The City would like to participate in any further discussions and looks forward to the ACTIVATE plan's completion.</p> <p>13. Greater emphasis should be provided on transit expansion and upgrades. For the City of Cleveland Heights, the Plan should include expanded bus service, rather than more limited service and stops. A strong regional bus system is important and should be central to the Plan.</p> <p>14. NOACA should be reminded that in the middle part of the 20th Century rapid transit was considered along Euclid Heights Boulevard towards Warrensville. In fact, the City's mixed-use zoning districts (S1 and S2) were developed to be able to accommodate transit stations. Although aspirational, Cleveland Heights should not be left out of the discussion of any rapid transit expansion.</p> <p>15. Further attention to the elderly and disabled should be provided. No mention is made of Universal Design. The Harvard Graduate School for Design recently published "Designing for Disability Justice", which illustrates how the American Disabilities Act (ADA) does not properly accommodate those with disabilities. Their needs and accommodations should be integrated into all of the projects within the Plan.</p> <p>16. The Plan's subtitle is "Invest in Equity" and it does a great job of having equity as a guiding principle. The City of Cleveland Heights applauds and supports this focus and encourages it to guide all of our regional decision-making. Chapter 2 includes a discussion of Environmental Justice and Cleveland Heights contains Environmental Justice areas. Chapter 6 examines affordability through the Housing and Transportation Index (H+T Index), but limits that analysis to 41 communities in the region (see Figure 6-26). All communities within the region should be included in that analysis (including Cleveland Heights).</p> <p>17. The availability of data is important in decision-making. The Plan in Table x on Page 152 of the PDF notes that NOACA utilizes automated counter equipment in two (2) locations within Cleveland Heights. The City suggests that Cleveland Heights should be able to access that data.</p> <p>18. Figure x.x. on Page 164 of the PDF lists ITS projects mapped to the regional ITS architecture. Project S-47 includes the reconstruction of 12 signals in the City as well as the removal of four (4) unwarranted signals. More information about the 4 signals to be removed should be provided.</p> <p>19. Sustainability and resiliency are mentioned in the Plan, but further emphasis should be provided given the impacts of climate change. Regional efforts on sustainability, such as the "Cleveland Comprehensive Environmental Policy Platform: A Vision for 2021-2025" should be recognized in the Plan.</p> <p>20. The of Cleveland Heights is a bicycle city and supports Bike Cleveland's comments and concerns about the Plan. Again, we appreciate all of the hard work that NOACA staff has put into the Plan and the opportunity to comment to make it even better. We look forward to working closely with you on a number of projects and initiatives moving forward.</p>	<p>NOACA appreciates the comments of the City of Cleveland Heights; they are extremely helpful. NOACA will take them under advisement in the specific implementation of eNEO2050 (e.g. Euclid Heights Boulevard corridor for public transit).</p> <p>Thank you for your suggestions concerning complete and green streets. In June 2020, NOACA adopted a complete and green streets policy, which speaks to your suggestions. Highlights of the policy are: NOACA's recently approved policy will ensure all roads that are repaved or reconstructed will implement elements of green and complete streets when appropriate and feasible. Incentives for funding green and complete streets are proposed for inclusion in NOACA's investment policy (RTIP). NOACA will implement a pilot project on E. 66 St from Euclid to Superior that will be used as a regional model for the urbanized area. The policy can be accessed here: https://www.noaca.org/home/showpublisheddocument/25242/637326542826470000.</p> <p>Specific to your non-motorized comments, eNEO2050 funds 926 miles of bicycle facilities, more than 11,000 pedestrian ADA and safe crossings, and 760 bike storage lockers for cyclist in the next three decades. eNEO 2050 implements recommendations from NOACA's existing Regional Bicycle Plan and the pedestrian and bicycle plan currently under development called ACTIVATE. The broader focus of the new plan addresses three usage categories for nonmotorized modes: utilitarian trips, access to transit services (first-/last-mile connectivity), and recreational pursuits. Also NOACA is implementing a Van Pool program. NOACA will work with interested communities to implement micro-mobility initiatives such as e-scooters, e-bikes, and transportation network providers (TMP). Thank you for your suggestions for additional locations for DCFC stations, and them under advisement.</p> <p>NOACA has included illustrative projects for the "once in a lifetime funding" such as expanded rail and the Hyperloop. Safety is very important to NOACA and has highlighted it in chapter 11, "The nationally Vision Zero initiative envisages to have a transportation network with zero deaths or injuries. One of NOACA's transportation planning goals is to achieve this vision in its five-county region in the future." The text continues describing how we plan to achieve this.</p> <p>The housing and transportation evaluation analyzed affordability for 41 communities in the five counties which is a representative sample. We will add more communities including Cleveland Heights.</p> <p>Further information concerning the ITS projects can be found in the Regional ITS Architecture Report: https://noaca-its.aecomonline.net/NOACA%20ITS%20Architecture%20Report%20FINAL%202019-09.pdf</p> <p>Thank you for your comments concerning sustainability and climate change. We will review the "Cleveland Comprehensive Environmental Policy Platform: A Vision for 2021-2025" for potentially amending to the plan.</p> <p>Please see the disposition of Bike Cleveland's comments.</p>
<p>Individual</p>	<p>Spend more, sooner, on transit improvements. Particularly rail and separated cycle paths, and extending the Waterfront line to CSU and Tri-C to extend rail's reach to jobs downtown.</p>	<p>NOACA appreciates the comments and will take them under advisement.</p>

Individual	<p>I like many things about the NOACA long range plan. The emphasis on the need for multi-modal transportation is good. I also really appreciate that NOACA pushed back on the proposed new highway interchanges - there is no need to be spending money on new interchanges or highway expansions in a region with no growth. Also, I believe that the report is saying many of the right things - the focus on equity, the acknowledgement of a substantial population of poor people and the challenges they face, and the need for better job related transportation. All of that said, I would like to focus my comments on constructive criticism. I think there are several missed opportunities in this plan. Please add focus in the following areas: - EVERY existing Red/Blue/Green station should be aggressive in pursuing Transit-Oriented Development. Nearly every station features a parking lot and no ToD. Rather than trying to figure out how to expand transit to get to remote jobs, encourage development that makes existing rail stations job-friendly. Push the city to revise zoning in support of ToD. - Put much more emphasis on developing proper bike infrastructure. Bike lanes are NOT sufficient - there need to be buffers between cars and bike lanes. These infrastructure improvements will make biking accessible to a much larger number of people. Simply put - most potential riders aren't comfortable on unprotected bike lanes.- Pedestrian safety needs to be prioritized. Roads in residential and retail areas should be designed to reduce speeds and calm traffic. Initial phases should just be paint and perhaps jersey barriers, with later phases more permanent. This isn't just about reducing pedestrian deaths, but also all the health benefits that accompany walking. People who aren't comfortable walking miss out on the health benefits of walking. This is the main driver of the American obesity epidemic, yet somehow it is rarely discussed.- Amtrak is proposing a massive expansion. If Congress funds these proposals, Cleveland will benefit perhaps more than any other city in the country. Yet somehow intercity passenger rail wasn't even discussed in this plan. (I suppose most of the work on this project was done before the Amtrak proposal, but this really needs to be revised to factor that in.)- Advocate for moving Amtrak back to Tower City to better align with existing transit infrastructure, thus supporting the Plan's multi-modal transit goals. - PLEASE STOP WASTING MONEY ON HYPERLOOP. It is unlikely that the many technical challenges will ever be sufficiently addressed to make hyperloop feasible. But more importantly, even if they get the tech figured out, the capacity of hyperloop is TERRIBLE. High Speed Rail is proven technology with outstanding capacity, and the Chicago - Cleveland - Pittsburgh - Philly - NYC is the best potential High Speed Rail corridor in the entire world that isn't currently served by such service. Hyperloop isn't enough faster than High Speed Rail to justify the tiny capacity, let alone that it is completely unproven technology.- The "Visionary Rail Network" expansion proposal in the Plan is strange - it expands to far off places without addressing the shortcomings of the existing system. Any expansion concepts should start with better serving downtown and University Circle and then better connecting those two points. A Euclid Avenue subway (similar to the 90's era Dual Hub proposal) would be FAR more impactful to the overall transit infrastructure and tax base of the region than any of the expansion proposals in the NOACA plan. (Underground downtown and UC, surface running on Euclid through Midtown.) And in the mean-time, please put pressure on RTA to fix the Healthline. It is much slower than it used to be. In order to decrease driver time spent collecting fares, implement proof-of-payment and civilian enforcement and civil (not criminal) penalties so as to comply with the court ruling and then get the priority signalization of traffic lights. This will trim a dramatic amount of time off the run, allowing more frequent service and/or lower operating costs.- Coordinate with Akron, Canton, and Youngstown! Northeast Ohio is one region and we need to act like it. I realize those are separate planning areas, but we need to work together instead of treating Akron like competition. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.</p>	NOACA appreciates the comments of Brian Schriver; Chapters 3, 7, 9, 10 and 11 of the Resource Document address the topics Mr. Schriver raises. The Vision Document provides further clarification of these issues. However, NOACA staff will also take Mr. Schriver's comments into account as part of future recommendations and implementation actions as part of ongoing planning work.
