APPENDIX A – List of Maps*

- Regional Setting
- Eastern Corridor Focus Areas
- Summary Analysis of Development Constraints
- Topography and Flood Hazards
- Slopes
- Land Cover (1994)
- Open Space
- Open Space Inventory
- Soil Building Limitations
- Hydric Soils
- Forest Cover (by Age)
- Vegetation Quality and Forest Type
- Wetlands
- Rare Species
- Sole Aquifer and Wellhead Protection Areas
- Eastern Corridor – Existing Land Use
- Eastern Corridor – Zoning
- Eastern Corridor Cultural Resources -- Historic Sites
- Eastern Corridor Cultural Resources -- Architectural sensitivity
- Eastern Corridor Cultural Resources -- Historic Railroad Corridors
- Eastern Corridor Cultural Resources -- Archeological Sites
- Eastern Corridor Infrastructure -- Electric
- Eastern Corridor Infrastructure -- Sanitary Sewer
- Eastern Corridor Infrastructure -- Water
- Eastern Corridor Infrastructure -- Natural Gas
- Focus Areas – Wasson
- Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan – Wasson Focus Area
- Focus Areas – Red Bank
- Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan – Red Bank Focus Area
- Focus Areas – Wooster
- Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan – Wooster Focus Area
- Focus Areas – Ohio 32
- Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan – Ohio 32Focus Area
- Focus Areas – Eastern Avenue / Lunken
- Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan – Eastern Avenue / Lunken Focus Area
- Focus Areas – River Plains
- Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan – River Plains
- Eastern Corridor Infrastructure --School District Boundaries
- Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan

*** Appendix A Maps contained in separate document**

APPENDIX B – Vision Group Meetings

Vision Group Meeting #1 - 2/7/01

- Meeting Summary
- Small Group Work
  - Initial Reactions/Hopes/Fears
- Comment Card Summary

Vision Group Meeting #2 - 2/21/01

- Meeting Summary
- Strength, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats Exercise Results
  - Community & Natural Resources
  - Natural & Cultural Resources
  - Infrastructure
  - Economic Development
- Preliminary Themes

Vision Group Meeting #3 - 3/7/01

- Meeting Summary
- SWOT Analysis Comments
- Prioritization of Opportunities
- *Revised* Preliminary Themes

Vision Group Meeting #4 - 5/29/01

- Meeting Summary
- Vision Group *Preference Survey* Responses (by Focus Area)

Vision Group Meeting #5 - 6/4/01

- Meeting Summary
- Small Group Land Use Vision Consensus Discussion

Vision Group Meeting #6 - 7/25/01

- Meeting Summary

Vision Group Meeting #7 - 10/24/01

- Meeting Summary
- Group Comments Regarding Focus Areas

Vision Group Meeting #8 - 4/4/02

- Meeting Summary

VISION COMMITTEE MEETING #1
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, February 7, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:10 p.m.
ATTENDEES: COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	Shelia Adams, Tom Albers, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Marty Bartlett, Harry Blanton, Liz Blume, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Mark Caesar, Kent Cashell, Dot Christenson, Gary Conley, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Ben Dotson, John Dowlin, Bette Evanshine, Paul Fox, Ken Geis, James Gradolf, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Carl Hartman, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Johnathan Holifield, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Lin Laing, Bill Lane, Kathy Meinke, Bill Miller, Pat Mitchell, Phil Montanus, Dory Montazemi, Melissa O'Farrell, Eric Partee, Doug Peters, Ron Regula, Peggy Reis, Tim Reynolds, Gwen Robinson, Don Rostofer, Rob Rubin, Eric Russo, Tom Ryther, Michael Self, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Eric Stuckey, Jim Taylor, Kathy Tyler, Matt Van Sant, Mary Walker, Donald Washington, Randy Welker, Robert Wendel, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ron Yeager, Dave Zaidain
ALTERNATES IN ATTENDANCE:	Suzanne Hopkins, Susan Olsen, Rick Toepfer, Tim Zelek
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Thomas Carch (spelling?), Clark Carmichael, Richard Combs, Ron Doctor, Ted Hubbard, LarryJacobson, Betsy Pierce, Patricia Strassel, William Showers,
PROJECT TEAM ATTENDING:	Barry Dalton, Quentin Davis, Doug Devine, Rick Record, Linda Fabe, Kellie Grob, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Paul Smiley, Bryan Snyder, Caroline Statkus, Dan Wagenmaker, Stacey Weaks , Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To begin to learn what the Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Planning (ECLUVP) project is about
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Notebooks
ASSIGNMENTS:	**Mission Statement revisions**: John Deatrick, Tom Ryther, Leonard Harding **Focus Area Photography:** ▪ *Eastern Avenue*: Phil Montanus, John Deatrick ▪ *Riverlands*: Eric Partee, Eric Russo ▪ *Wasson*: Mike Self, Bette Evanshine ▪ *Ohio 32*: Tom Hoft, Ken Geis ▪ *Red Bank*: Mark Caesar, Henry Blanton ▪ *Wooster*: Eric Russo, Jim Grandolf
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Results of small group work ▪ Comment Card Summary ▪ Vision Committee Contact list ▪ Vision Planning Team Contact List ▪ ERA PowerPoint Presentation Summary ▪ Balke PowerPoint Presentation Summary ▪ Meisner + Associates PowerPoint Presentation Summary
NEXT STEPS:	**Homework Assignments:** ▪ Review Tab #1 materials ▪ Below is a list of brief informative articles from the project notebook. We recommend that you become familiar with the ideas and concepts as they will help you to better understand the scope of the vision planning process. Please refer to Chapter and articles listed below. Feel free to read additional articles. ▪ 4C. The Evolution of Corridor Planning ▪ 5B. The Gallis Gauntlet ▪ 5C. Economics Urge Regional Partnerships ▪ 6E. Best Land Use Practices ▪ 7A. Redevelopment ▪ 8B. In Transit Gloria: How the Mass Transportation Connection Works ▪ 9D. Smart Transportation for Smart Growth ▪ 10B. Why Cities will Thrive in the Information Age ▪ 11A. Economics ▪ 11B. Financing ▪ 12E. Building Green Infrastructure ▪ 13B. Why Preserve Green Space

Small Group Discussion – Meeting 1

Black Group

Participants: Suzanne Hopkins, Mike Self, Phil Montanus, Dot Christenson, Rob Rubin, Kathy Tyler

What:

- Concerns among all jurisdictions important to obtain goals
- We must live with what's there—fixed assets i.e. River, airport, factories, waterworks
- Area is already rural and tends to be difficult with r/t universal acceptance
- East side vs. west side fallout—what about west side? All energy on east side.
- Need continuous improvement—redevelopment
- Need more diversity

Fear:

- People may drop out of process
- 15 months may be too long
  - need to see progress
  - list of tasks get smaller
  - checklist as we go!
- Plan important—mistakes happen without
- Time of meeting 4-7? Or other more accommodating
- Inclusion of people with disabilities in <u>all</u> matters

Blue Group

Participants: Ron Docter, Richard Hoekzema, Eric Partee, Hans Jindal, Harry Blanton, Tom Hoft

Reaction & Questions:

- Thoughtful effort—a lot
- *Lot of information in short time (ability to follow it?)
- Questions regarding Oasis project (not explained at meeting)
- Suggested a field trip (some people not familiar)
- Questions about assumptions regarding need for highway without land use input
- Great opportunity to look at land use planning & transportation at same time (to control land use now, before problem)
- Need meeting schedule, how to come to options

Which options to apply to all groups (Greenspace, etc.)

Green Group

Participants: Paul Fox, Robert Wendel, Tim Zelek, Marty Bartlett, Barry Dalton, Dan Wagenmaker (ERA)

- Rail Development
  - Use & ridership?
  - Density development (new)
  - Electric rail vs. diesel rail
    - Environmental effect of both
- Group Breakdown
  - Diversity of focus groups
  - Participation—community?
- Intermodal
  - Bike trails included?
  - Buses & airport route
  - Highway route
  - Special interest spot bus routes
- Thinking & planning now for future
- Wetlands/environmental
  - Watch out for environmental bias

Orange Group

Participants: Ken Geis, Matt Van Sant, Catherine Wuerdeman, Donald Washington, Dave Spinney

What:

- Improved transportation linkages for jobs
- *Economic impacts on outlying schools
- Relieve congestion –more efficient transportation linkages
- We can make and/or choices related to transportation and economic development
- We have a chance to exact a positive transportation system—not leaving it to chance
- Transportation system built on prior land use study plan

Concerns:

- Concerned about $
- Is there <u>really</u> an opportunity to change the current plan?
- Sharing the cost of transportation improvements
- Whether or not the current plan is concrete
- Decision-making—can consensus be reached in a group this size?

Purple Group

Participants: Jim Taylor, Len Harding, Tom Ryther, Eric Russo, Melissa O'Farrell, Marie Huenfeld, Jim Gradolf, Susan Olson

B.1. Reaction & Questions:

- Transportation is big issue –how to solve without disrupting everything else
- If you build transportation, you start limiting land use options
- Transportation brings people into area
- Economic development will increase as transportation options increase
- Land use as relates to transportation and new revitalized business
- Transportation to serve land use—land is the driver
- Land use decisions as relates to economically & environmentally sustainable transportation decisions
- Role of landscape & form as it relates to transportation & land use

B.2. How to work together:

- By consensus for working together
- Is there willingness to compromise
- Development driven by economics & group must be realistic, but there is need for vision
- Critical to see big picture—work as group, not just focusing on our own local needs

Red Group

Participants: Ted Hubbarel (Ham. Co.), John Deatrick (City), Kathy Meinke (CG&E), Randy Welker (CoC), Marc Caesar (5/3rd), Doug Peters (MSD), Emily Witte (HCRPC)

Reactions & Questions:

What does this project mean to me?

- Land use & transportation & workforce & brownfields & new housing & environmental protection enhance regions' competitiveness
- Untapped potential—diverse areas!
- Potential for infill & reinventing both brownfields & suburban zones--~Eastgate~~Batavia
- Create balance with greenspace & development in this vision
- Multi-modal; transportation opportunities
- Regional socio-economic issues/integration
- Don't repeat sprawl problems
- We must do something—not wait (as per Gallis)
- Let's start with dealing with Red Bank focus area & Fairfax & City & County project
- Deal with Duck Creek, Corp & flooding
- Foster intergovernmental cooperation!

Comment Card Summary – Meeting 1

Hopes	Fears
The balanced transportation & environmental Approach carries through to the implementation.	This will deteriorate into an interchange (32) project & highway and just be enhanced sprawl.
That the momentum of this vision is substantial & that positive approaches to transportation problems are addressed in the most economic way	
Not waste time –tag team with other people from my company on Focus Group	Deadlock Endless debates
Nice office/light industrial park that is sensitive to local issues	Entrenched positions
Think about meeting at 2 different times. Could have professionals at earlier time, neighborhoods at another time—then have joint meeting.	

VISION GROUP MEETING #2
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, February 21, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
VISION GROUP MEMBERS: ATTENDEES:	Shelia Adams, Tom Albers, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Marty Bartlett, Harry Blanton, Liz Blume, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Mark Caesar, Kent Cashell, Dot Christenson, Gary Conley, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Ben Dotson, John Dowlin, Bette Evanshine, Paul Fox, Ken Geis, James Gradolf, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Carl Hartman, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Johnathan Holifield, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Lin Laing, Bob Lane, Kathy Meinke, Bill Miller, Pat Mitchell, Phil Montanus, Dory Montazemi, Melissa O'Farrell, Eric Partee, Doug Peters, Todd Portune, Ron Regula, Peggy Reis, Tim Reynolds, Gwen Robinson, Don Rostofer, Rob Rubin, Eric Russo, Tom Ryther, Michael Self, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Jim Taylor, Kathy Tyler, Matt Van Sant, Mary Walker, Donald Washington, Randy Welker, Robert Wendel, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ron Yeager, Dave Zaidain,
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Paul Astles, Bill Baker, Dick Carleton, Ron Docter, Suzanne Hopkins, Ted Hubbard, Ken Kamphaus, Susan Olsen, Rick Toepfer, Tim Zelek
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Batty Baker, Daniel Hendrick, Reginald Victor, Jon West
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Kellie Grob, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Rick Record, Paul Smiley, Bryan Snyder, Caroline Statkus, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To continue to learn what the Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Planning (ECLUVP) project is about, and identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats within the planning area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Gallis Report Map of Focus area and political jurisdictions SWOT exercise worksheet

ASSIGNMENTS:	▪ Review Tab #1 materials
	▪ Continue to read the following list of brief informative articles from the project notebook. We recommend that you become familiar with the ideas and concepts as they will help you to better understand the scope of the vision planning process. Please refer to Chapter and articles listed below. Feel free to read additional articles.
	  ▪ 4C. The Evolution of Corridor Planning
	  ▪ 5B. The Gallis Gauntlet
	  ▪ 5C. Economics Urge Regional Partnerships
	  ▪ 6E. Best Land Use Practices
	  ▪ 7A. Redevelopment
	  ▪ 8B. In Transit Gloria: How the Mass Transportation Connection Works
	  ▪ 9D. Smart Transportation for Smart Growth
	  ▪ 10B. Why Cities will Thrive in the Information Age
	  ▪ 11A. Economics
	  ▪ 11B. Financing
	  ▪ 12E. Building Green Infrastructure
	  ▪ 13B. Why Preserve Green Space

REVISED DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. This is a plan that will be used to create an order of spending priorities, and guide the specific timing, design, and location of future multi-modal transportation and access improvements as identified by mode and method in the Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study (MIS). This plan will acknowledge the importance of and preserve our regional landscape in merging the natural and build environments. Recovering and reusing "brownfields" within the region is one way that the natural areas and landscapes can be preserved. This plan will build upon and strengthen the existing land use plans and local zoning to enhance neighborhoods, employment opportunities, ecological resources, and opportunities for mobility. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Results of small group SWOT work ▪ Planning Principles Summary ▪ Ahwahee Planning Principles ▪ Revised contact list (throw old one away)
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review **Draft Mission Statement (above)** ▪ To begin to translate the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats identified in the last meeting, into goals, objectives, and strategies ▪ To gain a broad perspective on managing future development intelligently and in a economically and environmentally sustainable manner ▪ Prepare for Focus Group work

S.W.O.T. Exercise – Meeting 2

COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES

Strengths/Opportunities

Schools:

- Good school districts across area (ie. Anderson, Forest Hills, Mariemont)****
- School influence neighborhood and community pride

Community Facilities:

- Good shopping for neighborhood*
- Internal connection good in individual villages
- Police, fire, public facilities*
- Multiple, unique neighborhood centers
- Opportunity for office development – dentist and doctors
- Variety of shopping opportunities along Beechmont Corridor
- Beechmont renewal has good potential
- Cluster and concentrate development
- Historic areas* –
    - Exploit historic character & areas ie pioneers cemetery, etc. town of Milford
- Diverse economic neighborhoods
- Planning can provide more opportunities for inclusiveness
- Most neighborhoods sheltered from main roads
- History of env. Groups & developers working together
- More innovative mixed use communities as examples*
- Mariemont good example of good planning
- Mariemont/Terrace Park/parts of Anderson twp are desirable communities
- Milford historic character + natural (river)
- Mix of uses in Milford commerce/residential
- Cooperation among jurisdictions
- People are good resource -> sense of community

Residential:

- Good mix of housing-variety throughout study area*
- Relationship of business & homes to daycare
- Good single family housing market
- Desirable housing fueled by school districts (Mariemont)
- New housing (infill) along Eastern Ave. and Walworth Ave.
- Pre-determined expansion plan for housing
- Great communities/well established (Mariemont)
- Good bedroom communities
- Lot of people/ institutions/organizations interested in QL issues
- Good housing seems to predominate -> perhaps a trend is developing

Transportation:

- Good bus transportation In some areas
- Transportation improvement will drive res. Expansion resulting in need for more public facilities
- Balanced transportation network with emphasis on rail generating jobs
- Have opportunity For diesel rail – rail already exists
- Building station in Milford

Green Space/Recreation:
- Greenspace
- Open space/recreational opportunities along river corridors
- Multiple well established neighborhoods (Hyde Park, Mt. Lookout, Farifax, etc.) along the corridor
- Link parks with bike paths
- Beautiful hillsides

Weaknesses/Threats

Community:
- Fragmented/isolated
- "pieces" have not come together
- Lack connectivity village to v. to township
- Need senior center + civic center
- Exclusivity
- Racial segregation – housing, schools, jobs
- No sense of community or centers
- Poor integration of land uses – sf housing with no parks – sf housing not close to schools
- Need to consider regional impacts – water/air
- Getting parks out of planning stage is lengthy
- Columbia Township between Mariemont and Terrace Park – lack of planning (Wooster Pike Corridor)
- Separation of res. & employment areas
- Most area is developed that is developable
- Inconsistent zoning between twps/jurisdictions: Miami/Union township sprawl easily change zoning policies (- eg Casban Excavation on Roundbottom Road)

Residential:
- Lack of affordable & accessible housing for people with disabilities especially the further east to Clermont = lack of inclusion in mainstream schools
- Not good affordable housing – not diverse enough
- Many scattered housing development
- Potential sprawling housing growing east and southeast from Newtown
- Lack of maintenance/lack of incentives for keep up older housing***

Transportation/Infrastructure:
- Roadways built to edge of curb/buildings-most major roads/Eastern Ave.
- No room to expand-- Building/development along above roads*
- Traffic @ limit, congestion*
    - Truck traffic on 561
    - Traffic cong. Beechmont & Clough
    - Congestion; hodge-podge of roads, 125, 32, 28
    - Beechmont Ave.; Rt 28 east of Milford; parts of Clough Pike
- Poor street signage
- Lack of consistent side walks, st. lights, curb cuts*
- Public transportation (metro does not serve west Clermont County)
- Transportation drives land use

Education:
- Some schools not as good

- Rising school population
- Milford school district (funding)

Economic:
- Beechmont mall weakness*
- Need to concentrate development + preserve greenspace
- Beechmont Avenue character is negative*
  - land use
  - congestion
- NIMBY

NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Strengths

*Greenspace & parks***
- Scenery
- Presidential Soccer Fields

Specific examples:
- Good job with: Hamilton County parks, Anderson parks, California Nature Preserve, Cincinnati Nature Center preserves, Lunken playfield/trail, Ohio River and Little Miami River (LMR) state and natural scenic river, recreation****
- *Little Miami bike trail linkage Cincinnati to Milford*
- *East Fork State Park and Harsha Lake*
- *Little Miami Inc. tore down 2 houses in Milford (to reclaim floodplains)*

Good cultural resources
- Appalachian heritage, African American heritage, Cultural diversity
- Neighborhood theater/arts and history; art important and performing arts
- Historical sites are important; and Pre historic archaeological sites-- Native American artifacts/mounds

Specific examples:
- *Observatory*
- *Mound Street in Milford*

Opportunities

*Greenspace & parks***
- Biketrails/bikeways
  - Lack of bike lanes on roads
  - Lack of tolerance/acceptance of/to bike riders
  - Opportunity to connect parks and recreation through bike trails, etc, historic and cultural sites
- Parks – recreation, views, passive recreation greenspace*; close to home increase recreational opportunity*; increases quality of life – reduces development along river
- Use green space as buffer between residential and high traffic areas
- If not preserved, convert agricultural to park lands
- Not enough $ to regularly maintain existing facilities
- Hills important*
  - Forested hillsides
  - Storm water control

- Air quality
- Cooling effects
- Migratory links for wildlife

Specific examples:
- Price Road great location for parks
- RR track along Eastern Ave. into bike trail = housing opportunities near natural areas

Ohio River, Little Miami River (LMR) & floodplains
- Runs through heart and is geographic focus for land use planning
- Little Miami River source of water; aquifer protection; Flood plain preservation supporting greenspace*; and natural habitats/land use process provides opportunity to preserve and protect LMR resource and to balance it w/ development; development limited; -don't screw it up
- Not all accessible to everyone; river access, etc. for all ages nature center
- Multi-agency natural resource management
- Preserves and parks const easements
- Transit system would reduce traffic flows

Specific example:
- Reclamation of Flood Plains by FEMA along Eastern Ave.

