TRANSPORTATION

Put the $ in - Urban: bus, Rural: Car

Around the Mahoning Valley, the communities were designed after the Ford Model T. Work within that reality, adding bus transit where feasible. Invest in rail to serve industry.

Personal freedom outweighs government transportation.
Let the free market decide.
I like the idea of getting somewhere on my own.
I believe in freedom, not communism.

Depends on area. City areas need walk, bike, transit. Roads need to be maintained, but not expanded.

Nice enough idea, but so cost prohibitive. Prioritize dollars for most critical needs.
Our auto-oriented infrastructure is deeply engrained in NEO. That won't change quickly. Any growth we have requires upgrades to our abysmal roads/bridges - not necessarily new miles but "new" (revamped) miles.
Transit/walk, bike focus OK for dense population areas. Not a real factor for rural areas. Investment in car infrastructure more important.
Balance in both. Focus on existing infrastructure/Avoid expanding highways into rural areas (i.e., 422 in Geauga County in 80's).
The car is not going away. It may become electric, but it is here to stay.
Those of us who are in rural residential settings are inclined to need the automobile and roads more than the more urban desires.
More light rail & commuter rail. Buses take too long.
Incentivize electric and natural gas vehicle infrastructure.
I am in favor of public transportation, however, the region is dependent on cars and interstates. The interstate system is in desperate need of funding.
The only issue to this is that locally, nothing is too far away - sometimes it's just easier to drive there instead of waiting for bus that makes multiple stops.
We will continue to require large investment in auto-oriented infrastructure but should slowly & gradually shift the balance.
We need all types of transportation.

I would love to be able to walk/bike or use public transportation for more regular activities.

Maintain & improve existing car "driven" infrastructure, but make public transit, walkability more available/easy to access.
Existing infrastructure should be maintained for cars, but new investments made for bike/walk/transit. Less funding should be allocated to maintaining status quo.

Walk/bike/transit are very key in redevelopment & growing our cities, conserving our land and protecting precious land & resources, but I'm in no hurry to give up my car just yet.

Would love to take the bus or train to work.

We just made a trip to Colorado and saw trails in almost all neighborhoods and lots of bike lanes and bikers. It's a lifestyle change but it has to be supported by infrastructure. Also, as I get older, I really want the area to have more public transportation options. I hate driving to Cleveland, but really like going to things in Cleveland. I want more public transportation options!

More investment in walk, bike & transit infrastructure

Bike lanes. Bus lanes. High speed rail. Community rail.
More environmentally friendly and efficient transportation.

I think we have far, far too much investment in and subsidies for cars. I prefer focus on safe, healthy cities, with equitable funding for safe streets, hike & bike trails & public transit.

We have sufficient infrastructure for existing projected population. It should be rehabilitated to maximize multi-modal usage.
We can't afford cars.
Auto oriented not conducive to youth - college grads. Keep them here and healthier choices in transit - especially trails and greenways.
Aging population needs transit.

However, existing roads do need to be maintained. But expensive widening, etc. should be scrutinized.

We already spend far too much on roads and far too little on transit. I would like a real choice when it comes to living without a car. I would like expanded rail service. I aslo would like to see one public transit system for the entire region.
Public transportation works best in more dense settings. Encouiraging more density would make it more possible.
Transit infrastructure is critical to economic development. Not everyone can afford a car. Most people have to work.
Establish bike lanes, improve sidewalks, have mixed-use neighborhoods, where walking is easy and is the norm. Make driving less necessary.
A healthy community transit system with a realistic auto-oriented infrastructure.
Rebuild existing infrastructure and add walking and biking access. Transportation is key in any redevelopment.
Let local government decide on growth, not NEOSCC.
Leave it pretty much the way it is.
Most people I know commute a fair distance to work. I personally would love to have access to affordable, safe public transportation. Convenient.
Roads feed sprawl, Stop widening ones. Stop building new ones. Stimulate public tranist. Fix it first.
Fix pot holes.
It would be great to have places available w/in walking or biking distance.

INVESTMENT IN COMMUNITIES (outward to inward)
Capitalism/personal choice outweighs.
Let the free market decide. Capitalism should prevail.

Building outward and/or inward should be up to the free marketplace not some mob rule decision.

Building inward offers lots of challenges. Distressed center cities are difficult to make attactive particularly high-poverty areas.
Do both but only as desired by the people.
I think we can grow differently and build outward.

We need to give people more choices to life close in, but we can't penalize them for living in the burbs.

This is my toughest card! I want loose rules on zoning and yet understand the dangers of mixed commercial, industrial and residential. Especially the residential with multi-family.

Yes, of course, but unless government applies a heavy hand, private capital will be drawn toward greenfields, and people will still pay to escape cities. I applaud this vision, but can't see how it is realistic.

It's clear to me we need to focus on investment on improving inner ring land use to maximize existing infrastructure and invest in rehabilitating vs new out ring development.

So much housing loss, abandonment - no need to break round on soil and forest better suited for passive use or farming.

Two factors work against this. 1) the HIGH cost of demolishing derelict properties 2) ground pollution clean up. Both are very expensive!

Why build out when so much property is available within? Tear down old buildings and use property to grow.

Both are needed but rebuilding our core needs to be done first.

Cost effectiveness is important and using what we already have.

Focus on what we have, don't spread outward.

Since Cleveland's infrastructure is built for over a million people reusing existing infrastructure makes financial & environmental sense.

People may think that a pro-urban perspective and pro-rural/Agriculture perspective are different, the same policies that are good for one are also good for the other and vice versa.

It's a crime to let cities deteriorate. We need incentives to keep people close -- small markets for groceries, walking areas.

Outward growth will result in a financial burden to taxpayers.

To build inward, investment must be made in safety, education and opportunities to move to the urban center.

Sprawl sucks. Building inward helps everyone.

Our cities are gems that need a little polishing with spots to shine more brightly.

I feel the more green space & open land that remains untouched the better off our region/earth will be.

This supports well-being of older adults, safety of children sense of community - economic access for varied income levels.

