1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Welcome to Local Officials
   b. Introduction of Consortium Members

2. Public Comment

3. For Action
   a. Approval of Meeting Minutes September 24, 2013 and October 22, 2013 (attachment)

4. For Discussion
   a. Objectives for December/January & Watch List (Morrison)
      i. Update on Vision Development, Recommendations & Initiatives
      ii. Update on Board Engagement on Vision
   b. Executive Committee Update (Gallucci)
      i. Resolution regarding future
      ii. Board Action on Vision in December and February
      iii. HUD Extension status
      iv. Status of Fund Match-Grant
      v. 2014 Board Meeting Schedule/Annual meeting
   c. Leveraged Match Presentation (Maier)
   d. Regional Data/GIS Sharing Feasibility Analysis (Maier)

5. For Information
   a. Standing Committee Reports
      i. Technical Steering Committee (attachment)
      ii. Finance Committee Report (no business conducted)
      iii. Communications and Engagement Committee Report (no business conducted)
      iv. Nominating Committee Report (tbd)
      v. Personnel Committee Report (no business conducted)
   b. Organization
      i. Progress and Status of Products
      ii. Month End Financial Report (attachment)
      iii. Open and Pending Contract Update (attachment)
      iv. Leveraged Match Report (attachment)

6. Old Business

7. New Business

Adjourn

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, December 17 – Akron Urban League
NEOSCC Annual Meeting: Tuesday, January 28 – Akron Urban League
Board Members: Jason Segedy, Pam Hawkins, Fred Wright, Emily Campbell, Nancy Cook, Angie Byington, Bill D’Avignon, David Beach, Ed Jerse, John Getchey, Bethia Burke, Joseph Calabrese, Mike Challender, Anna DeAscentis, Joe Hadley, Grace Gallucci Mike Lyons, Bob Nau, Jeff Dutton, Erin Gurm, Gene Nixon,

Alternate Board Members: Don Romancak, Steve Hambley, Donna Skoda, Marc Lefkowitz, Rachel McCartney, Lucy Miller

Staff: Hunter Morrison, Emma Petrie Barcelona, Jeff Anderle, Joe MacDonald, Kelley Britt, Sara Maier, Antoine Buie, Mike Nichols, and Kelly D. Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Public Comment

There was a presentation by Eric Ritter from LEEDCo, which is a regional non-profit and economic development organization building an offshore wind energy industry in Ohio. Mr. Ritter gave an overview of LEEDCo and some of the goals that the organization hopes to accomplish. There were several comments made by board member about other power utilities' positions on LEEDCo, cost differential, and if there are any critics against LEEDCo.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

There was a motion to approve the August 27, 2013 minutes made by Mr. Lyons and seconded by Mr. Challender. The motion was approved.

Approval of Fiscal Year 2012 Audit

Michelle Carano from Meaden & Moore gave a brief overview of the audit for NEOSCC. Mr. Nau made a motion to approve the audit, seconded by Mr. Calabrese. The motion was approved.

For Discussion

“Objectives for October/ Phase Three

Mr. Morrison began with an overview of the upcoming Vision Sessions and events that will be occurring in October.

Draft Proposed Vision Sasaki

Chris Horne from Sasaki began with an overview of draft the region vision. He explained the process of building the regional vision and the upcoming vision sessions. He continued with the components of the vision: the Inputs of the Vision and the Vision Objectives. Mr. Horne then explained the details of the regional vision maps. He proceeded with the intent and criteria of the indicators and explained how they were developed. Mr. Horne displayed the organization of the indicators and then began to explain how the targets related to them. He also focused on local indicators and targets associated with them, then transitioned into the recommendations. With the recommendations, he gave a breakdown of their organization, which includes community type and scale. He continued with the Development Guidelines and explained their purpose and displayed images from around the region pertaining to them.

Ms. Gallucci opened up a discussion so that board members could respond to the information that was displayed. Ms. Campbell expressed concerned about the vision not addressing issues with health and...
education. Mr. Beach and Mr. Horne responded to Ms. Campbell and explained that the vision does address some of those issues. Mr. Segedy commented about the responsibilities of the board and goals that the board wants to accomplish as well as the role of the individual organizations. There were several comments from board members about the maps and the appearance of those maps. It was suggested that having a print out of the presentation would be helpful. Ms. Gallucci addressed several things about the vision, such as the audience that is being addressed, adding an executive summary, and the role of NEOSCC and local agencies pertaining to implementation. She also asked Mr. Horne to forward the presentation so that board members could review.

**Phase Three Engagement**

Mr. Anderle gave an overview of the Geographic Reach throughout Phases One and Two. He displayed a chart of the percentage of people by county that participated in the workshops during those phases. He explained the “How Does the Scenario Planning Work” slide and discussed the timeline of events that will be occurring over the next three months. He then proceeded to discuss the locations and dates of the vision sessions and showed the flyers for the vision sessions. He transitioned to the upcoming caucus meetings that will be occurring throughout the month of October and the beginning of November, and briefly discussed different topics that the caucuses will cover. Finally, he displayed the timeline for events in the month November and highlighted how the vision will be explained at upcoming the MPOs/COG workshops and the December board meeting.

Ms. Choby gave a detailed overview of the caucuses. The details consisted of locations, dates, topic, and goals of the caucuses. Commissioner Hambley from Medina County asked if there was a list of people who will be attending the caucuses. Mr. Morrison commented and gave even more details about the caucuses.

**Future Committee Report**

Ms. Gallucci gave an overview of the progress of the Futures Committee. She then introduced the consultants assisting the committee. David Fitz from Strategy Design Partners presented the Recommended Approach. He displayed several possible alternatives for the Consortium, as well as other things that the board should consider such as action for strategic implantation on a regional scale, future campaign timeline, annual finding model, and much more NEOSCC. There were several comments from board members.

**Executive Committee Update**

Ms. Gallucci explained how the material covered today we as also covered with the executive committee expect for the Citizen Forms. She gave an overview of the Citizen Forums.

**Old Business**

Ms. Gallucci and Mr. Morrison announced changes with NEOSCC staff. They also gave updates about the HUD Grant Extension.

**New Business**

Mr. Shaun Donovan, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will possibly be visiting the region in the near future.

There was a **motion** to adjourn the meeting made by **Mr. Nixon** that was seconded by **Mr. Calabrese**. The motion was approved. The meeting ended.
The Board Meeting was called to order at 1:16 PM

Welcome and Introductions

Public Comment

No public comment

For Action

Approval of Meeting Minutes September 24, 2013

The minutes of the September Board Meeting were not voted on due to a lack of quorum at the beginning of the meeting. A comment was also made that a correction to the minutes needs to occur regarding the spelling of Mr. Shaun Donovan, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The corrected minutes will be voted on at the November Board Meeting. Quorum was reached soon after the meeting started.