Weaknesses
- Not enough golf courses
- Greenspace limited – need more parks
- Difficult to get to natural and historic sites
- Flood plains use lot of area, Flooding

Threats
- Value of greenspace is less than developed land; land is vanishing quickly through development
- Development may threaten* natural features from infrastructure improvements:
  - Hills, unstable
  - Lost habitat/resources can't be replaced once destroyed/developed
  - Agriculture, Orchards
  - Family farms; Truck farms
  - Ecological groups may stymie smart growth
- Need coordinated plan to preserve greenspace: lack of connection of parks and recreation, bike trails
- Gravel extraction is threat to enjoyment of natural resources*

Specific example:
- *32 corridor (road)* will fragment existing natural resource and recreation areas; More traffic through river valley generated by proposed plan

INFRASTRUCTURE

Strengths/Opportunities
- light rail
- bikeways
- build north-south connectors would spur development

  - opportunity to do it right
- investigate bus service potential and connections among systems before developing light rail
- Columbia pkwy
- Lt. Rail + other public transportation to expedite traffic/reduce congestion-express routes diff. From local service
- Universal design all equipment
- Topography is a hindrance
- Integrate sewer systems
- EMS collaboration- opportunity
- Plan contiguous systems + services collaboratively
- Modernize old infrastructure
- Public properties should be good neighbors (ie CWW, eastern ave)
- Wooster Pike sewer implementation – is remove package treatment plants
- Build out sufficient (not excess) road capacity
- Existing rail lines available to meet transportation needs
- Plan areas for "ultimate" (long time growth out to 50+ years) & then build what's needed incrementally – results in smart growth for infrastructure
- Need to look far ahead, but need to keep in step with technology
- Go wireless
- Potential connect there as (not yet realized)
- Rail resources exist and are good
- Anderson has green space set aside
- Rail lines exist
- Bike trials are established
- People in this area will ride trains as opposed to buses
- Bus service can be expanded
- Good base of infrastructure in general – most need improvements/alternatives
- Possible use of existing rail lines (Wasson) – multi-modal opportunities
- Possible pedestrian trail use of L&N bridge

Weaknesses/Threats

- poor north-south connections
- access to inner city
- congestion
- septic systems in Terrace Park & many others
- public transportation between mt. Washington & milford
- timing & direction of public transit is not complete
- "stigma" of using pubic transportation
- public transportation not convenient
- connect road system to sanitary sewer, storm sewer
- Other east/west roads inadequate
- Condition + maint. Problem
- Congestion
- No direct E-W routes
- Sewer plant in center of pop. + park area
- Indecision to build infrastructure because of lack of coordinated decisions along the corridor
- Lack of a systemic view – all pieces of puzzle not together
- need to expand utilities east
- need to replace old city utilities
- existing road encourages circuitous travel (eg 471)

- No multi modal choices
- Systems not yet fully extended & consistent
- Need additional treatment capacity
- Easier local access needed
- Need to carefully protect greenspace along corridor & watershed
- More roads may lead to more 'flight' to suburbs
- Sewage problems/overloads in Clermont County
- Proposed highway alignment parallel to rail may cause rail to fail
- Increase costs of personal transportation hurt lower income + gives them less options
- Jurisdictions are allowing development to expand too rapidly for lines/ eg Union Twp, other areas in Clermont County
- High water bills in Milford
- Have to buy water from Clermont County along south side of 131 west of Wolfpen-Pleasant Hill Road
- Congested traffic
- Lack of communication/planning between communities and utilities (need better coordination)
- Overloaded infrastructure, roads/sewers
- Lack of public transit to eastern portions of Hamilton/Western Clermont counties (bus)
- Underdesigned roads along US 50
- Beechmont/US 50/Wilmer intersection
- Lack of sewer service in Eastern portion of study area (Wooster Focus Area)
- Traffic problem @ Rookwood & Milacron

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Strengths

Residential:

- Some of wealthiest neighborhoods in corridor

Employment/economic:

- Good mix of existing light industrial, offices – strength – jobs! ***
- Airport(s) Lunken & CVG**
- Has improved – eg. Milford industrial park, Bach Buxton Road

Opportunities

Residential:

- Additional housing in former Industrial sites/brownfields redevelopment
- Housing in inner core for jobs

Employment/Economic:

- Beechmont mall has potential as mixed use; mix of shopping opportunities
- Potential for brownfield redevelopment of existing built infrastructure
    - Fairfax – old Ford infill – brownfield*
    - I-71 -> Redbank Road corridor infill/brownfield
- Lunken airport is catalyst for other redevelopment: recreation & transportation components*
- Utilize existing business areas before building new ones
- Land is available
- Job growth expanding
- Magnet for "upper" professional business
- Opportunity for smart growth

- Opportunity for development in transportation corridor that serves commuters:
  - Labor pool in Adams and Brown counties, KY—I-275 access*
  - Potential to improve employment w/improved transportation W/physical accessibility
- Fairfax + west of Mariemont, Oakley, Milford (US 50&275)
- Opportunity for redevelopment of Park 50 Industrial/commercial/office/retail => strong tax base
- Have Ancor area; has potential with rail to take to higher level, infill**

Tourism/Recreation:
- Eco-tourism and tourism potential
- Scenic river + parks stimulate development + trails*
- Biketrails; trails in Lunken area as an attraction (linking clusters together)

Weaknesses

Development:
- Need more light industrial – infill development
- Excessive retail/parking lots
- Connectivity problem - needs better access
- Hodge-podge development; Unplanned/unmanaged growth; sprawl
- James River underutilized
- Businesses tend to not support jobs for nearby residents; Business doesn't match residents; high unemployment rate near neighborhoods
- Empty stores Downtown Milford
- Lack of tourism

Environmental:
- Sensitivity to floodplain area; restricts commercial development; Scenic river limits economic development

Transportation & Infrastructure:
- Lack of connector between I-275 & I-71 hinders development
- Infrastructure not adequate for further growth; poor public transportation
- Excessive # school districts in region

Threats

Development:
- Econ. Dev. Creates green space threat to watershed quality & management
- Uneven/unplanned/unsuited to residential
- Overbuilt retail and of poor character
- Open areas make sprawl too easy; too tempting
- Discipline for smart growth
- Tax base hunting
- Attitudinal barriers
- Natural competition between jurisdictions to attract businesses – self serving; No prior cooperation between jurisdictions*; Lack of legislation encouraging cooperation
- Some zoning commissions are manipulated easily (eg. By retailers)
- Eastgate overpowers Beechmont Retail
- Rookwood is overpowering Hyde Park Plaza
- Northern Kentucky is economic threat to E.C.

Environmental:
- Greenspace threat to economic health

Transportation & Infrastructure:
- Lunken airport – noise pollution; Diesel rail is a pollution source
- Redevelopment stresses infrastructure – congestion

Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis

We have taken the opportunity to synthesize the following preliminary themes, subject to review and comment by the Vision Group. Some themes represent differing perspectives within the Vision Group.

Good Schools

- Important to the vitality of neighborhoods
- Other factors are important for maintaining good schools
  - Tax base
  - Attractors (jobs, neighborhood amenities, locational attributes)

Diversity of Residential Opportunity

- Need to create more affordable housing options in diverse locations
- Need to rehabilitate older residential structures
- There is a perception that we need to more diverse in our communities

Smart Growth

- Inter-jurisdictional dialogue and cooperation are necessary in order to intelligently manage growth. There have been signs that this kind of dialogue and cooperation is starting to develop
- Environmentally sensitive areas (floodplains, wetlands, hillsides, etc.) are often perceived as limiting economic development.
- There is also the perception that economic benefit would come from preserving greenspace (intrinsic value of natural areas, recreation, scenic attractiveness, value added to adjacent properties and surrounding region, tourism, air quality, cooling, carbon sequestration, erosion control, stormwater runoff attenuation, etc.)
- Local jurisdictions and zoning officials should be well-disciplined when considering proposed changes to zoning, or the expansion of infrastructure. It is often perceived that development is approved without a long term strategic plan
- Discourage the expansion of new infrastructure at the expense of making proper repairs to the existing infrastructure (roads, sewers, etc.)
- Create livable communities with amenities such as jobs, recreation and shopping within walking distance
- Plan emergency, fire, and public safety to work effectively with the future envisioned land uses (wireless systems?)
- Ensure tax base is adequate and diverse enough to support schools

Access and Mobility

- Need to connect people to destinations (jobs, services, amenities [shopping, entertainment, other neighborhoods])
- Need a reliable, safe and convenient interconnected multi-modal access system
- Lay groundwork of fiber-optic information network to facilitate the exchange of information in a more environmentally friendly manner (similar to what is being done currently in Butler County, Ohio). This can greatly enhance opportunities for telecommuting

Economic Development

- Build on existing strengths and seize opportunities as they present themselves
- Enhance opportunity to create workplaces near local employee base (i.e., allow opportunities for people to live close to where the work)
- Maintain/enhance good base of light industrial/office land uses for jobs
- Make use of Brownfield/Infill Redevelopment Opportunities a priority
- Take advantage of higher tech job opportunities (biotechnical, software technology, communications industry, and other areas) through building on current strengths of the region (e.g., presence of very good telecommunication infrastructure, strong research university and medical facilities, high-tech manufacturing, etc.)
- Reduce the dependency on tax abatements to attract employers, at least to the extent the funding for schools and local infrastructure does not suffer

Environment

- Preserve and enhance the environmental integrity of unique local ecosystems
- Create interconnections and wildlife corridors between greenspace
- Conserve and limit the developability of certain natural areas
- Create opportunities for people to experience natural areas (parks, trails)

VISION GROUP MEETING #3
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, March 7, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
VISION GROUP MEMBERS: ATTENDEES:	Shelia Adams, Tom Albers, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Marty Bartlett, Harry Blanton, Liz Blume, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Mark Caesar, Kent Cashell, Dot Christenson, Gary Conley, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Ben Dotson, John Dowlin, Bette Evanshine, Paul Fox, Ken Geis, James Gradolf, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Carl Hartman, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Johnathan Holifield, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Lin Laing, Bob Lane, Kathy Meinke, Bill Miller, Pat Mitchell, Phil Montanus, Dory Montazemi, Melissa O'Farrell, Eric Partee, Doug Peters, Todd Portune, Ron Regula, Peggy Reis, Tim Reynolds, Gwen Robinson, Don Rostofer, Rob Rubin, Eric Russo, Tom Ryther, Michael Self, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Daniel Startsman, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Jim Taylor, Kathy Tyler, Matt Van Sant, Mary Walker, Donald Washington, Randy Welker, Robert Wendel, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ron Yeager, Dave Zaidain,
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Paul Astles, Bill Baker, Jeff Bieber, Joanna Brown, Dick Carleton, Ron Docter, Suzanne Hopkins, Ted Hubbard, Ken Kamphaus, Susan Olsen, Jeanette Phillips, Rick Toepfer, Tim Zelek
OTHER ATTENDEES:	R. Blume (sp. ?), Art Daniels, Randy Freking, Don Gardner, Stu Mahlin, Julie Mahlin, Donald Mitchell, Wilma Mitchell, Jo Ann Stoddard
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Rick Record, Paul Smiley, Caroline Statkus, Merrie Stillpass, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To continue to learn what the Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Planning (ECLUVP) project is about, and identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats within the planning area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Economics of Greenspace Preliminary Themes Derived from SWOT Analysis Summary of SWOT Analysis/List of Opportunities identified in SWOT Analysis Focus Area Assignments/Focus Area Meeting Schedule
From the 3/7 meeting, comments and reactions from boards:	▪ Better address / emphasize race issues ▪ Address the issue of racial diversity ▪ Define "local ecological resources" ▪ Regarding scenic resources: give positives /negatives ▪ Emphasize the relation of transportation / roads to economic development ▪ Emphasize "smart growth" and public policy and cross-jurisdictional coordination of public investments (e.g. coordinating the governments of Evendale, Mt. Healthy, Silverton, etc.) ▪ Consider state incentives ▪ Emphasize the connectivity of both light rail transit and highways ▪ Mention housing – integration of people as well as labor force ▪ Define why specific areas are part of the focus (Brown Co. / Adams Co.) and why highways might be expanded to meet these areas ▪ Define the purposes of preservation: to protect the urban core or the suburban fringe ▪ Identify sources of assistance for building affordable housing (e.g. government, non – profit organizations) ▪ Identify possibilities of centralizing communities on buildable terrain **Also, SWOT should be working toward**: ▪ Creating a shared vision (as a guide) ▪ Creating a "real" plan to follow

REVISED DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Comments regarding previous Draft Mission Statement: ▪ Mission Statement considered very lengthy ▪ Some items in Mission Statement are possibly too specific (e.g. "brownfields") ▪ Mission Statement possibly too directional – seems to be dictating outcome

- First sentence is the essence of the Mission Statement
- Last sentence is also important to Mission Statement

Revised Draft Mission Statement, based on comments:
Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements.

The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.

ENCLOSURES:
- Revised Preliminary Themes
- Prioritization of Opportunities identified in SWOT Analysis
- Presentation Summary from the Smart Growth Coalition (SGC)
- Focus Area Assignments
- Focus Area Meeting Schedule

NEXT STEPS:
- Review **Draft Mission Statement (above)**
- Begin Focus Area Work, initially with the Red Bank and Wooster Focus Areas
- Continue to stimulate good ideas about intelligently planning the future of the Eastern Corridor

Comments Regarding SWOT Analysis

From the 3/7 meeting, comments and reactions from boards:

- Better address / emphasize race issues
- Address the issue of racial diversity
- Define "local ecological resources"
- Regarding scenic resources: give positives /negatives
- Emphasize the relation of transportation / roads to economic development
- Emphasize "smart growth" and public policy and cross jurisdictional coordination of public investments (e.g. coordinating the governments of Evendale, Mt. Healthy, Silverton, etc.)
- Consider state incentives
- Emphasize the connectivity of both light rail transit and highways
- Mention housing – integration of people as well as labor force
- Define why specific areas are part of the focus (Brown Co. / Adams Co.) and why highways might be expanded to meet these areas
- Define the purposes of preservation: to protect the urban core or the suburban fringe
- Identify sources of assistance for building affordable housing (e.g. government, non – profit organizations)
- Identify possibilities of centralizing communities on buildable terrain

Also, SWOT should be working toward:

- Creating a shared vision (as a guide)
- Creating a "real" plan to follow

Opportunities Prioritization: SWOT Analysis 3/7

# dots (important)	#stars (PRIORITY)	
Community and Neighborhood Opportunities		
		Community:
11	0	Cluster and concentrate development
9	6	Cooperation among jurisdictions
8	1	Schools influence neighborhood and community pride
7	0	Historic areas* and cultural resources
6	0	*Integrated schools help reduce racial barriers*
6	1	Planning can provide more opportunities for inclusiveness
1	0	People are good resource -> sense of community; lot of people/ institutions/organizations
		interested in quality of life issues
		Residential:
12	1	*Provide new affordable housing opportunities in the region*
5	0	Relationship of business and homes to daycare
5	0	*Provide more housing choices within neighborhoods*
2	0	Good housing seems to predominate -> perhaps a trend is developing; pre-determined
		expansion plan for housing
0	2	*Consolidating Governments*
Natural Features Opportunities		
		Greenspace and Parks:
14	0	*Preserve landscape features (streams, valleys, riparian corridors)*
12	0	Greenspace; Opportunity to connect parks and recreation through bike trails, etc.
		historic and cultural sites; paths (inter and intra community)
9	0	Parks – recreation, views, passive recreation greenspace*; close to home increase recreational
		opportunity*; increase quality of life – reduces development along river
5	0	Hills important*
4	1	Biketrails/bikeways
1	0	Not enough $ to regular maintain existing facilities
0	0	Use green space as buffer between residential and high traffic areas
0	0	If not preserved, convert agricultural to park lands
		Ohio River, Little Miami River (LMR) & floodplains:
9	0	Scenic river and parks stimulate development and trails*; Eco-tourism and tourism potential;
		open space/recreational opportunities along river corridors
8	1	LMR source of water; aquifer protection; Flood plain preservation supporting greenspace*; and
		natural habitats/land use process provides opportunity to preserve and protect LMR
		resource and to balance it w/ development; development limited; -don't screw it up
6	2	Runs through heart and is geographic focus for land use planning
2	0	Multi-agency natural resource management
2	0	Preserves and parks const easements
1	0	Not all accessible to everyone; river access, etc. for all ages nature center
Economic Development Opportunities		
17	2	Former industrial sites/brownfields potential for redevelopment of existing built infrastructure;
		utilize, additional housing and existing business in areas before building new ones
15	3	Opportunity for smart growth; housing in inner core for jobs
10	2	Opportunity for development in transportation corridor that serves commuters; improved
		employment w/improved transportation w/physical accessibility
4	0	Magnet for "upper" professional business
2	1	Job growth expanding
1	0	Labor pool in Adams and Brown counties, KY—I-275 access*
1	0	Land is available
Infrastructure Opportunities		
		Light Rail:
21	4	Light Rail and other public transportation to expedite traffic/reduce congestion-express*
6	0	Existing rail lines available to meet transportation needs; good base of infrastructure in general
		– most need improvements/alternatives; have opportunity for diesel rail – rail already exists
3	0	People in this area will ride trains as opposed to buses
		Transit / Transportation:
10	0	Investigate bus service potential and connections among systems before developing light rail;
		bus service can be expanded; potential connection there not yet realized
4	1	Build north-south connectors- would spur development--opportunity to do it right;
		routes different from local service
3	0	Balanced transportation network with emphasis on rail generating jobs
1	0	Build out sufficient (not excess) road capacity
		BOTH Light Rail and Transit / Transportation:
2	0	Transit system would reduce traffic flows
1	0	Universal design all equipment
0	0	Topography is a hindrance
		Utilities:
8	1	Plan areas for "ultimate" (long time growth out to 50+ years) and then build what's needed incrementally
		– results in smart growth for infrastructure; need to look far ahead, but need to keep
		in step with technology
3	0	Modernize old infrastructure; integrate sewer systems
3	0	Plan contiguous systems and services collaboratively; Emergency Medical Services (EMS) collaboration-
		opportunity; Go wireless
0	0	Public properties should be good neighbors
		Italicized opportunities: write - ins from 3/7 vision group meeting.

Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis

We have taken the opportunity to synthesize the following preliminary themes, subject to review and comment by the Vision Group. Some themes represent differing perspectives within the Vision Group.

Good Schools

- Important to the vitality of neighborhoods
- Other factors are important for maintaining good schools
    - Tax base
    - Attractors (jobs, neighborhood amenities, locational attributes)

Diversity of Residential Opportunity

- Need to create more affordable housing options in diverse locations
- Need to rehabilitate older residential structures
- Our communities need to be more racially diverse
- Need more residential opportunities near employment centers

Smart Growth

- Inter-jurisdictional dialogue and cooperation are important and necessary in order to intelligently manage growth. There have been signs that this kind of dialogue and cooperation is starting to develop
- Create community and neighborhood centers in appropriate areas
- Maintaining a strong urban core is vital to the entire metropolitan region, and decisions about development, land use, and access should bear this in mind when developing alternatives and options
- Environmentally sensitive areas (floodplains, wetlands, hillsides, etc.) are often perceived as limiting economic development.
- There is also the perception that economic benefit would come from preserving greenspace (intrinsic value of natural areas, recreation, scenic attractiveness, value added to adjacent properties and surrounding region, tourism, air quality, cooling, carbon sequestration, erosion control, stormwater runoff attenuation, etc.)
- Local jurisdictions and zoning officials should be well-disciplined when considering proposed changes to zoning, or the expansion of infrastructure. It is often perceived that development is approved without a long term strategic plan
- Discourage the expansion of new infrastructure at the expense of making proper repairs to the existing infrastructure (roads, sewers, etc.)
- Create livable communities with amenities such as jobs, recreation and shopping within walking distance
- Plan emergency, fire, and public safety to work effectively with the future envisioned land uses (wireless systems?)
- Ensure tax base is adequate and diverse enough to support schools
- Identify state and federal incentives to promote local smart growth initiatives

Access and Mobility

- Need to connect people to destinations (jobs, services, amenities [shopping, entertainment, other neighborhoods])
- Need a reliable, safe and convenient interconnected multi-modal access system. **It is essential that any transportation must be well interlinked (e.g., bus routes serving a local community, feeding into rail stations which can be accessed by bike trail or walked to from surrounding homes and or businesses; well placed and designed roads help to allow for the compact development to allow transit to be a viable option in the area.)**
- Need multiple options (walking, biking, bus, etc.) for short trip travel, especially encouraging a network of interlinked bike trails that can be use for recreation as well as short trips to work or shopping.
- Lay groundwork of fiber-optic information network to facilitate the exchange of information in a more environmentally friendly manner (similar to what is being done currently in Butler County, Ohio). This can greatly enhance opportunities for telecommuting

Economic Development

- Build on existing strengths and seize opportunities as they present themselves
- Better access and mobility in the Eastern Corridor could be beneficial in terms of economic development potential for that region
- It is also perceived that the type of economic development that occurs because of this enhanced access and mobility could induce sprawl, allowing people to live further from where they work. To

address this concern, efforts should be made to locate places of employment near the employee base that serves it, and to locate attractive and accessible neighborhood shopping within communities.