Agnostic: none of the above

Private investment should be encouraged everywhere. I'm concerned about a non-elected authority picking winners and losers restricting and encouraging growth through regulations and grants. Private sector should have the option to build where they want to spend $. Let people vote with their feet. If an area is undesirable and loses population and tax base from poor management. No sure it makes sense to reward them with investment funds.

NE Ohio does need to not invest in communitiies. The people of the communities will.

Building in areas that are 1) SAFE, 2) schools are in the top tier, and 3) where people want to live. Don't choose a location. Have the people choose.

I think small towns are ignored. Building - rehab within small towns seems like a bonus - Let's go Kinsmen and Braceville.

Invest in mixed use communities.

Helping cities atr city core with urban living & strong inner circle of housing.

LAND DEVELOPMENT (anywhere or not in environmentally sensitive areas)

Freedom of choice is more important than politicians making my decisions for me.

Extreme government regulation is almost never the best way. Building first class educational, amenity and infrastructure (and transit) in areas of desired growth is a better choice. Preserve liberty.

Property rights outweigh government intervention.

Housing typology needs to change not necessarily where we build.

As we have "choices" for our NEOSCC growth scenarios, consumers should have "choices" in where they live, yet I believe we can live better with environmental areas rather than simply restrict!

Metroparks are great and could expand more, but can't focus too much on enviromental restrictions if you want growth.

Needs to be a balance. Too much restriction because of environmental reasons.

I like the trees but I like freedom to go anywhere.

This region is way behind on the growth boundary concept. Policy and legislative intervention may impede development. Must demonstrate value of inward migration as a profitable venture.

Must strike balance between both.
If it means jobs anywhere.
Ecological reserves must be preserved for the quality of life to be sustained narrowly defined economic growth is not sustainable.
Environmentally sensitive areas should be protected - they contribute to the overall quality of land & water.

I'm not a tree hugger but you have to take care of the environement and use good judgement.

We don't need new neighborhoods. We need to fix the blight.

Again takes strong leadership to counter "I'll do what I want" mentality. Think of future generations!

People should have the freedom to live where they please but shouldn't be subsidized/paid for by tax payers. Collectively, we need to incentivize preserving natural resources we have! We should invest in agriculture.
We have lots of land to use. We need to protect our environmentally sensitive areas!
More restricted and protective of environmental areas is great - as long as the green spaces are still accessible to residents via parks, bikeways, trails.
I enjoy naure, woods, parks, lakes
Absolutely - we need to protect our environment

We have wasted prime agricultural lands. Ohio is blessed with fertile soils when comparied to the rest of the world and they should be protected. We are also wasting our historic built environment which is an underused assset that can be leveraged for population growth.

Allowing our green spaces to remain green is an investment in our future.
Certainly we would all benefit by having land development shift to more compactness. However, this is not consistent with a Midwest culture.

I think the EPA already aggressively limits any development in sensitive areas. I'm afraid I will lose my private rights of land use on my private land due to overcontrolling restrictive zoning. We encourage agricultrual use. This seems to be the modern environmentalist enemy when in fact it is the perfect land steward of good land practice usage and maintaining open undeveloped spaces.

What do the above entail? Who determines environmentally sensitive areas?
Land development should be decided by the land owner. Property rights matter.
As Americans, one should be free to go wherever one chooses. I support some development restrictions that benefit the welfare of the end user, however, one should not be restricted to develop where one wants.
Agriculture must be preserved & enhanced. Care for Sensitive areas.
We need a growth boundary. It is never too late to stop doing the wrong things. Sprawl is destroying our urban neighborhoods.
Preserve our parks & natural resources.

IDEAL COMMUNITY
My ideal community is where I live. If we all live where we want to then together we will have the NEO that we want.
1) Hands off our personal freedoms, 2) Mix as the market allows, 3) Keep your bike out of my way. You don't pay road taxes.
This process needs much more input from the non-government employed. Property rights must be recognized.
NE Ohio is notable because we do have "space" - we can still live in single family homes with yards, yet be near a city or town. I like that about my home.

The reason I picked the middle road is that change comes slowly with people. Though I am for the different results we must change slowly!

Remake our idea of cities. 20th Century model does not work well.

Emphasis should be on transit infrastructure, not bikes. Need to leverage and expand rail public transit.

Redevelopment of towns and cities rather than continue to expand outward. Walkability should be a goal.

Intersperse the quiet, leafy communities with much improved mixed-use communities. Add lots more green infrastructure & open space into run-down commercial zones.

It's all a balancing act.

Vibrant urban. Livable, walkable, healthy community with naturalized green space _ permaculture, urban food forests, artists!

Done wisely, we can have it all.

Community, community, community. We need to bring people back together.

City life is fun, but I will eventually want my own space/house. Walkability is critical.

Think eco-friendly & density.

The challenge is how to help doubters see this is the best option for our mutual future.

Walkable communities are healthier.

A neighbohood community with an involved citizen base with good core family values and an opportunity to choose the use of your private property as you wish. Growth boundaries/conservancies will kill areas -- picking winners and losers.

Is this a new community? Or are we looking to retrofit our current communities? The reality is that there are so many communities that were not designed for what we all think is ideal.

There need to be more "eco villages" Look at the one at Berea College, KY. 1) It's a traditional looking apartment complex, but A) they have solar panels B) they gather rain water from the roofs and route it to raised bed gardens in the public spaces C) People share the gardens, D) They have a food forest instead of planting ornamental trees and residents can help themselves, E) They have an aquaculture system set up to raise both fish and vegetables. All in a typical-looking apartment complex.

TREND SCENARIO

Better than throwing everything to the environment.

Freedom to move where we want to.

Outward migration is ruining our existing cities and infrastructure causing need of more building.

Good for rural areas (trend) but urban areas need to change.

Trends die before success

Curious how data was obtained & predictions modeled. Seems to theoretical. Not realistic enough.

Not my preferred, but this will be what happens if we do not break the cycles of cynicism, apathy and insular non-cooperation.

We don't want to be stagnant.

We need to reverse the trend.

Too much waste.

Not learning from past. Hurting multple budgets.

It does not appear though good things will come out of staying on the same path.

I'm a firm believer in economic benefits of urban density.

This is terrible for the environment & for the growth of abandoned neighborhoods.

Abandonment of core city and first ring fragmented - Driving Revenue

Not a good plan for future growth.