For Discussion

Objectives for November/November Watch List

Mr. Morrison gave an overview of the timeline of events from October to December. He displayed slides providing details of the November objectives and the vision approval process. He also gave a briefing on the public vision sessions.

Executive Committee Update

Ms. Gallucci asked Mr. Segedy to give a summary of the Executive Committee Meeting. Mr. Segedy outlined the meeting discussions. Ms. Gallucci asked questions about the HUD extension request. Mr. Morrison responded by detailing the status, stating that a formal request to extend for six months to the end of July 2014 was submitted just prior to the government shutdown, and that he had been in contact with NEOSCC’s HUD Government Technical Representative since the government reopened, and that an answer about the request may take between six and eight weeks, but that indications were favorable. Ms. Miller affirmed this statement. Board members asked questions about the end date of the consortium and funding for the consortium if the extension is
not granted, to which Mr. Morrison noted that the current end date is January 31, 2014, and that the Sasaki Team’s work is still scheduled to conclude by the end of December, should the request not be granted. There was also discussion about the status of the funding from the Fund for Our Economic Future, with Mr. Morrison noting that a proposal had been submitted to the Fund outlining how the Program Management Office would utilize remaining funds that were part of their original cash grant commitment. A response is pending.

Future Committee Update

Ms. Gallucci gave an update about the committee’s work and explained how she wanted to discuss the recommendations presentation with the Board and put it on the following month’s agenda. She also gave a briefing about some of the issues that the committee faced last month. Mr. Jerse asked about funding for the Future Committee and Mr. Lyons had some concerns about the recommendations. There was dialogue about some of the details. Ms. Gallucci asked for some of the charts from the presentation to be shown again. Mr. Nau wanted to clarify that the numbers in the recommendations presentation are not commitments, but they are possibly goals that can be adjusted based on funding. Ms. Gallucci explained that the next phase of work would create specific and detailed plans relating to funding, membership, operations, etc. Mr. Lyons suggested writing up a resolution and providing an attachment with some of the details of how the organization could be structured. Mr. Anderle informed the board that the presentation is available and would be sent out.

Other Discussion

Mr. Morrison gave a brief update on the products development.

Old Business

Update on HUD Secretary Donovan’s potential visit. Ms. Miller stated that she sent an issues paper out and the potential date is November 12, but due to the government shutdown it would be more likely to occur sometime in the future.

New Business

No New Business.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM for a work session on the vision recommendations with Board members. The meeting was unanimously adjourned with a motion from Mr. Segedy that was seconded by Mr. Lyons.
Memo

To: NEOSCC Board of Directors
Date: 11/14/2013
Re: NEOSCC Futures Committee and Draft Resolution

Action requested

The purpose of the draft resolution under consideration by the Executive Committee and Board is to complete the work to-date of the Future Committee and set clear direction for the Board and PMO for the future of NEOSCC.

On June 17, 2013, NOESCC hosted a day-long retreat for all board members to discuss the future of NEOSCC. At this retreat there was consensus that there was a need for NEOSCC to exist as a non-profit beyond the completion of the HUD grant-funded work.

In order to start developing a course, the Futures Committee, with consulting support from Strategy Design Partners, was established to begin the process of reviewing options and making recommendations to the Board regarding what NEOSCC could or should be moving forward.

The committee met over the summer of 2013 (week of August 5th, week of August 12th, week of August 19th, week of September 16th, in addition to conference calls and small group meetings) and completed their work with a presentation to the Board on September 23, 2013. It was then discussed again at the October Executive Committee meeting, with some additional discussion at the Board meeting on October 22, 2013. From that discussion, it was determined that the Board needed to accept/adopt the model as presented by the Futures Committee so that it could move into next steps of adding detail and specificity to the plan. The next phase will provide clear detail and areas of responsibility for action in order to create both a plan for ongoing operations and a transition plan (to move from how the organization is oriented now to its next phase).

In the recommendations from the Committee:
  - The mission would be modified to focus on strategic implementation of the VibrantNEO 2040 vision on a regional scale through:
Assisting, Assembling, and Advocating.

- The Board would transform to be more focused on this type of work of a non-profit, with additional committees and membership related to the ongoing work. Committees would include:
  - Executive
  - Standing
    - Research
    - Policy
    - Advocacy
  - Advisory
    - Experts
    - Friends
    - Leaders

- While staffing is dependent on budget and tasks, in order to accomplish the goals as presented in the mission, a likely model would include 4 FTEs:
  - Executive Director
  - Executive Assistant/Office Manager
  - Policy & Data Manager
  - Engagement Manager

- The annual budget would likely be $350,000-$500,000 based on the likely work, operations, and the market.

- Funding for the organization could come from any number of sources, but would likely include:
  - NEOSCC Membership Fee
  - Foundations (primarily those with mission in the environment, housing, economic development, transportation, and equity areas)
  - Government
    - MPOs/COGs
    - Counties
    - Other jurisdictions, regional authorities
  - Businesses
  - Project-based grants
  - In-kind
  - Fees for services

- A funding campaign would need to planned and should be executed as soon as possible in 2014 in order to allow for appropriate transition to the new organization.
The attached resolution is a draft and can be further modified as needed, but the main point here is that the organization needs to set a direction so staff and the public have an understanding of what NEOSCC is moving toward next, and so the Consortium can phase and deploy resources appropriately.
RESOLUTION NO. 2013-03
(Regarding the Future of NEOSCC, the non-profit)

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
NORTHEAST OHIO SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES CONSORTIUM, INC.

WHEREAS, the Northeast Ohio Sustainable Communities Consortium, Inc. (NEOSCC) is an Ohio non-profit corporation formed to develop a regional policy plan for sustainability for a 12-county region in Northeast Ohio and to create a community of practice among planners, governmental officials, nonprofit professionals and citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, a collaboration of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), established a Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA), acting as fiscal agent and lead applicant for the NEOSCC, was awarded $4.25 million in funding from HUD for the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program to develop the regional vision; and

WHEREAS, a Program Management Office for the NEOSCC was established and staffed to develop the regional vision; and

WHEREAS, the primary funding source and original purpose of the non-profit is approaching completion; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors at a retreat in June 2013 stated that there was an ongoing regional need for NEOSCC to be in existence, which was subsequently reaffirmed and organized by the Future’s Committee over the summer of 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Future’s Committee presented draft models for purpose, programming, organization, and funding for the non-profit to the Board of Directors in September 2013.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Northeast Ohio Sustainable Communities Consortium that:

Section 1: NEOSCC’s Board of Directors thanks the Futures Committee for their work to-date and adopts the findings and recommendations of the Future’s Committee, as amended, with the intent and understanding that this is currently a conceptual framework with details to be further defined and agreed upon in the coming months; and

Section 2: NEOSCC’s Board of Directors directs the Future’s Committee or designee to finalize the plans for NEOSCC 2.0 and present implementable details and assignable tasks for the purpose, programming, organization, and funding.