Individual	<p>Below is a letter that I fully agree with and urge the Board of Directors to Strongly Consider Fully. As a young Cleveland resident, there is much room for improvement in the NEO 2050 plan which is critical to keeping me and my family in the area, as opposed to moving to another community, which puts more of a focus on multi-modal transportation and public health affects. To: Grace Gallucci CC: NOACA Board of Directors RE: NOACA's eNEO2050 Plan I am writing to share concerns the undersigned organizations and individuals have with the NOACA eNEO2050 plan, NOACA's Long Range Transportation Plan. The LRTP should be our vision for how transportation decisions we make build a more equitable system-- one that improves quality of life, creates equitable economic growth, and improves public health. This plan should embrace our values as a region for addressing climate change and historic and systemic inequalities. There are notable positive aspects to the plan. The eNEO2050 Plan proposes 928 miles of new bike facilities and over 11,000 pedestrian ADA and safe crossings in the next three decades. It also includes key projects like connectivity along our lakefront and the Slavic Village Downtown Connector Trail. We also applaud NOACA for rejecting proposals to further expand sprawl and disinvestment in urban areas with additional highway interchanges in greenfield locations. Our concerns with the eNEO2050 plan are outlined below: 1. The long-range plan's strategy for addressing congestion -- "Arterial Street Restoration" -- presents safety and quality of life concerns. This term comes up many times throughout the plan. In chapter 3 the plan reads: "VMT percent of the freeway network is more than three times that of the major arterial network. This disproportionate shares result in daily delay on the freeway network twice that of the major arterial network. This is additional evidence for reinforcing the argument that the major arterial network as a mobility alternative to the freeway system is currently underutilized in the NOACA region." (Ch 3, pg 53). It sounds like "Arterial Street Restoration" is a strategy to alleviate traffic congestion on the interstate highway network by reallocating space on arterial streets. This strategy would increase traffic on city streets, making them less safe for people biking and walking. Flooding walkable business districts and neighborhoods with pass-through traffic is not an equitable solution to addressing congestion on the freeway system. This strategy would make it more difficult to reallocate space on arterials for bike lanes or transit lanes, also known as a road diet. There is much more to consider when trading off "access" and "mobility" than the functional classification of a street, such as the street's context. Moreover, is there adequate data analysis showing that there is unmanageable congestion on the freeway network, and that moving vehicles to the arterial network would be a successful solution? What about other solutions to congestion, like mode shift? Has such an analysis been presented to the public, and has public feedback demonstrated that this is a desirable solution? Are there specific arterials that have been identified? If so, what type of "restoration" is intended by the long range plan text on those corridors, and how does that match with existing plans for those arterials (road diet plans, transit plans, bike lane plans). It is current practice for many cities to accept that a certain amount of congestion is part of an urban center, and seek to have predictable congestion, rather than to eliminate congestion. Travel Time Reliability is a measure used to assess the consistency of travel times. This type of framework allows for a more balanced approach in urban areas that seek to balance the needs of transit, biking, walking, driving, and other road uses. More recently, with COVID demonstrating the ability for many to work from home and/or have a more flexible commute time., is "peak hour" congestion going to remain as important in the future as it has been in the past? It's important to note that this idea of Arterial Street Restoration is included in NOACA's Draft Overall Work Plan, which is concerning. 2. The long-range plan does not seek to reduce NE Ohio's overreliance on driving -- the most expensive and most polluting form of transportation. In the eNEO2050 plan vehicle miles traveled is projected to increase by over 7.5%, which means more pollution, more wear and tear and less overall efficiency. Through the long-range plan we as a region need to prioritize projects that reduce driving miles to address the impacts driving has on climate change and our region's air quality. Motor vehicles remain the largest source of ozone-producing chemicals. Although carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles did lessen in 2020, in part, due to telework during the pandemic lowering vehicle miles traveled, last year the region had 9 Ozone Alert Days (2 is the maximum allowed by law). The OEPA's five-year review of ozone is due in 2021, and the region is expected to remain in "non-attainment" status for ozone, triggering additional pollution-control measures. Climate change will exacerbate conditions -- with hotter and drier summers expected to contribute to more ozone spikes. With tougher, Tier 3 (they require a 99% reduction of emissions per mile) vehicle emissions standards coming into enforcement, communities that are proactive in reducing air pollutants stand to benefit from a fiscal and a public health perspective. Communities near highways and factories have disproportionate impacts to air quality, making commuter vehicle miles traveled (VMT) at the regional level an environmental justice concern. As the agency overseeing regional transportation and air quality, NOACA has a responsibility to advance regional cooperation on clean air -- by setting a goal to reduce ozone alert days to acceptable levels -- within this update of its Long Range Transportation Plan. 3. The long-range plan is not ambitious enough about promoting walking and biking as an alternative to driving, which we must do to address climate change. Section 11.6 on non-motorized transportation -- This section focuses heavily on why people do not walk or use bicycles as transportation by noting: "The low usage of walk and bicycle modes of transportation is due to many reasons such as: the concomitant increasing usage of motorized vehicles for transportation; the relatively low cost of operating motorized automobiles; the sprawling land use patterns; the adverse climatic conditions in the northeast Ohio." (Ch. 11, pg 47) In reading this statement I had to look up the word concomitant and found this exact statement in a University of Texas Austin published paper and want to note that it is taken out of context. The University of Texas paper goes on to say that it is crucial for the MPOs in regions with heavy congestion to achieve healthy air standards by reducing vehicular emissions by encouraging more non-motorized travel to reduce vehicular trips. Aside from sprawl and winter climate, the remaining reasons mentioned in the eNEO2050 plan for low bike usage is that people don't bike for transportation because people are naturally drawn to drive. This is incorrect, and is counter to the investments NOACA has historically been making in multimodal transportation. Studies and experience in other regions have shown that if the built environment is safe and accommodating for people to bike, they will utilize it year round (look at the modal split in Minneapolis). Referring to point 1 above, arterial street restoration, this will make our region's main thoroughfares more congested, provide less space for accommodating bike facilities, and in the end encourage more people to continue to drive. We need NOACA to commit to a mode shift goal away from cars and toward biking/walking/transit and commit to funding projects that will meet that goal. In addition, this section discounts, or doesn't even mention, the impacts that building a safe, connected bike network has on improving air quality, public health, and providing cheap, affordable, equitable transportation options. Instead it highlights a desire to connect active transportation users to transit. Overall, this plan reads as if the primary, and possibly only, transportation value of biking and walking is to access transit. Accessing transit is only one of many short trip types that biking and walking are ideally suited for, and the eNEO2050 plan doesn't acknowledge or plan for that. Lastly, in the revenue calculations in Chapter 10 the non-motorized revenue (funding for biking/walking projects) is the same for both the "status quo" and the "equitable" scenarios, at \$12,489,174. Building the proposed number of miles of bike facilities shown in the table 11-12 (Chapter 11) with the budget available seems like a major challenge, or even infeasible. When looking at an equitable scenario non-motorized transportation options should be prioritized over creating access to highways in the scenario's EJ areas. 4. The eNEO2050 plan doesn't adequately include NOACA's active transportation planning programs such as TICI and ACTIVATE: NOACA very recently spent a significant effort on updating it's bike plan and adding a pedestrian planning component. Updates on this plan were provided to BPAC and other committees, and the public and regional experts participated in the process via surveys, focus groups, etc. While the eNEO2050 plan does include some proposed bike/ped improvements, it isn't clear how those improvements were developed, and how they are connected to the ACTIVATE planning process and the public and expert feedback that was received. The bike inventory section in Chapter 3 uses incorrect terminology (e.g., segregated bike lane, shared bike lane) and is missing many types of bike infrastructure (e.g., sharrows, bike boulevards, bike routes); in addition, there seems to be errors in the table. The section on traffic control devices should include information from ACTIVATE on pedestrian signals and bicycle signals. The non-motorized transportation section in Chapter 3 has a significant amount of text copied from the last long range plan, AIM Forward 2040; this doesn't represent the recent planning done by NOACA. The TICI program is only briefly mentioned with an incorrect title in Chapter 9 ("transportation from livable community initiatives"); this planning program is heavily relied on as a crucial tool for active transportation planning in northeast Ohio, and should be a prominent component of active transportation planning in the long range plan. 5. The long range plan isn't clear on Vision Zero. Vision Zero is mentioned in various places throughout the long range plan report (including being stated as a NOACA goal in Chapter 11), but also includes a 2% reduction in fatal crashes based on a 5 year rolling average, with a performance measure being 75 fatal crashes by the year 2050. This would add up to over 3,000 fatalities on our roadways between now and 2050. As such, it is unclear what NOACA's stance on Vision Zero is, and how they are incorporating the Vision Zero goals of cities within the NOACA region. As Bike Cleveland noted in our memo to the Safety and Operations Council in November of 2020 this is an unacceptable performance measure. We, as a region, need to adopt targets that inspire decision makers to enact policy and design changes to eliminate serious injury and fatal crashes. We need to be assertive in addressing the epidemic of roadway injuries and fatalities across our region. A 2% reduction based off a 5 year rolling average (that continues to increase) is counter-productive to saving lives on our roadways. The Center for Disease Control and prevention estimates that in 2018, traffic fatalities cost Ohio \$1.69 billion in lost workforce and medical costs. But that isn't the most important cost. Each traffic fatality that we do not work towards ending is a lost mother, father, brother, son, or neighbor. These losses are preventable, we need the political will and bold action to address them. We understand there is a federal requirement for state DOT's to use a 5 year rolling average, but MPO's have the ability to set their own performance measures. Local decision-makers and the public look to NOACA for leadership in transportation planning, and we believe we as a region need to be visionary in setting our goals with an aim to eliminate traffic fatalities. 6. Despite the rhetorical emphasis on equity, there are no remedies proposed. Historically transportation decisions have undeniably divided and adversely impacted black and brown communities. This plan focuses heavily on the advancement of autonomous vehicles and the hyperloop, which are technologies that will likely not be accessible to low-income communities. It focuses heavily on reducing highway congestion by bringing more traffic to arterial roads which will exacerbate issues around equitable transportation, such as localized air quality problems and additional injuries to vulnerable users. In chapter 3, there is an equation to calculate EJ access to freeway interchanges. What is the meaning of this? Many EJ areas have the highest % of households with no access to vehicles; therefore, it may be inappropriate for freeway access to be a measurement of success for an EJ area. Certainly there are more pressing transportation issues in EJ areas, and those should be the focus rather than access to freeway interchanges. Moreover, the freeway network has historically had a negative impact on EJ areas. 7. The long-term plan does not advance a serious transit expansion plan or agenda. In the eNEO2050 plan highway spending is greater than transit funding (transit only grows by \$400million, while highway/roadway funding increases by about \$3billion). The rough outline of a long-term transit vision is not well developed. Though NOACA does say it intends to spend \$5 million on a transit plan, we are disappointed this was not further developed. MORPC in Columbus has developed a long-term plan that would concentrate job and residential development along key corridors, which would be serviced by frequent buses -- a much more cost effective proposal than the rudimentary vision presented by NOACA to extend rail service to outlying counties. That agency is working across municipalities to lay the groundwork with zoning changes to realize that vision for better sustainability and affordability. In addition, the transportation-focused chapters don't reference any recent transit planning efforts by NOACA, GCRTA, or others, including the NOACA TOD Plan, and the NOACA Regional Transit Plan. How is this work being incorporated into eNEO2050? Which plan do the transit priority corridors shown in Chapter 11 come from? These are our concerns and we encourage NOACA to reconsider these elements of the plan. We think the region could do better. It's not time to shrink from challenges but to be bold around building a safer and cleaner and more just NE Ohio. Sincerely, Jacob VanSickle, Executive Director Bike Cleveland</p>	Please see Bike Cleveland's disposition of comments
Individual	<p>I believe the draft plan to be flawed. I believe there is too much overreliance on driving as a means of transportation. The plan seems to promote more driving. Furthermore, it seeks to relieve highway congestion by rerouting traffic to city streets. What is needed is less traffic on city streets, not more. As a bicyclist, the streets are too dangerous now. This would make them even more so. I believe there needs to be more promoting of biking, walking and public transportation to help alleviate traffic congestion.</p>	Please see Bike Cleveland's disposition of comments

Individual	Why does this plan favor Cuyahoga County much more than Medina County?	The plan is a long range plan for the entire region. Cuyahoga County does contain more population and transportation infrastructure than Medina County, so it may appear to favor Cuyahoga County, but it does not. See appendix 10 for all of the projects for the next 28 years.