I don't want to live next to even more vacancy and blight.

Abandoned properties grow, suburban growth continues and farmland decreases.

We could be just more of the Rust Belt.

Abandonment & sprawl is not a good thing.

We need to start re-investing in what made NE Ohio what is was; what brought so many here.

Doing the same thing and hoping for a different result is a sign of insanity.

People leaving city because of crime & limited parking.

Must make serious changes in attitudes at the governmental level. Government needs to get out of the way of business.

Few advantages. Many drawbacks.

It's a disaster for this region -- killing us!

If you always do what you've always done, you'll always get what you always gotten.

See "grow the same" also NEO needs more jobs and population.

Not sustainable.

No innovation to remove our region from its current troubles.

It would be nice to see more increase in the interest of the city. Nice improvement so far.

Unsustainable

Won't agree with sprawl and suburban development.

For use of natural resources and (Illegible) economic growth.

Stays the same. Too much abandonment and moving from the city.

It's not working now. Why would it in 2040?

Obviously not working for anyone (except the 'new' suburbs at the moment).

Trend of outward growth eats up land and costs everybody more.

Core cities continue to decline.

This scenario would not plan for growth at the current trends, a lot of space is being wasted and isn't being managed.

Poor fiscal & environmental outcomes - unsustainable

Trend keeps changing so it is not very accommodating

Obviously the current paradigm is not working.

Does nothing for decreasing CO_2.

Funds come & go

Historically it does not work.

Current patterns are financially & environmentally unsustainable.

Things could always be better.

Many things can be improved from where we are now - transportation in particular.

Makes me embarrassed to be American.

There's nothing with Ohio today (that isn't different from other regions).

Reality if we do nothing.

Growth plus use current resources.

This will continue even as you change. You can't change trend overnight.

Destroys excellent assets we already have.

Overall regional slow-down.

Adaptive re-use of what we have makes more sense.

Again, not sustainable and too expensive.

Enormous problems in all areas covered -- transportation, housing, environment, etc.

If this happens, the community will accelerate decline.

Doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results is not a good strategy.

Status quo. Continuing decline and abandonment.

Not viable - region will lose jobs/people

Too much outdated infrastructure, agricultural and natural areas cost, too much driving miles & new roads.

See above

Pretty much the same as Grow the same.

NEO must reinvent itself to thrive and survive.

Deficit increases, so do the problems.

Current system is not working.

It seems to have better ideas, but will not offer our communities the best results.

Without a strong core, everything else ultimately crumbles.
Will remain hard to attract talent & business to urban cores. Increased poverty.
does not protect bodies of water and environment.
I want a focus on urban development, conservation of environmental spaces.
"Trends" tend to be mindless things.
Will not allow places to be special, will slowly watch areas evolve into poor shells of themselves at great
cost.
As a township fiscal officer, I'm very concerned about the trend in decreasing local government
revenues.
We should realize that what we have been doing isn't sustainable and is a leading us down.
Status quo is not great! That's why we're involved in this exercise.
Bankrupt the region
Not actually addressing any of the bad decisions that led to our current situation.
When my ancestors arrived 200 years ago there was heavily wooded, with rich soils - they those who
came after gave us what we have today & we can do much better.
We cannot sustainably keep going the way we are.
Challenges remain unsolved, the burden that outward migration places on creating new, expanded
infrastructure concerns me.
Makes a bad situation worse because the area is not going to expand population.
Combines the problems of "grow the same" with stagnation.
Why continue a downward trend? The way forward is up not down.
We have to do a better job at re-investment, but cannot if we don't address schools and crime.
Not sustainable. I will leave.
Continuing down the old road to ruin.
The current trend directions have proven to be a path to waste an dysfunction.
We're currently failing
This is the worst. And it's deadly! Even suicidal. But it's "FREEDOM'S' HOME RULE!!!!!!

We're spending too much on roads for the suburban communities and making the city more dangerous.
Not trendy, fads do not make successful cultures.
Although the region gains it is still at the expense of our environmental and natural resources.
Not sure I totally understand this.
Good things are happening, but I would like things to be more progressive.
I am neutral, but most disturbed because this implies little care & ability to change anything in our
region.
People who live in these homes also destroy them.

GROW THE SAME SCENARIO
Lacking a plan for jobs - scenario in only above
That is what made this country great.
Free market is the American way.
Maximum freedom
New homes create higher abandonment

Rural - needs to bolster roads/police/fire/sewers/storm water drainage; urban needs to grow greatly.
It isn't working

Curious how data was obtained & predictions modeled. Seems to theoretical. Not realistic enough.
I don't really think we've done that awful of a job.
Not my preferred, but this will be what happens if we do not break the cycles of cynicism, apathy and
We need to evolve by doing and thinking differently and allowing ourselves to grow as well.
It will cost us too much money to grow in this manner.

The world is overpopulated. We need to slow down growth and make the most of what already exists.

I'm a firm believer in urban density.
Growth is positive. Some improvement, but not great delta (Greek letter on sheet)
Abandonment of core city and first ring fragmented - Costly
Not a good plan for future growth.

Abandoned properties remains the same & suburban migration grows while agriculture decreases.
Horrible, wasteful outer ring attack on envirnoment and on interpersonal interaction
Abandonment & sprawl is not a good thing.

Too much growth in our smaller cities creating more traffic

Need some efficiencies
What we are currently doing is not working.
Because our patters have not served us. It's an unsustainable strategy set.
We aren't on a good path -why stay on it?
Grow the same will not answer our issues - need to change & deal with influx of people & jobs
People leaving city because of crime & limited parking.
Lower taxes on businesses significantly & become competitive with other states.
likely to happen
Few advantages. Many drawbacks.
We can't afford to continue on the same path.
If you always do what you've always done, you'll always get what you always gotten.
I am opposed to rising abandonment and we cannot afford to maintain compact infrastructure let alone more.
Not sustainable
Proven failure does not consider quality of masses
No innovation
Staying the course will not improve our region.
Unsustainable
Won't agree with sprawl and urban development.
Because we can not afford to 'grow the same'
The same old ways clearly don't work.
Inefficient land use and fragmented government.
Does not seem to change much for the community or make many positive developments
I don't feel like we are making enough progress for communities.

