



**NOACA Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Council**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
February 21, 2025  
NOACA Offices  
1299 Superior Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio

**Present:** Please see the attached attendance record.

Ms. Kiara Williams, Chair of Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Council, convened the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

**New Members**

- Veronica Newsome, Alternate for Dale Vandersommen
- John Watkins, Alternate for Anthony Ratajczak

**Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Jim Ziemnik made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of November 15, 2024. Mr. David Ray seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

**Public Comments on Agenda Items**

No public comments were made at this meeting.

**Executive Director's Report**

The following announcements were made by NOACA staff:

**Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Program**

Ms. Sarah White made the following announcement about the 2025 CMAQ application round:

- Eligible Projects
  - Vehicle/Machinery Updates
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
  - Traffic Signal Timing/Connection Hardware
  - Air Quality Education Programs
- Key Dates & Information
  - Applications Available Mid-March
  - Applicant Webinar Early April
  - For more information visit [www.noaca.org/cmaq](http://www.noaca.org/cmaq) or email [projects@mpo.noaca.org](mailto:projects@mpo.noaca.org)

**NOACA Climate Pollution Reduction Grants (CPRG) Program Community Projects Funding Opportunity**

Mr. Joe MacDonald made the following announcement about the CPRG fund opportunity:

- Funding & Eligibility
  - \$300,000 allocated for local climate action planning & engagement (community projects)
  - Eligible counties: Geauga, Lake, Lorain, and Medina

- Cuyahoga County projects will be coordinated through Cleveland's CPRG planning budget
- Key Dates & Information
  - Application Deadline: April 14, 2025, by 4:30 p.m.
  - Applicant Webinar: March 13, 2025, 11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
  - Application and webinar details: [noaca.org/community-assistance-center/funding-programs/carbon-reduction-program-crp/cprg-solicitation](https://noaca.org/community-assistance-center/funding-programs/carbon-reduction-program-crp/cprg-solicitation)

### **Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310) Program Project Solicitation**

Ms. White made the following announcement about the Section 5310 Program application round:

- Program Overview
  - Supports transportation providers that offer coordinated transportation for seniors and individuals with disabilities.
  - \$2 million available for SFY 2025-26 projects to be implemented in CY 2026-27
- Key Dates & Information:
  - Applications Open: February 14, 2025
  - Application Deadline: April 11, 2025, by noon
  - Applicant Webinar: March 6, 2025
  - Registration: Email [projects@mpo.noaca.org](mailto:projects@mpo.noaca.org)
  - More Details & Application: [noaca.org/5310](https://noaca.org/5310)

### **Action Items**

No action items were presented at this meeting.

### **Presentation/Discussion Items**

#### **Regional Metroparks Trails Connectivity Study (RMTCS) Update**

Mr. Matt Hils of OHM Advisors stated that the Regional Metroparks Trails Connectivity Study covers the entire NOACA service area and aims to develop a comprehensive bicycle network.

The study's key objectives include:

- Connecting parks and linking counties
- Providing better access for residents to parks
- Encouraging utilitarian trail use, such as commuting to work, school, or libraries
- Shifting transportation modes away from motorized and combustion-engine vehicles

The overall goal is to promote sustainable and active transportation options across the region.

Mr. Hils presented information on the following:

- Goals
- Project Status
- Engagement Summary
  - Community meeting #3 (66 map components)
  - Online survey #2 (1,530 responses)
  - Online survey #2 (93 components)
- Recommendations
  - Recommendations Process
  - Scoring Analysis
  - Overall Region Scoring
  - County-specific Scoring
- Implementation Plan
  - Facility Prioritization and Phasing

- Cost Estimates
- Implementation Considerations

Mr. Hils stated that the financial impact of this action is not to exceed \$249,965.

Mr. Hils stated that the next steps are as follows:

- End of February
  - OHM deliver report draft #1 to project team
- March/April
  - 3/4: Coordination meeting
  - 3/14: Project team send comments on report
  - 3/28: OHM deliver final draft
  - 4/11: Project team send final comments on report
  - 4/25: OHM deliver final report

Mr. John Kalas asked whether the focus of the project is on the Regional Metroparks Trails and related facilities.

Mr. Hils confirmed that it is.

Mr. Kalas then asked if the project would be added to the Long Range Plan.

Mr. Hils confirmed that it would be.