Individual	It talks a lot about equity, but it's not apparent in the plan itself. Still adding roads and dedicating the vast majority of resources to cars to a shrinking population and during a time when it's clear we need to drastically change travel habits to fight climate change. There are no greenhouse gas emission targets, too little for transit, and too little for safe pedestrian/biking. Our resources should go to expanding transportation options - please don't waste money on a hyperloop study when so many people can't get to jobs. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. eNEO2050 funds 926 miles of bicycle facilities, more than 11,000 pedestrian ADA and safe crossings, and 760 bike storage lockers for cyclist in the next three decades. eNEO 2050 implements recommendations from NOACA's existing Regional Bicycle Plan and the pedestrian and bicycle plan currently under development called ACTIVATE. The broader focus of the new plan addresses three usage categories for nonmotorized modes: utilitarian trips, access to transit services (first-/last-mile connectivity), and recreational pursuits. Also NOACA is implementing a Van Pool program. NOACA will work with interested communities to implement micro-mobility initiatives such as e-scooters, e-bikes, and transportation network providers (TMP). The Hyperloop was included as an illustrative project only, and no funding was dedicated to the project.
Medina County Economic Development Commission	<p>Having reviewed the NOACA long range plan, we feel there are some underlying assumptions that do not support our region. Our primary concern is the acceptance of the lack of population growth reflected in the plan. With our abundant water resources and strong communities throughout the region, we find no reason not to believe we could attract new population from outside the state. The Greater Cleveland area was originally built through immigration and there is no reason we cannot continue that historical pattern. We have the support systems in place, and it would increase our diversity throughout the region, achieve multiple goals of the plan, and increase tax base and employment. We also would like to understand why in several instances the public feedback indicated a score about 3 in a measure 1-5 with 5 being strongly agree. In the methodology, it is clear the drafters of the document felt this was something to be addressed but we would like to understand why. We have a number of asks regarding the plan itself. They are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stop the use of the term "urban sprawl". This term has negative connotations and indicates a value judgement on people having the right to choose where they would like to live. Downtown living is not for everyone, just as rural living, or suburban living isn't either. 2. We would like to see a review of MPO plans from cities more comparable to Cleveland. Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Houston, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and San Diego have significantly different challenges than a smaller city like Cleveland. Salt Lake City is significantly smaller than Cleveland and is also going to be different. 3. We would like to better understand job hubs and the underlying assumptions when identifying them. Also, they should not be committed to until the new census data comes out. 4. The mention of "legacy" and "minor" job hubs is limited to a map and a few comments, but does not actually factor into the analysis. The statistics and analysis in Chapter 3 should be fleshed out to include the impact on the job hubs in the four counties surrounding Cuyahoga County. 5. We would like to see included as a policy recommendation regarding Environmental Justice areas an opportunity for economic development professionals to come together and develop marketing materials to attract companies to those locations in a proactive approach to increase development rather than focus so much on stopping development in other areas. 6. There are significant Environmental Justice areas in several collar counties (Lorain, Medina, Geauga) which lack close access to a highway interchange. NOACA should ensure support for continued road maintenance for those arterials leading to interchanges, as well as stronger funding for public transit options in the non-urbanized areas of those collar counties. 7. A goal should be established to increase the percentage of each counties' populations who have "walk accessibility to transit." 8. For the definition of freight hubs, we would like to see this expanded to include access to multiple highways within 10 miles which would then expand it to include the Route 18 corridor. 9. We ask that all discussions of the use of incentives in development be removed from the plan. We do not feel this is relevant to the transportation discussion and is short sighted in the approach taken. 10. A recommendation outlined in Chapter 5 is for NOACA to create an Economic Development Primer of best practices. NOACA is not staffed with economic developers, nor is there strong expertise in economic development on the councils they would ask to undertake this effort. We feel this work is redundant and in the purview of other agencies in the region. Partnering with them to include transportation would be appropriate, but NOACA should not be the lead agency as they do not have the operational experience in economic development to actually give practical advice. 11. In Clean Water 2020, and in Chapters 5 and 8 of the Long Range Plan, remove concepts regarding the discouragement of new development on greenfield sites. NOACA should not withhold funding to local governments or property owners if the best thing in their area is to develop a greenfield. In many cases in suburban communities, undeveloped greenfields are already located in an industrial park or in areas zoned for industry, and it requires a very limited amount of new utility extensions to accommodate business growth that would otherwise not happen because of limited options. Even for greenfield development opportunities which may be located in areas that would require a more substantial amount of investment in new utilities and infrastructure, there should not be a blanket policy of discouragement, given how many new opportunities for new job growth require a much more substantial land mass. 12. A recommended action item in Chapter 6 calls for NOACA to "create a comprehensive housing strategy..." While this is an admirable goal, it seems well beyond the bounds of NOACA's mission to provide transportation and environmental planning. NOACA's board should rethink the investment of the organization's time and involvement in the area of housing. <p>Outside of the plan but what would be extremely helpful and match the goals as outlined in the plan is a project to fund bus stops with secure places for bicycles throughout Medina County. Without properly signed and secure locations, while residents are within a reasonable walking distance to use public transportation, they do not know where to get on the bus.</p>	<p>NOACA appreciates the comments from the Medina County Economic Development Commission. NOACA has specifically addressed the following comments through revisions to its Resource Document and Vision Document: Population projects) NOACA prepared the Vision Document such that users can now reference section 5.2. Scenarios 1 and 2 have trend projections, Scenarios 3 and 4 project population and employment growth. This is taken from Chapter 9 of the Resource Document, but is restructured, so it's more obvious;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) NOACA has reduced its use of the word "sprawl" in favor of phrases such as "outward migration" to more accurately describe the post World War II phenomenon of the decentralization of the region's population; 2) NOACA studied MPOs based on their approaches to planning, funding authorization, scopes, etc. (not just size); 3) Please reference continuing efforts by NOACA with respect to Workforce Mobility (https://www.noaca.org/tools-resources/recent-studies/workforce-accessibility-and-mobility); 4) The modeling efforts were focused on the regional job hubs because the majority of intraregional trips are to those locations and they encompass 25% of all jobs (6 locations); the minor and legacy job hubs only represent 5% of total jobs (12 locations) and thus cannot be modeled with the same level of statistical validity within the regional construct. Further study is planned for the minor and legacy job hubs as a continuation of the workforce accessibility initiative. 5) The recommendation was added to the list of economic development action items; 6) We agree; our environmental justice policies and our project prioritization criteria already reflect these points. 7) We agree; a broad goal to this effect is included in eNEO2050. Targets, however, have not been established and can be pursued as part of implementation efforts. This item will be placed on the agenda for Transit Council to be addressed. 8) This suggestion will be included as an action item to evaluate as part of the next Freight Hub Study. 9) NOACA did redact the discussion about incentives in the Resource Document requested by the Medina County Board of Commissioners; 10) NOACA did redact the proposed action to create an economic development primer in Chapter 5 of the Resource Document (see revised Implementation Actions on pp. 66-67); 11) The language cited by Medina County about "discourage greenfield development" comes from Goal #1 of the 2020 Board-Approved Clean Water 2020 plan; 12) NOACA has reviewed and revised recommendations and implementation actions proposed in all comprehensive planning chapters, including Excellent Housing (chapter6) of the Resource Document (specifically in chapter 6, p. 47, under implementation action items, revised #7 to say "Create a comprehensive housing and transportation strategy for the five-county region including affordable housing efforts for interested counties in cooperation with, Ohio Housing Finance Agency, and US-HUD.")