Growth fixes/masks a lot of problems. Not ideal, but unplanned growth is better than planned decline.
We will perpetuate the same problems and costs
Financially unsustainable
Core cities continue to decline, more green space/farmland is lost
This scenario would be very interesting b/c not only would it make NEO a worst place to live, but no one else will want to live there.
Not big enough impact on abandonment, conservation or fiscal sustainability.
Limited opportunity to accommodate changing needs of the society.
Better than - trend. But not good enough.
Maximizes sprawl, increases vacancy.
It doesn't work anymore
We need a different approach to how we do things.
Current patterns are financially & environmentally unsustainable.
We're Crashing
Huge suburbs take a disproportionally large share of tax revenue to maintain & I don't plan on living there.
Growing without fixing any of the financial burdens is not kind of growth.
We are a mess.
Further outward migration stresses our open space, natural environment and dis-invests in our urban core. More roads/bridges = increased cost.

Bad idea. Not smart growth.

Rural & environmentally sensitive areas used by urbanites escaping central cities & inner ring suburbs.
I love change!
Need to preserve our agricultural resources. This scenario grows outward the most.
Too many brownfields
Population growth might be good, well managed (not sprawl)
Same problems as other large cities all will not have enough to operate with. Large influx of more people moving in - highly unlikely.
Too much blight - not enough conservation
We are shrinking both in cities and region as a whole. Wise downsizing makes more sense.
Not sustainable, too expensive
Enormous problems in all areas covered -- transportation, housing, environment, etc.
I can't see anything on the horizon that leads me to believe that we are going to experience significant growth.
Status quo. Continuing decline and abandonment.
Unsustainable
Unrealistic growth projections.
Too much outdated infrastructure, agricultural and natural areas cost, too much driving miles & new roads.
All growth is currently outward.
Sprawl and its costs are not benefiting our lower & middle classes.
Status quo does not work & growth exacerbates problem.
More people and jobs aren't the answer unless they will personally improve neighborhoods and not force more building outward.
Current system is not working.
Does not seem to be working effectively and we cannot keep up with the costs.
Can't continue to do the same things and expect different results. The same way is not working.
Taxes will increase to provide services, resources dilute.
Need more urban. Suburban farming
I want a focus on urban development, conservation of environmental spaces.
Promotes further suburbanization & hollowing out of our urban core in the pursuit of horizontal development.
Long track record of missed opportunity with poor investment we have lost a lot that was special
Have to change with the times.
Already lost significant architecture and green space - poor planning.
It exacerbates income inequality - products of affluence verses pockets of non-affluence
Move at the same bad effects
We will destroy both our disinvested urban communities and our rural/agricultural land! This is the worst-case scenario!
We have lost some unique and important agricultural (illegible) such as Copley (illegible). We can't still afford to continue the same land consumption.
There is too much out-migration going on.
Challenges in NEO remain unsolved and perhaps intensify.
Can't be supported financially.
On the current track we will sprawl out to impact more of the environment while not improving our health or quality of life.
We are setting ourselves up to fail.
It's not working. We must find new ways to develop our area.
Stop the sprawl and all the problems that go with it.
I don't want to grow the same.
We must fix our schools in order to attract more residents/retain talent. Government must come up with incentives to convince employers to invest.
Not sustainable. No hope. No vibrancy. I will leave.

Because it does not keep up & dollars revenue.

What we did failed.

Repeating mistakes and obsolete priorities.

If the mindset doesn't change, at least some population growth would help prosperity & revenue strains.
Too much road building. Doesn't do much to address abandoned properties in my community, but I'd like to think we could grow anyway.
Repeating old social/urban mistakes does not yield progress
Little growth at the expense of great fiscal and environmental and natural resources.
Abandonment of central cities - environmental impact.
Better than same alternative.
More vacant properties, less job growth, more sprawl.
Continuing what we have done for much of the 20th century makes no sense. Look what "grow the same" has brought us.
Need to change our way of doing things.
Too much urban spread
It's what we've been doing and it doesn't work.
Shale, tech, (illegible)
I want things to be different. I don't like the historical trend toward cars & sprawl
Extremely fiscally and environmentally irresponsible.

DO THINGS DIFFERENTLY SCENARIO

Too environmental.
Bureaucratic
Takes land away from fair uses.
Isn't benefiting us much more than the current trend.
Good for rural areas (trend) but urban areas need to change.
It's not always a success

Same as "Grow the same" Disturbed that scenario isn't overly optimistic. Why should I stay here?
Scared on losing my choices as a landowner & business. (Home builder.)
This is the one I would love to see, but would be the hardest to achieve.
Not good enough.
Growth brings innovative new ideas that would further help the region.
Improvement without growth is still an improvement.
I feel this is the second best alternative.
Still shows too much growth in rural portions of the region.
Needed delta
outmigration, increase in revenue
Needed, but must include better growth capability
Although it improves conservation, it doesn't put a dent in abandoned buildings or urban living.
Ho hum. We could be more intentional & visionary.

We can grow the same, but think differently. Housing typology. Infrastructure (environmentally friendly).
Policy is important but we need to bring people back who will strengthen our regional economy.
This seems like the most likely scenario.
Striving for change is good, but economic health and vitality (growth) is needed for reinvestment, new investment and conservation.
Doing things differently is great, but without the growth it won't mean as much.
Put addicts in work farms outside of city. Create more off-street parking in cities.
Must alter the liberal fiscal policies that stymied our region for decades.
would be nice
Emphasize re-development & use of existing infrastructure.
Best choice.

We need to bring fresh ideas to our communities - old ones don't work any more.

Need growth.

Ambitious but less realistic than "Grow Differently"

Could be more encouraging of infill development and reinvesting in the core urban areas.

New people and new ideas can always help. Fresh look with fresh eyes.

Concentrating growth to protect environment through smart growth and (illegible) energy use.

Can be positive for Cleveland, but may be too much change at once.

Growth is important. Positive changes for communities that appear to be sustainable.

Doing things differently doesn't really matter if population, jobs and money continues to decline.

Encourages growth and development. I like the population does not increase as much.

Seems to support moderate growth. I prefer the preservation of our green spaces, etc.

