

**Olentangy Watershed Planning Partnership**

**Meeting of Wednesday, March 24, 2010  
The Willis Building, Delaware, Ohio  
Meeting Summary**

Attendees:

*Partner Communities*

James Andres, Brown Township  
Dave Betz, City of Powell  
Lynda Bitar, City of Worthington  
John Carter, City of Columbus  
Dave Efland, City of Delaware  
Roger Groll, Richland Township  
Scott Hale, Pleasant Township  
Jim Hatten, Oxford Township  
Beth Hugh, Orange Township  
David Hull, City of Columbus  
Brian McCombs, City of Delaware  
Matthew Shad, City of Upper Arlington  
Mark Wilson, Pleasant Township  
Warren Zachman, Richland Township

*Stakeholders*

Rita Au, Preservation Parks  
Amy Dutt, Friends of the Lower Olentangy Watershed  
Tiffany Jenkins, Delaware County  
Ed Miller, Delaware Soil and Water Conservation District  
Carrie Morrow, Franklin County Metro Parks  
Scott Sanders, Delaware County Regional Planning Commission  
Jim Schimmer, Franklin County  
Laura Shinn, OSU Facilities, Operations and Development  
Dan Stewart, Marion County Regional Planning Commission  
Brandi Whetstone, Ohio Sierra Club

*MORPC Staff*

Chester Jourdan, Executive Director  
Jerry Tinianow, Director of the Center for Energy and Environment  
Laura Koprowski, Director of Public & Government Affairs  
Erin Grushon, Planner  
Joseph Kitchen, Planner  
Annie McCabe, GIS Specialist

The meeting was called to order by Jerry Tinianow at 4:00 p.m. After a round of introductions, the agenda was approved without change. The [draft Meeting Ground Rules](#) were reviewed and approved without change.

Chester Jourdan made opening remarks emphasizing the importance of the balanced growth planning process, thanking the participants and emphasizing that this would be their process and their plan.

Joe Kitchen and Erin Grushon led participants in a discussion of the process of (a) defining goals of the planning process, (b) defining Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs), Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and, if the Partnership chooses to include them, Priority Agricultural Areas (PAAs), and (c) choosing criteria to support the designation of PCAs, PDAs and (if chosen) PAAs. They used a [PowerPoint presentation](#) that will be available to participants on the MORPC web site.

Key questions and points raised by the audience during this discussion included the following:

*If a floodplain is included in an area designated as a PCA, does this result in greater restrictions than are provided by current law?* – Not necessarily – this would depend on what implementation processes the Partnership chooses to recommend for protection and enhancement of PCAs. In addition, the Partnership cannot enact regulations or restrictions, but can merely recommend how PCAs should be managed. It might, for example, recommend that communities include the designated PCA/ PDA and possible PAA areas in Master Plans.

*How will the balanced growth plan affect Master Plans already in place?* – Existing plans will not be thrown out, but the planning process may result in a recommendation to amend existing plans.

*Is the Partnership going to try to force partner communities to implement the balanced growth plan through some sort of enforcement activity?* – No, there is no enforcement, no “green police,” no “tickets” issued for violations. Each community’s governing body decides how to implement the final plan. We do ask the partners to endorse the final plan, and if we win endorsement from over 75 percent of the Partnership (by number of partners, population and land area) there will be incentives from state agencies to assist with implementation.

*So if there is no enforcement, what is the point of participating in the planning process, particularly if we already have a master plan?* – We will take a watershed-wide look at existing and future plans to understand how they are all connected. Partners can seek to influence choices made in other communities so as to produce a better overall result for the region as a whole, and can coordinate adjustments to Master Plans if they choose to do so. We are planning for a better region to benefit every community in the region.

During this discussion, MORPC staff agreed to provide directions on how to locate a previously-endorsed balanced growth plan that included “overlap areas” where PCAs and PDAs overlapped. Staff also agreed to find out what role the Farm Bureau and Soil and Water Conservation Districts had in designating PAAs.

At the end of this discussion, Jerry identified the next tasks for the Partnership:

- Decide whether to adopt one or more goal statements, and if we choose to do so, select the wording of the goal(s);
- Decide whether to designate PAAs;
- Choose the definitions of PCAs, PDAs and (if chosen) PAAs;
- Select the criteria that will be used to designate PCAs, PDAs and (if chosen) PAAs, and decide how the chosen criteria will be applied to reach the final designations.

The participants then discussed how the Partnership could move forward to complete these tasks. After considering several possibilities, the Partnership decided that Staff will come up with a survey to send to each Partner Community to find out what goal statements and area designations (similar to PCAs, PDAs and PAAs) exist in the master plans of communities that have them, and will provide a matrix of this information to guide the Partnership in selecting goals and definitions that reflect the common themes in existing community plans.

The Partnership agreed that its next meeting would be on a Thursday afternoon late in April, from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., at a location to be selected in Worthington. [The next meeting will be on Thursday, April 29 from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. at a location TBD in Worthington.]

Jerry concluded the meeting by announcing that the Staff hoped to organize some non-business meetings on educational topics that would be of interest to the Partnership, such as the regional transportation system, local food, water quality, etc. Staff also hoped to organize one or more tours of the Olentangy Watershed. Jerry requested suggestions for such programs.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.