Section 3: NEOSCC’s Board of Directors directs the Future’s Committee or designee to create a transition plan with details and actions related to how the current organization, operation, funding, and programming transition to the next phase of organization, operation, funding, and programming.

Certified to be a true copy of a Resolution of the Board of Directors of NEOSCC adopted this 19th day of November 2013.
Secretary/Chair: __________________________

Date Signed: __________________________

Attachment: revised presentation from September 24, 2013
Northeast Ohio Sustainable Communities Consortium

NEOSCC
Future Committee Update- Revised 11/1/13

September 24, 2013
GOALS

• Discuss the *issues and options* generated through the board retreat

• Conduct *research or outreach* to assist with feasibility assessment

• Examine *pros and cons* of each option and determine the best, most feasible choice for NEOSCC

• Present *recommendations* to the full NEOSCC board on September 24th
Process Overview

Aug. 5th
Org. Activities & Board Structure
(Discussion)

Week of Aug. 12th
Org. Activities & Board Structure
(Recommendations)

Week of Aug. 19th
Staffing / Funding / Partnerships
(Discussion)

Week of Sept. 16th
Review Findings + Discuss Board Approach & Next Steps

Sept. 24th
Board Meeting
THE REALITY
Proposed Regional Vision Draft Objectives

• Overarching theme: promote investment in existing communities

• Protect our soil, water, air, and ecologically sensitive areas

• Improve regional fiscal health

• Develop our regional economy with accessible employment opportunities

• Enhance regional transit system

• Cultivate and celebrate local assets and places of public value

• Expand our parks and open space network

• Preserve our prime farmland
We expect a promising future for Northeast Ohio, but only if we address recent unsustainable development trends: Several decades of unabated outward migration in the face of modest regional population growth has resulted in housing markets characterized by an oversupply of units, weak prices, high vacancy rates, and widespread abandonment of the region’s oldest neighborhoods.

Across the region, the creation of additional developable land through the extension of the region’s infrastructure systems has been accompanied by the simultaneous abandonment of already developed land and the infrastructure that supports it. If this pattern of simultaneous infrastructure expansion and abandonment continues unabated, every community in Northeast Ohio will face chronic fiscal stress. By 2040, expenditures are likely to exceed revenues by upwards of 30% in the region’s counties.

Continued outward expansion reduces our region’s prime agricultural land and threatens our sensitive ecological areas while leaving large swaths of our legacy cities and towns abandoned: Blighted neighborhoods, abandoned shopping malls, and industrial brownfields would sap the vitality and weaken the tax base of each of our legacy industrial cities and their adjacent suburbs.

We must act now to advocate for policies that stimulate investment in existing communities while protecting our agricultural heritage and rural communities. By doing so, we can achieve more environmentally balanced and fiscally sustainable development patterns throughout our region. Clean Ohio, historic tax credits, county land banks, regional transit, rural land conservancy, and farmland preservation are all available tools to achieve these goals. We must advocate for the continuation and expansion of these tools.

NEOSCC is the only organization in Northeast Ohio that has assembled a broad and diverse group of leaders who are committed to and capable of implementing a regional development framework (Vibrant NEO 2040) that protects our future by creating conditions for a vibrant, resilient, and sustainable Northeast Ohio.
THE OPPORTUNITY (Example)

Finding
- Current development trends: costly and fiscally unsustainable
- Rebuild on already-developed land in our cities and towns
- Protect farms & natural areas

Preferred Scenario
- Limit further expansion of developed land
- Promote the reuse of already-developed land

Limit further expansion of developed land
- Allocate resources to rebuild on already-developed land.
- Limit the extension of infrastructure outside the region’s urbanized area.

Protect prime agricultural land by promoting local farming and conservancy
- Support local agriculture
- Support funding for conservancy
- Prioritize planning to protect natural resources

Align future building with changing market for walkable urbanism
- Establish consensus on development targets
- Obtain commitments at all levels of government to support desired market behavior

THE OPPORTUNITY (Example)
THE WORK
CURRENT MISSION

We exist to create conditions for a more vibrant, resilient, and sustainable Northeast Ohio.
PROPOSED MISSION

NEOSCC creates conditions for a more vibrant, resilient, and sustainable Northeast Ohio by assisting communities with research, analysis, and planning; assembling & engaging broad and diverse stakeholder groups; and collectively advocating for effective policy changes.
HOW TO GET IT DONE:

NEOSCC ACTION
Strategic implementation on a regional scale

ASSIST
(Tech, Tools, Data)
Scenario planning, maps, data, VibrantNEO website, dashboard of regional indicators, policy analysis, measurement

ASSEMBLE & Engage
Forum to share ideas, build consensus, and catalyze actions at a regional scale

ADVOCATE for Change
Collaborative advocacy and communication on issues of regional significance
THE BOARD
General Criteria for Future Board Membership

- Believes that the region’s future must be fiscally, environmentally, and economically sustainable
- Supports the implementation of the regional vision and framework
- Has a passion to create conditions for a vibrant, resilient, and sustainable NEO
- Agrees to advocate for policy changes at local and regional level
- Has the capacity to influence and ability to effect change
- Makes the commitment to support transparent, engaged, and open-source approach for sharing data and aligning local and regional measures
- Has the will and means to provide financial and/or in-kind resources
Suggested Model

OFFICERS: Board Chair 2 Vice Chairs Secretary Treasurer

Board (40-60)

- MPOs/COGs
- 12 counties (one each)
- Foundations/Funders
- Corporations
- Other (non-profit, academic, etc.)
- Meets quarterly / biannually

Executive Committee (15)

- Meet as needed
- Chair on EC
- Reports to EC

Research (25-30)

- 4 Counties
- 3 MPOs/COGs
- 2 Funders
- 2 Corporate
- 1-3 Other
- Meets monthly
- Geographic balance

Policy (25-30)

Standing Committees

Advocacy (25-30)

OFFICERS:

- Board Chair
- 2 Vice Chairs
- Secretary
- Treasurer

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- Report to Standing Committees

Experts
- Technical and issue-based
- Based work stream model
- Meets quarterly

Friends
- Citizens & Elected Officials
- Quarterly mtgs.