Medina County Commissioners	<p>The Medina County Economic Development Corporation staff have provided the Board of Medina County Commissioners a list of concerns and suggestions for modifications to the current draft of eNEO2050 Long Range Transportation Plan. The MCEDC critique is attached. As we understand it, the public have been invited to provide comments and suggestions for consideration at this time. The Board of Medina County Commissioners strongly support the suggestions made by MCEDC and encourage the NOACA staff to make the requisite alterations to the document for final consideration of the NOACA governing board members.</p> <p>In addition to these modifications, the Board of Medina County Commissioners want to emphasize our grave concern over statements in the plan which are clearly biased against economic development in non-Cuyahoga County communities that have so-called "greenfields." Specifically, under the subsection entitled "How to Make Incentives Work" within Chapter 5 Enable the Economy, the following statements are made:</p> <p>"Once again, place-based economic development is key. Incentives can be useful, but only if the development would not otherwise occur. Businesses or developers should affirm this publicly in the tax incentive agreement, which is a legally binding contract. The agreement should include "clawback" provisions if the business fails to live up to the terms of the agreement. They should be used in the right place at the right time, and only to offset any higher costs of place-based development. In other words, greenfield (previously undeveloped) sites do not need incentives; they are already the lowest-cost option for developers. Rather, incentives should benefit infill development of existing, underused sites (e.g., brownfields or greyfields)." (Italics added)</p> <p>These declarative statements placed within the proposed Long Range Transportation Plan presumes to incorporate policy statements regarding the appropriate use of incentives to encourage development that implies an endorsement of the NOACA governing board members and the communities which the members represent.</p> <p>This paragraph bares no direct relationship to the cited work of Timothy J. Bartik and John C. Auston¹ in the preceding paragraphs, nor to the recent research by Bartik entitled "Making Sense of Incentives: Taming Business Incentives to Promote Prosperity," which is referenced in The Brookings Institution article. In both works, the word "greenfield" is never used. Not even once. Clearly, the NOACA staff who authored this section went beyond the policy recommendations of the cited studies and have interjected their own biases that are prejudiced against NOACA communities that use incentives to promote development of "greenfields."</p> <p>The Board of Medina County Commissioners will not by inference or direct pronouncement agree to any statements that undermine the ability of our communities to use legally entitled incentives to promote development within their own jurisdictions. By implication, incorporating such a statement into the LRTP document infers that NOACA is subscribing to a long-range policy that eventually intends to withhold future transportation funding from communities that don't follow a prescribed economic development policy amenable to the NOACA Board.</p> <p>Transportation funding decisions by the NOACA Board should not be contingent upon the idiosyncratic acceptability of local economic development practices to the members or staff of the NOACA agency. Public policies which effect local economic development practices and transportation investment are related, and at times co-dependent. However, it should not be the policy of the regional metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to withhold, constrain or manipulate public funding for transportation projects contingent upon an economic development strategy that is agreeable to a majority of the MPO's board members. Simply stated, the use of economic development tools, as well as land use, zoning and housing policies, are appropriately the purview of "Home Rule" jurisdictions, as provided by state law. They are not under the authority of a regional governing organization, like NOACA. The Board of NOACA can provide input on those issues, but those decisions per state law should remain within the legally established authority of those jurisdictions – i.e. citizens, property owners and elected officials of those communities.</p> <p>For these reasons, we urge a redaction of this paragraph from the final document. The Board further maintains that statements affirming the validity, efficacy, and primacy of "Home Rule" decisions regarding economic development, zoning, land use and housing should be incorporated within the final document proposed for adoption by the NOACA Governing Board.</p> <p>Thank you for your timely attention to this important matter.</p> <p>Sincerely, William F. Hutson</p>	<p>NOACA appreciates the comments from the Medina County Board of Commissioners. NOACA did redact the discussion about incentives in the Resource Document requested by the Medina County Board of Commissioners (see pp. 54-55 in Chapter 5 of the Resource Document for revised version).</p>

	<p>Stephen D. Hambley Colleen M. Swedyk Medina County Board of Commissioners</p>	
Individual	<p>I am curious as to what specific bicycle projects are in the plan. While separated bicycle lanes are helpful, often times short projects that connect low traffic road are much less expensive and useful. Here are some examples, off the top of my head:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Route 83 in Grafton to connect Capel road. This is a very short section but it would join both sections of Capel and avoid bike travel on busy route 83. 2. Usher Road in Olmsted Falls, between Brentwood and Schady Roads. This would connect two lower traffic roads and allow cyclists avoid travel on busy Usher Road. 3. Bagley Road between Mapleway and Brentwood Roads. This will join two lower traffic roads and avoid travel on busy Bagley road. 4. Route 42 in Medina to connect Carlton Road and Buckeye Woods park. <p>These are short sections all much less than 1 mile which will greatly improve cycling in the area. Too often bicycle lanes are added where they fit, or to calm traffic, and not where they would actually help cyclists to travel on our busy roads.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 and its appendices of the eNEO2050 Resource Document provide information about proposed bicycle projects. Randy's response: "I worked with Andrew to address Mr. Snitzer's comment (see below). There is no need to revise Chapter 10, these are minor project segments that we can work to inform the local jurisdictions of the expressed need.</p> <p>1. Route 83 in Grafton to connect Capel road. This is a very short section but it would join both sections of Capel and avoid bike travel on busy route 83. – Not in LRTP. This is a very short segment, outside of Grafton municipal boundary, that doesn't connect any existing bike facilities. It does look like bike lanes would create a safer path for those riding along Capel Rd. where it jogs briefly along SR 83, so this is a good recommendation.</p> <p>2. Usher Road in Olmsted Falls, between Brentwood and Schady Roads. This would connect two lower traffic roads and allow cyclists avoid travel on busy Usher Road. – This is in the LRTP as a high priority. Usher Rd. is a Key Route in the Cuyahoga Greenways Plan between Bagley and Sprague.</p> <p>3. Bagley Road between Mapleway and Brentwood Roads. This will join two lower traffic roads and avoid travel on busy Bagley road. – This is in the LRTP as a mid priority. Bagley at this location is in the Cuyahoga Greenways Plan as a non-priority route.</p> <p>4. Route 42 in Medina to connect Carlton Road and Buckeye Woods park. – Not in LRTP. A short segment of Rt. 42 outside of the Medina municipal boundary. Rt. 42 is high stress, and this would help connect some medium-stress rural roadways to the park and eventually the Chippewa Rail Trail and US/State Bike Route network.</p> <p>NOACA will work with the local jurisdictions to make them aware of the expressed needs and consideration for future planning and implementation.</p>
Bike Cleveland	<p>The LRTP should be our vision for how transportation decisions we make build a more equitable system-- one that improves quality of life, creates equitable economic growth, and improves public health. This plan should embrace our values as a region for addressing climate change and historic and systemic inequalities. There are notable positive aspects to the plan. The eNEO2050 Plan proposes 928 miles of new bike facilities and over 11,000 pedestrian ADA and safe crossings in the next three decades. It also includes key projects like connectivity along our lakefront and the Slavic Village Downtown Connector Trail. We also applaud NOACA for rejecting proposals to further expand sprawl and disinvestment in urban areas with additional highway interchanges in greenfield locations. Our concerns with the eNEO2050 plan are outlined below:</p>	
Bike Cleveland	<p>1. The long-range plan's strategy for addressing congestion -- "Arterial Street Restoration" -- presents safety and quality of life concerns. This term comes up many times throughout the plan. In chapter 3 the plan reads: "VMT percent of the freeway network is more than three times that of the major arterial network. This disproportionate shares result in daily delay on the freeway network twice than that of the major arterial network. This is additional evidence for reinforcing the argument that the major arterial network as a mobility alternative to the freeway system is currently underutilized in the NOACA region." (Ch 3, pg 53). It sounds like "Arterial Street Restoration" is a strategy to alleviate traffic congestion on the interstate highway network by reallocating space on arterial streets. This strategy would increase traffic on city streets, making them less safe for people biking and walking. Flooding walkable business districts and neighborhoods with pass-through traffic is not an equitable solution to addressing congestion on the freeway system. This strategy would make it more difficult to reallocate space on arterials for bike lanes or transit lanes, also known as a road diet. There is much more to consider when trading off "access" and "mobility" than the functional classification of a street, such as the street's context. Moreover, is there adequate data analysis showing that there is unmanageable congestion on the freeway network, and that moving vehicles to the arterial network would be a successful solution? What about other solutions to congestion, like mode shift? Has such an analysis been presented to the public, and has public feedback demonstrated that this is a desirable solution? Are there specific arterials that have been identified? If so, what type of "restoration" is intended by the long range plan text on those corridors, and how does that match with existing plans for those arterials (road diet plans, transit plans, bike lane plans). It is current practice for many cities to accept that a certain amount of congestion is part of an urban center, and seek to have predictable congestion, rather than to eliminate congestion. Travel Time Reliability is a measure used to assess the consistency of travel times. This type of framework allows for a more balanced approach in urban areas that seek to balance the needs of transit, biking, walking, driving, and other road uses. More recently, with COVID demonstrating the ability for many to work from home and/or have a more flexible commute time., is "peak hour" congestion going to remain as important in the future as it has been in the past? It's important to note that this idea of Arterial Street Restoration is included in NOACA's Draft Overall Work Plan, which is concerning.</p>	<p>Road and street functional classification attempts to define roads, streets, and highways in a hierarchy based on the type of highway service they provide. Generally, how closely a highway or street actually functions compared to the defined service plays a crucial role in reducing congestion, promoting safety, and increasing transportation system efficiency. Streets and highways are part of an interconnected network, and each one plays a role in moving traffic throughout the system by a specified degree of access and a level of movement. The arterial network consists of major (or principal) and minor arterials. The major arterial network is a network of roads and streets that serve large amounts of traffic traveling relatively long distances at higher speeds. Considering the function class of the major arterial network, this network may play an alternative role to the freeway network in reducing traffic congestion, and reducing emissions is a priority for the region, and all roads will be evaluated against the complete and green streets policy. Arterials generally connect residential areas to many employment centers and intersects with freeways.</p> <p>The Arterial Street Restoration is intended to better utilize the entire transportation system, and to allow the arterials to function better to reduce vehicle miles traveled and emissions. Road diets and bike lanes will still be considered for arterials, but an analysis will need to be performed. Also an analysis of the arterial network functional classification will be done to determine if some roads require reclassification.</p> <p>NOACA has many congestion reducing strategies, as well as encouraging mode shift. Please see congestion management plan objectives in chapter 11, and the Congestion Management plan for congestion reducing strategies. Also see the Vision Document chapter 6, page 140 for a summary of congestion strategies and increase mode shift.</p> <p>Chapter 3 also discusses access to the existing highway and transit systems and level of mobility through these networks are evaluated as benchmarks for shifting travel demand from a mainly single mode, i.e. private motorized vehicles, to other mode choices in a more equitable transportation system. Chapter 3 also identifies the arterial street network, please see chapter 11, pages 25-28.</p> <p>Finally, traffic is not synonymous to crash. The safety objective of the eNEO2050 plan is zero fatality and major injuries, therefore major arterial restoration does not create an unsafe environment. In addition to current safety programs such as the Transportation Safety Action Plan, Regional Safety Program, Safe Routes to School, SAVE Plan, the Long Range Plan includes a Systematic Safety Management Program to program implementation of safety treatments at sites that reduce the potential for crashes using Crash Prediction Models.</p> <p>As for the future of VMT in a post COVID world, we can't predict at this time, but will be monitoring closely especially with our annual traffic count program and working with our partners.</p>

Bike Cleveland	<p>2. The long-range plan does not seek to reduce NE Ohio's overreliance on driving -- the most expensive and most polluting form of transportation. In the eNEO2050 plan vehicle miles traveled is projected to increase by over 7.5%, which means more pollution, more wear and tear and less overall efficiency. Through the long-range plan we as a region need to prioritize projects that reduce driving miles to address the impacts driving has on climate change and our region's air quality. Motor vehicles remain the largest source of ozone-producing chemicals. Although carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles did lessen in 2020, in part, due to telework during the pandemic lowering vehicle miles traveled, last year the region had 9 Ozone Alert Days (2 is the maximum allowed by law). The OEPA's five-year review of ozone is due in 2021, and the region is expected to remain in "non-attainment" status for ozone, triggering additional pollution-control measures. Climate change will exacerbate conditions -- with hotter and drier summers expected to contribute to more ozone spikes. With tougher, Tier 3 (they require a 99% reduction of emissions per mile) vehicle emissions standards coming into enforcement, communities that are proactive in reducing air pollutants stand to benefit from a fiscal and a public health perspective. Communities near highways and factories have disproportionate impacts to air quality, making commuter vehicle miles traveled (VMT) at the regional level an environmental justice concern. As the agency overseeing regional transportation and air quality, NOACA has a responsibility to advance regional cooperation on clean air -- by setting a goal to reduce ozone alert days to acceptable levels -- within this update of its Long Range Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 8 for further information. The plan has committed to decreasing the mode share of single occupancy vehicles, as well as nearly doubling the mode share of non-motorized and transit transportation, see chapter 6, page 140 of the Vision Document.</p>
Bike Cleveland	<p>3. The long-range plan is not ambitious enough about promoting walking and biking as an alternative to driving, which we must do to address climate change. Section 11.6 on non-motorized transportation -- This section focuses heavily on why people do not walk or use bicycles as transportation by noting: "The low usage of walk and bicycle modes of transportation is due to many reasons such as: the concomitant increasing usage of motorized vehicles for transportation; the relatively low cost of operating motorized automobiles; the sprawling land use patterns; the adverse climatic conditions in the northeast Ohio." (Ch. 11, pg 47) In reading this statement I had to look up the word concomitant and found this exact statement in a University of Texas Austin published paper and want to note that it is taken out of context. The University of Texas paper goes on to say that it is crucial for the MPOs in regions with heavy congestion to achieve healthy air standards by reducing vehicular emissions by encouraging more non-motorized travel to reduce vehicular trips. Aside from sprawl and winter climate, the remaining reasons mentioned in the eNEO2050 plan for low bike usage is that people don't bike for transportation because people are naturally drawn to drive. This is incorrect, and is counter to the investments NOACA has historically been making in multimodal transportation. Studies and experience in other regions have shown that if the built environment is safe and accommodating for people to bike, they will utilize it year round (look at the modal split in Minneapolis). Referring to point 1 above, arterial street restoration, this will make our region's main thoroughfares more congested, provide less space for accommodating bike facilities, and in the end encourage more people to continue to drive. We need NOACA to commit to a mode shift goal away from cars and toward biking/walking/transit and commit to funding projects that will meet that goal. In addition, this section discounts, or doesn't even mention, the impacts that building a safe, connected bike network has on improving air quality, public health, and providing cheap, affordable, equitable transportation options. Instead it highlights a desire to connect active transportation users to transit. Overall, this plan reads as if the primary, and possibly only, transportation value of biking and walking is to access transit. Accessing transit is only one of many short trip types that biking and walking are ideally suited for, and the eNEO2050 plan doesn't acknowledge or plan for that.</p>	<p>Specific to your non-motorized comments, eNEO2050 funds 926 miles of bicycle facilities, more than 11,000 pedestrian ADA and safe crossings, and 760 bike storage lockers for cyclist in the next three decades. eNEO 2050 implements recommendations from NOACA's existing Regional Bicycle Plan and the pedestrian and bicycle plan currently under development called ACTIVATE. The broader focus of the new plan addresses three usage categories for nonmotorized modes: utilitarian trips, access to transit services (first-/last-mile connectivity), and recreational pursuits. Also NOACA is implementing a Van Pool program. NOACA will work with interested communities to implement micro-mobility initiatives such as e-scooters, e-bikes, and transportation network providers (TMP). Also the plan has committed to decreasing the mode share of single occupancy vehicles, as well as nearly doubling the mode share of non-motorized and transit transportation, see chapter 6, page 140 of the Vision Document.</p>
Bike Cleveland	<p>4. The eNEO2050 plan doesn't adequately include NOACA's active transportation planning programs such as TLCI and ACTIVATE: NOACA very recently spent a significant effort on updating it's bike plan and adding a pedestrian planning component. Updates on this plan were provided to BPAC and other committees, and the public and regional experts participated in the process via surveys, focus groups, etc. While the eNEO2050 plan does include some proposed bike/ped improvements, it isn't clear how those improvements were developed, and how they are connected to the ACTIVATE planning process and the public and expert feedback that was received. The bike inventory section in Chapter 3 uses incorrect terminology (e.g., segregated bike lane, shared bike lane) and is missing many types of bike infrastructure (e.g., sharrows, bike boulevards, bike routes); in addition, there seems to be errors in the table. The section on traffic control devices should include information from ACTIVATE on pedestrian signals and bicycle signals. The non-motorized transportation section in Chapter 3 has a significant amount of text copied from the last long range plan, AIM Forward 2040; this doesn't represent the recent planning done by NOACA. The TLCI program is only briefly mentioned with an incorrect title in Chapter 9 ("transportation from livable community initiatives"); this planning program is heavily relied on as a crucial tool for active transportation planning in northeast Ohio, and should be a prominent component of active transportation planning in the long range plan.</p>	<p>NOACA corrected incorrect terminology in chapters 3 and 9 of the Resource Document (e.g. changed "segregated" to "separated" on p. 7 of Chapter 3 in the resource document; revised Active Transportation language pp. 47-49 in Chapter 9). NOACA revised Table 3.3 on p. 8 of Chapter 3 in the Resource Document. ACTIVATE is nearly complete, and many components from the draft plan were included in eNEO2050. Also all bike and ped projects from ACTIVATE were included in chapter 10. As stated above, NOACA is dedicated to increasing mode share. Please see chapter 6, page 140 in the Vision Document. TLCI is an important program. Since the last LRP, TLCI was expanded to include implementation, and 3 regional plans are currently under development.</p>
Bike Cleveland	<p>5. The long range plan isn't clear on Vision Zero. Vision Zero is mentioned in various places throughout the long range plan report (including being stated as a NOACA goal in Chapter 11), but also includes a 2% reduction in fatal crashes based on a 5 year rolling average, with a performance measure being 75 fatal crashes by the year 2050. This would add up to over 3,000 fatalities on our roadways between now and 2050. As such, it is unclear what NOACA's stance on Vision Zero is, and how they are incorporating the Vision Zero goals of cities within the NOACA region. As Bike Cleveland noted in our memo to the Safety and Operations Council in November of 2020 this is an unacceptable performance measure. We, as a region, need to adopt targets that inspire decision makers to enact policy and design changes to eliminate serious injury and fatal crashes. We need to be assertive in addressing the epidemic of roadway injuries and fatalities across our region. A 2% reduction based off a 5 year rolling average (that continues to increase) is counter-productive to saving lives on our roadways. The Center for Disease Control and prevention estimates that in 2018, traffic fatalities cost Ohio \$1.69 billion in lost workforce and medical costs. But that isn't the most important cost. Each traffic fatality that we do not work towards ending is a lost mother, father, brother, son, or neighbor. These losses are preventable, we need the political will and bold action to address them. We understand there is a federal requirement for state DOT's to use a 5 year rolling average, but MPO's have the ability to set their own performance measures. Local decision-makers and the public look to NOACA for leadership in transportation planning, and we believe we as a region need to be visionary in setting our goals with an aim to eliminate traffic fatalities.</p>	<p>Vision zero is the goal of NOACA. The 2% reduction you refer to are only the short term targets to achieve vision zero. The targets are re-evaluated annually, and the goal of the eNEO2050 plan is to get to zero by 2050 utilizing the strategies laid out in the SAVE Plan and the eNEO2050 Plan.</p>