We have to change to afford our lifestyle, but not as much conserved land.

Revitalized cities, better transportation options, fiscally sound communities.

This scenario would manage resources better and be mindful of the future. It will give people a chance to really enjoy their lives.

Greater conservation & improved fiscal performance (cost to revenue)

I like this option, but it needs to account for business behavior, financial & political scenarios.

Better than trend or grow the same, but still not what we want.

Maximizes open space

We need to change with the times.

Don't build new reuse existing buildings.

Need to keep trying different ways of development to find the one that works for the area.

Public transit/shared riding, pedestrians - and bike -friendly patterns are much more economically sustainable. More conducive to creating a more open society where people can interact more regularly

I think we need growth to resolve the problem of abandoned houses.

The mentality seems sustainable, but it would be great for the region to experience more growth.

Cities need to be saved (but what will it cost to save them?)

More public transportation options, develop in a compact pattern.

I believe this is the best opportunity for my children.

Most park space.

Best of all.

Shake up the box.

Focus on redevelopment in underserved areas.

Feasible. Stops sprawl.

We need change & development & redevelopment that makes sense . Abandonment will still be a risk.

Builds communities. More transportation -public. More conservation

We have a lot of underutilized built environment already. Also lots of farmland that could support more local food production not just cash grains.

Sustainable, least costly, best quality of life for residents.

Best result -- not perfect for jobs and home abandonment, but the most sustainable option.

This is the only option to consider. We as a region must change - evolve - or our region will lose competitiveness even faster than presently.

If we do things differently it may help us grow enough - if not, we will still be better off.

"Insanity: doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results." Time to look at our assets and envision and create a sustainable future for all Ohioans.

Need new paradigm of local resident communities.

Most realistic & desirable.

Reasonable growth across the board and the cost to revenue ratio is very good.

Rebuild neighborhoods!

Limited growth. Some recovery of brownfields, historic properties, urban farms, public transportation. All good stuff.

Almost equal fiscal impacts with much less environmental/resource/land use impact.

If we do things differently, people will move to the area and contribute to the improvements.

Change in policy and education will lead to better region.

Seems to be the most cost-effective and mutually beneficial for all counties in NEO.

I do not forsee any more growth in this area. I think we need to things differently to make the best usage of what we have.

Maximizes existing resources.

Protects more environmentally sensitive areas and our different bodies of water.

Urban development & environmental conservation

This is where study & accumulated knowledge leads.

Provides the best balance of modest growth and urban development along with the conservation and environmental resources necessary for a greenhouse world.

We need to take advantage of what we have learned.

Time to use good planning to make use of existing assets and protect valuable natural resources.

Would do the most to preserve and enhance what my county claims to value.

Beneficial development with more growth pressures.

This seems most realistic - double down on existing, but troubled neighborhoods, protests open spaces.

We need to make some important decisions about how local government needs to be how we can build strong communities and how we can best serve ourselves and others in the 21st century.

this is the best option. It minimizes sprawl more than any of the others.

The other scenarios are not sustainable.

Both this and the "grow differently" scenario provide opportunities to rethink how to address the most pressing issues anticipated.

The only way to create an area that is desirable and sustainable.

Seems to have the best environmental potential.

I'd like to think that if we do the right thing we'll have greater population growth. Plus, we already have the infrastructure for a larger population.

We need to learn what is doing well in other communities and innovate using our assets.

Less environmental degradation. More quality jobs.

Vision I can be excited about.

I lived in Lakewood - loved the strong neighborhood. Could walk or bike to anything. Also lived in Bologne, Italy - same concept.

I agree with inward reinvestment, environmental protection, public transit, fiscal health and doing things differently!

Best for people & for global harmony

Wishful thinking. Not likely unless we get water & climate refuges.

It's very practical and favors my preference for car-free/light living.

Incorporates better land development policies but allows increase in population in inner city and reuse of abandoned homes/neighborhoods.

Curb the planning green space.

Planned growth with care about environment, job growth, inward growth of city

Needs much stronger vision.

We should at least do this.

Improves quality of life.

What I would like to see in terms of environmental & socio-economic impacts of compact development.

(Illegible) I think it will be a tough sell to a stable population growth community.

Job growth is up, population seems to correlate with job growth, green space is good, transportation.

We need to change, period. And we don't need to invent totally new things or ways. There are already plenty of new ways we can adopt.

The world is changing and NE Ohio needs to change to promote growth.

Less urban spread. Conserve land and areas for animals and birds.

It's sensible and doable if we have the ants and the leadership.

We need to find a way to connect people with jobs & services in a manner that is equitable & efficient.
If we have limite revenues, this scneario is the wisest choice.
Maintain/repair critical Downtown infrastructure.
Reurbanization was a very interesting concept.
more jobs, green spaces, pop. Gravity
You need to start somewhere

GROW DIFFERENTLY SCENARIO

I understand this exercise is designed to push the user toward third option.
OK to some extent, but still no plan to grow jobs.
No need to change fee will dictate.
Bureaucratic
I do not believe that more lands needs to go to parks.
Reinvestment in existing infrastructure. Job growth. Less abandonment.

Great for urban areas. Cleveland, Akron, Canton. Youngstown is too remote - not connected yet
Trumbull County is in the outer limits - not connected. Not part of the identity known as CLE/AK/CA.
Seems to have the best results

Curious how data was obtained & predictions modeled. Seems to theoretical. Not realistic enough.
But I do believe we can always to things better. I want to believe this region can grow again.
I think this is the one the region will be forced into accepting.
Allows us to continuously improve which allows us to have a successful economy and better family-related outcomes.
Want to promote/attract growth as much as possible but grow in a smart way.
We need to replace jobs and residents with growth. But do it smarter.
Progress
Does not take agriculture into consideration. It also does not take into account conserved land also incurs a cost. The study needs to take in account that haves can no longer function.
Prepared scenario smart and targeted reinvestment.
Need to change the way we do this - it's not working & timeline is important.
I feel this scenario makes the most out of what already exists.
Still shows a little too much development in places like Geauga County.
Seems like excellent direction. Hesitant with all the delta
Increase in population, increase in cooperation, collaboration, sharing of resources - bringing much needed quality of life to core - shopping, groceries - right on regarding buses / transit.
Best way to creat growth for all.
It grows the region, addresses urban abandonment.
see 6 items below that keep me from giving it a 5.