Leaders
- Corporate
- Commits $name
- Meets as needed
THE STAFF
Future Model

**Ballpark Budget: $350-500K**
- Executive Director ($100-150K)
- Executive Asst./Office Manager ($35-50K)
- Policy Manager ($45-60K)
- Engagement Manager ($45-60K)
- Consultants ($30-50K)
- Other (e.g. health care, retirement, rent, office & meeting supplies, etc.) ($100-125K)

**Executive Director**
- Planning & Strategy
- Budget
- Fundraising
- Spokesperson
- Board relations

**Executive Asst. / Office Manager**
- Scheduling
- Supplies
- Payroll
- Policies
- Secretary to board and EC
- Other Admin. & Operations

**Policy Manager**
- Coordinate with MPO staff
- Scenario planning
- Data mngt. / analysis
- Policy analysis
- Staff bd. research comm.
- Staff policy comm.
- Staff experts comm.
- Consultant mgmt.

**Engagement Manager**
- Communications Plan
- Outreach Plan
- Media Relations
- Consultant management
- Update website, materials
- Staff bd. advocacy comm.
- Staff friends comm.
- Staff leaders comm.

**Assist** ➞ **Assemble** ➞ **Advocate**
THE FUNDING
NEOSCC will implement the Vibrant NEO 2040 plan by assisting communities with research, analysis, & planning; assembling & engaging broad and diverse stakeholder groups; and advocating for real policy changes throughout the region.

The current organizational model anticipates four organizational staff positions and total budget of approximately $500K:

- Executive Director
- Executive Assistant/Office Manager
- Policy Manager
- Engagement Manager

NEOSCC seeks $500,000 each year to support an initial 3-year pilot program for a total of $1.5 million, which would fund these staff positions and their vital activities.

NEOSCC seeks foundation, government, business membership, non-profit membership, project-based, and in-kind funding to support its work.
Possible Funding Sources:

- NEOSCC Membership Fee
- Foundations
  - primarily those with mission in the environment, housing, economic development, transportation, and equity areas
- Government
  - MPOs
  - County
  - Other jurisdictions, regional authorities
- Businesses
- Project based grants
- In-kind
- Fees for services
Future Campaign Timeline

**Oct. - Dec.**
- Create transition plan
- Identify one/few actionable items from Sasaki plan
- Complete case for support
- Finalize list of funding prospects
- Develop compelling presentation & collateral package
- Establish initial targets, schedule meetings

**Jan. - March**
- Meet with prospects
- Build board and advisory committees
- Define job descriptions for Executive Director and staff

**April - June**
- Finalize budget
- Complete on-boarding of board and advisory comm.
- Engage Executive Director and staff
NEOSCC Technical Steering Committee Meeting Summary
Tuesday, November 12, 2013
SCRPC/SCAT’s Offices & GoTo Meeting Webinar

- **Public Comment:** None.

- **Minutes from the October 8, 2013 meeting were approved.**

- **Revised Vision Recommendations & Initiatives:** Mr. James Miner (Sasaki Associates) described how comments on the recommendations and initiatives from the vision sessions, Board session, caucuses, and other public feedback was processed into the set of revised recommendations and initiatives. This was followed by a Web presentation by Ms. Jill Allen (Sasaki Associates) that included three main discussion items that the team needed guidance and or agreement on from the TSC. Of note was that the three thematic areas (strengthen established communities, increase transportation choice, and preserve and protect natural resources) presented in the vision sessions were expanded to include a fourth: government operations. Members received a hard copy of the original recommendations and initiatives along with a copy of the revised recommendations and initiatives and discussed desired changes during the meeting. The Sasaki team agreed to take these comments and prepare a revision to the list for final review by November 15.

- **Products Update:** Ms. Sara Maier briefly updated the group that the products were awaiting the final list of recommendations and initiatives so that they could be completed. The project managers had integrated as much as possible, but were waiting on this last piece.

- **Communications Update:** Mr. Jeff Anderle noted that the PMO is in the process of contacting the various members individually regarding presentations for their respective Boards. No other update was given.

- **Old Business:** None.

- **New Business:** Mr. Hunter Morrison briefed the group on changes to the NEOSCC Futures Committee resolution that had been emailed to the Board. The group discussed additional points of clarification and possible ways to move forward. The resolution will be presented for action at the November Executive Committee meeting and is a discussion item for the November Board meeting.

- The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:30 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for December 10, 2013, from 10am-12pm at NEOSCC’s offices.
## Financial Information

### Total Expended Through 10/31/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Target of (94%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,942,290</td>
<td>$1,412,152</td>
<td>$530,138</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Salaries & Fringes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries $</td>
<td>1,590,552</td>
<td>$1,234,292</td>
<td>$356,260</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>357,738</td>
<td>177,960</td>
<td>173,778</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Private Vehicle $</td>
<td>35,984</td>
<td>$22,939</td>
<td>$12,659</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC Transportation</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>(4,641)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC Per Diem</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,385</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplies and Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>28,300</td>
<td>$19,866</td>
<td>8,434</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier Lease/Usage</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>7,605</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Accommodations</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop/Workstations</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>22,211</td>
<td>(4,811)</td>
<td>139%</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellphones/IT Telecomm</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>30,866</td>
<td>(20,036)</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>149%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Base Analysis</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>$31,750</td>
<td>118,250</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built &amp; Natural Environ</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>169,590</td>
<td>30,410</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; IT Connections</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>148,250</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Based Regional Plan</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>34,207</td>
<td>165,793</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration &amp; Govern Supp</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>223,043</td>
<td>26,957</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS &amp; Data Integration</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>31,985</td>
<td>193,015</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; PMO Support</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>101,603</td>
<td>148,397</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Engagement</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>248,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Sector Engage</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>157,540</td>
<td>92,460</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasaki Consulting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>965,350</td>
<td>(965,350)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-Based Management</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>147,586</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; Research Evaluation</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>(585)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Agent Fee</td>
<td>83,285</td>
<td>(83,285)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>39,894</td>
<td>(39,894)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit/Tax Returns/ACCTG/HR</td>
<td>19,380</td>
<td>(19,380)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Moving</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>(1,400)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Direct Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Meeting/Intra Agency</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>$19,902</td>
<td>70,098</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone/Cellphone Plans</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>8,887</td>
<td>8,393</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>4,751</td>
<td>13,249</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,237</td>
<td>(30,237)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total HUD Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,247,500</td>
<td>$5,554,731</td>
<td>$692,769</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* These line items will be within budget as the program progresses toward completion.