Bike Cleveland	<p>6. Despite the rhetorical emphasis on equity, there are no remedies proposed. Historically transportation decisions have undeniably divided and adversely impacted black and brown communities. This plan focuses heavily on the advancement of autonomous vehicles and the hyperloop, which are technologies that will likely not be accessible to low-income communities. It focuses heavily on reducing highway congestion by bringing more traffic to arterial roads which will exacerbate issues around equitable transportation, such as localized air quality problems and additional injuries to vulnerable users. In chapter 3, there is an equation to calculate EJ access to freeway interchanges. What is the meaning of this? Many EJ areas have the highest % of households with no access to vehicles; therefore, it may be inappropriate for freeway access to be a measurement of success for an EJ area. Certainly there are more pressing transportation issues in EJ areas, and those should be the focus rather than access to freeway interchanges. Moreover, the freeway network has historically had a negative impact on EJ areas.</p>	<p>The Hyperloop project is illustrative, so there is very little focus on it at this time. The autonomous vehicles proposed are autonomous shuttle feeder buses, which would assist with the first/last-mile connections of transit riders to jobs. Once a rider reaches a job hub via the expanded transit network, the final location of their work trip might not be within a reasonable walking distance. A series of autonomous shuttles would help circulate riders within the job hub or to other employment centers nearby. In addition, these shuttles would help feed riders into the expanded transit network from nearby residential areas with direct and frequent service to the job hub stations. This would be beneficial to all populations, but especially so for transit dependent individuals to provide more opportunities for them to access jobs. Although many EJ households do not have cars, more than 50% do. The plan, however, is focusing on many transportation issues, such as, equity in transportation, increasing active transportation, expanding transit, safety for all, complete and green streets, decreasing emissions, etc. Freeway access is only one aspect of transportation.</p>
Bike Cleveland	<p>7. The long-term plan does not advance a serious transit expansion plan or agenda In the eNEO2050 plan highway spending is greater than transit funding (transit only grows by \$400 million, while highway/roadway funding increases by about \$3 billion). The rough outline of a long-term transit vision is not well developed. Though NOACA does say it intends to spend \$5 million on a transit plan, we are disappointed this was not further developed. MORPC in Columbus has developed a long-term plan that would concentrate job and residential development along key corridors, which would be serviced by frequent buses -- a much more cost effective proposal than the rudimentary vision presented by NOACA to extend rail service to outlying counties. That agency is working across municipalities to lay the groundwork with zoning changes to realize that vision for better sustainability and affordability. In addition, the transportation-focused chapters don't reference any recent transit planning efforts by NOACA, GCRTA, or others, including the NOACA TOD Plan, and the NOACA Regional Transit Plan. How is this work being incorporated into eNEO2050? Which plan do the transit priority corridors shown in Chapter 11 come from? These are our concerns and we encourage NOACA to reconsider these elements of the plan. We think the region could do better. It's not time to shrink from challenges but to be bold around building a safer and cleaner and more just NE Ohio</p>	<p>NOACA is very serious about transit planning, and have completed a TOD Plan, Tier II Transit TAM plan, a Regional Strategic Transit Plan, among other plans, and are planning to embark on a \$14B transit expansion plan. The \$5m is dedicated towards developing a feasibility study for the transit expansion plan. Feasibility studies contain things like overview of existing conditions, community input, needs assessment, engineering, cost, funding, etc. The MORPC High-Capacity Corridor Planning that was referenced has only identified 5 corridors that have the potential to support high capacity transit. NOACA has identified 10 Priority transit corridors based on the existing and future transit lines as the supply side and the future ridership demand based on the NOACA travel forecasting model, as well as GCRTA's Pillar Study. NOACA has always and will continue to collaborate with GCRTA. Please refer to chapters 9 and 11 for more details on previous and future planning efforts. The goal is to move drivers to transit riders.</p>

Individual	Scenario 3 should be adopted. It provides virtually all the benefits of Scenario 4 at a lower cost and a much greater likelihood of completion.	"Thanks for contacting NOACA about our eNEO2050 plan. We are still in the public comment period, so we welcome your feedback. Relative to Agenda 21, we have no connection to it whatsoever. In no way was it even a consideration in the development of the plan. Best wishes for a positive meeting this evening."
Individual	Chapter 6 (Excellent Housing): Concerned about use of a study by Bates et.al. (2015) because of its validity and the parent organization of the study (Kirwan Institute at Ohio State University)	Revisions to Chapter 6 (Excellent Housing) of the eNEO2050 Resource Document .(see pages 3-4, 10-11, 13-15, 36, highlighted)
Individual	Chapter 6 (Excellent Housing) 1. Concerned about use of a study by Bates et.al. (2015) because of its validity and the parent organization of the study (Kirwan Institute at Ohio State University) 2. Concerned about eNEO2050's overemphasis of transportation infrastructure investment on Cleveland's population loss, suburban sprawl and the current development pattern. How much did transportation infrastructure investment really impact urban core decline and population loss compared with other subsequent, social causes? Transportation decisions are not the main driver of urban sprawl. The connections between the social issues and transportation are not as clear as the plan is implying. 3. eNEO2050 does not currently provide much history about housing and development beyond the 1960s. What about the 1970s legislation (e.g. fiscal solvency, court-ordered busing to achieve school integration, Community Reinvestment Act of 1978); the 1980s and 1990s (general quality of life such as housing, education and crime). There are other causes of flight from urban areas and the current draft does not address those adequately.	Revisions to Chapter 6 (Excellent Housing) of the eNEO2050 Resource Document .(see pages 3-4, 10-11, 13-15, 36, highlighted)
Individual	No bike path should be planned for Chagrin Blvd. from the middle of Moreland Hills eastward into Chagrin Blvd. The primary reason is the danger caused by the steep hillsides on either side of the Chagrin River, the sharp curves in the existing route and the cross traffic on Chagrin River Road at the foot of the descent east. Due to gravity, bikes could easily attain a speed of over 45 mph going down hill. Only Tour de France level cyclists could climb either hill up from the river. In addition, any attempt to construct a bike path would require cutting hundreds of trees on steep hillsides which would prompt perpetual erosion and destroy natural beauty.	NOACA includes a low-priority (2041-2050) bicycle project in the area of comment in Appendix 10-6 of the resource document. Subject to future evaluation.
Individual	I think this is a terrific plan. However, how viable is the proposed rail line that parallels I-480? The NEORail study NOACA sponsored many years ago suggested that a rail route from Lorain through Tower City to Solon would be feasible. In fact, technologies exist today that would permit regional rail trains to operate on Red Line tracks over the Cuyahoga Viaduct and through Tower City between existing NS lines (legacy Nickel Plate on the West Shore and legacy Erie-Lackawanna from Cleveland to Solon/Aurora). Something to consider and study.	NOACA includes "Conduct feasibility studies and/or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for achieving the visionary rail scenario" in its final plan (Chapter 11)
Individual	I reviewed the transportation plan for eNEO2050 and I have a number of concerns. First, I believe that a long-term, sustainable (affordable) transportation plan must take into account maintenance costs. The American Society of Civil Engineers have consistently rated the nation and the state as having failed to maintain our existing infrastructure to a high quality. To do so without dramatically increasing our spending (and thus taxes) we need to take our maintenance obligations into consideration BEFORE adding new infrastructure and thus additional future maintenance obligations. If that analysis is done, I believe that adding additional lane-miles to our roadway system would not be feasible. But maintenance costs must be considered, and efforts should be made to decrease our overall maintenance costs. Second, while there may be political reasons to extend our rail network through low-density areas, I believe that improving rail transit in the existing network (inside the highway belts) should take precedence over extending new rail to neighboring counties. Racial equity should be taken into account on rail expansion as well. To make the rail network more efficient, focus on quality stations, quality railcars, upgraded signaling, and power supply. A high priority also should be placed on completing the Waterfront line to make a loop around the downtown so that more businesses (and Tri-C and CSU) are within walking distance of a rail stop. Finally, there should be an emphasis on transit-oriented development at transit stops, and that should be included in any strategy for expanding the rail network. Properly leveraged this can increase ridership and cover some of the development cost.	1) Maintenance discussed throughly in Chapter 10 as part of the Financial Plan; 2) NOACA includes "Conduct feasibility studies and/or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for achieving the visionary rail scenario" in its final plan (Chapter 11); 3) Pilot TOD development is part of the recommendations and implementation actions in Chapters 6 and 7
Individual	Expansion of the highway and road network represents a high cost and high future maintenance liabilities. These costs and liabilities far exceed any return on the investment. Spending on automobile infrastructure should be limited to ongoing maintenance and improvements for safety. No expansions should be considered. Funds should be shifted to public transit and pedestrian & bicycle infrastructure to the maximum extent possible. In fact, the highest priority for spending should be given to projects that repair the negative fiscal and socioeconomic impact of overbuilt roads and highways. For example: projects that remove automobile travel lanes and redirect the right-of-way to transit and bike lanes; removal of urban freeways; or capping of interstate trenches. I look forward to an even bigger increase in priority for liveability and economic opportunity.	Maintenance discussed throughly in Chapter 10 as part of the Financial Plan. Safety summarized in Chapter 2 and also included extensively in Chapters 10 and 11. Other comments pertain to scenario preferences (scenarios summarized in Chapter 9 and final plan in Chapter 11).
