

**Communities of the Future Advisory Committee (CFAC)
Fourth General Meeting Notes
Prepared by Hamilton County Planning & Development**

December 16, 2010
MSD Administrative Center, Room 104/105
10 – 11:45am

Attendance:

John Lyons	Jennifer O'Donnell
John Aldrich	Marilyn Wall
Kelly Kuhbander	Marybeth Grew
Ward Wilson	Sam Stephens
Dave Gamstetter	Denise Driehaus
Sam McKinley	William Shuster
Laith Alfaqih	Cameron Ross
Sharon Jean-Baptiste	Larry Falkin
Brewster Rhoads	Mary Stagaman
Kathy Schwab	Samantha Brackfield
Robin Corathers	Brooke Furio
Jon Grosshans	Biju George
Tony Parrott	Deb Leonard
Dean Niemeyer	Brian Wamsley
MaryLynn Lodor	Chad Edwards
Margo Warminski	

Tony Parrott – Welcome, Announcements and Updates

Dean Niemeyer—Lick Run Open House

Dean Niemeyer from Hamilton County Planning and Development informed the Committee that there would be eight topic stations (e.g. What is the Challenge? What is MSD's Proposed Solutions, etc) at the Lick Run Open House on January 19, 2011. He said the stations would be staffed by MSD employees and volunteers from the Committee. He requested that the Committee members take time after the meeting to review and offer comments on the draft Open House Posters in an adjacent room.

John Aldrich – Value Engineering Study

John Aldrich from Tetra Tech Engineering presented the preliminary findings from the Value Engineering Study and in general supported the approach that MSD is taking towards solving the Consent Decree and Lick Run. John said that a more formal final report should be available in late January or February.

Someone in the audience asked John about the VE studies cost matrix comparing the four alternatives. John stated in the presentation that all four alternatives would cost approximately the same in the end, disregarding external cost and benefits, and community goals. This surprised some in the audience because many believe that in general, green projects are more affordable than grey. John pointed out that the green project factored in four more "to-be-determined" projects in other watersheds to compare apples to apples. Someone in the audience was wondering if this factored in long-term

maintenance costs and energy usage as well. John stated that energy usage was an important reason for ultimately choosing a more green solution.

U.S. EPA Project Integration

Bill Schuster from Ohio EPA described the on-going Union Terminal Vision Plan and the opportunity that this presents for us to link stormwater controls. He discussed the EPA's creation of a national pilot program to evaluate "green plus grey" solutions. He believed that Lick Run was too late to be considered for this grant. He also mentioned that the Lick Run Project would be the first daylighting of a CSO. However, three other municipal sewer entities are looking at doing similar projects on a smaller scale to solve their Consent Decrees.

Region 5 – Planning Assessment

Jon Grosshans from US EPA Region 5 discussed the EPA's evaluation of the potential Lick Run Project. He also asked for "one-liner" feedback from each of the attendees on the biggest challenge that needs to be addressed. He then distributed forms with a series of questions to collect planning input.

Comments from the audience on the challenges that need to be addressed included:

- Need to look into securing open space easements and hillside protection
- Need to establish a "lead agency" to start preparing for the community engagement
- Community members of South Fairmount believe that there's really not much community left, so it's hard to know who to talk to
- Members from the business community in South Fairmount are resistant to change
- We need to figure out the energy implications and opportunities, like does it save a lot when we handle stormwater without sending it all through the treatment plants?
- This could be the next "Banks Project," with the first really sustainable community built in the Lick Run area
- We have trouble figuring out how to truly engage people at the household level
- We should be communicating with the public more often even if we are telling them that we still do not have all the answers. We want to manage their emotions through more frequent communication.
- We need to keep educating the public about wet weather problems and solutions.
- We need to be more transparent and more communicative. This project has the capability of creating jobs and transforming community.
- We need to educate and convince the public that the environmental benefits are worth the costs- as other cities have done successfully.