Mr. Kalas noted that when Mr. Makarachi spoke at the Long Range Plan meeting in Medina County, he covered topics related to first-mile and last-mile connectivity for people accessing bus stops and trails, such as the Regional Metroparks Trails. He asked whether, as NOACA gathers input through online surveys and engagement sessions, the agency is broadening its focus beyond just the Metroparks Trails to include how surface roads will be affected by this project. He mentioned that Medina County has 55 mph speed limits in some areas and 45 mph speed limits near metroparks, which could significantly impact how people move around townships. He asked if this impact is being communicated to the public participating in the studies.

Mr. Hils responded that if that specific question comes up, an OHM representative would explain it. He clarified that the goal is to implement facilities with minimal impact on current traffic flow. Given the wide variety of conditions, some proposed facilities may need to integrate with existing roadways. The recommendations will be specific to locations where implementation is most feasible. He emphasized that OHM is planning at a high level, meaning that any recommendations will require further detailed study (such as in a preliminary engineering phase) to fully assess feasibility and potential traffic impacts.

Mr. Kalas then asked whether Mr. Hils was referring only to the facilities, stating that this information is not being fully communicated to the public. He expressed concern that as people participate in surveys, NOACA is not asking about their commuting concerns or how their daily lives might be affected. He suggested that this omission could prevent people from fully weighing in on their support for the project. Mr. Kalas said he might argue that the scope of the survey is omitting some important details.

Mr. Hils acknowledged Mr. Kalas' concerns.

Mr. Makarachi clarified that the OHM project does not cover all nonmotorized facilities. Mr. Hils was only discussing trail networks, which is the specific scope of OHM's work. Mr. Makarachi further explained that the first mile-last mile issue is part of NOACA's Long Range Plan and the ACTIVATE plan, which focuses on accessibility, sidewalks in residential areas, and other aspects

of pedestrian and transit connectivity. However, these elements are not part of OHM's project tasks. Mr. Kalas' questions extended beyond OHM's scope, but NOACA is actively considering first mile-last mile solutions as previously presented in Medina County.

Mr. Kalas acknowledged the need for compartmentalization to advance projects, but he expressed concern that if NOACA is using surveys to gather data and shape project direction, the public should be fully aware of the implications of their decisions. He believed that the potential impact on people's daily lives was not being fully conveyed, which he felt was unfair.

In response, Mr. Hills stated that preliminary engineering phases of any project should involve additional stakeholder and public engagement. This would provide another opportunity to inform the public and gather their input on the final design. He emphasized that this survey process is only an early step and that further public consultation will occur before the construction of any facility.

### **Bike Demand Analysis & Bike Counting Program**

Mr. Sam Schweikert presented information on the following:

- Manual Bike Counts
- Automated Bike Counts
- NOACA Bike Count Program Locations
- Location Selection
- Data
  - Manual bike counts
  - Automated bike counts
  - Accessing the manual bike count data

Mr. Rob Uhlhorn presented information on the following:

- Potential Cycling Demand
- LTS Length
- LTS Connectivity

Mr. Uhlhorn stated that NOACA staff will continue conducting further analyses and develop more accurate cycling supply and demand relations and update the Council on the progress.

Mr. VanSickle referenced a comprehensive bike count program report written in 2020 and asked if there is a standard timeframe for programming the report's creation.

Mr. Makarachi stated that NOACA first created eNEO2050 in 2020 and will use the same approach for eNEO2050+, an updated version set to be completed in the coming months.

Mr. Tom Jordan asked about the impact of E-Bikes on bike count numbers.

Mr. Uhlhorn responded that the current model does not track E-Bike trips but acknowledged the importance of incorporating them. He mentioned that NOACA staff had internal discussions on improving analysis accuracy. He suggested that NOACA should begin tracking E-Bike trips in the future, as they enable people to travel greater distances.

Mr. Jordan noted that E-Bikes can handle tougher roads.

Mr. Makarachi confirmed that respondents from the Household Travel Survey mentioned E-Bikes as a transportation option.

Mr. Jordan emphasized that E-Bike usage is growing.

Mr. Makarachi agreed, acknowledging the rising popularity of E-Bikes. He stated that NOACA staff will analyze the demand for E-Bikes to assess whether they should be incorporated into the model. He noted that E-Bikes cover longer distances.