** The Consortium has expended approximately eighty-eight percent of the Sustainable Communities budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions To Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members: 33.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD: 64.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING BALANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD LOCCS REIMBURSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFOEF CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENDORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYROLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDING BALANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECEIPTED FUNDS:

- DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD) $4,020,600.00
- FUND FOR OUR ECONOMIC FUTURE (FFOEF) 180,502.82
- CITY OF ELYRIA 10,000.00

TOTAL $4,211,102.82

ADDITIONAL CASH RESOURCES:

- NOACA LINE OF CREDIT $0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Consortium Board Member</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Committed Match per Consortium Agreement</th>
<th>Cumulative Reported Match</th>
<th>Percentage of Reported to Committed Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Akron, City of</td>
<td>received partial through 4Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$141,530.00</td>
<td>205.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS)</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$127,812</td>
<td>$144,300.49</td>
<td>112.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>nothing received</td>
<td>$77,642</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Akron Urban League</td>
<td>received through 4Q12</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$8,877.56</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ashtabula County</td>
<td>received through 2Q12</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$3,645.32</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Catholic Charities, Diocese of Youngstown</td>
<td>received partial through 4Q13</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$7,521.86</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Center for Community Solutions</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$13,606.93</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cleveland, City of</td>
<td>received partial through 1Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$12,741.23</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cleveland Metroparks</td>
<td>nothing received</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$71,022</td>
<td>$38,367.72</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>received through 2Q12</td>
<td>$79,188</td>
<td>$81,073.75</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>received partial through 4Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$45,443.47</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>received through 4Q12</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$7,427.47</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eastgate Regional Council of Governments (Eastgate)</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$110,372.52</td>
<td>160.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Elyria, City of*</td>
<td>received through 4Q12</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$28,923.70</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fund for Our Economic Future**</td>
<td>received through 2Q12</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$393,454.50</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$53,918.12</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lorain County (Lorain County Growth Partnership)</td>
<td>received through 4Q12</td>
<td>$83,897</td>
<td>$20,751.81</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$10,041.51</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mahoning County</td>
<td>received through 4Q12</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$19,933.63</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA) (Fiscal Agent)</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$179,415</td>
<td>$354,561.72</td>
<td>197.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Northeast Ohio Community Development Alliance</td>
<td>nothing received</td>
<td>$28,771</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Northeast Ohio Four County Regional Planning &amp; Development Organization (NEFCO)</td>
<td>received partial through 4Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$71,416.41</td>
<td>103.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Policy Bridge</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$27,995.00</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Regional Prosperity Initiative</td>
<td>received through 4Q12</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$89,731.74</td>
<td>598.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Stark County</td>
<td>received through 2Q13 (began tracking 2Q12 when SCATS hit $69,000)</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$60,082.72</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Stark County Regional Planning Commission/Stark County Area Transportation Study (RPC/SCATS)</td>
<td>received through 2Q12 - completed</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>received through 2Q13</td>
<td>$69,018</td>
<td>$6,826.58</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$97,728</td>
<td>$18,204.87</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Summit County Public Health</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$60,004.11</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Trumbull County</td>
<td>received through 3Q13 - completed</td>
<td>$38,034</td>
<td>$38,388.31</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Youngstown, City of</td>
<td>received through 3Q13</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$49,203.19</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>completed match 2Q11</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,048,427</td>
<td>$2,047,346.35</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $10,000 cash match

**Includes $500,000 cash match, of which $213,000 has been released

11/17/2013
The following is the proposed Board and Executive Committee meeting schedule for 2014. This schedule assumes that the starting times and meeting dates (2nd and 4th Tuesday – except for November and December) remain the same. We will be making a determination on the board meeting location over the coming month.

**Executive Committee – Time: 1:30 pm, Location: 146 S. High Street**

January 14  
February 11  
March 11  
April 8  
May 13  
June 10  
July 8  
August 12  
September 9  
October 14  
November 4  
December 2

**Board of Directors – Time: 1:00 pm, Location: TBD**

January 28 Annual Mtg.  
February 25  
March 25  
April 22  
May 27  
June 24  
July 22  
August 26  
September 23  
October 28  
November 18  
December 16
# December Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Planning, Scenario Planning and Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Communications and Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Continue working on final report</td>
<td>• Board Organizations Presentations and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare presentation for 12/17 Board Meeting</td>
<td>• Executive Summary and Roadmap development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional AI/FHEA</th>
<th>Meetings/Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Final report is available</td>
<td>• Presentation: Madison Perry Chamber of Commerce on 11/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Dashboard: Refinement based on recommendations, Meeting 12/3, 10:00 AM</td>
<td>• Presentation: Mahoning County Commissioners on 11/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tool Kit &amp; Best Practices: Refinement based on recommendations, Meeting 12/5, TBD</td>
<td>• Presentation: NEFCO ERTAC on 12/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy Recommendations: Refinement based on recommendations, Meeting 12/3, 1:00 PM</td>
<td>• Presentation: GCRTA on 12/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pilots: Refinement based on recommendations, Meeting 12/2, 1:00 PM</td>
<td>• Presentation: Efficient Gov on 12/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Engagement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Nominating Committee</td>
<td>• Presentation: AMATS Policy on 12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual Meeting Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finance Committee: 2014 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is Leveraged Match?

- Work on behalf or in support of NEOSCC that would not normally be undertaken as part of daily duties or activities
- Examples:
  - Board members' time at meetings, plus travel time & mileage
  - Consultant proposal review & selection processes
  - Staff time spent working on Workstreams & Product Groups
  - Scenario planning workshop volunteering
  - Meeting space
  - Printing
Why is Leveraged Match Necessary?

- Local match (in-kind or leveraged resources) required to draw down federal funds: $1.466 million*
  - Originally minimum amount: $1.998 million
- Part of our cooperative agreement with HUD
- Part of NEOSCC Consortium Agreements
  - Pledged match amount: $3.048 million

*Revised to $1.466 million in August 2013 per HUD’s request, removing 80% of MPO match

Records Verification & Update

- November 5: Record of match reported sent to all Board members, who were asked to:
  - Carefully review information
  - Update any rate information or complete additional leveraged match tracking forms for staff members
  - Note any staff hours (one-off activities) for whom the general consortium rate should apply
  - Provide an approval and/or corrections by November 15
Status of Match Reported through Nov. 17, 2013

- Reporting still uneven
  - 13 of 33 (39.4%) responded to Nov. 5 email
  - 21 of 33 (63.6%) are current through at least 2Q13
  - 3 of 33 (9.1%) have not reported anything
- $2.047 million gross reported
  - 102.5% of original HUD required match
  - 67.2% of Consortium Agreement committed amount
- $1.457 million of $1.466 million (net of 80% MPO reduction)
  - 99.4% of revised HUD required match
Current Match Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium Board Member</th>
<th>Percentage Matched to Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met or Exceeded Commitment</td>
<td>189.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Prosperity Initiative</td>
<td>168.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, City of</td>
<td>205.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOACA</td>
<td>107.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easigate</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKATS</td>
<td>122.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEFCO</td>
<td>103.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull County</td>
<td>109.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>102.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRPC/SCATS</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met 75-99% of Commitment</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark County</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County Public Health</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met 50-74% of Commitment</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, City of</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Bridge</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium Board Member</th>
<th>Percentage Matched to Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met 25-49% of Commitment</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Our Economic Future**</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harta, City of*</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Community Solutions</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning County</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities, Diocese of Youngstown</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Less than 20% of Commitment</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County (Lorain County Growth Part.)</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, City of</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron Urban League</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland County</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Metroparks</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Ohio Community Development</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $10,000 cash match
**Includes $150,000 cash match, of which $72,000 has been released

