

**Olentangy Watershed Planning Partnership
Meeting of Thursday, July 29, 2010
The Willis Building
2079 U.S. Highway 23 N
Delaware, Ohio 43015
Meeting Summary**

Attendees:

Partner Communities

John Peacock, Pleasant Township
Duane Matlock, Oxford Township
Jim Hatten, Oxford Township
Jay Shoup, City of Marion
Lynda Bitar, City of Worthington
David Hull, City of Columbus
David Efland, City of Delaware
Lorraine Winters, City of Columbus
David Anderson, Liberty Township
Hal Clase, Marlboro Township
Beth Hugh, Orange Township

Stakeholders

Dan Stewart, Marion County RPC
Carrie Morrow, MetroParks
Brian McCombs, Watershed Coordinator
Lee Brown, Franklin County
Laura Shinn, Ohio State University
Scott Sanders, Delaware County RPC
Amy Dutt, FLOW

MORPC Staff

Jerry Tinianow, Director of the Center for Energy and Environment
Joseph Kitchen, Associate Planner
Erin Grushon, Associate Planner

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. There were no comments on the draft agenda and the agenda was approved.

Erin began the meeting by informing attendees that the OWPP will be finalizing a Priority Area criteria list by the end of the meeting. She reminded the partnership that preliminary maps with the criteria shown were made available to the partnership online or through the mail for review and that the initial Priority Area maps will look very different once the mapping analysis is conducted. She noted that the Priority Agricultural Area (PAA) map in particular shows a lot of coverage, but the analysis will further narrow down the Priority Areas.

Erin pulled up the recommended criteria list and explained that this list was seen by the partnership before and that the OWPP Technical Committee further refined and defined the list since the July 1st meeting of the full OWPP. The list was reorganized and the criteria neatly listed.

Erin explained that this criteria list was originally derived from a straw poll conducted and administered to the full OWPP. The full partnership had the opportunity to vote on which criteria were most important for designating each of the Priority Areas in the Olentangy watershed. This initial list was then further refined by the OWPP Technical Committee in early June, shown to the full OWPP on July 1st for comment and feedback, further refined by the Technical Committee in mid-July, and then mapped and posted on the OWPP Balanced Growth Website (<http://BalancedGrowthPlanning.morpc.org/OlentangyRiver.aspx>) for further comment by the full partnership.

Joe and Erin discussed the comments received and any minor changes made to the criteria list. They indicated that a good data source for the grain elevators criterion could not be found and it had subsequently been removed. Technical staff found no appropriate way to map the criterion of “contiguous farmland” and it was decided that “minimized agricultural conflict areas” would be substituted in its place. Joe explained that this criterion is intended to highlight agricultural areas that are not in conflict with developed areas. Erin explains that the Technical Committee recommended removing the scenic portion of 315 from the PDA criterion.

Erin pulled up the Priority Area Criteria maps and opened the floor to the OWPP to comment on each of the Priority Area maps.

Amy Dutt asked about the data source used for the waterways and said that it would be important to include perennial and ephemeral streams. Erin said that she would check with the technical staff and follow up.

Scott Sanders asked about areas of overlap in the Priority Area maps. Joe explained that most of the overlap would be dealt with in the analysis portion of the criteria mapping and that the partnership would decide on a uniform way of dealing with Priority Area overlap in the future. Joe also stressed the value of local review as a process to ensure that the criteria maps accurately reflect the community and watershed needs.

David Hull asked if the partnership would be locked into the criteria list once adopted. Joe explained that once the list is finalized, Priority Area maps can be created and that we will be taking the maps to the communities for local review so that any necessary and justified revisions can be made. Jerry highlighted the need to come out of this meeting with a finalized set of criteria so that we can begin mapping.

David Efland confirmed the value of the local review process. Mr. Efland indicated that it would be difficult to find any other criteria to include on the final criteria list other than what has been listed already.

The process of weighting the criteria was mentioned as a way for the partnership to have further input in the criteria analysis.

Amy Dutt asked about the inclusion of slope in the permeability score PCA criterion and it was believed that slope is a consideration in this criterion.

Erin moved on to pull up the PDA criteria map for the partnership to comment on.

David Hull asked if public facilities like schools, public building and libraries should be included as a criterion on the PDA criteria list. Erin suggested that public institutions would be part of the “future land use” criterion on the list and highlighted the “parks and open space” criterion on the PCA list as an example.

Amy Dutt noted the importance of making use of existing infrastructure as part of the PDA criteria list.

Laura Shinn pointed out that we are just identifying Priority Areas, where it is that we would like to funnel our efforts and areas we want to target. Efforts can occur outside of these Priority Areas.