- Enhance opportunity to create workplaces near local employee base (i.e., allow opportunities for people to live close to where the work)
- Maintain/enhance good base of light industrial/office land uses for jobs
- Make use of Brownfield/Infill Redevelopment Opportunities a priority
- Take advantage of higher tech job opportunities (biotechnical, software technology, communications industry, and other areas) through building on current strengths of the region (e.g., presence of very good telecommunication infrastructure, strong research university and medical facilities, high-tech manufacturing, etc.)
- Reduce the dependency on tax abatements to attract employers, at least to the extent the funding for schools and local infrastructure does not suffer

Environment

- Preserve and enhance the environmental integrity of unique local ecosystems
- Create interconnections and wildlife corridors between greenspace
- Conserve and limit the developability of certain natural areas
- Create opportunities for people to experience natural areas (parks, trails)

VISION GROUP MEETING #4
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Tuesday, May 29, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
VISION GROUP MEMBERS: ATTENDEES:	Shelia Adams, Tom Albers, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Marty Bartlett, Harry Blanton, Liz Blume, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, JoAnn Brown, Mark Caesar, Kent Cashell, Dot Christenson, Gary Conley, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Ben Dotson, John Dowlin, Bette Evanshine, Paul Fox, Ken Geis, James Gradolf, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Carl Hartman, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Johnathan Holifield, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Lin Laing, Bob Lane, Margo Lindahl, Kathy Meinke, Bill Miller, Pat Mitchell, Phil Montanus, Dory Montazemi, Melissa O'Farrell, Eric Partee, Doug Peters, Todd Portune, Ron Regula, Peggy Reis, Tim Reynolds, Gwen Robinson, Don Rostofer, Rob Rubin, Eric Russo, Tom Ryther, Michael Self, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Daniel Startsman, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Jim Taylor, Kathy Tyler, Matt Van Sant, Mary Walker, Donald Washington, Randy Welker, Robert Wendel, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ron Yeager, Dave Zaidain,
FOCUS GROUP MEMBERS ATTENDEES:	Scott Adams (WA), Mark Alexander (RB,RP), Don Burrell (WO), Ruth Ann Busald (RP), Tom Caruso (OH32), Richard Combs (RP), Jim Coppock (EL, RB), Steve Dana (RP), Susan Doucleff (WA), Nancy Drambarean (EL), Mary Dunlap (RB), Clare Evers (EL), Bob Fischer (RP), Ted Fischesser (OH32), Nancy Forbriger, Cathy Gatch, Rick Greiwe, Donald Keyes, Cheryl Koopman, Margo Lindahl (RP), Dacia Ludwick, Diana Martin (OH32), Mel Martin, Bill Meyers (OH32), Dean Niemeyer (OH32), Susan Olsen, Jack Reed (WA), Charlie Reid (RB, WO), Gilbert Richards (RP), Kate Schroder, Vic Shaffer (RP), Tom & Almeda Stitt (WO), Ryan Taylor (RP), Reginald Victor, Vermorgan Ziegler (WO)
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Rick Record, Paul Smiley, Caroline Statkus, Merrie Stillpass, Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	1. To review the conceptual land use planning work of each Focus Area Group 2. To identify the key themes within each focus area 3. To learn more information from resource sub-consultant presentations: ERA, G&P, NKU
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Preference Survey ERA summary of demographic, economic, real estate, and fiscal factors that affect the Eastern Corridor Gray & Pape, Inc. Cultural Resources Study Summary NKU Environmental Studies Summary
MEETING SUMMARY	**Recap of work to date Recap what has happened since VG last met** ▪ Preliminary Preference Survey ▪ The surveys will be tallied and used for the discussions June 4 **Focus Area Groups Report Out Presentations** Red Bank Wooster Wasson Eastern Avenue/Lunken Ohio 32 River Plains **Historical & Cultural Analysis Presentation** - Gray & Pape, Rita Walsh **Economics & Market Analysis Presentation** - ERA, Dan Wagenmaker **Ecological & Environmental Resource Analysis Presentation** - NKU, Barry Dalton
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Continue to stimulate good ideas about intelligently planning the future of the Eastern Corridor

Eastern Ave./Lunken Focus Area

29-May-01 **As of June 1, 2001:** 20 vision group survey responses

COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES: The need to create/rehabilitate/preserve diverse neighborhoods to provide housing opportunities for a range of income and age groups, and design communities that are accessible to the physically disabled are important. Creating diverse communities with housing to meet the needs of many demographic groups helps to create community stability by allowing individuals to relocate within the same community when their financial status or other needs change over time. The need to create recreational opportunities for youth in these communities is also important.

The need to create/enhance the neighborhood/town centers as "economic centers" or gathering places in old and new communities through the location of amenities such as schools, shopping, and recreation are within easy walking distance is very important.

The need to further distinguish and preserve the special character of neighborhoods and communities and enhance the "sense of place" as well as to buffer these communities from some of the impacts of traffic, development and other perceived impacts.

VG Consensus	FG Consensus	Preliminary Consensus Total	Needs More Study	
95%	87%	90%	10%	▪ Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
95%	95%	95%	5%	▪ Create more walkable communities with services, schools and amenities within short walking distance
47%	39%	43%	57%	▪ Develop a K-12 Community Center school
76%	48%	61%	37%	▪ Create a possible neighborhood center along Eastern Ave. near Collins Ave
100%	90%	95%	5%	▪ Revitalize neighborhood centers in Linwood and California
95%	86%	90%	10%	▪ Create/Revitalize Town Center in Columbia-Tusculum
63%	73%	68%	27%	▪ Create new and rehab existing residential development along Eastern Ave. with flood protection
67%	78%	73%	27%	▪ Reconnect neighborhoods currently bisected by roads or railroads
95%	87%	90%	10%	▪ Buffer residential areas from development and traffic (air, road, and rail)
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The need to attract and retain businesses as well as explore redevelopment opportunities that provide jobs for local residents and generate tax revenue and income to the local jurisdictions to pay for public services, schools and public safety. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT				
95%	67%	56%	40%	▪ Consider potential relocation of a Barge Terminal near International Friendship Park to south of Lunken Airport to provide more efficient freight transportation and reduce truck traffic
84%	79%	81%	16%	▪ Preserve / Expand Farmer's Market on Wilmer Ave., north of Kellogg Ave.
74%	72%	73%	25%	▪ Create Bed + Breakfasts in California, Columbia Tusculum, and East End
53%	27%	39%	51%	▪ Develop Water taxis from Downtown to California and Anderson Township
32%	43%	38%	60%	▪ Discussion of removing rail from along Eastern Ave. with potential relocation of a Barge Terminal near International Friendship Park, to reconnect neighborhoods while maintaining right of way for future transit options or bike trail
76%	93%	84%	9%	▪ Encourage attractive light industry/office development at Lunken and in commercial zones
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES: The need to protect and preserve environmentally sensitive areas/resources and cultural/historic through the provision of ample recreation opportunities with convenient connections between them can help create an environment and "place" that attracts and retains residents. In doing so, it provides employment opportunities to our region and also serves to improve the health and quality of life of local residents.				
83%	96%	90%	5%	▪ Expand public recreation opportunities along the Ohio River from East End to California
83%	96%	90%	10%	▪ Provide a Hike/Bike Trail from downtown to Lunken Airport
88%	96%	93%	2%	▪ Create "green streets" and scenic roadways
INFRASTRUCTURE: The need to improve the ability of people and goods to move within and through the Eastern Corridor, as well as connecting to a larger multi-modal transportation network serving the metropolitan area for all activities (jobs/services/goods/recreation). Also includes providing adequate utility services.				
83%	87%	85%	12%	▪ Improve existing roadways and service roads
79%	78%	79%	21%	▪ Provide Intersection Improvements at Beechmont Ave./Columbia Parkway and Wooster Road/Wilmer
47%	39%	43%	52%	▪ Explore the possible elevation/relocation of part of Wooster Road, north of Beechmont Ave., to provide flood protection to Linwood north and east of Beechmont Levee
63%	45%	54%	37%	▪ Locate Potential rail stations along the Oasis rail line: (1) near Eastern Ave. and Collins Ave., (2) near Eastern Ave. and Stanley Ave., (3) near Lunken Airport, and (4) near Beechmont and Columbia Parkway
68%	65%	67%	33%	▪ Create a potential Metro Transit Hub: (1) near Beechmont Ave., Wooster Road, and Wilmer Road, (2) on Wilmer Road across from Lunken Airport Terminal, or (3) near Wilmer Road and Kellogg
FURTHER DISCUSSION BY GROUP				
23%	45%	36%	58%	▪ Lunken Airport growth and noise containment issues

Note: Consensus percentage was calculated by dividing the amount of votes cast for "Good Idea" and "Good Idea with proper mitigation" by the total votes cast per objective

Ohio 32 Focus Area

29-May-01

As of June 1, 2001: 20 vision group survey responses

COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES: The need to create/rehabilitate/preserve diverse neighborhoods to provide housing opportunities for a range of income and age groups, and design communities that are accessible to the physically disabled are important. Creating diverse communities with housing to meet the needs of many demographic groups helps to create community stability by allowing individuals to relocate within the same community when their financial status or other needs change over time. The need to create recreational opportunities for youth in these communities is also important.

The need to create/enhance the neighborhood/town centers as "economic centers" or gathering places in old and new communities through the location of amenities such as schools, shopping, and recreation are within easy walking distance is very important.

The need to further distinguish and preserve the special character of neighborhoods and communities and enhance the "sense of place" as well as to buffer these communities from some of the impacts of traffic, development and other perceived impacts.

VG Consensus	FG Consensus	Preliminary Consensus Total	Needs More Study	
89%	88%	89%	11%	▪ Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
95%	92%	93%	5%	▪ Create more walkable communities with services, schools & amenities in short walking distance
79%	80%	80%	20%	▪ Create/Revitalize town center in Mt. Carmel on Old 74 and Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road, south of 32
79%	92%	86%	14%	▪ Revitalize Newtown as a village and recreation hub with close proximity to the Little Miami River, bike trails and lakes and with amenities serving those uses, similar to Loveland
95%	83%	88%	9%	▪ Create Hike/Bike Trail connection from Turpin High School to Clough Pike with connections to Newtown town center and further south along the river
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The need to attract and retain businesses as well as explore redevelopment opportunities that provide jobs for local residents and generate tax revenue and income to the local jurisdictions to pay for public services, schools and public safety. A3				
63%	67%	65%	28%	▪ Develop Class A office and mixed use development southeast of interchange at I-275 and Ohio 32
33%	46%	40%	48%	▪ Create a "satellite city" neighborhood/town center with park space to east of office and mixed use development southeast of interchange at I-275 and 32
89%	74%	80%	17%	▪ Develop Ancor area with a mix of office, industry and some recreation
82%	70%	75%	20%	▪ Create/Revitalize community center and mixed use development at Beechmont Mall site
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES: The need to protect and preserve environmentally sensitive areas/resources and cultural/historic through the provision of ample recreation opportunities with convenient connections between them can help create an environment and "place" that attracts and retains residents. In doing so, it provides employment opportunities to our region and also serves to improve the health and quality of life of local residents.				
89%	96%	93%	7%	▪ Preserve agricultural land and greenspace in flood plain
95%	96%	95%	5%	▪ Preserve/enhance water, visual and air quality in the region
95%	96%	95%	5%	▪ Minimize negative impacts of noise, air, and water pollution, and visual impacts of new development and new/existing road improvements
INFRASTRUCTURE: The need to improve the ability of people and goods to move within and through the Eastern Corridor, as well as connecting to a larger multi-modal transportation network serving the metropolitan area for all activities (jobs/services/goods/recreation). Also includes providing adequate utility services.				
95%	100%	98%	2%	▪ Improve local access, through traffic access and reduce congestion around the Eastgate area
94%	96%	95%	5%	▪ Reduce highway traffic congestion in and around Newtown, Fairfax, Mariemont and Columbia Twp
79%	79%	79%	21%	▪ Locate Potential Metro Transit Hub: (1) near Newtown (2) near Eastgate, probably southeast of interchange at I-275 and Ohio 32. Consider Hub near 32 and Eight Mile
63%	80%	73%	27%	▪ Locate Potential rail stations: (1) near Newtown (2) in Ancor, (3) near Mt. Carmel, and (4) near Eastgate, southeast of interchange at I-275 and Ohio 32
58%	73%	67%	24%	▪ Locate Ohio 32 bypass to provide a through connector road to I-275 from Red Bank Road. Create a 'parkway' like road and consider service roads and overpasses to reduce congestion

Note: Consensus percentage was calculated by dividing the amount of votes cast for "Good Idea" and "Good Idea with proper mitigation" by the total votes cast per objective

Red Bank Focus Area

29-May-01

As of June 1, 2001: 20 vision group survey responses

COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES: The need to create/rehabilitate/preserve diverse neighborhoods to provide housing opportunities for a range of income and age groups, and design communities that are accessible to the physically disabled are important. Creating diverse communities with housing to meet the needs of many demographic groups helps to create community stability by allowing individuals to relocate within the same community when their financial status or other needs change over time. The need to create recreational opportunities for youth in these communities is also important.

The need to create/enhance the neighborhood/town centers as "economic centers" or gathering places in old and new communities through the location of amenities such as schools, shopping, and recreation are within easy walking distance is very important.

The need to further distinguish and preserve the special character of neighborhoods and communities and enhance the "sense of place" as well as to buffer these communities from some of the impacts of traffic, development and other perceived impacts.

VG Consensus	FG Consensus	Preliminary Consensus Total	Needs More Study	
100%	96%	98%	2%	▪ Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
100%	100%	100%	0%	▪ Make neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens, and youth
100%	92%	95%	5%	▪ Create more walkable neighborhoods and communities with services, schools and amenities within short distance
95%	91%	93%	5%	▪ Revitalize the neighborhood center in Madisonville at Bramble Road and Whetsel
90%	92%	91%	9%	▪ Preserve / Rehabilitate older buildings to preserve neighborhood character
89%	88%	89%	11%	▪ Create/Revitalize a Town Center/Neighborhood Business District in Fairfax along Wooster Pike
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The need to attract and retain businesses as well as explore redevelopment opportunities that provide jobs for local residents and generate tax revenue and income to the local jurisdictions to pay for public services, schools and public safety. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT				
47%	43%	45%	52%	▪ Create hotel (possibly extended stay) and conference center in Fairfax
89%	81%	84%	16%	▪ Revitalize neighborhood and Town centers in Madisonville and Fairfax
94%	100%	98%	2%	▪ Develop and retain local employment opportunities
80%	88%	85%	13%	▪ Maintain the Red Bank Corridor as primarily industrial and office, with some retail
80%	92%	86%	14%	▪ Redevelop brownfield sites along the Red Bank Corridor and create Infill Development/ business incubators
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES: The need to protect and preserve environmentally sensitive areas/resources and cultural/historic through the provision of ample recreation opportunities with convenient connections between them can help create an environment and "place" that attracts and retains residents. In doing so, it provides employment opportunities to our region and also serves to improve the health and quality of life of local residents.				
85%	84%	84%	11%	▪ Create more green space along Red Bank Road, Duck Creek and Little Duck Creek
95%	91%	93%	5%	▪ Create more recreation opportunities
85%	83%	84%	14%	▪ Make Hike/Bike Trail connections from Ault Park, Murray Ave. in Fairfax, Red Bank Road and connect to a larger bike trail network including the Little Miami Bike Trail and Lunken
INFRASTRUCTURE: The need to improve the ability of people and goods to move within and through the Eastern Corridor, as well as connecting to a larger multi-modal transportation network serving the metropolitan area for all activities (jobs/services/goods/recreation). Also includes providing adequate utility services.				
95%	88%	91%	7%	▪ Improve existing roads and intersections
89%	88%	89%	11%	▪ Ensure that roadway improvements are done in an environmentally sound and aesthetically pleasing manner, and in such a way that neighboring properties are buffered from the impacts of traffic and development
85%	77%	81%	19%	▪ Improve Brotherton Ave., Murray Ave., and Red Bank Road intersection
68%	75%	72%	23%	▪ Create a tree-lined boulevard along Red Bank Road
70%	81%	77%	19%	▪ Create a tree-lined boulevard along Wooster Pike in Fairfax
100%	92%	95%	5%	▪ Develop better transit options (shuttle buses serving neighborhoods, etc.)
75%	68%	71%	29%	▪ Locate a Potential Metro Transit Hub in Madisonville on Madison Road (1) near Red Bank Road, or (2) near Ebersole Ave., or (3) near Plainville Road; or (4) near Whetsel Ave. and Erie Ave.
65%	80%	73%	27%	▪ Create a Potential Metro Transit Hub in Fairfax associated with a rail station along the Wasson line: (1) where it crosses the Oasis line, (2) near Wooster Road, or (3) to the East of the Keebler Property
68%	75%	72%	26%	▪ Locate a Potential rail station along the Wasson line in Fairfax: (1) where it crosses the Oasis line, (2) near Wooster Road, or (3) to the East of the Keebler Property
80%	92%	86%	14%	▪ Coordinate the widening of Red Bank Road with the Duck Creek Flood Control Project
63%	80%	73%	23%	▪ Create a relocated Ohio 32 roadway connection from Red Bank Road to existing Ohio 32, east of Newtown

Note: Consensus percentage was calculated by dividing the amount of votes cast for "Good Idea" and "Good Idea with proper mitigation" by the total votes cast per objective

River Plains Focus Area

29-May-01

As of June 1, 2001: 20 vision group survey responses

COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES: The need to create/rehabilitate/preserve diverse neighborhoods to provide housing opportunities for a range of income and age groups, and design communities that are accessible to the physically disabled are important. Creating diverse communities with housing to meet the needs of many demographic groups helps to create community stability by allowing individuals to relocate within the same community when their financial status or other needs change over time. The need to create recreational opportunities for youth in these communities is also important.

The need to create/enhance the neighborhood/town centers as "economic centers" or gathering places in old and new communities through the location of amenities such as schools, shopping, and recreation are within easy walking distance is very important.

The need to further distinguish and preserve the special character of neighborhoods and communities and enhance the "sense of place" as well as to buffer these communities from some of the impacts of traffic, development and other perceived impacts.

VG Consensus	FG Consensus	Preliminary Consensus Total	Needs More Study	
95%	88%	91%	7%	▪ Create more walkable communities with services, schools, and amenities within short distance
87%	75%	79%	18%	▪ Protect and buffer Shademore residential development
85%	100%	94%	6%	▪ Reduce congestion on Wooster Pike and in Fairfax, Mariemont, Columbia Twp. and Newtown community / neighborhood centers with new road configurations and create more of a pedestrian friendly design where applicable
90%	92%	91%	7%	▪ Involve local property owners in developing a vision and strategy for protecting local natural resources through time
63%	72%	68%	30%	▪ Create new residential development along Eastern Avenue only with proper precautions against flooding
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The need to attract and retain businesses as well as explore redevelopment opportunities that provide jobs for local residents and generate tax revenue and income to the local jurisdictions to pay for public services, schools and public safety.				
90%	100%	96%	4%	▪ Understand and emphasize the economic value of greenspace
85%	92%	89%	9%	▪ Consolidate development and specific land uses together and limit access in floodplain to keep pressure off agriculture and greenspaces from development
72%	73%	73%	27%	▪ Increase efficiency of freight transportation and reduce truck traffic by use of barge & rail terminals
70%	85%	78%	22%	▪ Allow industrial development in Milford near US 50 & I-275, in such a way that the watershed and greenspace is better protected from pollution, sedimentation and storm runoff
85%	96%	91%	9%	▪ Develop industrial land on brownfields and infill development where industrial land use is already established
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES: The need to protect and preserve environmentally sensitive areas/resources and cultural/historic through the provision of ample recreation opportunities with convenient connections between them can help create an environment and "place" that attracts and retains residents. In doing so, it provides employment opportunities to our region and also serves to improve the health and quality of life of local residents.				
90%	92%	91%	7%	▪ Preserve agricultural land and greenspace in flood plains
85%	92%	89%	11%	▪ Preserve wetlands, expand forested areas along rivers' edges and reforest edges of riverplains to provide buffers
95%	96%	96%	4%	▪ Local governments should encourage greenspace preservation through zoning, tax incentives, donation, purchase, etc., and through cross-jurisdictional cooperation
95%	100%	98%	2%	▪ Protect the quality of surface water, groundwater, and air in the region
74%	83%	79%	21%	▪ Preserve water recreation opportunities around Ancor
79%	96%	89%	11%	▪ Provide better recreational access to Ohio & Little Miami River
95%	92%	93%	7%	▪ Implement better stormwater management throughout all jurisdictions in watershed
INFRASTRUCTURE: The need to improve the ability of people and goods to move within and through the Eastern Corridor, as well as connecting to a larger multi-modal transportation network serving the metropolitan area for all activities (jobs/services/goods/recreation). Also includes providing adequate utility services.				
95%	92%	93%	7%	▪ Emphasize public transit nodes as a viable option to automobiles for travel through the corridor
90%	96%	93%	7%	▪ Provide collector bus connections to serve neighborhoods outside of walking distance from potential bus or rail stations
89%	88%	88%	7%	▪ Limit accessibility to proposed roads to reduce development pressure on greenspace/agricultural areas
55%	70%	63%	35%	▪ Consider rail line parallel to Red Bank Road for transit
75%	73%	74%	26%	▪ Consider location of Potential Metro Transit Hub: (1) near Newtown/Ancor (2) near interchange of I-275 and US 50
70%	73%	72%	28%	▪ Locate Potential rail stations: (1) near Newtown (2) near Ancor at Broadwell Road and rail line, northeast of Newtown, and (3) near interchange of I-275 and US 50
FURTHER DISCUSSION BY GROUP				
75%	87%	81%	12%	▪ Locate Ohio 32 bypass to provide a through connector road to I-275. Create a 'parkway' and consider service roads and overpasses to reduce congestion and limit development pressure on agriculture
80%	73%	76%	22%	▪ Address concerns about additional traffic that may be generated on Round Bottom Road by roads connecting to South Milford Road from new development and/or new elementary school (north of East Fork of Little Miami and east of South Milford Road

Note: Consensus percentage was calculated by dividing the amount of votes cast for "Good Idea" and "Good Idea with proper mitigation" by the total votes cast per objective

Wasson Focus Area

29-May-01 **As of June 1, 2001:** 20 vision group survey responses

VG Consensus	FG Consensus	Preliminary Consenus Total	Needs More Study	
COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES: The need to create/rehabilitate/preserve diverse neighborhoods to provide housing opportunities for a range of income and age groups, and design communities that are accessible to the physically disabled are important. Creating diverse communities with housing to meet the needs of many demographic groups helps to create community stability by allowing individuals to relocate within the same community when their financial status or other needs change over time. The need to create recreational opportunities for youth in these communities is also important.				
The need to create/enhance the neighborhood/town centers as "economic centers" or gathering places in old and new communities through the location of amenities such as schools, shopping, and recreation are within easy walking distance is very important.				
The need to further distinguish and preserve the special character of neighborhoods and communities and enhance the "sense of place" as well as to buffer these communities from some of the impacts of traffic, development and other perceived impacts.				
95%	96%	95%	5%	▪ Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
100%	96%	98%	2%	▪ Make neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens, and youth
94%	100%	98%	2%	▪ Create more walkable communities with services, schools and amenities within short walking distance
94%	96%	95%	5%	▪ Preserve the historic built environment and other important sites
82%	61%	70%	25%	▪ Create community gateways in Oakley on Madison Road to the east and west of business district
88%	63%	73%	22%	▪ Create improve streetscaping and Gateways in Evanston and Oakley from I-71
94%	79%	85%	15%	▪ Evanston – Revitalize town center near Dana and Montgomery Roads, and Woodburn and Montgomery Road including streetscaping and greenspace for a community gateway
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The need to attract and retain businesses as well as explore redevelopment opportunities that provide jobs for local residents and generate tax revenue and income to the local jurisdictions to pay for public services, schools and public safety.				
90%	100%	95%	5%	▪ Oakley: Maintain a mix of office, residential and industrial around new retail near Marburg Ave. & I-71
100%	71%	84%	14%	▪ Reconfigure Hyde Park Plaza to be more pedestrian-friendly and fit better with local context
58%	26%	40%	50%	▪ Oakley – Encourage hotel near former Milacron site
84%	88%	86%	14%	▪ Provide Brownfield and Infill development in Oakley, potentially incorporating a business incubator
89%	83%	86%	14%	▪ Provide Brownfield and Infill development in Evanston along Dana Ave.
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES: The need to protect and preserve environmentally sensitive areas/resources and cultural/historic through the provision of ample recreation opportunities with convenient connections between them can help create an environment and "place" that attracts and retains residents. In doing so, it provides employment opportunities to our region and also serves to improve the health and quality of life of local residents.				
74%	70%	71%	34%	▪ Locate a Bike Trail along the Wasson rail line toward Fairfax
100%	100%	100%	0%	▪ Preserve existing parks/greenspaces in Evanston, Norwood, Hyde Park and Oakley
INFRASTRUCTURE: The need to improve the ability of people and goods to move within and through the Eastern Corridor, as well as connecting to a larger multi-modal transportation network serving the metropolitan area for all activities (jobs/services/goods/recreation). Also includes providing adequate utility services.				
88%	86%	87%	10%	▪ Improve existing roadways and service roads
79%	42%	58%	29%	▪ Implement intersection improvements in Hyde Park at Edwards Ave. and Madison Road, perhaps consider a traffic circle
74%	48%	60%	33%	▪ Oakley – Consider transit, perhaps rail or bus, to new development at former Milacron site near Marburg Ave. and I-71
74%	63%	67%	30%	▪ Locate Potential Metro Transit Hub: (1) near Montgomery Road and Dana Ave., (2) near Madison Road and Edwards Road, or (3) on Wasson Road between Paxton and Marburg
72%	67%	69%	27%	▪ Locate Potential rail stations along the Wasson line: (1) near Montgomery Road and Dana Ave., (2) near Madison Road and Edwards Road, (3) on Wasson Road between Paxton and Marburg, and possibly (4) where Erie crosses the Wasson rail line

Note: Consensus percentage was calculated by dividing the amount of votes cast for "Good Idea" and "Good Idea with proper mitigation" by the total votes cast per objective

Wooster Pike Focus Area

29-May-01

As of June 1, 2001: 20 vision group survey responses

COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES: The need to create/rehabilitate/preserve diverse neighborhoods to provide housing opportunities for a range of income and age groups, and design communities that are accessible to the physically disabled are important. Creating diverse communities with housing to meet the needs of many demographic groups helps to create community stability by allowing individuals to relocate within the same community when their financial status or other needs change over time. The need to create recreational opportunities for youth in these communities is also important.

The need to create/enhance the neighborhood/town centers as "economic centers" or gathering places in old and new communities through the location of amenities such as schools, shopping, and recreation are within easy walking distance is very important.

The need to further distinguish and preserve the special character of neighborhoods and communities and enhance the "sense of place" as well as to buffer these communities from some of the impacts of traffic, development and other perceived impacts.

VG Consensus	FG Consensus	Preliminary Consensus Total	Needs More Study	
100%	88%	94%	4%	▪ Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
100%	96%	98%	0%	▪ Create more walkable communities with services, schools and amenities within short distances
81%	77%	79%	15%	▪ Create a neighborhood center along Wooster Pike in Columbia Township to the east of Mariemont and west of Newtown Road, taking advantage of the Little Miami River as an amenity
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The need to attract and retain businesses as well as explore redevelopment opportunities that provide jobs for local residents and generate tax revenue and income to the local jurisdictions to pay for public services, schools and public safety. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT				
80%	92%	86%	11%	▪ Preserve and revitalize town center along Wooster Pike in Terrace Park at Given Road
76%	89%	83%	15%	▪ Preserve and revitalize town and neighborhood centers of Old Milford, near Five Points intersection, and potentially create new neighborhood centers near new elementary schools
81%	71%	76%	22%	▪ Revitalize commercial centers along Ohio 28 and US 50
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES: The need to protect and preserve environmentally sensitive areas/resources and cultural/historic through the provision of ample recreation opportunities with convenient connections between them can help create an environment and "place" that attracts and retains residents. In doing so, it provides employment opportunities to our region and also serves to improve the health and quality of life of local residents.NATURAL & CULTURAL RESURCES				
90%	85%	87%	11%	▪ Provide Bike Trail connections from Little Miami Bike Trail to West (Lunken, Downtown, etc.) and make connections from neighborhoods to the bike trail network
90%	100%	96%	4%	▪ Create more public access and recreation opportunities along the Little Miami River
95%	100%	98%	0%	▪ Preserve hillsides, river edges, parks and US 50 visual quality as a green "parkway" corridor
INFRASTRUCTURE: The need to improve the ability of people and goods to move within and through the Eastern Corridor, as well as connecting to a larger multi-modal transportation network serving the metropolitan area for all activities (jobs/services/goods/recreation). Also includes providing adequate utility services.				
90%	92%	91%	7%	▪ Improve existing roads and intersections
86%	96%	91%	9%	▪ Ensure that roadway improvements are done in an environmentally sound and aesthetically pleasing manner, and in such a way that neighboring residential properties are buffered from the impacts of traffic and development
90%	76%	82%	13%	▪ Create a landscaped boulevard along Wooster Pike in Columbia Township to the east of Mariemont
70%	68%	69%	23%	▪ Create a relocated Ohio 32 connection from Red Bank Road to existing Ohio 32, east of Newtown to relieve local traffic congestion, especially on US 50
95%	92%	93%	7%	▪ Develop better transit options (shuttle buses serving neighborhoods, etc.)
62%	68%	65%	35%	▪ Locate a potential Rail Station west of interchange of I-275 and US 50
71%	69%	70%	30%	▪ Locate a potential Metro Transit Hub west of interchange of I-275 and US 50, near rail station

Note: Consensus percentage was calculated by dividing the amount of votes cast for "Good Idea" and "Good Idea with proper mitigation" by the total votes cast per objective

VISION GROUP MEETING #5
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Monday, June 4, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
VISION GROUP MEMBERS: ATTENDEES:	Shelia Adams, Tom Albers, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Marty Bartlett, Harry Blanton, Liz Blume, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, JoAnn Brown, Mike Burson, Mark Caesar, Richard Carlton, Kent Cashell, Dot Christenson, Gary Conley, Jim Coppock, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Ben Dotson, John Dowlin, Bette Evanshine, Paul Fox, Ken Geis, James Gradolf, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Carl Hartman, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Johnathan Holifield, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Scott Kravetz, Lin Laing, Bob Lane, Margo Lindahl, Mel Martin, Kathy Meinke, Bill Miller, Pat Mitchell, Phil Montanus, Dory Montazemi, Dean Niemeyer, Melissa O'Farrell, Susan Olsen, Eric Partee, Doug Peters, Todd Portune, Ron Regula, Peggy Reis, Tim Reynolds, Gwen Robinson, Don Rostofer, Rob Rubin, Eric Russo, Tom Ryther, Michael Self, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Daniel Startsman, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Jim Taylor, Kathy Tyler, Matt Van Sant, Reggie Victor, Mary Walker, Donald Washington, Randy Welker, Robert Wendel, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ron Yeager, Dave Zaidain, Tim Zelek
FOCUS GROUP MEMBERS ATTENDEES:	Scott Adams (WA), Jim Bell (RP), Ruth Ann Busald (RP), Tom Caruso (OH32), Richard Combs (RP), Steve Dana (RP), Mary Dunlap (RB), Ted Fischesser (OH32), Rick Greiwe, Janet Keller (RB), Randi Mathieu (EL), Loretta Rokey, Vic Shaffer (RP), Ted Shannon (RB, WO), Tom Stitt, Ryan Taylor (RP), Heinrich Zehetmaier
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Rick Record, Paul Smiley, Caroline Statkus, Merrie Stillpass, Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	1. To get reactions, suggestions, and input regarding any areas of disagreement for conceptual Land Use Planning work to date. 2. To obtain as much consensus as possible regarding plan.
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Preference Survey Results *What Olmsted Knew* – March 2001 Western City article
MEETING SUMMARY	I. Introduction, Goals & Agenda A. Welcome & Goals & Agenda for Today B. Introduction & Recap CDC Public Health + Land Use Considerations II. Overview of Project Mission, Goals & Themes: BIG PICTURE A. Project Mission Project Goals Vision Group Themes B. Big picture considerations C. Preliminary Preference Survey III. OVERALL REACTION TO PLAN: Small group discussion Big Picture considerations discussion: *A. Are the land uses within the study area balanced: including housing, employment, services, recreation, etc.?* *B. Are transportation improvements and modes of access connected to jobs/employment?* *C. Do neighborhoods have sufficient greenspace and connect to the larger park/greenspace system via hiking/biking trails?* *D. Do neighborhood/communities have centers that provide local services, jobs and links to transportation?* *E. Does the plan work together?*

NEXT STEPS:	▪ Continue to stimulate good ideas about intelligently planning the future of the Eastern Corridor

LAND USE VISION SMALL GROUP CONSENSUS DISCUSSION – MEETING 5

Gold Group

Group Facilitators: Merrie Stillpass, Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Heather Quisenberry

Vision Group:	Focus Group:
Bette Evanshine	Mel Martin
Dick Hoekzema	Richard Carlton
Jennifer Kaminer	Jim Coppock
Melissa O'Farrell	Tom Caruso
Eric Partee	Mary Dunlap
Harry Blanton	Tom Stitt
Reggie Victor	Vic Shaffer
Jim Gradolf	
Loretta Rokey	
Mike Burson	
Dean Niemeyer	

Gold Group Chartpack Notes

Discussion Items

- Red Bank
  - Connection to Ohio 32
  - Metro hub and rail locations
- Eastern Ave./Lunken
  - Noise/growth containment issues with Lunken
  - Neighborhood center on Eastern Avenue & Collins
  - Potential relocation of barge terminals
  - Oasis stations
  - Metro hub and rail locations (many)
    - Need to better distinguish between commuter and light rail
  - Community school in East End area
  - Barge and rail relocation
- Wasson
  - Streetscaping
- Ohio 32
  - Red Bank Road/Ohio 32 connection
  - Rail stations
  - Relocated 32
  - Eastgate as a satellite city
- Riverplains
  - Red Bank connection to Ohio 32
- Overall
  - Support for greenspace preservation
  - Support for maintaining and improving existing roads

River barge & rail relocation

- Potential need for expansion at metropolitan sewer district in +/- 20 years
- Recreational boating conflicts

- Generate new truck traffic; perhaps
- City's economic development
- Is it compatible with local residential use in Columbia-Tusculum
- Truck traffic through neighborhoods

Satellite city near Eastgate

- Creates more traffic problems
- High density residential might be more appropriate
- Needs certain density of development to justify a rail line
- Has potential as park + ride (rail or bus)
- Location has high visibility; lends itself to office space

- From Clermont, #1 commute to CBD, #2 to Blue Ash

Airport Growth and Noise
- Park 150 starting soon
- Much opposition to expansion locally
- Measures underway to lessen noise voluntarily
- New housing going in
- Questionable viability of commuter flights @ Lunken
- Plans for hotel near airport

East End community school
- Needs more study

Relocated Ohio 32
- Needs to be elevated
    - Visual nuisance, safety issue (freezing)
- Would require a bridge or tunnel
- Low consensus in Ohio 32 and River Plains
- Providing good access to City from east
- Relieving congestion in Fairfax, Mariemont, Columbia-Tusculum, Newtown
- Is this a real solution or does it open the floodgates to much more traffic through the region
- Multi-modal aspect needs to be emphasized and implemented together to minimize overall negative impacts
- Minimize overall negative impacts

Ancor Development
- Preserve wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas

Gold Group Facilitator's Notes

Concerns, ideas, etc.
- How specific are our goals – how specific should they be?
- Infrastructure seems to have lowest agreement (why?)
- Why not a column on the survey for 'needs more study'
    - Lack of consensus may come from areas that fall into this category
    - May need revisiting after traffic modeling
- Metro hub and rail locations have issues in each area:
  Should be a distinction between diesel rail and new light rail (difference between using old and creating new)

- Focus areas grouped; can lead to communities not having their own identity
- Barge terminal/rail line
    - How well can this balance with the City? City goals vs. community goals
    - Possible MSD expansion interest in at Wilmer due to increased need
    - Lack of majority vote may have come from 'need more study' area (revisit after traffic modeling)

Blue Group

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner, Brian Balsley, Travis Miller, Linda Fabe

Vision Group:	Focus Group:
Liz Blume	Janet Keller
Dot Christensen	Jim Bell
Joanne Brown	Steve Dana
Ken Geis	Dick Combs
Jane Smelser	Rick Greiwe
Dave Zaidain	
Eric Russo	
Susan Olsen	
Len Harding	
Tom Hoft	
Tim Reynolds	
Tom Ryther	
Jane Smelser	
Tim Zelek	

Blue Group Chartpack Notes

- Add 32 connector at Broadwell (part of MIS)

Issues:

- Too many new development zones identified (i.e. Red Bank corridor, Ancor property, Rt. 50 Tech center
    - Response: economic study will consider absorption rates

Vision:

- Livable communities linked be access which impacts as little as possible on communities (limited access highways)

Areas of interest for discussion;

- Ohio 32 alignment

Ideas to incorporate:

- Larger green buffer along Little Miami River
- Be more 'visionary'
- Carrying capacity
- Density – encourage higher density
    - Consider higher densities in commercial/industrial development
- Ecological capacity
- Projections to identify densities needed for town centers
- Population and employment projections for area

Defining the line between sprawl and smart growth

Unifying principals:

- Idea: we want t preserve (x)% of greenspace
- Preserve (x) density to sustain community centers
- Possible identity: walkable communities
- What do we need to "beef-up" the core?
- Balance expansion to east – strengthening the core

Implementation: incentives for reinvestment in the core

Blue Group Facilitator's Notes

- Who is the audience we are preparing plan for – who will implement the non-transportation issues
- Should group be focusing on 'big $' transportation issues
- Connector road from Broadwell road to Ohio 32
- Quantity of development zones may cause development to be spread too thinly
    - What is the absorption rate
- May be good to have options for development zones – not all area necessarily need to develop
- Residential needs vs. commuters needs of the study area need to be addressed
- Quality of life – communities must respond to all residents, young and old.
    - Want to attract new people to 'live' in this area
    - Concentrate development in nodes
    - Utilize features to best advantage – give 'edge' to all neighborhoods
        - i.e. River views, hillsides, greenspace – build upon assets
- Highlighted areas on survey results discuss 'specific' elements – those that rate high are general – generically good
- Where is relocated Ohio 32
- Shouldn't 'vision' take on challenge of making changes – current plan seems similar/same to existing plan – shouldn't we take the challenge of change
- Increase River corridor buffer zone
- Where are broad goals, plan seems too specific, plan should be more conceptual at this place

VISION GROUP MEETING #6
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, July 25, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:30pm END 8:00 p.m.
VISION GROUP MEMBERS: ATTENDEES:	Shelia Adams, Tom Albers, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Marty Bartlett, Harry Blanton, Liz Blume, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, JoAnn Brown, Mike Burson, Mark Caesar, Richard Carlton, Kent Cashell, Dot Christenson, Gary Conley, Jim Coppock, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Ben Dotson, John Dowlin, Bette Evanshine, Paul Fox, Ken Geis, James Gradolf, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Carl Hartman, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Johnathan Holifield, Suzanne Hopkins, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Scott Kravetz, Lin Laing, Bob Lane, Margo Lindahl, Mel Martin, Kathy Meinke, Bill Miller, Pat Mitchell, Phil Montanus, Dory Montazemi, Dean Niemeyer, Melissa O'Farrell, Susan Olsen, Eric Partee, Doug Peters, Todd Portune, Ron Regula, Peggy Reis, Tim Reynolds, Gwen Robinson, Don Rostofer, Rob Rubin, Eric Russo, Tom Ryther, Michael Self, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Daniel Startsman, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Jim Taylor, Kathy Tyler, Matt Van Sant, Reggie Victor, Mary Walker, Donald Washington, Randy Welker, Robert Wendel, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ron Yeager, Dave Zaidain, Tim Zelek
PROJECT TEAM:	Gary Meisner, Heather Quisenberry, Rick Record, Paul Smiley, Caroline Statkus, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	1. To review the work to date of the Vision Group 2. To better understand the land use descriptions and locations 3. To gain additional consensus for the Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Land Use Definitions Results of July questionnaire mailer
MEETING SUMMARY	I. Introduction, Goals & Agenda A. Introduction B. Purpose C. Process D. Where we are now II. Land Use Descriptions and Presentation of Land Use Vision Plan A. Land Use Descriptions B. Land Use Vision Plan/Focus Area Surveys III. Discussion A. Feedback from Vision Group B. Any additions to Land Use Vision Plan? C. Is this acceptable for 1st cut at traffic modeling?: D. Opposition to expansion at Lunken Airport E. Old Ohio 28 land use is subject to debate F. Cincinnati Public Schools has more than sufficient high school space (with regards to new school near Madisonville) G. Needs to be some type of reconciliation between Land use Vision Plan and local adopted plans H. Question: how do areas of change get related to the local jurisdictions (areas requiring zoning changes?)

VISION GROUP MEETING #7
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, October 24, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00pm END 9:20 p.m.
ATTENDEES: (all Vision Group members and Focus Area Participants were invited)	Richard Combs, William Showers, Jim Bell, Pallab Ghosh Choudhuri, Barry Dalton, Mike Moore, Patricia Strassel, Susan Gibler, Robert Vogt, Ian Scott, Susan Roschke, Ruth Ann Busald, Dacia Ludwick, Charlene Metzger, Clare Evers, Susan Olson, Dean Niemeyer, Cathy Gatch, Ron Docter, Susan Doucleff, Larry Brewer, Stephen Dana, Rick Oberschmidt, Tom Ryther, Marina Fendon, Reggie Victor, Bette Evanshine, Jane Smelser, Harry Blanton, Melissa O'Farrell, Dave Zaidain, Doug Peters, Tom Hoft, Dot Christenson, Eric Russo, Ben Dotson, Ken Geis, Eric Partee, Jim Gradolf, Len Harding, Tim Reynolds, Martha Bartlett, Liz Blume. (Vision Group Attendees)
PROJECT TEAM:	Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Todd White, Merrie Stillpass, Brian Balsley, John Stillpass, Rick Record, Caroline Statkus

PURPOSE:	1. To review new and relevant data from consultants 2. To review Land Use Plan highlighting zones of potential change and significant issues 3. To test for Overall Agreement to the Land Use Plan's "Big Picture"
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	1. Agenda 2. Project Scope, Methodology, and Products 3. Implementation Status Report 4. Preliminary Ecological Assessment Executive Summary 5. Potential Zones of Change 6. Significant Focus Area Issues
MEETING SUMMARY	I. Introduction, Goals & Agenda A. Discussion of Scope of Work, Methodology, Products, and Schedule II. Presentations A. Economics Overview – Economics Research Associates B. Implementation Status – Vision Implementation Group - discussion of revenue generating/sharing mechanisms C. Ecologic Summary – NKU Env. Res. Management Center D. Travel Demand Modeling (TDM) Overview – Balke Engineers E. Public Opinion Survey Status - Balke Engineers III. Discussion A. Discussion, by Focus Area, focusing on "Zones of Potential Change"

Overall Issues

- What are the assumptions for the Economic Report?
  - Those will be made more explicit in the final report, but they are based on demographic projections, real estate trends, regional and community characteristics (access, topography, existing land use), etc.
  - This study assumes a certain amount of growth to occur in the entire metropolitan region, and assumes that the Eastern Corridor would capture a certain share of that growth based on future events in the region (improved access, land use decisions, etc.). This study does not assume that any of these events would lead to an overall increase in growth for the entire metropolitan region.
- Projected negative growth (-10% retail over the next 5 years) impacts what is and isn't happening in places
- Will some areas be cannibalized by development in other areas (e.g., will new retail development in one area cause the decline of other nearby areas)

	- That is a likely possible occurrence, but it is beyond the scope of this study to predict exactly how and where that would occur. • Will this information be available to make decisions in the Focus Area Meetings - We hope to have this report available as a ".pdf" file on the Eastern Corridor website at www.easterncorridor.org • Are sensitive areas shown with the transportation improvements? - The sensitive areas, along with the Vision Group and Focus Area participant suggestions regarding land use, will influence the location of the transportation improvements. • Should a public survey be conducted? It would help to get input from those people not here. • Vision Group members who have participated regularly should have input on questions - See attached sheet for volunteers to review survey - The status of funding for the survey is still in question
Land Use Vision Plan Issues	See attached of discussion of issues categorized by Focus Area.
ENCLOSURES:	• Summary of Discussion of Focus Area Issues • Please visit the www.easterncorridor.org website to view reports beginning in mid to late November

Comments Regarding Focus Areas – Meeting 7

Wasson

- Question of amount of retail in Wasson focus area – how that relates to economic research / assumptions used are critical.
- Cannibalizing retail within ½ mile radius
  Example: Hyde Park Plaza and Rookwood, new development at Milacron site.
  Is this what we want to have happen?
- Can Land Use map and Transportation control / influence direct nature of what happens? (big picture)
- Can group decide on uses?
- Ridge and Highland "Red Zone": too much commercial / retail – need for more mixed use, offices, housing.
- More emphasis on high quality workers, high – tech jobs
- Consider Joint Economic Development Districts (JEDDS) and other joint development districts
- Concerns for how JEDD officials powers are not excessive (beyond government entities)
- Infill development should have high standards – layout, greenspace, mixed use – but government entities must be charged to make it happen, not let things happen due to lack of preparation or office dysfunction.

Red Bank

- Mapping issue: Color scheme for land uses does not emphasize industrial areas enough for developable opportunities.
- Metro – hub location?

Wooster

- Any agreements / suggestions on limiting eastern boundary to limit sprawl(?)
- 28 corridor: retail, 50 corridor: industrial; Milford has zoned commercial and retail
- Focus Area looking at quality of life (beyond zoning)
- Townships have different zoning laws – cooperation is necessary
- Medium to high density housing - for all focus areas
  - Supports walkable business districts
  - Won't get small business without density
- Group evaluation criteria to judge focus area – score sheet
- Survey – important way to know if we have the right set of priorities

Eastern Ave. – Lunken

- City Planning – Linwood study in process
- Farmer's Market at Lunken – access issues (incl. Air show, Speed show, etc) needs an increase in size – well patronized
- Anderson Riverfront – Five Mile to Cincinnati change designation
- Hafner land – fill – shown as office development
- TIP grant for Metro Moves hub – Beechmont at Five Mile (Ohio 32 Focus Area)
- Status report from city (Liz Blume) regarding river / barge terminal
- Neighborhood center – more retail / mixed use – school (K-12) / Columbia Parkway
- K- 12 school will be a development driver

Ohio 32 / River Plains

- Beechmont Mall: Zone of Change – possible site for a Metro Moves hub
- Reconsider industrial land use designation at Bach – Buxton
- Land use plan does show the designation as industrial

Overall Comments

- Consider economic and demographic trends for next 20 years
- Where in the "pie" will growth and development be drawn to? What impact will this have on the other parts of the "pie"
- Look at patterns (development / investment)
- Historic growth patterns rooted industrial shifting

VISION GROUP MEETING #8
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, April 4, 2002
MEETING TIME:	START 6:10 END 9:20 p.m.
VISION GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	**Land Use Vision Plan Participants:** Vision Group Members shown in **bold** / Attendees shown with underline

Scott Adams	**Sheila Adams**	**Tom Albers**
Mark Alexander	**Bob Alsfelder**	James Anderson
Jeff Anderson	Paul Astles	**Jerry Ballard**
Gary Banfill	Jerry Bargo	Terry Barhorst
Marty Bartlett	Bob Beiting	Jim Bell
Rachel Belz	Michael Benken	Bob Bibb
Jeff Bieber	Lou Bishop	**Harry Blanton**
Liz Blume	Mike Brandy	Bruce Branstetter
Bill Brayshaw	**Pat Bready**	Delores Brown
Jo Anna Brown	Peter Bruemmer	Cooper Burchenal
Betty Burns	Bob Burns	Michael Burns
Don Burrell	**Ruth Ann Busald**	Mark Caesar
Clark Carmichael	**Tom Caruso**	Edward Casagrande
Kent Cashell	Doug Cheney	Jim Childress
Dot Christenson	Mary Anne Christie	Jim Cohen
Gary Conley	Richard Combs	Theresa Conover
Jim Coppock	John Coyle	**John Cranley**
Greg Curless	Stephen Dana	Bill Davin
Paul Davis	Officer Dawson	**John Deatrick**
Bob Deck	John Delaney	Charlie Desando
Rick Dettmer	Pat DeWine	Dan Dickten
Greg Dobur	Ron Docter	Edward Dohrmann
Henry Dolive	Benjamen Dotson	Jon Doucleff
Susan Doucleff	Nancy Dranbarean	David Duckworth
Mary Dunlap	**Brian Eliff**	**Melissa English**
Sara Evans	**Bette Evanshine**	Keri Everett
Clare Evers	Jim Farfsing	Marina Fendon
Duane Ferguson	Tom Fiorini	Bob Fischer
Bill Fisher	Altman Fleisher	Kevin Flowers
Anne Fogel-Burchenal	Ed & Patty Fox	**Paul Fox**
Mike Fremont	Larry Fronck	John Frye
Don Gardner	**Cathy Gatch**	**Ken Geis**
Kathryn Gibbons	Susan Gibler	Tony Giglio
Tim Gilday	***Jack Gordon***	*Jim Gradolf*
Ronald Gramke	***Rick Griewe***	*Patricia Haas*
H. Hafner	Linda Hafner	Tom Hagerty
Holly Halcomb	*John Hammon*	*Leonard Harding*
Gerald Harris	**Carl Hartman**	Diane Havey
Jerome Heil	Patricia Henderson	Charlene Hetzger
Shelly Higgins	Warren Hill	Tom Hmurcik
Joseph Hochbein	Jack Hodell	**Richard Hoekzema**
Tom Hoft	**Jonathan Holifield**	**Jerry Honerlaw**
Amy Holter	Suzanne Hopkins	Bill Hopple
Robert Horne	Ted Hubbard	Dick Huddleston
Ken Hughes	Chris Humphrey	Gretchen Hurt

John Isch
Roland & Claire Johnson
Barbara Kadinger
Kent Kamphaus
Don Keyes
Hank Kleinfeldt
Fredrick Koehler
Tony Kountz
John Kucia
Bob Lane
Jennifer Liles
Anne Lyon
William Martin
Molly McClure
Mike McKeehan
Charlene Metzger
Bill Miller
Thomas Moeller
Carl Monzel
Carolyn Motz
Linda Murphy
John Neyer
Rick Oberschmidt
Kevin Osterfeld
Eric Partee
James Pepper
Betsy Pierce
Dave Prather
Alicia Reese
Thea Reis
Gilbert Richards
Susan Roschke
Kirstin Rubinstein
Mike Rutenshroer
Trent Schade
Greg Schrand
Dottie Scott
Tony Selvey-Maddox
Theodore Shannon
James Siegel
Gates Smith
David Spinney
Ron Regula
George Stewart
Patty Strassel
Joshua Swain
Charle Thomas
Matt Van Sant
Reggie Victor
Mary Walker
Donald Washington
Bob Wendel
John Westheimer
LuAnn Winkle
Catherine Wuerdeman
Bob Zumbiel

Bill Jenike
J. Johnson-JioDicci
Jennifer Kaminer
Dan Keefe
Doug King
Charles Klingman
Craig Kolb
Claudia Krysiak
Donald Kunkel
C. Michael Lemmon
Dacia Ludwick
Patrick Manger
Randi Mathieu
Frank McCune
Kathy Meinke
Susan Micheli
Dean Miller
Phil Montanus
Mike Moore
Dan & David Motz
John Murray
Mike Niehaus
Melissa O'Farrell
Carl Palmer
Rick Patterson
David Perry
Ron Plattner
Pamela Quisenberry
Ed Ratterman
Tim Reynolds
Gwen Robinson
Dave Ross
Julie Rugh
Tom Ryther
Stephen Schmidlan
William Schrock
Ian Scott
Mike Setzer
Mark Sheppard
Steve Sievers
Wendy Smith
Roger Stafford
Bob Steier
Tom & Almeda Stitt
Eric Stuckey
Jim Taylor
Dilip Tripathy
John Van Volkenburgh
Dorothy Vogt
David Waltz
Otto Weening
Bob Wessell
Benjamin Wetherill
Steve Wood
Ronald Yeager

Hans Jindahl
Tom Jones
John Kammerer
Janet Keller
Steve Klein
Pinky Kocoshis
Cheryl Koopman
Chuck Kubicki
Lin Laing
John Liken
Juanita Lynem
Mel Martin
Anne McBride
Jim McDonough
Suzanne Meruci
Anastasia Mileham
Pat Mitchell
Dory Montazemi
Charlene Morse
Edmund Motz
Sharon Muyaya
Dean Niemeyer
Susan Olson
Doug Parham
Chris Patton
Doug Peters
Todd Portune
Jack Reed
Charles Reid
Betty Rhodes
Loretta Rokey
Rob Rubin
Eric Russo
David Sams
John Schneider
Steve Schuckman
Michael Self
Vic Shaffer
William Showers
Jane Smelser
J.D. Spinnenweber
Daniel Startsman Jr.
John Stevens
Lee Stone
Jack Sutton
Ryan Taylor
Kathy Tyler
Rick Veith
Carl Walker
Michael Ward
Randy Welker
Mark Westermeyer
Michael Whitney
Jeff Wright
Virmorgan Ziegler

PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Merrie Stewart Stillpass, Todd White, Rick Record, Kellie Grob, Caroline Statkus, Bob Vogt, Thomas Shaw, Linda Fabe

PURPOSE:	1. To briefly review the work done to date 2. To review and revise the vision statement for the Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan 3. To review Focus Area Plans and Issues 4. To make any revisions, improvements, and/or additions to plan, if necessary and request endorsement by the Vision Group 5. To review the public opinion survey results 6. To prioritize General and Focus Area Issues 7. To provide an overview of implementation tools (Incentives for good design, Conservation Easements, Special Economic Districts, etc.) 8. To review / Discuss Implementation Priorities and Strategies 9. To evaluate the Land Use Vision Plan (LUVP) process
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	1. Meeting Agenda (white) 2. Consolidated Issue List (yellow) 3. Focus Area Resource Allocation Exercise Summary (keyed to Consolidated Issue List) (blue) 4. Directions for Resource Allocation Exercise (green) 5. Evaluation Form for the Land Use Visioning process (pink)
ADDITIONAL INFO:	1. Public Opinion Survey Report (available as a PDF from www.easterncorridor.org) 2. Economic Context Report (available as a PDF from www.easterncorridor.org) 3. Implementation Strategy Summary Sheets (we have a few handouts available)
MEETING SUMMARY	**Vision Statement:** Forested waterways, greenways, and tree-covered hillsides define the character of the region, making it attractive to visitors as well as residents. Jurisdictions work cooperatively to focus development in the most appropriate areas while environmentally sensitive zones, parks, and recreational areas are preserved. Pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods with housing opportunities and accessibility for all are distributed throughout the region. A well integrated transportation system composed of roads, convenient transit options, and hike/bike trails allow local residents and passers-through to get to employment, shopping, recreation, entertainment, and other destinations quickly and efficiently with minimal adverse impacts to the environment or local communities. **General Issues / Opportunities:** General Consensus **Wasson Focus Area:** General Consensus ▪ Connectivity improvements need to be made that meet the needs of the proposed land uses while reducing congestion **Red Bank Focus Area:** General Consensus ▪ Some of the people present from Madisonville indicated that the preferred lo9cation for a transit hub in that neighborhood would be at the intersection of Madison and Red Bank Roads **Ohio 32 Focus Area:** General Consensus **Wooster Focus Area:** General Consensus ▪ Relocated Ohio 32 could reduce congestion in some communities, but there are environmental and aesthetic concerns that would need to be addressed ▪ South Milford – currently planned for school, park, and office development o Need to maintain access from neighborhoods to parks and ballfields ▪ Columbia Township, east of Mariemont o Concern over Wooster Pike widening, needs to create bicycle connections and pedestrian friendly design o Concerns that if ODOT is unresponsive to local wishes expressed in this Vision Plan with regard to creating pedestrian and bicycle connections, that it would reflect poorly on the land use visioning process

- Concerns regarding mixed use development in this area, that it would needs sewers and would burden local schools (sewer improvements planned for very near future, beginning this summer, 2002)
- Milford – Ohio 28 corridor: there needs to be better pedestrian amenities (sidewalks, etc.) in the vicinity of the new Post Office

Eastern Ave / Lunken Focus Area: General Consensus

- Some people would like to limit air traffic at Lunken Airport
- Creating attractive Industry and Office space around Lunken is not intended to endorse creating office space at California Woods
  - Preserving California Woods is a part of the Land Use Vision Plan

River Plains Focus Area: General Consensus

- The development discussed within this focus area is smaller scale development
- Focus development in areas where development currently exists
- Emphasize resource-sensitive development
- Preserve agricultural land

General Comments:

- Reducing congestion can be adversarial to creating neighborhood centers (i.e., there is a certain amount of traffic necessary to make neighborhood centers viable)
- It is important to keep the Focus Area priorities prominent in the final document, especially with regard to access to parks, preserving greenspace, etc.)
- Regarding the interconnectedness of the Land Use Vision Plan - Emphasize preference for transit and facilitating alternative transportation options that are more environmentally friendly

REVIEW OF LAND USE VISION PLAN

Focus Area Characteristics

Eastern Ave / Lunken Focus Area

- Zones of Change
- Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations
- Important Focus Area Issues
- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

River Plains Focus Area

- Zones of Change
- Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations
- Important Focus Area Issues
- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

ENCLOSURES:

- Summary Group Work

NEXT STEPS:

- Review Mailed Materials
- Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into
- Attend Public Meetings

VISION GROUP RESOURCE ALLOCATION EXERCISE RESULTS				
$ Allocated (in millions)	**Dots**	**# of Allocaters**	**Avg. Allocation**	***Issue***
98	**5**	**15**	**6.53**	Preserve land in river plains for agriculture or open space. Reestablish forested streamside corridors along the Little Miami River to preserve and enhance water quality
98	**10**	**12**	**8.16**	**Create connectivity improvements for people and goods. This could include any or all of the following (subject to recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Travel Demand Modeling and Engineering studies):** Basic Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study (MIS) recommendations: • Intersection / Interchange Improvements • Park-and-pool or park-and-ride lots • Expanded use of motorist information system message boards (ARTIMIS) • Better traffic signal coordination • Road Widenings o New and expanded bike lanes and trails o More frequent service on existing bus routes • Expanded bus transit system coverage (new routes) service • New rail transit service • Widened, expanded, or new roadways • New Road Alignments **Additional recommendations and considerations that came out of Focus Area discussions:** • Transit service to neighborhoods by smaller shuttle buses • Create convenient and direct forms of transit • New, relocated or consolidated barge terminals • Rail freight improvements • Water Taxi service (Ohio River) • Commuter air passenger service (Lunken) **(not endorsed by the Wooster Focus Area)** • Air freight (Lunken) **(not endorsed by the Wooster Focus Area)** **Also:** **Red Bank Focus Area:** • Maintain at-grade connection of Madison Road at Red Bank **Eastern Ave / Lunken Focus Area:** • Consideration of other transit options such as transit that may not follow existing rights-of-way, but could run in air-space above the ground surface / road ways. Views of the Ohio River could be an amenity associated with this type of transit.
52	**0**	**15**	**3.47**	**Parks and Open Space:** Preserve existing parks and open space, and create new parks and open space for under-served areas **WASSON FOCUS AREA (Parks and Open Space):** • Evanston • North Oakley **RED BANK FOCUS AREA (Parks and Open Space):** • Madisonville • Fairfax • Little Duck Creek Corridor **WOOSTER FOCUS AREA (Parks and Open Space):** • Along Little Miami River's edge • Near new development • Public playfields on the 80 acres in south Mariemont **OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA (Parks and Open Space):** • Near new development

				• Preserve wetlands and hillsides • Near lakes in Newtown / Ancor **EASTERN AVE / LUNKEN FOCUS AREA (Parks and Open Space):** • Along Ohio River's edge • East End • Columbia Tusculum • Linwood
38	**2**	**13**	**2.92**	**Reduce Flood Hazards and moderate urban storm runoff quality of US 52 along the Ohio River**
36	**0**	**13**	**2.77**	Preserve hillsides, architectural character, and visual quality of US 52 along the Ohio River
34	**0**	**12**	**2.83**	Create bike trail connections (e.g., from neighborhoods to an integrated bike trail network which includes the Little Miami, Lunken, and Ohio River Bike Trails)
32	**2**	**10**	**3.2**	Preserve hillsides, Little Miami River's edge and visual quality of US 50 along the Little Miami River
30	**2**	**4**	**7.5**	Encourage Office and Industrial uses in Red Bank Corridor while limiting Retail Development Develop Business incubators, perhaps in campus-type setting Redevelop Brownfields and under-utilized sites
26	**0**	**6**	**4.33**	Develop Ancor and Northeast Newtown area with a mix of office, industrial, and recreation Preserve environmentally sensitive areas and link them with green space corridors, creating an office park atmosphere with recreational opportunities
24	**1**	**7**	**3.43**	Develop industrial uses on brownfields and create industrial infill development where industrial uses are already established
22	**1**	**7**	**3.14**	Revitalize Madisonville NBD near Whetsel Ave. and Madison Road
19	**0**	**9**	**2.11**	Minimize the negative impacts of any connectivity improvements
17	**0**	**7**	**2.43**	Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
16	**0**	**6**	**2.67**	Revitalize / Create Fairfax NBD
16	**0**	**3**	**5.33**	Revitalize / Create smaller Madisonville NBD at Whetsel Ave. and Bramble Ave.
14	**0**	**5**	**2.8**	Preserve/Enhance air, water, and visual quality in the region
14	**0**	**3**	**4.67**	Expand residential opportunities along the Ohio River in a way that they are kept away from flood hazards
13	**0**	**8**	**1.63**	Reduce congestion caused by through traffic to allow for a more pedestrian friendly design: • Fairfax (Wooster Pike) • Mariemont (Wooster Pike) • Columbia Township, east of Mariemont on Wooster Pike • Newtown • Eastgate / Eastgate South
12	**1**	**1**	**12**	Develop south of I-71 and Ridge Ave. (near Milacron site) with a mix of office, retail, and residential, and keep nearby industrial uses • Develop Business incubators, perhaps in campus-type setting • Redevelop Brownfields and under-utilized sites
11	**0**	**7**	**1.57**	Enhance pedestrian-friendly character using traffic calming measures, preferably with a planted median in most locations listed below • Fairfax (Wooster Pike) • Columbia Township, east of Mariemont on Wooster Pike • Columbia Tusculum along Columbia Parkway between Delta & Stanley Ave • US 50 Corridor in Milford, east of Five Points • Possibly along Old SR 28 alignment in Miami Township
11	**0**	**4**	**2.75**	Develop, or find existing, criteria to evaluate and assess proposed development in environmentally sensitive areas, such as South Milford, so that sensitive areas are preserved or enhanced
9	**0**	**6**	**1.5**	Make Neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens and youth

9	0	8	1.13	Create planted median in Columbia Township with green strips on either side of Wooster Pike and create provisions for bicycle traffic and connections to planned hike/bike trails Reduce curb cuts on south side and create shared parking opportunities
8	1	4	2	Create / Revitalize Evanston NBD, east of Xavier, near Montgomery Road and Dana Ave. Develop Business incubators, perhaps in campus-type setting Redevelop Brownfields and under-utilized sites
7	0	2	3.5	Develop north of I-71 and Ridge Ave. (the area around John Nolan Ford, Circuit City, K-Mart, Sam's Club, etc.) with a mix of office, retail, residential, and light industrial uses, as appropriate.
7	0	5	1.4	Revitalize / Create Newtown Neighborhood Business District
7	0	2	3.5	Design new development in south Milford in an environmentally sensitive manner
6	0	3	2.0	Explore the possibilities of creating incentives (e.g., special economic districts, conservation easements, purchase/transfer of development rights, developer incentives for providing socially desirable features in their projects, etc.) that would facilitate appropriate development, make the best of use of the resources available, and help to create an equitable distribution of the benefits of development and preservation in the region.
6	0	4	1.5	Given the pressure for development in the area north of Rookwood (along Edwards Ave., near on-ramp to I-71), guide that development to minimize the creation of further congestion, and create pedestrian connections within the development and to the surrounding areas. The land use envisioned in this area is a mix of office and other commercial development with limited retail
6	0	3	2.0	Revitalize / Create Anderson Township Town Center at Beechmont Mall site
6	0	3	2.0	Redevelop Ohio 28 Corridor in Miami Township as mixed use pedestrian friendly development
6	0	1	6.0	Redevelop / Enhance California Neighborhood Business District along Kellogg Ave.
6	0	3	2.0	Encourage attractive light industry / office development near Lunken Airport
5	0	3	1.67	Develop the area around Perintown with mixed-use pedestrian friendly development
5	0	3	1.67	Redevelop along US 50 corridor in Milford to be more pedestrian friendly
4	0	4	1.0	Make Hyde Park Plaza area more pedestrian-friendly and fit better with local context
4	0	4	1.0	Preserve / Expand the Farmer's Market on Wilmer Ave., near Kellogg
4	0	2	2.0	Redevelop Columbia Township along Wooster Pike east of Mariemont with a mix of housing and neighborhood retail
3	0	2	1.5	Develop the US 50 Corridor from Milford to Perintown with a mix of office and industrial uses
3	0	3	1.0	Redevelop / Create Columbia Tusculum Neighborhood Business District (along Columbia Parkway and to the south, between Stanley and Delta) as mixed use pedestrian friendly development
2	0	2	1.0	Create streetscape and gateway improvements along key corridors
1	0	1	1.0	Revitalize Neighborhood Center in Mt. Carmel, along Old 74 and Mt. Carmel - Tobasco Road
1	0	1	1.0	Create a neighborhood center at Clough Pike and Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road
0	0	0	0	Consider the creation of pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development in appropriate locations in Union Township. These may include the following: • Near Clough Pike and Gleneste-Withamsville • Near Clough Pike and Bach-Buxton • Near Aicholtz and Ferguson
0	0	0	0	Develop the area along Clough Pike near Bach-Buxton with a mix used development. Primarily a mix of office and industrial to the east.

0	**0**	**0**	**0**	Create / Encourage Bed + Breakfasts in California, Columbia Tusculum, and East End
0	**0**	**0**	**0**	Redevelop / Create Linwood Neighborhood Center along Eastern Ave., north of Beechmont
0	**0**	**0**	**0**	Redevelop / Create Neighborhood Center (s) in East End • Near Eastern Ave. and Kemper • Near Eastern Ave. and Collins
0	**0**	**0**	**0**	Create new East End K-12 School and Community Center along Kellogg Avenue, near Delta or Stanley

APPENDIX C – Focus Area Meetings

Wasson Focus Area

Red Bank Focus Area

Wooster Focus Area

Ohio 32 Focus Area

Eastern Avenue/Lunken Focus Area

River Plains Focus Area

APPENDIX C – Focus Area Meetings
Wasson Focus Area

Focus Area Meeting #1 - 4/11/01

- Meeting Summary
- Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #2 - 4/18/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #3 - 4/25/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Combined Wasson / Red Bank Focus Area Meeting #4 - 2/20/02

- Meeting Summary
- Prioritization of Action Items

WASSON FOCUS AREA MEETING #1
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, April 11, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	Sheila Adams, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Terry Barhorst, Pam Bowers, Delores Brown, Tom Brown, Ed Casagrande, Bill Davin, John Delaney, Charlie Desando, Rick Dettmer, Rene Dierker, Susan Doucleff, Jon Doucleff, Bette Evanshine, Ron Gardner, Kathryn Gibbons, Tony Giglio, Ed Goering, Joseph Hochbein, Richard Hoekzema, Ken Hughes, Tom Jones, Jennifer Kaminer, Charles Klingman, Cheryl Koopman, John Kucia, Donna Lake, Bob Lane, Pat Mitchell, Charlene Morse, John Murphy, Sharon Muyaya, Carl Palmer, Tim Reynolds, Gilbert Richards, Barb Rider, Gwen Robinson, Susan Roescrun, Susan Roschke, Eric Russo, Trent Schade, John Schneider, Michael Self, Mark Sheppard, Reginald Victor, Dorothy Vogt, Alex Warm, Bob Zumbiel
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Scott Adams
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Paul Smiley, Bob Vogt, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Wasson Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Aspects of Smart Growth/Standards for Recreational Activities (double-sided) Planning Principles Handout Ahwahnee Planning Principles Handout Ground Rules Handout Consensus Process Handout Visioning Worksheet 11x17 Map of Focus Area Political Jurisdictions 11x17 Map of Focus Area Slope and Building Footprints *MetroMoves* brochure
MEETING SUMMARY	• Introductions • History of and Context of Eastern Corridor Land Use Visioning • Discussion of Land Use Visioning Methodology • Discussion of Goals and Ground Rules • Visioning Exercise for Future of Wasson Focus Area
INITIAL HOPES/FEARS REGARDING THIS PROJECT (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	Hopes • Would like an emphasize on pedestrian movement systems • Add multi-family infill housing • Brownfields converted to greenspace/parks • Hyde Park Plaza can be planned to integrate into surrounding neighborhood • Metro hubs would be great • Hope this plan moves quickly • Excited by Wasson rail potential • Maybe bikeways could be option • Enhance diversity of process; seniors, social, racial • Focus community identity – Oakley
	Fears • How can we fund these proposals • "Cannibalism" of new retail development • Loose towne centers & neighborhood centers to develop • Loss of manufacturing base – progressive problem • Concerned Hyde Park plaza expansion creates problems • Fear this plan will not be implemented

DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	*Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements.* *The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.*
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Visioning Summary
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Wasson Focus Area – Meeting 1

Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry
Group participants:
Jon Doucleff
Bette Evanshine
Ken Hughes
Eric Russo
Reginald Victor
Charlene Morse

Chartpack Notes

- Expanded services
- Transfer station @ Xavier
- Observatory an attraction
- Greenspaces, community gardens
- Intensive multi-family development/mixed use
- Racial & economic diversity
- Public art/fountain @ Oakley Square
- Shuttles between business districts
- Enhanced crosswalks @ Oakley Square
- Identify Oakley architectural treasures; modern/ celebrate Milacron; 20th century
- Madison road bikeway
- Underground utility wires!
- Eliminate Oakley Square billboards; all
- Enhance square & community gathering
- Community schools – elementary
- Children playing – (Mariemont)
- Balance; homes, retail, schools, focal space, community space
- Core space – hierarchy of spaces
- Sense of identity
- Connectivity/regional & neighborhoods
- Sustainable neighborhoods
- Vehicles not polluting
- Alternative transportation options/future
    - PRT/"beam me up" to Hyde Park Square
- North Avondale homes – back to single residency from multi-family
- Create affordable living options
- Create diverse neighborhoods
- Future neighborhood with pride/ racial, social, economic, diversity
- No new shopping places
- Commuter highways/controlled lanes
- Clean air/no pollutants
- Focus development on neighborhood nodes
    - Self-sufficient
    - Pedestrian oriented
    - Mini downtowns
    - Complete services
- Create/recreate uniqueness of city in its neighborhoods
- Mixed uses/public spaces/geographic dist. group houses

- Development required to include greenspace around/into all development
- Design all buildings with dignity & artfulness

Facilitator Notes

Reginald Victor
- Expand services (transportation)
- Transportation hub at Xavier (not just UC)

Ken Hughes
- Shuttle from Hyde Park Square to Oakley to connect the 2 cbd's
- Raised crosswalks, connecting greenspace
    - Pavers/more identifiable crosswalks
- Celebrate architectural 'treasures' (ex: 20th century)
- Bike lane down Madison Rd
- Break away from housing that is dehumanizing (i.e. large apartment complexes)

Jon Doucleff
- Balance equilibrium between homes/retail
- A focal public space
- Hierarchy of activities radiating from a community "spine"
- Connectivity
- Housing/business units self sustaining – less dependant on power

Eric Russo
- Public art/fountain at Oakley
- Radial patterns of development – around new nodes (Hyde Park, Walnut Hills, etc.)

Bette Evanshine
- Aesthetic ground rules (try to avoid things like 5/3 sign in Oakley)
- Community schools (especially for elementary)

Charlene Morse
- Some multi-family back to single family
- Spread multi-family sections throughout corridor; create diversity
- Mo more shopping centers – we've reached the limit
- Plan for roads to accommodate <u>future</u> transportation

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Todd White
Group participants:
Susan Doucleff
Scott Adams
Terry Barhorst
Trent Schade
John Schneider
Tim Reynolds
Dotty Vogt

Chartpack Notes

- Synergy of retail/industry/residential
    - Need to maintain & enhance
- Get higher paying jobs throughout focus area
    - Industrial/high-tech
- Keep work <u>here</u> rather than suburbs (i.e. Blue Ash)
- Create higher quality of life w/diversity
- Oakley has capacity for industrial redevelopment
- Good schools / better public and private schools
- Deter traffic congestion
- Strength in current neighborhood identity
- Great housing stock exists
- Draw distinction between suburbs and here (this <u>isn't</u> the suburbs!)
- East/west connection needed

- Wasson rail line potential use
  - Light rail
  - Road improvement

Facilitator Notes

Tim Reynolds
- Norfolk Southern abandoned rail line
  - Xavier to Bond Hill
- Great opportunity to address traffic problem in Hyde Park and redevelop Hyde Park Plaza to be more of a neighborhood center

Sue Doucleff
- Maintaining industrial base (manufacturing, high-tech)
  - Example Milacron

Dorothy Vogt
- Wants a safer environment; beautification
- French restaurant on Woodburn

Trent Schade
- Envision Norwood continuing patter of Rookwood Towers
- Improved diversity & vital neighborhoods spurred by new local employment opportunities

John Schneider
- More east-west flow
- Value creation where paths cross
  - Red Bank/Madison
  - Evanston/Norwood/Xavier
  - Fairfax

Terry Barhorst
- Underground utilities in Hyde Park; no overhead telephone lines
- More greenspace (along I-71 & freeways)

WASSON FOCUS AREA MEETING #2
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, April 18, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Sheila Adams, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Terry Barhorst, Pam Bowers, Delores Brown, Tom Brown, Ed Casagrande, Bill Davin, John Delaney, Charlie Desando, Rick Dettmer, Rene Dierker, Susan Doucleff, Jon Doucleff, Bette Evanshine, Ron Gardner, Kathryn Gibbons, Tony Giglio, Ed Goering, Joseph Hochbein, Richard Hoekzema, Ken Hughes, Tom Jones, Jennifer Kaminer, Charles Klingman, Cheryl Koopman, John Kucia, Donna Lake, Bob Lane, Mike McKeehan, Pat Mitchell, Charlene Morse, John Murphy, Sharon Muyaya, Carl Palmer, Tim Reynolds, Gilbert Richards, Barb Rider, Gwen Robinson, Susan Roescrun, Susan Roschke, Eric Russo, Trent Schade, John Schneider, Michael Self, Mark Sheppard, Reginald Victor, Dorothy Vogt, Alex Warm, Bob Zumbiel
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Scott Adams
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Albert Nelson, Lorraine Shannon, Robert Shannon
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Bob Vogt, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Wasson Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis Opportunities Prioritization: SWOT Analysis 3/7 "Developing Around Transit" article (ULI 4/01) copied on back of above
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning ▪ Land Use Images ▪ Brief Recap of Planning Principles ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Whole Group Area Assessment of Focus Area ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan
Additional Themes/Issues (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	▪ Community aesthetics ▪ Neighborhood character o Preserve/ Rehabilitate ▪ Emphasize preserving & creating job opportunities ▪ Preserve & enhance residential neighborhoods ▪ Balanced land use is critical to strengthening neighborhoods and communities ▪ All schools (including higher education) are important to consider
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Wasson Focus Area – Meeting 2
April 18, 2001

Group Analysis

Strengths/Opportunities

- Older neighborhood retains pedestrian character
- Many transportation assets (i.e. rail lines, etc.)
- Higher education facilities are in this condensed area
- Mixed housing stock
- Vibrant neighborhood districts
- Flat topography
    - Attractive to business and industry
    - Results in less 'litter' than the hillsides in other areas of the City
- Social diversity
- Proximity to downtown and other places (King's Island, Riverbend)
- Area connects east-west (Norwood Lateral)
- Area sits in geographic center
    - Potential transportation hubs leading to strong economic development
- Use of existing abandoned rail lines will be of less consequence than a major highway
- Not much vacant land in this area results in vibrant real estate market/attracts investment

Threats/Constraints

- Streets are congested/overcrowded
- Mixed housing stock
- Schools need restructured to serve all neighborhoods (i.e. Madisonville)
- Proximity to attractions brings transportation pressures
- Lack of strong high-volume connection between 75 & 71
    - Hershel Avenue is becoming a thru-street
- Norwood divided by transportation corridors (I-71/Lateral/future light rail(?))
- New transportation corridors /links need to enhance communities not divide them
- Light rail will/will not enhance economic development
- Communities that do not accept/work with change
- Will communities be enhanced or destroyed by new transportation infrastructure?
- Norwood area concerned about re-use of rail lines/impact of; noise, interruption of traffic, etc.)
- Not much vacant land in area for new development

Potential Zones of Change

- Evanstan (south) vacant land along Dana Avenue
    - Gateway into area
- Milacron site
- Robertson Road corridor

Land Use – Area Analysis Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/ Brian Balsley

Reggie Victor	City of Cincinnati
Charlene Morse	North Avondale
Jon Doucleff	Oakley
Robert Vogt	RSVP
Mike McKeehan	Norwood
Ken Hughes	Oakley

Chartpack Notes

Zones of change

- Norwood, between I-71 & Edwards Road
- Along Wasson Rd between Paxton & Marburg – Kroger expansion & homes at Marburg
- Milacron site redevelopment
    - Industrial to 'big-box' retail
    - Changed traffic patterns
    - Propose to be office/light industrial/tech center

Rail/Transit hub locations

- BASF site
- Madison & Edwards "triangle"
- XU/Dana rail junction
- Hyde Park Plaza
- Erie Avenue (whistle stop)
- Light rail along Wasson to I-71 then north
- Norwood station west of Edwards & north of Rookwood
- Large Station on Milacron site
- Bus hub in Norwood at Surry Square or Central Park or Montgomery Rd/562 (NW corner)
- Bus hub at BASF site (major hub)
- Bus hub at Oakley Drive-in area

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Todd White/ Stacey Weaks/ Linda Fabe

John Schneider	First Valley Corp
Sue Doucleff	Oakley
Tim Reynolds	SORTA/Metro
Scott Adams	Richards Industries

Chartpack Notes

- Hyde Park County Club has declining membership, worth watching as a potential developable site
- Milacron Park is 50% sure to go 'big-box' (north portion)
    - Meijer's, Target, Sam's
    - Hopeful to retain residential + office uses
- Loss of manufacturing is a serious concern / lots of interconnection between local industries in Oakley
- Development @ Milacron (retail) would cause decline of commercial area at Ridge & Highland
- HQ is church site w/plans for expansion with a school
- Loss of homes north of HQ
- Hyde Park Plaza – Kroger is expanding
    - Recreate plaza to be more pedestrian friendly (currently doesn't reflect community atmosphere)
- Reinforce unique character of Oakley/Hyde Park

- Rail station potential location
  - Montgomery
  - Rookwood
  - Hyde Park Plaza
  - Marburg (maybe)
  - Erie (park & ride)
  - Bus hub at Rookwood or Hyde Park Plaza
- Potential for parallel bike trail along Wasson connecting to Little Miami + Ohio River
- Potential residential redevelopment
  - 20 units of owner-occupied north of Wasson, west of Marburg
  - Hyde Park Country Club
  - Need for housing designed for seniors
  - Need for affordable housing ($100,000-150,000)
- Redevelopment at BASF
  - Potential transit hub
  - Public Facilities (Library, urgent care)
  - Some retail
  - Business District
  - Flex space; single story office
  - Business incubators
- Need more greenspace + recreation space
  - Around Milacron development
  - Bike trail along Wasson

WASSON FOCUS AREA MEETING #3
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, April 25, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Sheila Adams, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Terry Barhorst, Pam Bowers, Delores Brown, Tom Brown, Edward Casagrande, Bill Davin, John Delaney, Charlie Desando, Rick Dettmer, Rene Dierker, Ron Doctor, Susan Doucleff, Jon Doucleff, Bette Evanshine, Ron Gardner, Kathryn Gibbons, Tony Giglio, Ed Goering, Joseph Hochbein, Richard Hoekzema, Ken Hughes, Tom Jones, Jennifer Kaminer, Charles Klingman, Cheryl Koopman, John Kucia, Donna Lake, Bob Lane, Mike McKeehan, Pat Mitchell, Charlene Morse, John Murphy, Sharon Muyaya, Carl Palmer, Tim Reynolds, Gilbert Richards, Barb Rider, Gwen Robinson, Susan Roescrun, Susan Roschke, Eric Russo, Trent Schade, John Schneider, Michael Self, Mark Sheppard, Reginald Victor, Dorothy Vogt, Alex Warm, Bob Zumbiel
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Scott Adams, Tom Ryther
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Paul Smiley, Bob Vogt, Stacey Weaks, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Wasson Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Land Use Issue Areas
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work of last meeting ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work
Additional Themes/Issues (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	▪ Maintain balance of residential and employment ▪ Quality of employment opportunities is declining (mainly low and high end) ▪ Recommend Hi-tech incubators ▪ Traffic and parking issues around Xavier University ▪ Economic development (broad spectrum and sustainable) ▪ Improved mobility for residents and workers
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Wasson Focus Area – Meeting 3
April 25, 2001

Land Use – Area Analysis Exercise

Group 1
Group Facilitators: Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Linda Fabe, Heather Quisenberry

Cheryl Koopman	
Edward Casagrande	
Ron Doctor	
John Schneider	First Valley Corp
Sue Doucleff	Oakley
Tim Reynolds	SORTA/Metro
Scott Adams	Richards Industries

Chartpack Notes

- Globe Site (Norwood, Montgomery north of Lateral)
  - Environmental, traffic reconfiguration, etc
  - Planned for hotels, Kroger's
  - Would be nice to have a more unique development their
- Dana Avenue
  - Gateway just west of I-71
  - Under utilized land between Dana and railroad to north
  - Dana/Montgomery has potential as a destination
  - Gateway at Dana and Ledgewood
  - Creation of own identity for Evanston
  - BASF is considered a clean site
- Madison & Edwards
  - Excellent location for transit hub
  - Potential roundabout/gateway
- Hyde Park Plaza
  - Appears like a suburban center in an urban environment
  - Out of character
  - More pedestrian-friendly
    - (Eg. Mashpee Commons in Massachusetts)
  - Residential component
  - More access/frontage from Wasson
  - Room for bike trail along Wasson as far west as Hyde Park Plaza; perhaps further
- Reinforce qualities of this area that has make it successful while mitigating bad aspects of success (traffic)
- Unpleasant to walk to local shopping
- North of Rookwood
  - Transitional; attempting to retain residential character
- Milacron Site
  - Oakley Power supplies energy locally (to US Playing Card, etc.)
    - Generates power in the local industrial buildings
  - Creating big-box may bring down all local industries
  - Lack of expansion potential for local industries
  - Local industries don't want to restrict their ability to sell land for retail uses
  - Economic development needs to better attract/retain businesses
  - Gateway where Ridge enters Oakley from I-71
  - Lots of factors pushing for retail
- Hyde Park Country Club redevelopment opportunities
  - Cluster development with lots of public greenspace

    - Mix of housing prices

- Marburg and Wasson (NW corner)
    - Condos or single family housing

- Re-designation/Relocation of Ohio 561 to Red Bank and elsewhere
    - Take traffic out of residential areas
    - Maintenance funding would be modified
- Hierarchy of centers and subcenters with "sense of place" with transit hubs, neighborhood business districts, gateways, etc.

Facilitator Notes

- Globe site (north of lateral, Norwood)
    - Potential site for limited development (due to site contamination)
    - Planned for hotels, Kroger's; dependant on clean-up
    - Don't want a big parking lot: will not enhance quality of life
    - Want to try to maintain historical areas
    - Possible transit hub?
    - Norwood doesn't want to be "used"
        - Wants development that will speak to the people of Norwood, not just "guests"
        - Generally opposed to light rail
- Underutilized site
    - Dana Avenue: just west of I-71 (gateway from Xavier to Norwood/Evanston)
    - Maybe any architectural features from Xavier pulled in
    - (see Evanston Gateway prog. in plan; also Oakley Gateway)
- How can development be attracted to Evanston?
    - Five points area
    - Where's the core?
    - Could light rail go through Evanston? Could it be viable? Right now no reason
    - Gateway from Victory Parkway?
    - Separate sense of identity: not "Evanston an extension of Xavier"
- Rail hub on Madison (near Rookwood/Norwood)
    - Madison & Edwards
    - Coletta Building: Norwood (rail line is the division)
    - Roundabout in area? (like Eden Park)
    - Potential rail station at Paxton (Hyde Park Plaza)
    - Redevelopment of Hyde Park Plaza
    - Mashpee Commons (Mass.); needs to be more "village" like
    - Infill housing/starter housing/office space
- Pedestrian links (Smith/Edwards)
    - Rookwood / both for Cincinnati & Norwood sides
- Take traffic out of residential
- Redesignation of 561
- Room for bike trail along Wasson (west of Hyde Park Place, maybe more)
- North of Rookwood-transitional
- Hierarchy of nodes; leading to "sense of place"
- Business incubators
    - Use manufacturing areas in a new tech way
    - Don't limit zoning to only manufacturing just in case area needs to change to same tax base
- Oakley manufacturing areas hold potential to bring area down/questions in play about how it should be used/don't want to see a Colerain or Beechmont

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner, Brian Balsley, Travis Miller, Paul Smiley

Ken Hughes	Oakley
Eric Russo	Hyde Park
Mike McKeehan	Norwood
Bette Evanshine	Oakley/Hyde Park
Deloris Brown	Evanston
Jon Doucleff	Oakley
Robert Vogt	RSVP

Chartpack Notes

- Redevelopment of Norwood Plaza area
- Hyde Park Plaza Thriftway vacancy? Replacement with higher intensity use-more vehicles
- Parking needs at hubs and stations presently limited
- Rail stops need to be limited to keep travel times down
- Road blockage by trains could increase congestion: Madison/Edwards and Paxton/Wasson
- Economic development needed in urban core to retain homeowners in traditional neighborhoods
- Park-n-ride bus hub at Milacron site beside I-71
- No park-n-ride at Norwood Surrey Square due to limited space
- Move Rookwood rail stop closer to Withrow High School or at Blue Moon Site
- Withrow conversion to condos?
- Erie rail stop can be eliminated or a bus stop/walk to stop only
- Consolidate Paxton and Erie stops to west of Marburg
- Potential high rise office at I-71 & Dana
- If no light rail, same concerns and identified zones of change
- Need to redefine "true" sense of neighborhood/community
- The Teays River valley "fertile crescent"
- Cincinnati zoning code revisions to limit retail

Themes

- Sense of community/neighborhoods
- Mid level jobs/"fertile crescent"
- Light rail hubs/station (approximately 1mile intervals)
- Bus hub & park-n-ride (approximately 3 mile intervals)
- Preserve and revitalize
    - Residential neighborhoods
    - Neighborhood business districts
    - Parks & greenspace
- Redefine our actual neighborhood vs planning districts
- Focuses of development
    - UC
    - Xavier
    - Aging neighborhoods and populations

Facilitator Notes

- Norwood Plaza needs redeveloped
- BASF site
    - Potential rail/bus hub
    - Currently planned for retail (possibly new development may contain hub)
- Rookwood and Hyde Park Plaza is currently under in recommended parking spaces for retail square footage; the addition of transit hubs will further burden
- Hyde Park Plaza/Rookwood draws regional shoppers; UC & Xavier to Terrace Park
- Light rail ridership needs to relate to bus use

    - (i.e. if rail use eliminates bus use/stops need to be re-evaluated)
    - Light rail = regional transportation
    - Bus = localized transportation
- Locations of hubs need to be spaced to best serve community and commuters using transit
- Madison/Edwards, Paxton/Wasson
    - Rail will only congest area more with frequent stops
    - Stacking at hub there will be consideration not to block those roads
        - Rookwood location needs to be west (near Blue Moon)
- Consider seniors/aging – will they accept light rail?
- Area consists of young and old – middle ages with families have predominately relocated to suburbs for schools.
- Where rail goes development will go
- Need stop near Ault Park/recreational areas
- Transit need to be people/user friendly
- Students at Xavier/UC will be large users of light rail – not the elderly
- Park-n-ride location at I-71 & Ridge on Milacron site
- Withrow High School – possible redevelopment site
- Zones of change
    - BASF
        - Light rail needs to co-exist/be included in proposed retail development on the site
- Hub/stop locations
    - Blue Moon (stop)
    - Hyde Park Plaza – close to Marburg
- Notion of individual communities need to be re-evaluated
    - Neighborhoods should be 'redefined'
    - Strengthen true sense of neighborhood in older communities (i.e. walkable areas)
    - Encourage/emphasize points of commonality/gathering spaces (churches, schools, markets)
- Rail "crescent from Fairfax, up Red Bank, through (above) Norwood,
    - Opportunity for change – "fertile crescent"
- Maybe focus shouldn't be on Wasson corridor only – consider 'crescent'
- Manufacturing in this area will determine future of Cincinnati
    - Needs to be handled/driven in a positive way
- Crescent should have fiber-optic infrastructure
- Flex-space as used in Norwood should be modeled throughout crescent area

RED BANK AND WASSON FOCUS AREA MEETING #4
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Tuesday, February 19, 2002
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	**Red Bank:** Mark Alexander, James Anderson, Bob Beiting, Michael Benken, Harry Blanton, Mike Brandy, Jo Ann Brown, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Bob Burns, Kent Cashell, Jim Coppock, Officer Dawson, John Deatrick, Ron Docter, Ben Dotson, Susan Doucleff, Mary Dunlap, Sara Evans, Tom Fiorini, Bill Fisher, Altman Fleisher, Don Gardner, Tim Gilday, Patricia Haas, Tom Hagerty, Warren Hill, Amy Holter, Richard Hoekzema, Robert Horne, Ted Hubbard, Kenneth Hughes, Susan Hughes, Hans Jindal, J.J. Jioducci, Jennifer Kaminer, John Kammerer, Janet Keller, Doug King, Dacia Ludwick, Juanita Lynem, Mel Martin, Steve Mary, Kathy Meinke, Sue Micheli, Bill Miller, Thomas Moeller, Carl Monzel, Linda Murphy, John Murray, John Neyer, Curt Paddock, Carl Palmer, Victoria Parlin, David Perry, Doug Peters, Pamela Quisenberry, Charles Reid, Kirstin Rubinstein, David Sams, Theodore Shannon, James Siegel, Bob Steier, Lee Stone, Joshua Swain, Rick Veith, David Watlz, Randy Welker, Michael Whitney **Wasson:** Scott Adams, Sheila Adams, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Terry Barhorst, Pam Bowers, Delores Brown, Tom Brown, Edward Casagrande, Bill Davin, John Delaney, Charlie Desando, Rick Dettmer, Rene Dierker, Ron Doctor, Susan Doucleff, Jon Doucleff, Bette Evanshine, Ron Gardner, Kathryn Gibbons, Tony Giglio, Ed Goering, Joseph Hochbein, Richard Hoekzema, Ken Hughes, Tom Jones, Jennifer Kaminer, Charles Klingman, Cheryl Koopman, John Kucia, Donna Lake, Bob Lane, Mike McKeehan, Pat Mitchell, Charlene Morse, John Murphy, Sharon Muyaya, Carl Palmer, Tim Reynolds, Gilbert Richards, Barb Rider, Gwen Robinson, Susan Roescrun, Susan Roschke, Eric Russo, Trent Schade, John Schneider, Michael Self, Mark Sheppard, Reginald Victor, Dorothy Vogt, Alex Warm, Bob Zumbiel
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther, Vermorgan Ziegler, Patricia Haas, Robert Vogt, Matt Grever
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Rick Record, Merrie Stewart Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Todd White
PURPOSE:	4. To review the work done to date and its purpose 5. To review Focus Area Plans and Issues 6. To make any needed revisions, improvements, and/or additions to plan 7. To prioritize Focus Area Issues for review by the Vision Group 8. Supplement representation to the Vision Group 9. Identify individuals to present Focus Area recommendations to the Vision Group on 4/4/02 10. Evaluate the Land Use Vision Plan (LUVP) process
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Focus Area Issues Process Evaluation Form
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of the Land Use Visioning process ▪ Incorporating the LUVP Travel Demand Modeling ▪ Implementation Considerations o Special Economic Districts (JEDDs, CEDAs, TIFs) ▪ Economics Overview of Focus Areas
REVIEW OF LAND USE VISION PLAN	*Focus Area Characteristics* Wasson Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues

- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

Red Bank Focus Area

- Zones of Change
- Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations
- Important Focus Area Issues
- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

ENCLOSURES:

- Summary Group Work

NEXT STEPS:

- Review Mailed Materials
- Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views
- Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

WASSON FOCUS GROUP RESOURCE ALLOCATION EXERCISE RESULTS				
$ Allocated (in millions)	**Dots**	**# of allocaters**	**Avg. Allocation**	**Action Item**
18	**2**	**6**	**3**	Create areas with multiple pedestrian-friendly destinations within walking distance. These would be areas that could effectively be served by modes of transportation other than only automobiles, or could serve to reduce the amount of automobile travel necessary to accomplish multiple purposes. There are many areas that are experiencing development pressures, and if this development occurs haphazardly, as it has in the past, this could lead to many undesirable outcomes (congestion, multiple curb cuts, lack of pedestrian connections, etc.) Creating methods to guide and implement mixed use, pedestrian-friendly development can guide the future land use to be compatible with surrounding uses and minimize negative impacts. Examples of various types of mixed use development, having varying degrees of pedestrian-friendliness, include the following areas that currently exist within the Cincinnati Region: • Ludlow Avenue in Clifton • Rookwood Commons/Plaza • Hyde Park Square • Mariemont • Mt. Lookout Square • Downtown Cincinnati • Silverton • Norwood Business District near Surrey Square • Whetsel Ave. and Madison Road in Madisonville • Oakley Square • O'Bryonville Within this Focus Area, some of the areas that may be suitable for creating or enhancing pedestrian-friendly design include the following: • Near Dana Ave. and Montgomery Road in Evanston, east of Xavier U. • Near the Rookwood development • Near Hyde Park Plaza • Near I-71 and Ridge Ave. • Fairfax
17	**1**	**4**	**4.25**	Create connectivity improvements. This could include any or all of the following (subject to recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Travel Demand Modeling and Engineering studies): **Basic Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study recommendations:** • Intersection / Interchange Improvements • Park-and-pool or park-and-ride lots • Expanded use of motorist information system message boards (ARTIMIS) • Better traffic signal coordination • Expanded bus transit system coverage (new routes) service

				• New rail transit service • Widened, expanded, or new roadways • New Road Alignments Other recommendations that came out of Focus Area discussions: • New or relocated barge terminals • Rail freight improvements • Water Taxi service (Ohio River) • Commuter air passenger service (Lunken) • Air freight (Lunken)
12	**2**	**4**	**3**	Create bike trail connections (e.g., to and from Ault Park; along Wasson; to Little Miami, Lunken, and Ohio River Bike Trails)
10	**1**	**5**	**2**	Create / Revitalize Evanston NBD, east of Xavier, near Montgomery Road and Dana Ave. • Develop Business incubators, perhaps in campus-type setting • Redevelop Brownfields and under-utilized sites
7	**0**	**4**	**1.75**	Preserve existing parks and open space, and create new parks and open space for under-served areas (e.g., Evanston, North Oakley, etc.)
5	**0**	**4**	**1.25**	Create streetscape and gateway improvements along key corridors
4	**0**	**4**	**1**	Develop north of I-71 and Ridge Ave. (the area around John Nolan Ford, Circuit City, K-Mart, Sam's Club, etc.) with a mix of office, retail, residential, and light industrial uses, as appropriate.
4	**0**	**3**	**1.33**	Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
4	**0**	**2**	**2**	Make Neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens and youth
3	**0**	**2**	**1.5**	Make Hyde Park Plaza area more pedestrian-friendly and fit better with local context
2	**0**	**2**	**1**	Develop south of I-71 and Ridge Ave. (near old Milacron site) with a mix of office, retail, and residential, and keep nearby industrial uses • Develop Business incubators, perhaps in campus-type setting • Redevelop Brownfields and under-utilized sites
2	**0**	**2**	**1**	Preserve the historic built environment
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Develop the area north of Rookwood (along Edwards Ave., near on-ramp to I-71) with a mix of office and other commercial development with limited retail
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Minimize the negative impacts of any connectivity improvements (see WA-15)
0	**0**	**0**	**0**	Explore the possibilities of creating Special Economic Districts that would mutually benefit the jurisdictions involved and facilitate implementing some of the LUVP recommendations

APPENDIX C – Focus Area Meetings
Red Bank Focus Area

Focus Area Meeting #1 - 3/20/01

- Meeting Summary
- Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #2 - 3/28/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #3 - 4/4/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Combined Wasson / Red Bank Focus Area Meeting #4 - 2/20/02

- Meeting Summary
- Prioritization of Action Items

RED BANK FOCUS AREA MEETING #1
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Tuesday, March 20, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	James Anderson, Michael Benken, Harry Blanton, Mike Brandy, Jo Ann Brown, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Bob Burns, Kent Cashell, Jim Coppock, Officer Dawson, John Deatrick, Ron Docter, Ben Dotson, Susan Doucleff, Mary Dunlap, Sara Evans, Tom Fiorini, Bill Fisher, Altman Fleisher, Don Gardner, Tim Gilday, Tom Hagerty, Warren Hill, Richard Hoekzema, Ted Hubbard, Hans Jindal, J.J. Jioducci, Jennifer Kaminer, John Kammerer, Janet Keller, Doug King, Dacia Ludwick, Juanita Lynem, Mel Martin, Steve Mary, Kathy Meinke, Sue Micheli, Bill Miller, Thomas Moeller, Carl Monzel, Linda Murphy, John Murray, John Neyer, Carl Palmer, David Perry, Doug Peters, Pamela Quisenberry, Charles Reid, Kirstin Rubinstein, David Sams, Theodore Shannon, James Siegel, Bob Steier, Lee Stone, Joshua Swain, Rick Veith, David Watlz, Randy Welker
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Susan Hughes, Kenneth Hughes, Mark Alexander, Bob Beiting
OTHER ATTENDEES:	William Martin, Tom Ryther, Michael Whitney
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Paul Smiley, Caroline Statkus, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To delevop a vision for future land use in the Red Bank Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Planning Principles Handout Ahwahnee Planning Principles Handout Ground Rules Handout Consensus Process Handout Visioning Worksheet 11x17 Map of Focus Area Political Jurisdictions 11x17 Map of Focus Area Slope and Building Footprints *MetroMoves* brochure
MEETING SUMMARY	• Introductions • History of and Context of Eastern Corridor Land Use Visioning • Discussion of Land Use Visioning Methodology • Discussion of Goals and Ground Rules • Visioning Exercise for Future of Red Bank Focus Area
INITIAL HOPES/FEARS REGARDING THIS PROJECT (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	• Will this really be used? • Red Bank connector will be high speed "x-way" like road • Access need for Red Bank Road • Improve Old Red Bank Road access – emergency vehicles, etc.
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Visioning Summary
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an toward what you would like the area to develop into

Red Bank Focus Area – Meeting 1
March 20, 2001

Key Images / Visioning Exercise

Group 1
Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry

Chartpack Notes
- Resurrect Swallen's site
- Put old Ford site to higher use
- Create a beautiful tree lined boulevard with wildflowers + paths
- Connect bikeways to Little Miami River bikeways
- Locate 1 or 2 Transit hubs in Red Bank area
- Create communication/recreation (neighborhood + senior)
- Improve public transit + connections to other neighborhoods and downtown
- Improve "walkability"
- Improve Madisonville Road NBD
- Improve Fairfax NBD
- Create employment and job opportunities
- Revitalize housing/residential districts
- Smoothen out boundaries between neighborhoods
- Create new affordable housing options
- Create mixed use development options
- Improve separation of residential from industrial uses
- Create green buffers
- Enhance all development with green + landscape
- Clean rivers + streams
- Respect freight & airport uses – improve compatibility
- Unique transportation corridor – How do we make it work?
- Enhance + improve cross jurisdiction land use planning and zoning
- Improve safety of neighborhoods
- Reduce fears between neighborhoods
- Reduce fears for potential reinvestment
    - Industry
    - Housing
- Improve transit/access with shuttles

Facilitator Notes
- Swallen's resurrected into new use
- Transportation corridor/ Ron
- Revitalized Red Bank corridor new infrastructure + greenspace
- Transit Center
- Recreation facilities*/connect
- Wildflowers along highway
- Tree lined streets/boulevarde
- Clean rivers/beautification
- Bikeways
- No ugly sound barriers
- Greenspace/walksways/bikeways
- Transportation access improved/mass transit cross metro area + downtown
- Improve walkability
- Smoothen out boundaries
- Refurbish business district
- Metro shuttles
- Employment/jobs opportunity