Reported vs. Committed Match by Member (100%+)

- Cumulative Reported Match
- Committed Match per Consortium Agreement
Status by Sub-Region/Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium Board Member</th>
<th>Committed Match per Consortium Agreement</th>
<th>Cumulative Reported Match</th>
<th>Percentage of Reported to Committed Match</th>
<th>Percentage of Reported Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - NOACA Region</td>
<td>$876,522</td>
<td>$653,251</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, City of</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$12,741.23</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Metroparks</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>$71,022</td>
<td>$38,367.78</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>$79,188</td>
<td>$83,073.75</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$45,443.47</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$7,427.47</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria, City of</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$28,933.79</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$53,918.12</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County (Lorain County Growth Part.)</td>
<td>$83,897</td>
<td>$20,751.81</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$20,041.51</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOACA</td>
<td>$179,415</td>
<td>$354,561.72</td>
<td>197.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - NEFCO Region</td>
<td>$786,200</td>
<td>$580,243</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, City of</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$145,530.00</td>
<td>205.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>$77,642</td>
<td>$77,642</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMATS</td>
<td>$127,812</td>
<td>$144,300.49</td>
<td>112.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron Urban League</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$8,877.56</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEFCO</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$71,416.41</td>
<td>103.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark County</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$60,082.72</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRPC/SCATS</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$6,826.58</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>$97,728</td>
<td>$18,204.87</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County Public Health</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$60,004.11</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Status by Sub-Region/Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium Board Member</th>
<th>Committed Match per Consortium Agreement</th>
<th>Cumulative Reported Match</th>
<th>Percentage of Reported to Committed Match</th>
<th>Percentage of Reported to Consortium Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - Eastgate Region</td>
<td>$404,034</td>
<td>$289,065</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashbela County</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$3,645.32</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities, Diocese of Youngstown</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$7,521.86</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$110,372.52</td>
<td>160.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning County</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$19,933.63</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull County</td>
<td>$38,034</td>
<td>$38,388.31</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, City of</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$49,203.19</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-County Region</td>
<td>$981,671</td>
<td>$524,788</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Community Solutions</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$13,606.93</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Our Economic Future **</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$393,454.50</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Ohio Community Development Alliance</td>
<td>$28,771</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Bridge</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$27,995.00</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Prosperity Initiative</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$89,731.74</td>
<td>598.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,048,427</td>
<td>$2,047,346.35</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Match Reporting

- Leveraged Match tracking form
  - Same format as July 2012 update
  - Tabs for each quarter of the grant period
  - As always, can still use prior format
- Tracking form available on GlassCubes
- Historical meeting attendance is available on GlassCubes
- Send form each quarter (Jan. 10, Apr. 10, Jul. 10, Oct. 10, Jan. 10) to sustainablecommunities@mpo.noaca.org
### Northeast Ohio Sustainable Communities Consortium

Leveraged Match Reporting - CFO/Accounting Summary Page

HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant

**NOTES:** If you have previously submitted this form and the information is the same or has not changed you do not need to fill this CFO page out, simply return the employee forms by 30th day following the end of the quarter (Jan. 31, Apr. 30, Jul. 30, Oct. 31) to sustainablecommunities@mno.noaca.org.

Please return forms by email or mail to:

sustainablecommunities@mno.noaca.org
9th Floor, NOACA, 1299 Superior Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44114

Consortium Member Entity Name

Entity Address

City, State & ZIP

Financial Contact Name

Financial Contact Title

Financial Contact Phone

Financial Contact Email

What data are the direct, fringe, and indirect rates below good through?

What data did the direct, fringe, and indirect rates below good through?

New Submitted:

Signature:

Please fill out the hourly rates for the employees who have/had work on the project. Attach additional pages if needed

Employee Name

Department

Direct Labor Rate

Fringe Rate

Fringe Base

Total Rate

---

### NEOsCC Member Employee Leveraged Match Tracking Form 10/1/13-12/31/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium Member Entity</th>
<th>Due 12/31/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please return form by email or mail to: <a href="mailto:sustainablecommunities@mno.noaca.org">sustainablecommunities@mno.noaca.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Sara Maier, NOACA, 1299 Superior Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Match Period:** 10/1/13-12/31/13

**Instructions:** Fill out only sections in blue. Provide detail on the type of activity, scheduled time, and details on travel time included, if applicable. If claiming mileage, deduct any miles that should not count towards match or that the employee would have driven normally part of his or her regular commute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Activity Location</th>
<th>Hours Leveraged (to .25 hr)</th>
<th>Mileage Claimed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex.</td>
<td>2/16/2013</td>
<td>NEOsCC Board meeting, 1-3 pm plus 1.25 hr drive time</td>
<td>Richfield City Hall</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Leveraged Match Explanation (if applicable):**

---

11/18/2013
Main Takeaways

- NEOSCC will meet HUD-required leveraged match commitment
- NEOSCC will not meet $3.048 million pledged in Consortium Agreements
- Just over half of members on-track to meet majority of their pledged commitment
- Information on actual match should be used in discussions of NEOSCC 2.0 or future efforts

Questions?

- Contact Sara Byrnes Maier with questions/comments
  - smaier@mpo.noaca.org
  - 216.241.2414, ext. 308
GIS and Data Accessibility for the NEOSCC Assessment of Alternatives for Storage, Maintenance & Sharing of Data

Draft Report
November 19, 2013

Presentation to NEOSCC Executive Committee

Funded through a contract with The Center for Community Solutions

Subcontracted to:
Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University & The Center for Urban and Regional Studies, Youngstown State University

Primary Project Staff:
Mark Salling, Ph.D., GISP and Ellen Cyran of CSU
Assistance from John Bralich, YSU
Purpose Today

1. Provide broad information about:
   - Ways to share data/GIS
   - How Consortium member GIS users currently use data & their preferences and priorities
   - How other organizations, many SCI grantees, are dealing with data/GIS
   - General costs of building out low-, medium- and high-scale options

2. Discuss preferences for data/GIS & next steps, with or without NEOSCC 2.0

Objectives

1. Provide a descriptive inventory of the databases and files developed by NEOSCC
2. Assess alternatives concerning how these data should be stored, maintained, and shared at the conclusion of the NEOSCC grant
   - Survey of NEOSCC member organizations and select data partners
   - Interviews with planning organizations, including HUD Sustainable Communities grantees, about data sharing
Status