We can grow the same, but think differently. Housing typology. Infrastructure (environmentally friendly).
We need to bring people back to the city while strengthening our infrastructure and support them.
Not optimistic enough
we need to think, act and plan on a regional level.
Youngstown and the Valley must embrace novel ideas, if and when necessary. Ensure solutions to some of our unique issues.
want to see growth, but thoughtful, healthy growth.
Our urban areas need to grow and do things differently in order to remake themselves by 2040.
Put addicts in work farms outside of city. Create more off-street parking in cities.
Fiscal health and protection of important natural resources.
Metro areas need to work more closely in sending unified message to business considering locating here.

Growth isn't likely.

We don't really need more people. I like mid-sized.

Improves transportation and saves green spaces while maintaining suburbs.

Takes advantage of existing infrastructure and promotes some growth, but is there an in-between scenario between these two? (Doing things differently with some growth?)

Would like to see a balance between "grow" & "do"

Could be more encouraging of infill development and reinvesting in the core urban areas.

Change for the better.

Focus on protecting natural resources and (illegible) development to existing areas.

Seems to have most positive qualities for Cleveland out of all 3 scenarios.

Position more in the right direction to benefit communities.

Growth combined with better planning & allocation of residents more sustainably.

Better option for families.

Too much growth? Could that equally be a problem?

Most conserved land

Revitalized cities, better transportation options, fiscally sound communities.

I care for compact development & promoting center revitalization. So I think that this, done well, will improve Cleveland metro into a better place.

Maximized scenario. Bring jobs, land conservation and fiscal performance.

New solutions for new trends or gauging society need.

This is definitely what we need!

New laws, new approaches and the beginning of a new culture.

Depends on how it is done.

Clean up area after industry left. Promote agriculture.

Attract new people/businesses to these areas.

Public transit/shared riding, pedestrians - and bike -friendly patterns are much more economically sustainable. More conducive to creating a more open society where people can interact more regularly

Grow but by new means & a new mindset

Busy cities are safer & Cleveland is a nice place to live so everyone should mover here.

Its smart, well-informed scenario that looks forward and factors in many aspects - environment, transportation, etc.

Lower abandonment, focus on re-investment, protect environment.

I don't believe this scenario will come into fruition.

Not a significant difference with trend scenario.

This encourages growth but in a controlled way. It's good for our communities financially and also means more neighborhoods, better neighborhoods and greater green space.

I am interested in growing our urban centers and preserving open space.

Need to utilize current development.

New opportunities to allow one to grow differently

Population growth might be good, managed well, not sprawl.

Is this growth realistic for all parts of the region? Some trade offs.

Adaptive re-use of what we have makes more sense.

Growing differently is nice as a scenario, but unlikely to be a reality.

A little better, but population & job growth may sound good at one level, but will cause future problems.

Well, I hope we can attract 875K people, but only if we do we must change our quality of life.

It would be nice if we experienced significant growth, but it seems unlikely.

Don't believe we have big growth in our future. Sprawl is out of control.

Still not progressive enough

Because new jobs will be more than new residents which may draw more people.

Ideal, but unrealistic.

Those in charge profit from the same old -same old.

Mostly good. Smart growth. Not sure I'd want us to grow as much as the predictions in this scenario, but the policies it envisions are good.

Uncomfortable with perception that growth is always necessary to thrive.

I like the idea of increasing population and jobs, but expansion is not attractive. There are enough houses and buildings available to either update or start fresh.

Too much change to be handled and some counties fair better than others without equal beneficial growth.

Uses much less resources

This is where study & accumulated knowledge leads.

Growth requires alignment of internal and external forces. Changing internal may allow for growth to occur, but does not guarantee.

Some loss of green space, but good planning and better outcomes.

Over the years residents of my county have expressed a wish not to increase population significantly.

Depicts a comfortable place to live for more people, not just wealthy/car-owning.

If the area is to grow, it should (illegible) differently. Akron's re-development in response to needs from Akron is a guide to make our own central cities more enticing.

Better, but not as comprehensive as "do things differently."

I was struck by the statements that "abandonment" basically disappears in this scenario.

Leverage existing infrastructure and redevelop existing areas will create living standards at reduced cost.

Has good balance. Creates new jobs and revenue.

doing things differently is the most important thing.

More tax dollars for established cities - better use of land.

I have a hope that we can pull this off. But am afraid that if the infill areas do not have good schools or are unsafe, this will not happen.

Vibrant & Sustainable.

Planning is needed to protect our streams and other water bodies; with the huge costs of new infrastructure, building new infrastructure has to be well (thought) out.

Doing it differently in ways that make sense will create the incentives for smart growth & redevelopment.

Only as long as the "grow differently" makes economic, market-driven, sustainable sense. Growth will follow good planning.

This is most likely . Reminds me of the orderly land use of the European social (aristocracies? -- illegible) TIDY. Green.

Trains! And all the development in cities and towns. I'm fairly optimistic about how many people can be added to the region.

We need to create livable more compact urban area.

Needs work on how to.

I like the growth and doing it compactly. I don't know if we can expect or need to strive for national population and job growth.

Population growth & better government policies would be great, but is overly optimistic.

Loses points b/c growth stresses resources, requires infrastructural investments even if different.

More job growth, but still sprawl, some protected green space.

Change is needed to promote growth.

OK, but too much emphasis on growth alone.

I see a commitment to reinvest in the "Rust Belt"

We need innovation badly. The status quo has disconnected our region and threatens our economy.

I value jobs and environmental responsibility while maintaining places with character.

WHAT IS MISSING FROM THE SCENARIOS?

No proper community development. Euclid is horrible. Example of poor community development.

A way to actually obtain the desired scenario. Realistically, our population will shrink and uban sprawl will continue.

Focus on jobs. If you provide good jobs, the population will grow and along with that incomes. There needs to be a dozen scenarios.

Age groups. Results should be grouped by what age of the people responded. Also education and knowledge base of people that responded. How informed where the people in the survey?