### **Cost Benefit Analysis of FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures**

Ms. Kessa Turnbull presented information on the following:

- History of Proven Safety Countermeasures
- Countermeasures & Costs, Crash Data, and Crash Costs
- Contributors of Crashes
  - Key Contributors to Crashes
  - NOACA 2024 Analysis
- Common Causes of Crashes
  - Human Mistakes
  - Inadequate Infrastructure
- Analysis
  - Crash causes breakdown (2024 data): 48% what should not be there, but is and 52% what should be there, but is not
  - Average crash cost: \$75,010
  - Infrastructure deficit impact: 52% of \$75,010 = \$38,632
- Calculations: expected crash reductions x \$38,632 = estimated annual savings from fewer crashes
- Timeline for Projected Savings
- Non-motorized Countermeasures
- Motorized Countermeasures
- Example: Non-motorized countermeasure – Brunswick
- Example: Motorized countermeasure – Elyria
- Safe Returns
- Cost-Benefit Ratio Analysis Chart

Ms. Turnbull stated that NOACA is exploring the creation of a new safety fund aimed at implementing FHWA safety countermeasures at the community level. NOACA will continue evaluating the feasibility of funding a new safety program.

Ms. Joyce Braverman inquired whether Ms. Turnbull had researched pedestrian crashes at Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RFB) crosswalks and if she knew the crash rate.

Ms. Turnbull stated that RFBs have presented challenges, even when installed, as the rate of usage is only about 30%. She did not have specific statistics on crash rates but noted that many pedestrians fail to activate the button.

Ms. Braverman expressed concern that pedestrians might feel a false sense of security at RFB crosswalks because drivers often do not stop. Anecdotally, she noted that there have been many crashes at these crosswalks, leading some pedestrians to avoid using them altogether.

Ms. Turnbull acknowledged that she had anecdotal knowledge of crashes at RFB crosswalks but lacked statistical data.

Mr. Jordan stated that rumble strips help reduce crashes and asked whether they are effective in preventing crashes involving pedestrians, bicycles, and cars. He also pointed out that ODOT installs rumble strips on highways to reduce vehicle-to-vehicle crashes.

Ms. Turnbull stated that rumble strips primarily prevent roadway departures, which are more related to vehicle crashes rather than crashes involving pedestrians or bicyclists. She explained

that shoulder-line rumble strips help prevent single-vehicle crashes, where a driver runs off the road, and centerline rumble strips are designed to prevent head-on collisions, where a driver crosses the centerline and crashes into another vehicle. Regarding how the new safety fund would address such issues, Ms. Turnbull referred the question to Mr. Makarachi, noting that the fund is still in its early stages.

Mr. Jordan pointed out that the area in Lorain referenced by Ms. Turnbull was not a highway but a highly motorized area. He asked whether rumble strips would be used to reduce pedestrian and bike crashes or if they were more focused on single-vehicle crashes.

Mr. Makarachi asked for clarification on whether Mr. Jordan was referring to funding for the safety measures.

Mr. Jordan confirmed that he was.

Mr. Makarachi explained that when adding information to the Community Safety Reports, NOACA staff had a discussion with Executive Director Gallucci about creating a fund similar to the Transportation for Livable Communities Initiative (TLCI). TLCI funds can be used for projects including signalization, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements in addition to other infrastructure needs. The new safety fund could be allocated for both motorized and nonmotorized projects. Once NOACA formally establishes a fund, Committee and Council members can refer to the Community Safety Reports to determine eligibility for funding.

Mr. Ziemnik said some of the comments and questions inspired him. He asked whether rumble strips could be used instead of lane delineators, such as flexible posts or wide painted stripes that fade over time, to better separate vehicles from bicycles.

Ms. Turnbull stated that rumble strip research is still developing. National organizations are working on "mumble strips" with cut-throughs to allow safe bicycle crossings. She suggested that ODOT may have more details on this innovation.

Mr. Ockunzzi explained that ODOT uses rumble strips or stripes depending on road type. Stripes are painted on rural two-lane roads, while strips are used on wider shoulders to prevent single-vehicle crashes. ODOT avoids placing them near bike paths unless there is sufficient separation to prevent interference with non-motorized vehicles.

Mr. Kalas commented on the crash data, noting that 48% of crashes result from driver mistakes and 52% from infrastructure issues. He questioned whether the Council assumes bicyclists and pedestrians bear no responsibility for crashes.

Ms. Turnbull clarified that crash reports specify who was at fault, including drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. Police officers can mark the type of user as being in error in a single crash.

Mr. Kalas stressed the importance of how crash data is presented to the public. He noted that transportation is becoming more complex with the rise of Uber Eats, E-Bikes, and delivery services, and pointed out that individuals outside their vehicles are classified as pedestrians. He shared his rural experience, where delivery drivers frequently park in streets and interact as pedestrians. He pointed out that NOACA is highly detailed in some areas while omitting details in others. Mr. Kalas stated that the more details the better.

