

Upper Scioto Watershed Planning Partnership  
Meeting of Thursday, September 30, 2010  
Dublin Council Chambers  
Dublin Municipal Building  
5200 Emerald Parkway  
Dublin, OH 43017  
Meeting Summary

Attendees:

*Partner Communities*

Greg Delong, Marysville  
Linda Rosine, Grove City  
Harold Henson, Walnut Township (Pickaway County)  
Yvonne Clippinger, Shawnee Hills  
Steve Langworthy, Dublin  
Janell Thomas, Washington Township (Franklin County)  
Jamie Adkins, Dublin  
Scott Fulton, Franklin County Economic Development & Planning  
Mike Brake, York Township (Union County)  
Justin Goodwin, Dublin  
Joe Clase, Millcreek Township (Union County)  
John Kuss, Grandview Heights  
Tracy Hatmaker, Prairie Township (Franklin County)

*Stakeholders*

Don Glosser, Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce  
Kaylee Port, Union County

*MORPC Staff*

Joseph Kitchen, Associate Planner  
Erin Grushon, Associate Planner  
Amy Lowe, Membership Coordinator

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 working with the Upper Scioto Planning Partnership (USPP) to establish ground rules for partnership meetings.

Then, Erin reviewed the overarching tentative schedule for the development of the Upper Scioto Balanced Growth Plan and reviewed the process and components of Balanced Growth Planning. Joe showed examples of potential Priority Area criteria and also went through the criteria list created by the Olentangy Watershed Planning Partnership. Following

the review, Joe reminded voting members that their communities needed to pass and submit a resolution to participate, if they had not done so already, by **Thanksgiving (November 25, 2010)**. Joe provided the partnership with a draft [resolution](#) to assist the partnership in this process.

Next, Joe explained two potential models for how the partnership could operate throughout the planning process. In the first model, the partnership would form a steering committee that had the power to make some decisions (goals, definitions, etc.), allowing the full partnership to meet less frequently. In the second model, the partnership would form a steering committee that could only make recommendations, requiring the full partnership to continue meeting regularly throughout the process. Joe noted that, in either case, anyone could volunteer to serve on the steering committee and all voting members would still vote on the final maps and final Balanced Growth Plan. The meeting attendees discussed the two models and raised the following questions:

*Q: Can anyone attend the steering committee meetings?*

A: Yes, anyone from the Upper Scioto Watershed Planning Partnership may attend the steering committee Meetings. They may participate in the meeting but only steering committee members may vote.

*Q: How many votes per community are allowed on the steering committee?*

A: Each community is limited to 1 vote on the steering committee.

In addition to these questions, the steering committee discussion included comments from many participants. One member expressed a concern that communities who join the partnership later (Thanksgiving is deadline to join) would not have a say in the decisions being made now. Members also discussed and questioned the make-up and voting structure of the steering committee. Joe explained that the steering committee would be made up of volunteers from the full partnership and that everyone would have the opportunity to volunteer. More than one member from each community would be permitted to participate or attend meetings, but each community would be limited to one vote on the steering committee. Joe also explained that, with the Olentangy Watershed Planning Partnership, decisions were often made by consensus and formal voting was not always used.

However, due to the interest in the voting structure of the steering committee, MORPC staff agreed to send out an email explanation of who would be eligible to participate and vote on the Upper Scioto Steering Committee. The steering committee will decide how to address the issue of representation on the steering committee for those communities that sign on later.

The partnership then decided that they preferred the model where the steering committee is able to make decisions. Joe said that he would send out a request asking for volunteers to serve on the steering committee. We agreed to post all future meeting dates, times and locations for the Steering Committee meetings on the [website](#). It is the responsibility of the

full partnership to check the website if they would like to attend the steering committee meetings.

At the meeting, the partnership also decided that they did want to start off the Balanced Growth Planning process with goal(s) and that they did want to include Priority Agricultural Areas in their plan.

Joe suggested that the meeting attendees begin brainstorming ideas for goals with the time remaining. Then, the steering committee would have some input from the full partnership when they meet to finalize the goals. Joe mentioned the possibility of sending out a brief survey to collect information about goals that are already established in existing community plans throughout the watershed. Attendees agreed with this idea. One member indicated that she would like MORPC to send out a goals survey so that she could get the planner for her community involved in the goals discussion. Joe agreed and said that he would send out a survey about goals to the partner communities.

Joe pulled up a list of potential draft goal statements and the partnership discussed them. Joe explained that the draft goal statements were based on common themes found in central Ohio community plans and could be used as a starting point when the Upper Scioto Steering Committee meets to finalize the goal(s) for the USPP.

There was a positive response to all of the draft goal statements and it was decided that the steering committee would use both the draft goal statements and the results of the goals survey when they meet to finalize the goals. One member commented that she preferred a paragraph goal statement to a list of multiple statements because it leads the reader to believe that one goal was not more important to the others.

In addition to the draft goal statements presented, members suggested that agriculture needed to be considered and that the partnership should include ecology in its goal(s). Another member commented on the importance of preserving the rural character and urban vitality throughout different parts of the watershed. Finally, a member noted that the partnership needed to consider a respect of private property rights if they wanted to gain general support for this plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.