A discussion of private property rights.

Maintain control of local government. Do not want an unelected regional board making decisions that should be done locally.

Too much to put into words!

Would like more information on the way that numbers were projected for each of the scenarios.

Until high speed rail or "true" freeway connection between Trumbull County and Cuyahoga/Summit/Stark, then Trumbull County is not a part of this concept for NE Ohio.

Impact on the resident's lives at home.

Community, population health

Recognizing that most streets, water and sewer line are installed by private developers and paid by (of ourselves, yes citizens must maintain the infrastructure and treatment plants and have cars but they don't bear 100% of the cost.

We need investment in our public schools so badly.

Agriculture preservation "food for the future."

The impact of changes in education and taxes to drive movement patterns of residents.

A better understanding of the general population in NE Ohio that grows differently is an opportunity to have better jobs, better communities and better family-lives.

Revised models for governing the region. Do away with multiple layers.

Perception - draining business investment

The effect agriculture has on the economy and tourism.

Inclusion of all economic and regional groups.

Education

Doesn't address education & how that relates to the scenario.

Comparison scenario to (Illegible) cities than Cleveland ??? Tracks 3-7 years ??? (i.e. Philadelphia)

- Radically reducing the number of governmental units. We can't afford to pay for "Big Frog in a Little Pond" egos. -Water security & quality is present, but way understated. - Renewable resource electricity generation & modern power grid. -Social dynamics needs of aging population base. -Health, wellness & educational facilities should be co-located. -Poisoned industrial site identification & remediation.

I know these are all scenarios but it's hard to give a solid answer about what to expect in each, but it would be more useful to know that "in this scenario, it will lead to B," or at least as much as that's possible. For example with land conservation it seems like the maps showed which could be conserved, not what will be conserved.

Elimination of bad housing. Creation of internal green beds.

Schools.

Local vs. regional outlook. It's hard to not (illegible) regionally.

Clarify rural investment - are we encouraging exurban sprawl or agriculture and conservation?

Crime management. Housing for addicts & street girls out of cities on work farms.

Emphasis on matching jobs and housing - not everyone has a car to drive to work.

And understanding of why people prefer to build a new house in a cornfield as opposed to rehabbing an old house, why people want their own cars instead of riding a bus, etc.

I think the primary thing that is missing from the scenarios is an explanation of how the growth that is expected to occur in the "Grow the Same" and "Grow Differently" scenarios might occur. The jump between where we are now and the national growth rate is quite large and seems unlikely to change between now and 2040 without significant changes in both local and national policy about where investment/reinvestment should occur. I think the scenarios could also be more upfront about the types of policies that would likely be required to incentivize/promote each of these scenarios.

Should be more emphasis on upgrading existing infrastructure to incentivize redevelopment.

Education - or bad educational options - is far & away the largest driver of migration. Offer much greater choice & control by parents of kids schools & that driver is essentially eliminated. Lack of yard, greenspace, parking & general infrastructure obsolescence is 2nd largest driver. Crime & lack of services is third. Fix these first.

This is showing what to do, but not how to do it.

Global factors that may impact the trend.

Education

A good regional rail to link inner ring suburbs with the urban core.

No mention of our biggest asset, Lake Erie, the shore, great lakes. Fresh water will be a huge draw to the area in the future. Great lakes must be protected much of the rest of the country cannot thrive without fresh water.

Ways to balance the more difficult questions such as growth vs. conservation.

Education

Context - education, etc.

Scenarios capture what is important.

Schools! What changes will be made? Are any necessary?

Development approaches framed in relation to large metros. Metropolitan and other smaller industrial city hubs (Ashtabula., Alliance, Lorain, etc.) are their own centers of gravity regardless of large metros.

Nothing

The effects of over-polulation

The "magic potion" to create a wide range of leaders that can really change - not just keep studying the problem.

Social Justice, equity, safety for women, accessibility of disabled communities, better schools in Cleveland.

Money (funding). Political support. Modifications needed in existing planning & development, and tax/revenue generation.

Energy consumption

Too confusing (as I have highlighted above) of names. Consider: 1) Same Everything, 2) More Population But Nothing Else Changes, 3) Same Population but Change Other Things, 4) More population and change other things.

Concept of willingness to change -- through collaboration -- sharing schools -- libraries -- interesting -- the private sector has no problem "merging."

Mixture of all of them

Tax impact. Summary of implementation of various scenarios.

1) More housing discussion - affordability, 2) Lack of any visibility of the FHEA that is a part of NEOSCC.

Impact of educational opportunities for young people to fill existing manufacturing jobs in the near future.

One of the hardest things to quantify, human investment. The efficiency of investing infrastructure i.e. low density areas is much different than doing same in more dense areas. Similarly educators focused in more dense areas are a "better" perhaps more efficient investment. But schools follow people, don't they?

Crime information

Some kind of age breakdown. It would be nice to see how differently communities serve the needs of children and seniors. Also, I have never seen this large a group of people dressed this upper-middle-class in my life.

1) What happens to the areas that we don't invest in? 2) What kind of impacts would each scenario have on socioeconomic status/public health/quality of life?

Perhaps an appreciation for the power of private capital and the decisions that people with capital make. Also an appreciation for the tendency of upwardly mobile people to escape cities.

Social Impact: Health, Life Expectancies

Understand family status on trends

What if instead of growth our region loses people and jobs? We have a (illegible) system of communities and a history of political corruption and cronyism - not to mention a rust belt past always (illegible) on us. I am optimistic about NEO, but not blind to our recent past.

Religion / Education.

An explanation on how we get there (other than "TREND"). People need to know what policy, land use, law changes would need to be made to "your vision." It is easy to say you support all of the scenarios.

Growth in schools/better education programs and youth programs.

No mention of education.

Structure of other areas. Example - can south & west maintain water levels/usage? If not, how does that impact this region?

Not all populations are equal - not consideration of the social factors driving trends - flight from "Low Class" people.

What are the resources for power and gas? In the future of the area, where does electric power come from since utilities are reducing production facilities, natural gas development needs more oversight, but could be a good source for energy development. Utilities will increase in cost? With less demand?

I do not see plans for how to bring about the changes. I think they are great goals, but I am not optimistic that they will occur.