Data Inventory
• Excel inventory of data files and databases gathered and stored on NEOSSC's BOX server developed spring/summer 2013
• 4,446 files, many are image files, Word and text documents, PDFs, and Excel and CSV files, while there are GIS files (both shape and geodatabase types)
• Some data gathered was incomplete (no metadata)
• Additional documentation will be developed as time permits

Assessment of Alternatives for Storage, Maintenance & Sharing of the Data
• This presentation summarizes the findings of the draft report
• Final report due early December and will be available online
Methodology

A. Online survey of NEO organizations
The survey includes questions on the following topics:
1) GIS staffing and resources;
2) Policies and opinions about sharing data; and
3) GIS and related data use and priorities

B. Telephone and email survey of 14 organizations from around the country that provide examples of data sharing

GIS Staffing and Resources
Staff and Proficiencies

How many staff use GIS and what are their proficiencies?

- High end expert
- GIS Professional
- Basic User

Number of Organizations

Number of Staff

Averages:
- High-end experts: 1.4
- GIS professionals: 2.6
- Basic users: 4.4

National Survey:
- 4.7
- 8.8
- 24.6

Data Standards

Do you have data standards that are followed?

- Users maintain their own documentation and there are no standards or requirements.
- We have requirements and standards concerning metadata, but they are not much followed.
- Most of our data are well documented, but there is also much important data that is not.
- There are few data that are not well documented.

11/19/2013
Data Maintenance

Do you maintain metadata (data documentation)?

- 9: Users maintain their own documentation and there are no standards or requirements.
- 1: We have requirements and standards concerning metadata, but they are not much followed.
- 3: Most of our data are well documented, but there is also much important data that is not.
- 6: There are few data that are not well documented.

Policies and Opinions About Sharing Data
Charging for Data

Charging Policy for Data

- We provide existing files
- Will provide customized data

National survey
13 of the 14 offer existing data files free
6 of 9 offer customized data at no charge

How is Data Transferred

How Data Are Provided

National survey found that, generally, web downloads are offered.
8 of the 14 have internet mapping
How often is Data Requested

Almost half (47.4%) frequently obtain data from state and federal agencies.

Universities/colleges and local governments are the next most often suppliers of data.

GIS and Related Data Use and Priorities
### How often is Data Shared?

#### How Often Shared

**Transportation Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public bus and/or rail routes</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic analysis zones (TAZ)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airports and or port facilities</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auto crash sites</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvements Programs</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike paths</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic counts</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavement conditions</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiking trails</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other transportation data</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = frequently

---

Data types with higher scores on priority for regional planning than on how much they are used and their importance to the organization's mission may indicate that such data are recognized as important beyond their specific importance to individual organizations.
Note that LandSat and retail and manufacturing centers are seen as important for regional planning even though they are used less often by the organizations and are not strong matches for their mission.

Zoning data are needed but not used in proportion, probably because it is not very available.

**Land Use/Zoning Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priority for Regional Planning</th>
<th>How Much Data are Used</th>
<th>Importance to Organization's Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LandSat</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcels</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoning</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail and/or manufacturing centers</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other land use data</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Data Types**

**Average Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-Highest score</th>
<th>Priority for Regional Planning</th>
<th>How much you use such data</th>
<th>Importance to Organization's Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment; e.g., Toxic Release Inventory (TRI), air quality, point source pollution, soils, wetlands, water sheds</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic, Socioeconomic; e.g., census data on population, age, gender, race and ethnicity, household</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health; e.g., death and disease records, data on morbidity, access to care, obesity and other health</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing; e.g., RRU data on subsidized units, affordability, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Employment; e.g., employment by industry (LEHD) journey to work characteristics</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Safety; e.g., roads and highways, airports, water ports, rail</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities; e.g., water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Cover; e.g., from LandSat, property records, land use inventories</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Cultural; e.g., neighborhood boundaries, cultural assets such as arts and sports venues, recreational resources</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projections; e.g., land use, housing, transportation, and population projections</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Interview Findings

## What Other Planning Organizations Are Doing Concerning Web Portals and Data Updates

General cost information for alternative scenarios for future data sharing and maintenance is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Similarities to Interviewed Organizations</th>
<th>Total Start-up and first year</th>
<th>Annual ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
<td>Inventory of files available online, request specific files through ftp or other ad hoc methods</td>
<td>NOACA</td>
<td>$15,100</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIUM 1</strong></td>
<td>A mix of online files in an accessible repository along with some files in an existing viewer like NOACA's GIS Server</td>
<td>Partly DRCOG (Denver)</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIUM 2</strong></td>
<td>GIS coordinator obtaining data from the authoritative sources and maintaining the web site and GIS staff to maintain key layers. The website would have searching capabilities and downloading, but no editing</td>
<td>Low-end Metro (Twin Cities)</td>
<td>$148,500</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH 1</strong></td>
<td>Web-based GIS mapping portal using ArcGIS online and a consultant</td>
<td>Only done in pieces Houston-Galveston and Columbus</td>
<td>$207,750</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH 2</strong></td>
<td>Web-based GIS mapping portal, built in-house with aid of consultant</td>
<td>Partly Boston</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlights

- There is a wide range in types of technology used.

- Web portals can be designed for easy access to data and also with the ability to allow shared updates and automatic transfers.

- In general, members contribute to the general support of the organization and sometimes provide funding on special projects.

- Some also receive additional support when purchasing aerials (digital orthophotography or other remotely imaged data).

- Generally, members do not provide support for the cost of web portals. Most funding for the portals comes from federal and state grants, or was funded out of general operating budgets.

Highlights (Cont'd)

- Larger organizations have special grants or foundation funding.

- Nine of the sites were built in-house with only three hiring consultants and one planning on hiring a consultant.

- The GIS portion of the portals were generally all up in nine months or less, though more complex systems require more substantial on-going development for much longer.

- Web portals can be designed for easy access to data and also with the ability to allow shared updates and automatic transfers.
General Conclusions

- Most of those interviewed said that the portal has helped the organization's stakeholders make better decisions.

- Many stakeholders have come to depend on the regional organization as a reliable source of data.

- Having a substantial set of data, and data that meets required standards, is seen as an important asset for the organization.
Vibrant NEO
Final Report Recommendations and Initiatives
November 18, 2013

Recommendation 1: Focus new residential and commercial development on sites within established communities

Initiative 1.1: Encourage infill and redevelopment through the use of tax credits and other direct and indirect public incentives.

Initiative 1.2: Fix it First: Continue to privilege projects that maintain the existing road network in a state of good repair, rather than building additional capacity.