Individual	Since we last connected with your team, we have heard some concerns raised by the community about the plan's emphasis on driving (increased vehicle miles traveled, single occupant vehicle travel) over mode shift (public transit, biking, walking). As we know, transportation and land use patterns tied to current or increased reliance on driving (even with EVs) will continue to contribute to overall carbon emissions. We welcome the opportunity to reconnect with you soon to better understand the plan's approach to vehicle transportation and alternative transportation.	Specific to your non-motorized comments, eNEO2050 funds 926 miles of bicycle facilities, more than 11,000 pedestrian ADA and safe crossings, and 760 bike storage lockers for cyclist in the next three decades. eNEO 2050 implements recommendations from NOACA's existing Regional Bicycle Plan and the pedestrian and bicycle plan currently under development called ACTIVATE. The broader focus of the new plan addresses three usage categories for nonmotorized modes: utilitarian trips, access to transit services (first-/last-mile connectivity), and recreational pursuits. Also NOACA is implementing a Van Pool program. NOACA will work with interested communities to implement micro-mobility initiatives such as e-scooters, e-bikes, and transportation network providers (TMP). Also the plan has committed to decreasing the mode share of single occupancy vehicles, as well as nearly doubling the mode share of non-motorized and transit transportation.
	Comments from May 3, 2021 Public Meeting	Impact to eNEO2050
Individual	By using my car, I have to purchase gas which includes a tax for maintaining roads. Using a bicycle does not involve paying a tax to maintain the roads. Keep all bicycles off the roads. I don't want to see anymore bicycle lanes in the roadway. Establish a separate lane from the road for bicycles.	NOACA appreciates the comments and will take them under advisement.
Individual	Dear NOACA Board, I write this letter in strong support of the NEO2050 plan and encourage you to expand the percentage devoted to expanding capacity beyond 1%. This is a good plan and a healthy start in creating the transportation networks NE Ohio needs and deserves.	NOACA appreciates the comments and will take them under advisement.
Individual	Support trails - and multimodal connections. FUND a hi-level pedestrian-bike bridge connection at Clark-Pershing	Chapter 10 lists a separated bikeway from Public Square to Pershing Avenue under Major Projects; no mention of pedestrian improvements on Pershing Ave bridge over I-77 (very limited development west of I-77)
Individual	This looks to be fabulous! Just make sure the cement curbs protecting bicyclists and pedestrians are high enough. I used to love to bicycle, biked all over Cleveland, belonged to a bike club, went on GOBA many times. Now I have trouble walking, share a car with my husband who needs it for work, so a lot of times I'm stuck at home. Not quite handicapped, and so don't qualify for Paratransit. Uber and Lyft expensive. Are there plans for jitnies (small vans) that could pick people up and drop them off in the Metro Parks, or the Art Museum, or the Symphony or the YMCA or Blossom, even, and then get them home again? Thank you.	design considerations for bicycle paths and trails could be part of PPR; automated shuttles (including on-demand) included in both Chapters 10 and 11
Individual	Happy to see a more balanced approach than to simply build and maintain roads. The train and bicycle networks are badly in need of catch up funding to provide real alternatives to the automobile. The auto lobby has never paid its fair share. As a result, no new roads should be built... the existing roads should be maintained.	Thank you for your comment.

Individual	I strongly hope you will consider these views in the final draft of the plan: 1. New roadways and expanded roadways reflect the reality of the private sector business community. New roads and intersections keep jobs and businesses in the region. Businesses use many factors to evaluate their location that have nothing to do with what you believe is urban sprawl, but is just what any reasonable business would consider. These factors include: education, workforce preparedness, business climate including regulatory and taxes, cost of doing business, and importantly, public safety. Realize that these factors favor suburban and x-urban locations. These locations should be rewarded for attracting business and jobs, and this plan should reflect that these are the actual factors for business location. Supporting new interchanges and new roads improves the whole region. Denying them forces businesses to consider other regions. Let us not make it hard for them to stay, but provide new regional options. 2. Light rail is a massive cost for a minimal reward. NE Ohio is not densely enough populated to make for a cost effective public rail transport system. The existing system is under used for the most part and heavily subsidized. Any additional rail lines would similarly not be in the interest of the public. Only densely populated areas in the Northeast have made light rail work successfully. The cost is prohibitive and unwarranted in our region. Spend that money on traditional infrastructure. 3. 926 more miles of bike paths do not seem like a prudent investment at all to facilitate commerce in NE Ohio. If local communities think they are needed, they can build them. The paths that I see as I drive extensively throughout NE Ohio are so lightly used as to be negligible. Simply put, not many people use the existing bike paths, and NE Ohio has plenty of sidewalks, where I have driven my bicycle for years successfully. This should not be a priority of the District, it is non strategic and the existing paths are very lightly used as to make them more of a nuisance for actual automobile and truck traffic. 4. The premise that somehow NE Ohioans are not going to extensively use automobiles is more fantasy than any type of reality. It defies the reality of choices that Americans prefer the independence of vehicular traffic and by massive margins. Any scheme that takes public resources away from expansion and or maintenance just inconveniences the commuter and is not routed in reality. NE Ohioans are aware of every alternative way of transportation and choose to take automobiles, SUVs, trucks. You are not going to change these preferences, please recognize them and make it easier for citizens to commute. By pretending that this is not true and trying to force public policy to restrict automobile usage, it only restricts consumer preference. Gas taxes are fueling these dollars, all derived from automobile vehicular traffic. We expect well maintained roads and new routes to enhance our quality of life. But you are literally restricting our quality of life and trying to force people to not drive back and forth to work. There are 120 years worth of evidence that this is the preferred consumer choice to go to and fro, you should respect consumer's overwhelming choice. 5. The existing transit agencies can use the funds that would be expended on rail for bus service. That would be a far better use of these funds than attempting to create a rail system where one cannot logically exist. Bus traffic is needed and vital for jobs and careers of all NE Ohio citizens, and bolstering spending in this area would be more prudent.	NOACA appreciates the comments and will take them under advisement.
Individual	I'd like to see more planned spending allocated to bike lanes and rail lines than for existing roadways. I currently can't ride my bike anywhere that isn't for pleasure. If I could ride it to or from work, or the grocery store SAFELY everyday I would. Too many drivers are distracted by their technology in their cars that it makes riding on roadways dangerous. Why should cars have access to a dedicated road literally everywhere but bikes do not without risking the life of the rider?	Thank you for your comments. Specific to your bike lane comments, eNEO2050 funds 926 miles of bicycle facilities, more than 11,000 pedestrian ADA and safe crossings, and 760 bike storage lockers for cyclist in the next three decades. eNEO 2050 implements recommendations from NOACA's existing Regional Bicycle Plan and the pedestrian and bicycle plan currently under development called ACTIVATE. The broader focus of the new plan addresses three usage categories for nonmotorized modes: utilitarian trips, access to transit services (first-last-mile connectivity), and recreational pursuits.
Individual	I am writing to ask that the NOACA Board not support the new ramps at the I-77/Miller interchange. I have read through the eNEO2050 objectives and this project does not fit within those objectives. Brecksville is a thriving community with a strong housing market and business tax base. There are entrance and exit ramps a short drive from Miller Road. The only justification I can see for the new interchange is the financial benefit of a few land owners who will profit from the increased value of their property adjacent to the highway. This interchange will in no way meet the objectives laid out in eNEO2050. Recently ASCE gave Ohio's bridges a C+, Ohio's roads a D, and Ohio's transit a D. With such desperate needs for existing infrastructure it seems counter to NOACA's mission to recommend these new ramps. I ask that NOACA support projects that repair, replace or enhance existing transportation infrastructure, not continually add more for the financial benefit of a few. Lastly, if NOACA does want to consider improvements in Brecksville with a true regional benefit I would recommend looking at the public transportation and pedestrian infrastructure instead. I live on the south end of Brecksville near the Richfield border. There are a number of jobs that could be filled by residents who may not have cars. Unfortunately, the RTA and Akron Metro stops do not overlap and are in areas with no sidewalks or shelters. Also the current commute time from the metro downtown areas is extremely long making these jobs difficult for people coming from the urban centers. I hope you will consider looking into that situation rather than spending our tax dollars on more ramps.	Thank you for your comments concerning the Miller Rd interchange and will take it under advisement. Concerning transportation infrastructure asset management, NOACA has an transportation asset management program, and it guides the agency in all funding decisions. The NOACA Board adopted a policy to limit enhancement and capacity adding projects to only 10% of the budget, with 90% going to preservation.
Individual	You're on the right track. I love the prioritizing of equity. Please make this a region where people can get good jobs and live active lives without a car, and invest in transit infrastructure that makes the already-built city and suburbs the most attractive places to live in NEO. For too long, we've pushed people ever outward with our transportation investments, and that not only exacerbates but has created the racial and economic segregation that's our region's greatest weakness	Thank you for your comment.