Notes taken by Brooke Furio from US EPA Region 5, on the challenges ahead:

1. Designing more source control solutions at the top of hill and removing it before it enters the combined sewers.
2. State rep; messaging is critical to get the public to understand that this has to happen and we are going to pay for it one way or another and the green way is the better way. Belief in South Fairmount neighborhood that this will be a great challenge. Trust of government is something that has to be overcome. Community meetings are critical. We value the input of the current residents.
3. Will the current transportation needs of the community be accommodated during the construction phase? How will we alleviate inconveniences to the public?

4. Consent Decree demands that 85% of overflow has to be dealt with. Can we educate and convince the public to go farther to protect the environment with this project
5. Major transportation corridor without other opportunities has left very little community left to work with.
6. Energy efficiency greater Cincinnati energy alliance can play a role on retrofitting buildings
7. Transportation opportunities “public” transit oriented development opportunity. Key is to get everyone at the table to get their input
8. Possibility to get open space easements on the hillside to accommodate tree reforestation
9. East side will help us with bigger project
10. Have to understand the actual plan for the donut hole will get more buy in.
11. Keep existing business in corridor will help get buy in and grow the ED piece that has not been yet well addressed
12. So far, the leader has been MSD, but many of the other opportunities will have to be led by other organizations, because of organizations responsibilities. We need to plan the transition so that others get out in front and take the lead on this project.
13. What does the future look like to get a common platform?
14. Currently, there is a lack of infrastructure to implement this type of community strategy. MSD cannot provide that capacity, some other entity will have to pick up and leverage the MSD investment.
15. At the December South Fairmount community council-meeting residents said, there is no community in South Fairmount, the community is dead. So how do we get the remaining business and residence that involved? How do we find those people willing to invest time into this project?
16. Need to communicate more with the private sector community and non-profits.
17. Chad Edwards on the phone, disputes a bit about what the community in South Fairmount is and how to educate them on what is possible for the future. What is a possible realistic vision?
18. Connection not identified, what are the energy implications of the project, are their renewable energy opportunities. Long-term energy demands, what are the consequences?
19. This could be an impactful project for the whole region. This project could become the first planned sustainable neighborhood in Cincinnati. It could be a model for region and nation.
20. Challenge and opportunity for a model for how to do this work and fully engage with a community that is in place. Currently we do not have a ready means at HUD to get to a grass roots level/household level so that decisions are made collectively with all engage and build capacity over time to make decisions now and in the future
21. Preventive measure, sometimes open houses and charrettes sometimes are a turn off because the plans are so vague and the benefits are too vague and the locals do not get the technical jargon. We need a simple message like “what is in it for me.”
22. Use MaryLynn’s simple talking points. This project has a lot of info, how to break it down simply. Develop a road map to simplicity for the public outreach.
23. By separating into small sections at the Open House, the overall community does not hear the whole discussions because comments would be separated by topics. Therefore, the overall community does not hear all of what was discussed. We should take time at the end to communicate the overall conversation to the whole group.

West Fork Watershed Source Control

Kelly Kuhbander from Strand Associates led a group exercise that allowed the attendees to explore source control solutions in the West Fork Watershed. Preliminary data and maps were handed out to assist the attendees. The attendees divided into four small groups, discussed the opportunities for ten to fifteen minutes and then presented their findings.

The small groups recommended:

- building three retention/detention ponds in the middle of Mt. Airy park
- creating a naturalized stream in the floodplain along West Fork Road
- creating a socio/economic watershed project around Fay Apartments, which would complement the owner's goal of becoming a LEED-ND certified project
- creating complete streets that include stormwater planters in the dense areas of South Cumminsville and Northside
- continue the reforestation in the right-of-way of major streets
- assist owners in Northside who are interested in green roofs with technical and financial help
- Create larger-scale detention/retention at the downstream corner of Mt. Airy Forest
- Recreate wetlands in the West Fork floodplain