The money to do any of it.

Re-organizing more of our agriculture to provide more regionally supplied flood. Shifting to 35% grown in region would mean 27,000 new jobs according to 25% shift study.

Examination of other communities' efforts to engage regional planning. Seems elephant in the room is what would be the main drivers behind encouraging dense development/discouraging out-migration.

Maybe this is part of investing in legacy cities, but would like to see more on strategy to demolish vacant and abandoned housing in NEO. An in a similar vein, how to utilize land banks in the region.

Conservation about energy diversity / Sustainable energy choices being developed on local scales, solar, wind, geothermal.

Physical health of residents -- connect this with open space & environment. Spiritual health of residents - connect this with open space & environment.

Relativity of rest of US comparison to other communities across world

Health benefits for transportation.

These choices are all interrelated & difficult to prioritize.

What is missing is the fix. Everyone is entitled to a new 2400 square foot home as their first home. This logic causes suburban sprawl in 3 generations cities are dying over "New homes.'

A realistic assessment of the difficulties of getting to the "differently" scenarios. Selling that to the Greens, Medinas etc. will not be easy. Need a transition plan, for example for aging 2nd ring suburbs. "What's in it for me" will be tougher to answer for some communities than others.

1) more information on public transportation trade-offs: additional transit benefits & road costs & some way to compare 1 mile of road and 1 mile of transit via capacity. 2) Discussion of unemployment rate in different growth scenarios in grow differently: population growth > job growth in absolute numbers. Consequences?

No mention of education, but I do feel that if the communities improve, so will the schools.

Consolidation of existing governmental structures . Too many separate entities eating up too many resources on duplicative overhead.

The public transportation only looks at the short-term costs of rail and not the long-term savings.

Self-sustaining communities - utilizing urban spaces to grow, food for low income families/communities.

Scenarios do not address the fact that young families cluster, seniors cluster, etc.

Climate change for one

Education seems to be missing. Costs/Quality/Impacts.

An understanding of natural building methods. Incorporating sustainable materials and methods in new construction. Better & easier access to local healthy food including in the cities.

Analysis of what this means to any individual - i.e. How much does it cost a person to build roadways?

The effects of oil and gas exploration/development on open space/environment/quality of life.

Global climate change models that could strongly affect the economics of the different scenarios -- e.g. downpours, flooding, run-off, timely carbon tax in 10 years, etc.

Sustainability

People in rural areas and/or large landowners should be encouraged to take advantage of conservation easements, such as those offered by the Western Reserve Land Conservancy, to preserve their land from development for posterity.

Connecting infrastructure costs vs. health. So if we work or access recreation or commute on bikes our health care cost goes down. I'd rather pay for bike lanes than drugs for blood pressure.

x

Intentional communities, affordability, egalitarian, bartering/sharing/exchanging skills & energy. Time banking, e-bikes, bike shares, urban gardens/farms, reuse, universal health care, neighborhoods, community involvement, noise pollution, air/water pollution, energy decent plan.

I would have liked to see more of how people of varying scocio-economic statuses would potentially be impacted by the different scenarios. There was some attention to this in the transportation scenario.

To me it's all about removing the auto as the idol of worship for all planning.

Improving public schools in the legacy cities. Improving public safety in the legacy cities.

A little more discussion of the benefits of mixed use.

For cities like Warren, emphasis must be on jobs. Without jobs, people are going to continue to move to other areas without looking back. Yes, we need transit, environmental protection and mixed business, they are the backbone of jobs.

Water quality, water use, lake front access.

1) Impact of schools, 2) crime data. The root cause of urban sprawl is schools, crime and high taxes. We should probably focus a bit more on these aspects if we want real change.

Native plant corridors are extremely important.

Job centers should be in major cities in county.

More emphasis on clearing and cleaning sites for wealth-creating industrial manufacturing in order to attract and grow businesses to provide working-middle-class jobs.

Land use planning , charming infrastructure.

1) Reindustrialization of old contaminated industrial areas with clean-up and redevelopment. 2) Salvaging residential properties that can be rehabilitated when economically feasible. This will require lending capital to rehab. Investors who are not served by banks, HUD, FHA, Fannie Mae, Freddy Mac, etc.

Dedication to the arts. Make these strong and you keep educated people in the area, while including older, established residents and new college grads.

Nothing I can think of. Good job..

Explanation on how projected growth was determined - seems really high.

Tax base revenue sharing!!! (What ever happened to that great idea?)

The scenario where northeast Ohio splits from the State of Ohio in order to overcome the State government's limitations with respect to funding transit projects and addressing local issues in a relevant way.

1) Inefficiencies in multiplicity of cities & municipalities 2) Preference of public transportation to private modes of transportation ignores the fact that both are technologically similar but change in capacity. I recommend investment in new transportation/communication technology.

Not enough emphasis on remediating sewers and clean water (illegible). I like the concept of mixed use development.

Make sure people understand their living costs won't go down with better policies.

Recognition of the sacrifice of some value for choices. Need more education of the costs of continued trend.

Building shared goals/wins (i.e. across all 1st & 2nd outer/inner communities.

Most of the current best thinking on sustainability. Try some permaculture philosophy.

I wish there had been a choice for controlled (moderate/managed) growth and do things differently.

Reality of what is most likely growth scenario, would contribute to weighing of policy change.

Consideration of cultural activities.

Creating a "culture of a region."

Cultural shifts - How people think about driving, where they want to live.

Locale-specific development & predictions due to specific employers or new trends in migration economy.

How can these be useful to decision makers? What are the institutional drivers pushing the trend scenarios and how might those need to change to reach a different development trajectory?

Seems to be very thorough. Nothing missing that I see.

Nothing

Schools

Keep development out of agricultural land. We need to rasise food, not houses.

How to incentivize (other than redistrict) responsible growth. People will respond favorably to incentives, especailly when they will provide a more livable and vibrant region.

Get better infrastructure - get power lines under ground. Fix the bridges and roads.

Meeting the needs of an aging population.

Our diverse pieces of the puzzle are our strengths for the region. The free market can do some of those things despite some who claim it can't. Thus I don't think anything is missing.

I await the mechanisms of how to encourage investment.