Individual	Hi, I emailed and left a voice message yesterday and have not received a response, so I wondered if you received my messages. I would like to comment on the May 3rd presentation but cannot until I receive a hard copy that I can actually read. The presentation had an enormous amount of information that we were unfortunately unable to process at one time, nor could we decipher the charts, tables and graphs. Due to the unreliability of another government entity, the USPS, we really need to have a readable copy of the presentation as SOON AS POSSIBLE in order to adequately study it. Also, how do we attend the "Lunch and Learn" series of seminars? Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.	Responded via email where to find the plan and presentation 5/7/2021
Individual	How do I access the appendices referenced regarding public input through the regional survey? See the following quote - "Analysis and Reports A series of reports that focused on the overall results of the survey, as well as specific elements were produced. While each of these reports is too lengthy to include in eNEO2050 (see Appendices 4-2 through 4-7), data and analysis from these reports helped inform the content included here. This section provides and discusses some of the overall results of the Regional Survey, while other results are shared through subsequent chapters that focus on specific topics (Economy, Chapter 5; Employment, Chapter 6; Housing, Chapter 7; Environment, Chapter 8; etc.)." Thank you	Responded via online 5/5/2021; Responded that all appendices would be posted by weeks end 5/7/2021
Individual	Please paginate your chapters pages so that the public can provide specific comments. Secondly, please review and edit some of your table headings and columns for visibility - sometimes your color choices are too dark to contrast well with the text, therefore unreadable. Lastly, please let mem know that you have received these comments and will be making corrections. It is difficult to encourage my constituents to review and comment, when they can't read sections or identify the page number. Thanks you	Responded with thank you for comments and advice via online 5/5/2021
Individual	I'm interested in the non-motorized projects. Do you have more detailed bicycle and pedestrian project maps? Appendices 10-6 and 10-7 don't show municipal boundaries, street names, etc. And/or is there a list of projects that are being considered? Second item, can you send me the project lists, app 10-4, as a spreadsheet file? That would be helpful.	1) The maps in Appendices 10-6 and 10-7 are already very detailed. Additional information on the map, such as municipal boundaries or street names, would make the maps too difficult to read. A detailed list of minor projects, including bicycle and pedestrian projects, is available in Appendix 10-4. This is a comprehensive listing of all minor projects generated from NOACA pavement, bridge, and non-motorized plans and tools; and through the community and regional agency project solicitation. 2) Responded via online 5/5/2021
Individual	What are we doing to preserve the Cleveland core vs urban sprawl?	Chapter 7 (Efficient Land Use) of the resource document addresses the impacts (both urban and exurban/rural) of outward spread of development in a region that has lost population since 1970. There are also elements of this discussion in Chapters 5, 6 and 8 of the resource document.
Individual	As a MPO where does your authority come from to do housing or land use planning	Responded via Q&A 5/3/21: Our authority is only in context to transportation; we will not be planning for housing or land use, which is a local responsibility.
Individual	Given the effects of the pandemic, how have you been able to engage with the public while their attention was (rightly) focused elsewhere? Why will there be no further opportunities for comment? What would you say to those who would complain of feeling rushed?	Responded via Q&A 5/3/21: It was not easy! We engaged through virtual meetings, surveys, website activities and more. You will have 30 more days to comment.
Individual	With the Ohio legislature controlled by a large number of leaders from small, rural communities, who are not supporters of public transportation and larger cities, will NOACA work to secure equitable redistricting based on the 2020 census?	NOACA does not have a formal role in the redistricting process scheduled to follow release of 2020 Census data, but NOACA will analyze and incorporate 2020 Census data into the update of eNEO2050 over the next four years (2021-2025).
Individual	Why not start funding Geauga County roads, equity planning is wasteful spending and promotes racism! This is wasteful spending.	See appendix 10 for all the Geauga County projects
Individual	Will we be able to share this Slide Presentation with others after this Public Mtg ?? Sorry if you already answered this	Responded via Q&A at 5/3/21: Yes, it will be posted to the website. Also responded where to find the presentation on the website.
Individual	Shouldn't our region, NOACA's influence spread to follow the population into the south eastern burbs, adding counties? adding funding?	Comment is unclear; the recent growth areas in the NOACA region have been in the western counties of the region (Lorain, Medina). Southeast of NOACA is AMATS (Portage, Summit) but those counties have not demonstrated substantial growth

Individual	We know how sprawl harms core counties and communities. How does sprawl harm the region as a whole and the outer ring communities in particular?	Chapter 7 (Efficient Land Use) of the resource document addresses the impacts (both urban and exurban/rural) of outward spread of development in a region that has lost population since 1970. There are also elements of this discussion in Chapters 5, 6 and 8 of the resource document.
Individual	NOACA is an MPO it has no authority to do landuse or housing planning. Government has never been good at determining what will work or NOT. Cars are fundamental to everyones sucess who the heck is NOACA to determine the best MODE? Socialism has never worked and will not this time.	NOACA's authority is only in context to transportation; we will not be planning for housing or land use, which is a local responsibility.
Individual	People move out to the Geauga county because we don't need public transportation here!!! Stop trying to bring this socialist equity to our county!	Responded via Q&A 5/3/21: Public transportation is not being proposed for Geauga County. Please see the Visionary Transit Plan map.
Individual	just put the roads in so folks have the liberty make choices to get a job where they choose. Get a job, buy a car, and you will succeed. NOACA cann not determine a companies success. That will happen or not. It is nature. Why would NOCA want to interfere with the natural process? Folks without a car should get a job and they can make payments. Stop trying to control everything.	See appendix 10 for all the roadway projects in the region.
Individual	2 questions: 1) Has this plan been formally approved, accepted and adopted by the NOACA board? 2) Also, does the proposed GCRTA Redesign enhance or inhibit the new NOACA Long Term Plan?	1) Official NOACA Board review for possible approval will happen at their June 11 meeting; 2) Draft information about the GCRTA Redesign included in eNEO2050 (see Chapters 9 and 11 of resource document)
Individual	Who is in your environmental justice ground zero zone in Geauga County? How do I challenge your data?	See the environmental justice areas in Geauga County at https://gis.noaca.org/Portal/
Individual	Thank you so much for your helpful response. I have visited the website you provided and have easily located the PowerPoint presentation. I am told that draft documents are public information. Given this, would it be possible for me to immediately receive the draft version of all the public comments that were submitted during the presentation? If you could provide a complete copy what you have now, that would be most appreciated. Thank you in advance.	Responded email: 5/7/2021 (Responded where the draft plan is located on the website).
Individual	Great VISION.. lets Create an ACTION PLAN and get State and Federal \$\$\$\$ to MOVE Forward	Thank you for the comment.
Individual	hyperloop is a big waste of both time and money	The hyperloop is included in the plan as an illustrative project, so there is no funding dedicated to it.
Individual	Thanks for this presentation! My question: What would be ODOTs or the Ohio Rail Development Commissions role in the facilitation or development of the enhanced Rail system? Would NOACA lead such enhancements with state assistance if needed, or do we need to rely on help from Columbus to make it happen?	The rail expansions could be funded by different resources. For example, Some MPOs design a congestion pricing policy and the collected revenues are invested in transit. The eNEO2050 plan presents several tables for comparing investments in the roadway category and transit category. The investment in transit has increased compared with the past, but still should be higher. Also, as discussed in Chapter 3, most residents have only one option for their transportation needs. Investment in transit and non-motorized modes will provide alternatives to car for more residents. The Congestion Management Plan of the eNEO2050 plan has set up objectives indicating higher shares for transit in the next three decades. Also, the section of the illustrative or fiscally unconstrained discusses two phases for the rail network expansion. However, the gradual expansion may also be possible. In AIM2040 we introduced the idea of the rail expansion, and in two scenarios of the eNEO2050 plan, we tested the enhanced rail network and the results showed that the transit ridership could be tripled. Also we calculated the investment requirements at the planning level.
Individual	In what discipline is Joe's Ph.D?	Responded with details regarding Dr. MacDonald's educational background including degrees and universities.
Individual	Why should public money be used to supply charging stations? That is not how gas stations came about.	The EV charging stations are proposed to the counties/local communities for installation on public property so that all electric car owners can use them, wealthy or not. Specifically though, it is to make them more available for the average person who owns the less expensive version of electric cars that do not have as many networks for EV charging locations as compared to their more expensive counterparts (think Leaf vs. Tesla). More importantly, there is significant air quality benefit from emission reductions, and the cost of investing in the EV charging stations is significantly outweighed by the air quality benefits.
Individual	this is a cleveland, cuyahoga centric plan. There is NOTHING in this plan for Geauga, Medina, or Lake.	See appendix 10 for all the roadway, bridge and enhancement projects in the region.
Individual	How many people were surveyed?	Responded that 2464 were surveyed
Individual	any consideration of adding summit and portage counties?	Summit and Portage counties are not part of NOACA, they are part of AMATS.
Individual	To what extent does UN Agenda 21/2030 influece this plan?	Not at all.
Individual	What is an MOE?	"MOE" is Measure of Effectiveness, introduced and explained in Chapter 9.
Individual	Need explanation of NPV, MOE, etc. No idea what they stand for.	"MOE" is Measure of Effectiveness, introduced and explained in Chapter 9. "NPV" is Net Present Value, introduced and explained in Chapter 10.
Individual	Have you looked at the unintended consequences of multi-modal transportation? Mixing transportation modes with vehicles having a wide variation in speed (i.e.: bicycles vs cars or trucks), creates hazardous situations for vehicles and their operators. There are plenty of examples in other metropolitan areas where mixed-mode transportation was implemented poorly. Have learned what NOT to do?	NOACA appreciates the comments and will take them under advisement.
Individual	Listed under "Land Use" was "Discourage Exclusionarland use". What is this referring to - individual housing	Exclusionary land use are ordinances to exclude certain types of land uses from a given community.
Individual	Covid & Technology have changed the face of work forever, many employees are no longer required to commute at all. How has the recent change been taken into consideration.	The pandemic is an ongoing event and worker habits and commuter patterns continue to evolve in this situation. NOACA will certainly gather and analyze data from the time of the pandemic. NOACA can incorporate its analysis into the next iteration of the long range plan, in development during the next four years.
Individual	Guessing that work from home WFH, the new normal, will have a great impact on transportation planning. How does NOACA plan with this new reality.	The pandemic is an ongoing event and worker habits and commuter patterns continue to evolve in this situation. NOACA will certainly gather and analyze data from the time of the pandemic. NOACA can incorporate its analysis into the next iteration of the long range plan, in development during the next four years.