Ms. Newsome shared that the City of Lorain recently installed rumble strips along the buffered bike lanes on the Henderson Bridge, a high-elevation bridge. This was done to make cyclists feel safer, as previously there were only four traffic lanes and one bike lane in each direction without any separation. After implementing a road diet, the city added buffered bike lanes with a 4 to 6-

foot buffer. The rumble strips are located in the buffered area, not near the bike lane or traffic. Cut-throughs were added every 50 feet to allow cyclists to maneuver around debris, connecting to the buffer for easy access.

Mr. Ockunzzi explained that rumble strips are designed to keep vehicles in their lanes, particularly when drivers are fatigued or impaired, preventing them from drifting.

Mr. Ziemnik shared that several years ago, with NOACA's support, four Lorain County cities (Avon Lake, Lorain, Sheffield Lake, and Vermillion) discussed creating a bike lane along the lakefront. Consultants were involved in these discussions, particularly about lane delineators. However, recent experiences have shown that snowplows would likely destroy lane delineators, making them impractical—one consultant even called them "stupid sticks." Rumble strips, by contrast, provide a buffered lane and some level of delineation, helping cyclists know where to stay while avoiding the issues with vertical elements like delineators. Mr. Ziemnik found this solution promising, suggesting that adding a stripe over the rumble strip would be easier than working around vertical elements. He expressed interest in current trends and how they could improve regional trail connectivity, especially in rural areas and highways. He believed that buffered lanes could improve the level of traffic stress (LTS) for cyclists, improving safety and encouraging more people to ride.

Mr. VanSickle defended lane delineators. He noted that numerous studies have shown that plastic delineators or any vertical separation next to a bike lane improve safety for cyclists. He cautioned against dismissing these measures just because they might be temporary or need regular replacement, emphasizing that they still provide a meaningful safety benefit for users.

### **Reports/Updates**

Mr. VanSickle highlighted uncertainty regarding federal funding and its potential impact on regional projects. He shared that Bike Cleveland is working with the League of American Bicyclists to compile a list of projects at risk of being cut or clawed back. He encouraged anyone concerned about specific projects to reach out to him, as Bike Cleveland/League of American Bicyclists plan to present this information to local representatives and senators to advocate for their importance. He also invited BPAC members to contact him for more information.

### **Old Business**

No old business was discussed at this meeting.

### **New Business**

No new business was discussed at this meeting.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Jordan made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:59 a.m. Ms. Sara Maier seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

*Note: Additional information on the agenda items can be found on [NOACA's website](#) and [YouTube channel](#).*



# NOACA

Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency

## NOACA BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COUNCIL 2025 Attendance Record

MEETING DATES	2/21/25	5/16/25	8/15/25	11/21/25
<b>ALAI</b> , Samuel (David Schroedel, Alternate)	X			
<b>ANTOSKIEWICZ</b> , Larry (Thomas Jordan, Alternate)	A			
<b>BASS</b> , David (Phil Kidd, Alternate)	X			
<b>BRAVERMAN</b> , Joyce (Kara Hamley O'Donnell, Alternate)	X			
<b>DAVIS</b> , Sarah (Phil Kidd, Alternate)				
<b>DEGEETER</b> , Timothy (Scott Wangler, Alternate)	A			
<b>EXLEY</b> , Alan (Kirk Dimmick, Alternate)				
<b>GEORGE</b> , Meghan (Dave Baas, Alternate)	A			
<b>GORRIS</b> , Nick James W. Dvorak	X			
<b>FINK-ROHDE</b> , Erin (Alternate not designated)	X			
<b>HARRISON</b> , Aaron M. (John Kalas, Alternate)	A			
<b>KAZY</b> , Brian (Kris Harsh, Alternate)				
<b>MCDERMOTT</b> , Sean (Sara Byrnes Maier, Alternate)	A			
<b>OCKUNZZI</b> , Scott (Jeremy Adato, Alternate)	X			

MEETING DATES	2/21/25	5/16/25	8/15/25	11/21/25
<b>RATAJCZAK</b> , Anthony (John Watkins, Alternate)	A			
<b>RAY</b> , David (A.J. Stoll, Alternate)	X			
<b>SHOP</b> , Neil (Melinda Bartizal, Alternate)	X			
<b>SONNHALTER</b> , James M. (Paul Triolo, Alternate)	X			
<b>VANDERSOMMEN</b> , Dale (Veronica A. Newsome, Alternate)	A			
<b>VANSICKLE</b> , Jacob (Jenna Thomas, Alternate)	X			
<b>WASHINGTON</b> , Ariel (Alternate TBD)	X			
<b>WILLIAMS</b> , Kiara (Alternate not designated)	X			

X = Member present

A = Alternate present

DRAFT