Jerry suggested that we identify nodes on the maps showing the public institutions rather than adding them in as separate criteria and it is agreed that the partnership will move forward in this manner.

David Efland recalled a discussion at the Technical Committee about adding “airports” as a criterion to the PDA criteria list. The partnership agreed to add airports as a PDA criterion. Scott Sanders asked what the buffer would be around the airports. The buffer will be similar to that around the intermodal yard criterion.

The partnership moved forward to look at the PAA criteria map. Amy Dutt expressed a concern over the slope of the land used for agriculture due to erosion potential. Jim Hatten pointed out that land with a higher slope makes good land for grazing animals. Amy agrees.

Joe asked for a motion to adopt the final Priority Area criteria list for the OWPP:

PCA	Data Feature	Buffer/ Notes
PCA	100 – Year Floodplain	
PCA	Soil Permeability Score (Slope, Permeability, Depth to Groundwater)	
PCA	Natural Land Cover	
PCA	Wetlands	
PCA	Habitats	
PCA	Hydric Soils (would be wetlands)	
PCA	Wellhead Zone	1 year
PCA	Wellhead Zone	5 Year
PCA	Upground Reservoir	
PCA	Future Land Use (Park & Open Space)	
PCA	Scenic Roads- Remove 315 PDA Section	Remove from PDA

PDA	Data Feature	Buffer/ Notes
PDA	Sewer Service Areas	
PDA	Major Roads	¼ mile
PDA	Major Roads	½ mile

PDA	Highway Interchanges	1 mile
PDA	Public Transit	¼ mile
PDA	Rail Lines	¼ mile
PDA	Intermodal Freight Yards	½ mile
PDA	Airports	½ mile
PDA	Urbanized Area/ Urbanized Center	
PDA	Enterprise Zones (EZ)	
PDA	Community Reinvestment Area (CRA)	
PDA	Current & Future Land Use	High Density Res.
PDA	Current & Future Land Use	Comm. & Ind. Dev.

PAA	Data Feature	Buffer/ Notes
PAA	Prime Farmland	
PAA	Prime Farmland if well drained	
PAA	Future Land Use (Agriculture)	
PAA	Minimized Agricultural Conflict Areas	
PAA	Agricultural District	

Lynda Bitar moved to adopt the (above) list as the final criteria list for the OWPP. David Efland seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Lorraine Winters asked about karst topography and similar subsurface geology as part of the criteria. It is explained that it cannot be added as a separate criteria to the final criteria list, but it may be considered as part of the wellhead criterion or other PCA criteria.

Joe led a discussion on weighting the final Priority Area criteria list. Joe pulled up an excel sheet with the criteria listed and opened the floor to the partnership on how they would like to move forward with weighting. Joe explained that the base level for the weighting system is a 1 (low) and that if a criterion is deemed of high importance the partnership may weigh it higher. A 3 is the highest weighting. The recommended weighting system is a combination of recommendations from the OWPP Technical Committee and MORPC technical staff. Joe noted that the partnership should feel free to alter any of the weights as they see fit.

Beth Hugh suggested weighting the 50 year flood plain different from the 100 year flood plain as part of the “floodplain” PCA criterion. David Efland pointed out that there is a separate process for building in the FEMA floodplain. It is decided that the partnership will not weight the floodplains differently.

A partner suggested weighting the “sewer service area” criterion a 3 rather than a 2. A partner suggested that the sewer service criterion remain a 2, that development will follow, and the partnership agrees.

A partner asked why airports are weighted as a 1 and Joe clarified that it could be weighted higher if the partnership felt that was necessary. The partnership agreed to weight both the airport and intermodal yard criteria as a 2.

The partnership discussed the next steps for the Balanced Growth Process. It is agreed that the analysis will be performed with the finalized Priority Area criteria list and the preliminary criteria weights. MORPC staff will work to create a map showing quartiles that the partnership will be welcomed to view at a future date to decide on the threshold that will be used in designated Priority Areas.

David Hull asked if there would be a large break between this meeting and the next full partnership meeting. Joe indicated that once maps are created (by October), MORPC staff will be bringing the maps to the OWPP communities for review and any necessary revisions. Joe also indicated that there will be a number of educational opportunities made available to the partnership in the coming months to keep everyone engaged. Jerry reminded the OWPP that we will seek to overlap identification of implementation methods with the revision process and that the partnership may be meeting in the coming months to pursue this option.

Partnership members agreed that it was important to continue to meet as a partnership and to offer educational opportunities to ensure that the partnership does not languish over time.

Joe indicated that the next steps will be to use the final criteria list adopted by the OWPP and the preliminary weighting system to create the initial Priority Area maps. MORPC staff will immediately begin mapping following the July 29th meeting. MORPC hopes to complete preliminary mapping by the end of September.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm.