

Upper Scioto Watershed Planning Partnership
Full Partnership Meeting
Meeting of Tuesday, February 22, 2011
Dublin Municipal Building
Council Chambers
5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, OH 43017
Meeting Summary

USPP Meeting Attendees:

Partner Communities

Steve Langworthy, Dublin
Bill Lynch, Millcreek Township
Pat Monahan, Shawnee Hills
Justin Goodwin, Dublin
Janell Thomas, Washington Township
Greg DeLong, Marysville
Ron Miller, Dover Township
Scott Fulton, Franklin County
John Carter, Columbus
Tracy Hatmaker, Prairie Township

Stakeholders

Jenny Snapp, LUC Regional Planning
Kaylee Port, Union County SWCD
Bill Narducci, Union County Engineer's Office
Lorraine Winters, Columbus
Kim Martin, Metro Parks

MORPC Staff

Jerry Tinianow, CEE Director
Joseph Kitchen, Associate Planner
Brandi Whetstone, Outreach Coordinator

For the most up to date information including the next meeting date, time and location, previous meeting slides and minutes, please visit our website at <http://balancedgrowthplanning.morpc.org> and click on your watershed or contact Joe Kitchen at jkitchen@morpc.org

Joe welcomed the full Upper Scioto Planning Partnership meeting attendees to the February 22, 2011 meeting and the group proceeded with a round of introductions. The group was reminded that there would be a free educational Watersheds 101 event directly following the business meeting with Union County SWCD and a Columbus Watershed Manager presenting on issues affecting the Upper Scioto watershed.

Joe gave a summary of the meeting agenda and indicated to the partnership that the main goal of the meeting was to adopt a finalized Priority Area criteria list for the Upper Scioto Planning Partnership (USPP). The criteria list that the Upper Scioto Planning Partnership has shaped and adopted will then be the basis for Priority Area maps that our technical staff will create for communities in the partnership. The USPP Steering Committee met in late November of last year to develop a list of criteria recommendations to provide to the full USPP. In the interim, MORPC staff checked the availability of data sources for each of the Priority Area criteria through follow up calls and meetings in addition to consultation with data keepers at MORPC.

The group was briefly reminded of the general Balanced Growth Planning process and also reminded that there will be financial and technical assistance incentives from state agencies for endorsed Balanced Growth plans available to communities participating in the plan. Prior to opening the floor to the partnership communities and stakeholders for a discussion of the criteria, Joe reviewed the Balanced Growth Plan goals and the three Priority Area definitions that the USPP drafted and adopted at a previous meeting. Joe reminded the partners that the criteria the partnership adopts will be used to create draft maps and that the draft maps are a broad-brush stroke across the watershed at a regional scale. The draft maps will be distributed to communities in the future so that communities can make revisions to the maps during the local review process. The partnership explored an example of local review and revision from one of the past endorsed Balanced Growth plans from the Village of Woodmere.

To assist the Upper Scioto Planning Partnership in making their final decisions regarding which criteria to adopt as the official mapping criteria, watershed-wide maps were created based on the initial recommendations of the USPP Steering Committee. These criteria maps highlighted the coverage for some of the criteria to provide partners an opportunity to better gauge criteria coverage. Corridor Management Zones (CMZ) were the first example. A USPP partner community spoke briefly about what a CMZ was. The partner mentioned that the zones were created to protect the local drinking water supply, which includes a 600 foot corridor. One community mentioned that they do monitoring and identify potential sources of pollution within those zones. Several other criteria maps were highlighted and summarized as well to demonstrate the different Priority Area criteria.

The group then turned to criteria finalization and adoption. Joe pulled up the criteria list recommendations developed by the USPP Steering Committee for the full USPP to consider. Joe suggested taking a look at the criteria that have particular issues that need to be addressed first and then moving on to the rest of the criteria, but welcomed the partnership to suggest an alternative course of action. The partnership agreed to move forward in the suggested manner.

The partnership first took a look at the recommended Priority Conservation Area (PCA) criteria list developed by the Steering Committee. Covered bridges were discussed first and the partnership suggested including a 100-foot buffer around the covered bridges as the criterion. There was general consensus among the group to do so. The next criterion the partnership considered was "scenic roads" and Joe asked the partnership what kind of "buffer" they would like to establish around the scenic roads to capture land area as part of

the criteria assessment. The partnership considered what another watershed partnership did and it was decided that they would use the right-of-way plus a one-foot buffer to capture the parcels that run adjacent to the scenic roads.

The USPP then turned to the Priority Development Area (PDA) criteria list recommendations. Major roads and road classification were discussed. The partners asked what data source would be used and they were told that we use ODOT classification. It was suggested that partners consider local plans and consult with their county engineer during the local review process to supplement this data. The partnership considered two options for the roadway criterion. There was discussion about whether we are driving linear development along roadways. The partnership decided to eliminate having two different roadway criteria and elected to use "Major Roads (Arterial)" excluding limited access highways with a ¼ mile buffer with a "low" weight.

The group discussed the "improvement to land value ratio" and the benefit to including such a criterion in urbanized areas to reduce the labor required of urban areas during the local review and the manner in which such a criterion would encourage infill and brownfield redevelopment. The partnership decided to give a low weight based on the variation between auditor information and values that may not be reflected from foreclosures.

Priority Agriculture Areas (PAA) were discussed next. NRCS soils data was used to identify prime farmland. Several partners mentioned that Union County is mostly tilled prime farmland. The partnership decided to use one criterion for the soils data entitled "Prime Farmland and Prime Farmland if well-drained". Agricultural Security Areas (ASA) were removed from the PAA criteria list because none exist in the Upper Scioto watershed planning area at present so it would not impact the analysis. The partnership considered adding in Century Farms as a PAA criterion and the group agreed that they would include it. Century farms are an ODA preservation program and recognize farms that have been in the same family for over 100 years.

Suggestions were made by the partnership to give high priority to local plans to reflect the efforts of local communities. There was general consensus among the partnership to do so and the local plans were weighted higher.

John Carpenter made a motion to adopt the criteria list as the final USPP criteria list. Tracy Hatmaker seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of adopting the criteria list.

Joe briefly reviewed the next steps, explaining that MORPC would analyze the criteria the partnership adopted using GIS and would create draft maps for local review. He also explained that there is a little bit of flexibility built into the weighting system. The partnership has established weights (low, medium, or high) for each criterion. Those weights will be translated into scores ranging from 1-3 for criteria weighted low, 4-6 for criteria weighted medium, and 7-9 for criteria weighted high. Initially, MORPC's technical staff will use the middle of each scoring range (2 for low, 5 for medium, and 8 for high). However, if the maps need some adjustment, we may ask the Upper Scioto Steering Committee to meet again to review the progress and to assist MORPC staff in adjusting the individual scores within the

established scoring ranges. All of the criteria would maintain scores within the range related to the weight established by the partnership. For example, the Steering Committee could suggest changing the score of a criterion weighted as medium from 5 to 6, but could not change the score to anything in the low (1-3) or high (7-9) ranges. This process is slightly different than what we used in the Olentangy watershed, but it should help us avoid some of the initial problems we had with the Olentangy maps and should prevent us from having to bring together the full partnership multiple times to make minor tweaks during the analysis.

The partnership requested that the final criteria list be sent to the full partnership following the meeting. Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:00 p.m.