Initiative 1.3: Improve the ability of municipalities and townships to analyze the long-term impacts of new development and better manage their own development.

Initiative 1.4: Continue to permit development throughout the region in accordance with local zoning, but prioritize public subsidies to projects within the region’s existing urbanized areas.

Initiative 1.5: Require the users of new sewer extensions that serve previously unsewered areas to pay the full cost of service.

Initiative 1.6: Consider instituting a land value tax (LVT) to replace existing improvement-based property assessment and taxation methods.

Recommendation 2: Develop a robust network of regional job centers connected by multimodal transportation corridors within and between counties

Initiative 2.1: Strengthen regional job centers—and the corridors that connect them—by diversifying and intensifying land uses and investing in strategic local economic development within them.

Initiative 2.2: Use transit oriented development (TOD) to create stronger, more accessible, regional job centers.

Initiative 2.3: Implement a tiered approach to local parking requirements:
- parking maximums in walkable districts with high frequency, all day transit
- no maximums or minimums in walkable areas with significant transit service
- reduced minimums in areas with some transit service
- no change in areas without transit service

Recommendation 3: Pursue the remediation, assembly, marketing, and redevelopment of abandoned properties at both the local and regional levels

Initiative 3.1: Develop and maintain a regional vacant and industrial commercial properties database and criteria for determining the most appropriate successive use, whether for redevelopment, green infrastructure, food production, parks, or natural areas.

Initiative 3.2: Expedite permitting and remove barriers both for demolishing blighted properties and for adaptively reusing vacant buildings and empty lots.

Initiative 3.3: Expand and coordinate existing land bank efforts to acquire, assemble, manage, and dispose of vacant properties throughout the region.
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Initiative 3.4: Identify, evaluate, and—where appropriate—pursue the reuse of vacant and abandoned industrial sites endowed with significant preexisting infrastructure that could provide unique opportunities for regional economic development. Advocate for a brownfield redevelopment fund and promote these sites through a large-scale marketing campaign.

Recommendation 4: Encourage a higher frequency of mixed-use development and a range of diverse, affordable housing options

Initiative 4.1: Include mixed-use designations and/or planned unit overlay districts in zoning codes throughout the region.

Initiative 4.2: Include traditional small-lot, compact single-family and townhouse residential designations in zoning codes throughout the region.

Initiative 4.3: Offer financial incentives to developers that incorporate affordable housing units into their projects and implement inclusionary zoning in markets with widespread affordability gaps.

Initiative 4.4: Offer financial literacy and housing education programs for tenants and homeowners. Focus on areas in established communities where investments in housing are underway.

Recommendation 5: Enhance and coordinate the region’s rail and bus services

Initiative 5.1: Invest in a regional network of bi-directional public transit connections between Northeast Ohio’s major job centers.

Initiative 5.2: Create a network of high-frequency express and local transit routes connecting the region’s job centers. Prioritize infill development in the corridors served by these routes. In the short- and medium-terms, upgrade high-performing existing bus routes and create new bus routes in designated corridors. In the long-term, upgrade the highest demand routes for commuter rail service.

Initiative 5.3: Coordinate the region’s transit systems for joint marketing, information technology, and fare media, including information regarding private transit resources such as university/health system shuttles, private bus services, airport transportation, etc.

Initiative 5.4: Evaluate the condition of all existing rail trackage and rail crossings to determine what investments would be necessary to bring substandard infrastructure up to standard for freight and passenger service.

Recommendation 6: Enhance walking and cycling as transportation options to increase regional mobility and improve public health

Initiative 6.1: Expand the existing bicycle lane and trail system and connect it to regional transit hubs via on-and-off street facilities.

Initiative 6.2: Repair existing sidewalks and crosswalks and add new ones as needed wherever a fixed route bus service is in operation

Initiative 6.3: Promote "Complete Streets" through regional policy and the identification of local champions.
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Initiative 6.4: Collaborate with school districts and local communities to further develop safe routes to school, encouraging walking and biking, and site new schools in walkable locations.

Recommendation 7: Preserve our natural areas for future generations, provide outdoor recreation opportunities, and develop a regional approach to protecting air, water, and soil quality.

Initiative 7.1: Expand and connect the existing network of parks, trails, rivers, lakes, and natural areas through continued partnerships with private land owners, land conservancies, land trusts, community members, and local governments.

Initiative 7.2: Support and expand green infrastructure options for flood control and general water management, both at the local level with projects like green alleys and bioswales, and at the regional level with a network of large, upstream water retention areas.

Initiative 7.3: Improve regional quality of life and health by focusing on the interface between natural and human systems in the areas of flood mitigation, stormwater run-off, and clean beaches and the water quality of our lakes, rivers, and streams.

Initiative 7.4: Strengthen and expand watershed partnerships that foster communication and collaboration between upstream and downstream communities across all 15 Northeast Ohio watershed geographies.

Initiative 7.5: Expand collaboration between existing natural resource districts and consider the creation of new districts where appropriate.

Initiative 7.6: Develop and maintain a natural resources inventory of the region.

Recommendation 8: Support sustainable agriculture and the local food system in Northeast Ohio

Initiative 8.1: Support the expansion of community supported agriculture (CSAs), farmer cooperatives, farm-to-school programs, and other existing mechanisms that support sustainable agriculture and enhance food access.

Initiative 8.2: Partner with individual landowners, the food processing industry, and local organizations to protect agriculturally valuable land for future generations.

Initiative 8.3: Review and amend local ordinances to allow for small- and moderate-scale urban farming on occupied and vacant parcels that are environmentally safe for growing food.

Initiative 8.4: Support the work of local food initiatives to share best practices and identify policies of regional significance.

Recommendation 9: Increase collaboration among the region’s government agencies to expand information sharing and find more cost-effective means of providing essential services.

Initiative 9.1: Study privatization and public-private partnerships as means to fund critical infrastructure projects that cannot be funded solely through public dollars.
Initiative 9.2: Utilize joint procurement strategies and the sharing of facilities, staff, and other resources wherever possible to save money on the provision of public services.

Initiative 9.3: Identify one or more organizations that will host and maintain the technical resources created by NEOSCC so that they will remain current, accurate, and available for future regional visioning and planning.

Initiative 9.4: Align MPO/COG/ODOT transportation model inputs and continue to collaborate, share information, and align policy objectives across the multiple regional planning agencies of Northeast Ohio.

Initiative 9.5: Foster greater engagement between MPOs/COGs and organizations/initiatives that address natural resources, parks, sewer, public health, housing, education, private business investment, and economic development.

Initiative 9.6: Sustain the momentum of NEOSCC by continuing to convene stakeholders to identify and address regional issues and to advance the region's collaborative capacity.