- Remodel housing
- Red Bank Boulevard
- Affordable housing + mixed use development

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Brian Balsley

Chartpack Notes

- Urban gardens sprinkled throughout
- Schools for every age. Or a school complex
- Residents know each other, familiarity
- Recreation for all ages: Toddlers to play, elderly to walk
- Decoration for all areas- in all spaces, a mix (like Europe)
- Kids: education, play/parent interaction
- Blending boundary lines between communities
- Hi-tech transportation: Monorail, Electronic tickets
- Create a "urban town"-Whetzel & Madison & outward
- w/ library, 1 of a kind shops, antique-specialty stores to attract people
- Learning centers & libraries
- Metro hub
- Display rich diverse history – walking trails/tours w/markers (Europe does)
- Separate retail from commercial & other uses or blend more greenspace – downtown (Madisonville) & scattered
- Sidewalk architecture
- Rehab houses
- Housing of all types include condos; for elderly
    - Lower, middle, upper, inc.
- Bike trails
    - Connect from Lunken thru Fairfax, Mariemont, Terrace Park, to Loveland (Little Miami Trail)
    - Scenic Tunnel under Wooster to river
- A community oriented Rec. center – a "Y"
- Strengthening Madisonville within the context of the entire focus area will help bring it together with the other communities in the focus area

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Travis Miller/Quentin Davis

Chartpack Notes

- Better access from I-71 (both north and south connections)
- More hotels/restaurants/services for corporate needs
- Redevelop existing industrial sites
- Connect neighborhoods thru pedestrian trails/rails to trails
- Encourage private $ in public infrastructure
- Better relations between communities and employers/industries
- Expanding parks in Madisonville; specifically Bramble park
- Areas could be redeveloped into recreational uses
- Erie Avenue ripe for residential renovation
- Businesses need room for expansion
- Redeveloped schools

Facilitator Notes

John Kammerer – Business Owner

- Need hotels, restaurants, and services for corporate employees
- Metro terminal
- Parks need expanded and enhanced

Jim Siegel - Silverton
- North bond access to I-71 for employment
- Redevelopment

Tom Fiorini – Cincinnati Sports Mall
- Area is broken into distinct parts
- Pedestrian access (thru greenspace)
    - Connect to Ault Park
- Communities need more control over industries (they can now do virtually anything they want)
- Better relations between communities
- Stabilized residential and business
- Rails to Trails

Michael Benken – Business Owner/Greenhouse
- Better access to east (32)
- Need east to west connection
- Landfill area has potential for redevelopment
- Swallen's needs redevelopment
- Need jobs

Michael Whitney – resident
- Need for private $ in public infrastructure
- Potential for regional commercial center

Group 4

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Darin Armbruster

Chartpack Notes

- Restoration of natural areas especially floodplains & hillsides
- Neighborhood grocery stores and walking accessibility
- Local transit (shuttles) part of larger system
- Presentation of current built environment
- Maintain community identity
- Historic preservation
- Maintain & improve existing housing stock
- Increase home ownership
- Control traffic (slow it) through existing business districts/improve pedestrian environment
- Neighborhood recreation/greenspace
- Neighborhood schools
- Reduce empty buildings (blight)
- Buffers between residential & industrial/manufacturing
- Separate bike lane not just route – connect major destinations (universities/parks)
- Better jobs for more neighborhood stability – less transient population
- Adequate tax base to support services in communities
- Educate population about true costs (and trade-offs) of current growth patterns
- Better pedestrian & bicycle connections between destinations
- Brownfields redeveloped for recreation
- Healthy amount of industrial/manufacturing jobs at a variety of school levels
- Create high-tech jobs
- Growth of smaller businesses
- This focus area is becoming center of city (not downtown)
- Accessibility benefits of suburbs combined with the benefits of living in a more compact urban area
    - Center of town is moving outward form downtown where accessibility is better

Facilitator Notes

Mark Alexander – Business Owner

- Confusing road system duplication
- Greenspace + recreation
- Grocery + basic necessities nearby
- Preserve/protect hillsides
- Long term plan to return floodplains to natural habitat
- Light rail + local buses developed before more roads
- Brownfields + empty structures redeveloped

Ken Hughes - Oakley
- Change brownfields to recreation areas (e.g. sportsmall)
- Traffic goes around business center; pedestrian friendly
- Proper bike lanes
- Reroute truck traffic to alleys for service

Sue Doucleff – Oakley
- No transportation, salt storage area in Madisonville
- Office facilities; increased home ownership
- Some higher paying jobs

Sue Micheli – Madisonville
- Changed diversity (increased)
- Few large manufacturers; more smaller
- Easier trips from home to work
- Neighborhood schools
- Rehabbed houses & infill development of housing
- Parks and greenspaces
- Grocery

Janet Keller – OKI
- More socioeconomic mix
- Walkable destination
- Neighborhood schools
- Central sense of place
- Be considerate to local NBD when redeveloping (e.g. Milacron)
- Walkable daycare
- Mix of housing types
- Separation of industry
- Better transit connections to jobs
- Sidewalks
- Smaller scale development
- Restore natural areas

Jim Anderson – Silverton
- Trying to develop Stewart Road
- Better connection from Silverton Stewart to Red Bank
- Light Rail
- Envisioned as younger community
- Feeder buses to light rail
- Convert lighthouse annex to retail
- Library in community
- Need more greenspace
- Overall envision light rail in future
- Need an exit going north from Stewart

RED BANK FOCUS AREA MEETING #2
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, March 28, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Mark Alexander, James Anderson, Bob Beiting, Michael Benken, Harry Blanton, Mike Brandy, Jo Ann Brown, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Bob Burns, Kent Cashell, Jim Coppock, Officer Dawson, John Deatrick, Ron Docter, Ben Dotson, Susan Doucleff, Mary Dunlap, Sara Evans, Tom Fiorini, Bill Fisher, Altman Fleisher, Don Gardner, Tim Gilday, Tom Hagerty, Warren Hill, Amy Holter, Richard Hoekzema, Robert Horne, Ted Hubbard, Kenneth Hughes, Susan Hughes, Hans Jindal, J.J. Jioducci, Jennifer Kaminer, John Kammerer, Janet Keller, Doug King, Dacia Ludwick, Juanita Lynem, Mel Martin, Steve Mary, Kathy Meinke, Sue Micheli, Bill Miller, Thomas Moeller, Carl Monzel, Linda Murphy, John Murray, John Neyer, Carl Palmer, David Perry, Doug Peters, Pamela Quisenberry, Charles Reid, Kirstin Rubinstein, David Sams, Theodore Shannon, James Siegel, Bob Steier, Lee Stone, Joshua Swain, Rick Veith, David Watlz, Randy Welker, Michael Whitney
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther, Ted Hardman
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Scott Kravitz, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Brian Snyder, John Stillpass, Rita Walsh, Stacey Weaks, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To delevop a vision for future land use in the Red Bank Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis Opportunities Prioritization: SWOT Analysis 3/7
MEETING SUMMARY	• Introductions • Brief Recap of last meeting • Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning • Land Use Images • Brief Recap of Planning Principles • Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area • Whole Group Area Assessment of Focus Area • Small Group development of conceptual land use plan • Presentation of Small Group Work
Additional Themes/Issues **(as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)**	• Balancing street calming with the need for emergency vehicle response time • Jurisdictional planning zoning + land use + access • History of corridor is fragmented – confusing to find places • Respect all issues/viewpoints/and diverse problems-opportunities • Return flood plains to natural habitat/prairie; preserve hillsides
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Group Area Analysis ▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an toward what you would like the area to develop into

Red Bank Focus Area – Meeting 2
March 28, 2001

Preliminary Themes: Most Relevant Themes/Ideas

Chartpack Notes

- Issue: Balancing street calming with the need for emergency vehicle response time
- Issue: Jurisdictional planning zoning + land use + access
- Issue: History of corridor is fragmented – confusing to find places
- Issue: Respect all issues/viewpoints/and diverse problems-opportunities
- Issue: Return flood plains to natural habitat/prairie; preserve hillsides

Area Analysis

Chartpack Notes

- Interconnected bike paths – connecting parks
- Old Red Bank Road
  - Residential vs. non-residential uses
- Murray Road has little transition between uses
- Floodplains should be uses for open space
- Kids need space to play
- Need to improve access
  - Alternate ways to get in/out
- Railroad separates Old Red Bank Road – becomes safety/access concern
- Increase in traffic w/ decrease air quality cause noise pollution
- Fairfax council decided no activity for 90 days at Red Bank – don't want "Beechmont Avenue" – council sees need to work with surrounding jurisdictions
- Fairfax mtg. monthly on vision plan
  - Will include bike plan – hope to tie in with Downtown Cinti. & Mariemont
- Consider 'residents' in bikeway plans
  - Consider maintenance
- Fairfax plans to eliminate creek @ Swallen's – converting to 'slow-flow'
  - Creek may be last in area – should it be culverted?
- Try to restore some greenspaces
- Community displacement is concern
  - Plan should consider residents of community
- Transportation choices will impact future
  - Should be done to preserve communities to maximum degree
- Need to address the cause of problem (transportation)
- Protect neighborhood integrity
- Threat to existing housing is major concern
- Madisonville/Whetsel business district should not be 'cut-off'
- Economic development
  - Brownfield redevelopment is <u>top</u> priority of Fairfax
- Oakley – industry suffering from 'flight'/it once thrived on industry

Land Use – Area Analysis Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry/ Brian Balsley

Chartpack Notes

- Fairfax –RB & Wooster should compliment, not compete as each develops (Redevelops)
- Fairfax: mixed use south of Wooster (some homes to be removed)
- Swallens site: prefer not commercial
- Fairfax portion of Red Bank Road improvements – $2.5 million
- Ford site: important consideration

- Preserve hillside greenspace north of Madisonville
- Access to Ault Park from Fairfax side
- Provide office/warehouse space for small companies
- Old Red Bank Road could be bikeway into Madisonville
- Improve access to Corsica hollow
- Red Bank aesthetics: Gateway/streetscaping
- Ideas should be practical & implementable

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Darin Armbruster/Travis Miller

Chartpack Notes

- To work & live in the same area/ Do we want this in this area?
- Walk to work
- Pedestrian friendly vs. auto oriented
- Cross town metro connections: Madisonville potential hub location
- Where does hub 'fit' into land use of Madisonville
- Youth need to get to jobs: hub could be advantage to get people to jobs
- Industrial corridor/identify vacant businesses
- Develop businesses in area not send away via hub
- Need way to get supplies in/out of businesses
- Make business more desirable
- Bus service should accommodate users (types of buses/routes)
- Many business centers along Madison Road (city wide)
- Encourage growth along Madison Road w/o hurting businesses
    - Need to manage properly
    - Maintain small/local scale of Madison
- Creation of bike lane (not just route) along Madison
- Transitional zoning needed
- Need to target defined uses (i.e. high-tech industry)
- Move people/traffic thru north-south
- Bike use should not be permitted on Madison – too much conflict w/auto traffic
- Duck Creek
    - Current crime problem
    - Need lighting
    - Pollution is issue
    - Dumping is problem
    - (trails in North Avondale through Avon Fields Golf Course on Paddock Road may have solved this problem)

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Stacey Weaks

Chartpack Notes

- Neighborhoods would like less impact from transportation
- Are we increasing sprawl with creation of relocated 32?
- Red Bank: lots of truck traffic supporting local industry
- Red Bank widening to 4 lanes possibly
    - Done in conjunction with Duck Creek flood control
    - Done in anticipation of relocated OH 32 (reconfigure interchange w/Wooster)
- Widening to west side in Fairfax
- Tree lined boulevard
- Greenspace, perhaps, over unbuildable area over Duck Creek
- Bike paths along side
- Currently 28,000 cars/day on Red Bank Rd.

- Possibly transit hub @ Claire Rail yard
- Madisonville: looking at enhancing neighborhood center at Whetsel & Madison
    - Would be nice to have a local high school
- Bramble school needs to be replaced (too small)
- Potential to expand John T. Parker (Anderson Place Elementary) as larger campus
- NuTone property?
- Important to buffer neighborhoods from arterial traffic
- Transit hub (metro) at Whetsel & Madison
- Get truck traffic off Charlamar
    - Ohio Medical Instruments needs better access
    - Access thru Oakley Drive-in or SW Publishing
- Possible High School locations
    - Rosslyn west of Red Bank
- Redevelopment in Farifax
    - Architectural review overlay
    - Avoid big box retail
    - Focus on commercial & office along Red Bank
    - Small retail serving Sports Mall, on Red Bank
    - Possible conference/meeting center
    - Extended stay facility maybe w/the aforementioned meeting center
    - Multi-family housing south of Wooster –office/retail/multi-family
- Need to improve quality of public schools
- Underground utilities Red Bank/COE projects; Fairfax along Wooster
- Expand greenspace; improve landscaping
- Small business incubator at Bramble and Whetsel

RED BANK FOCUS AREA MEETING #3
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, April 4, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Mark Alexander, James Anderson, Bob Beiting, Michael Benken, Harry Blanton, Mike Brandy, Jo Ann Brown, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Bob Burns, Kent Cashell, Jim Coppock, Officer Dawson, John Deatrick, Ron Docter, Ben Dotson, Susan Doucleff, Mary Dunlap, Sara Evans, Tom Fiorini, Bill Fisher, Altman Fleisher, Don Gardner, Tim Gilday, Tom Hagerty, Warren Hill, Amy Holter, Richard Hoekzema, Robert Horne, Ted Hubbard, Kenneth Hughes, Susan Hughes, Hans Jindal, J.J. Jioducci, Jennifer Kaminer, John Kammerer, Janet Keller, Doug King, Dacia Ludwick, Juanita Lynem, Mel Martin, Steve Mary, Kathy Meinke, Sue Micheli, Bill Miller, Thomas Moeller, Carl Monzel, Linda Murphy, John Murray, John Neyer, Curt Paddock, Carl Palmer, Victoria Parlin, David Perry, Doug Peters, Pamela Quisenberry, Charles Reid, Kirstin Rubinstein, David Sams, Theodore Shannon, James Siegel, Bob Steier, Lee Stone, Joshua Swain, Rick Veith, David Watlz, Randy Welker, Michael Whitney
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Quinten Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Paul Smiley, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Stacey Weaks, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To delevop a land use vision plan for the Red Bank Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda/Land Use Goals (double-sided)
MEETING SUMMARY	• Introductions • Brief Recap of last meeting • Discussion of "Themes" for Red Bank Focus Area • Review of Land Use Goals • Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning • Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area • Reviewed Whole Group Conceptual Land Use Plan • Small Group refinement of conceptual land use plan • Presentation of Small Group Work
Summary Ideas (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	▪ Strengthen "town centers" of Fairfax & Madisonville; rebuild ▪ Hub locations possibly outside town centers ▪ Buffer land uses, strengthen arterial connections but allow greenspace; reduce noise for neighborhoods ▪ Brownfields – south of Madison along Red Bank to river – office, manufacturing, light industrial o Strengthen density in large redevelopment sites ▪ Maximum retail in neighborhood centers [concentrate retail in neighborhood centers; keep Rec Bank Corridor predominately Office and Light Industrial (non-retail)] ▪ Hike/bikeways – connect to Lunken and Hamilton County parks, other communities, continuous system ▪ Options for roads – i.e. Madison & Red Bank bridging
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Notes from Small Group discussions regarding land use
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Red Bank Focus Area – Meeting 3
April 4, 2001

Land Use Vision – Summary Ideas

Chartpack Notes

- Strengthening "town centers" of Fairfax & Madisonville; rebuild
- Hub locations possibly outside town centers
- Buffering land uses, strengthen arterial connections but allow greenspace; reduce noise (neighborhoods)
- Brownfields – south of Madison along Red Bank to river – office, manufacturing, light industrial
    - Strengthen density in large redevelopment sites
- Maximum retail in neighborhood centers
- Hike/bikeways – connect to Lunken and Hamilton County parks, other communities, continuous
- Options for roads – i.e. Madison & Red Bank bridging

Areas of Difference

- Locations of hubs
- Employment center – means maybe brownfield revitalization
- Campus style office development, greenspace in Red Bank corridor
- Oakley, Madisonville (re)development moratorium? Like Fairfax
- School expansion – by recreation center north of Anderson Place

Land Use Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry/ Brian Balsley

Tory Parlin	Seven Hills School
Mark Alexander	Red Bank Drive
Ted Shannon	Fairfax
Robert Vogt	RSVP
John Kammerer	Red Bank Business Owner
Lee Stone	Old Red Bank Road resident

Chartpack Notes

- Close walking distance to transit centers
- US 50/Red Bank Transit hub may not be desirable
- Fairfax town center to have mixed uses – office, retail, high density residential
- No retail on Red Bank (no competition with town center)
- Retirement home in Fairfax town center
- Bikeway + greenspace along Red Bank
- Circular transit linkage between Madisonville, Mariemont, & Fairfax
- Parking lot or garage at transit hub w/ retail
- Madisonville transit hub at Madison & Plainville (not at Whetzel) – better residential service
- Development at Madison & Plainville limited by hillside
- Erie & Whetzel development potential + transit hub
- Transit hub at Madison & Red Bank
- Communities should work together to attract non-competing retail
- B+O line has 1 track on double-track railbed (R.O.W. space for other use)
- Development/planning along Red Bank should be focused south of Madison Road
- Greenway where possible along Red Bank
- Preserve woodlands (county home)

- Greenway along Wooster in Fairfax
- Greenway/transit (trolley) loop- Red Bank, Madison, Plainville & Wooster
- Small warehouse campuses for small companies not just office-only & big-box warehouse
- Ford redevelopment – office, conference center, other – will be architecturally reviewed for zoning conformance
- Public squares for eating & gathering
- Ault Park access from Red Bank

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Paul Smiley/Travis Miller

Jim Coppoch	City of Cincinnati
Deborah Reid	Seven Hills School
Pamela Quisenberry	Madisonville Community Council
Quentin Davis	VIG
Dacia Ludwick	Hamilton County Office of Economic Development
Ken Hughes	Oakley Community Council
Curt Paddock	Trajectory Consultants, Fairfax
Tom Fiorini	Cincinnati Sports Mall
Carl Palmer	Metro

Chartpack Notes

- Create/reinforce buffer between Hyde Park residential & industrial land use along Red Bank
- Possible transit hub at Erie and Red Bank
    - To support Red Bank 'employment zone' area
- Encourage white-collar, high-tech business & discourage big-box/fast food retail
    - Discourage heavy (dirty) industry – encourage clean industry
    - Structures/built environment should be well designed
    - Well landscaped office complex(s) w/ amenities
    - No higher than 5-6 stories
- Discourage access onto Madison Road from Oakley Drive-in area – Encourage access to to Red Bank
- Discourage salt dome (ODOT) on Red Bank
- Redevelopment area north west of Erie/Red Bank
    - Relocate existing uses
    - Same office 'complex' style above
- Madisonville Town Center (Whetzel/Madison)
    - Small specialty retail/bakeries/restaurants
    - Mixed uses – shops below/residential above. (all along Madison)
    - Village feel (like Ludlow NBD)
    - Support for Red Bank – lunch, shops, etc.
    - Artist/crafts area (re-upholstery, furniture refinishing, etc.)
    - Find a niche that doesn't compete w/ O'Bryonville, Oakley (not antiques, for example)
    - Could service Indian Hill
- Light rail hub w/shuttle at intersection of CSX & Oasis rail lines
    - Joint development vs. exclusive use issue
    - Limited access to Oakley & Madison Road (to east)
    - Would infrastructure improvements (over/under crossings) destroy character/impede redevelopment?
    - More discussion needed
- Improve traffic along Red Bank between Madison & Duck Creek
    - High congestion
    - High accident counts
    - No light – cops won't direct traffic – to dangerous
- Anderson Place should remain a school
    - Remain greenspace if it is redeveloped

- Bike paths
  - need to be separate from auto traffic
  - Possibly use rail corridor
  - Madison – bike lane already a high use path for bike traffic
  - Need to maximize connections (Sports Mall, Routes to XU, UC, Ault Park, Little Miami trial etc.)
  - Further work in fall
- Brownfield revitalization – related to Red Bank revitalization (employment zone)
  - Ford plant site
  - Swallen's site
  - Duck Creek project – maintain greenspace near Swallen's site could be bike pate link from Murray to Little Miami via Sports Mall

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Stacey Weaks

Michael Whitney	Red Bank Rd resident
Mary Dunlap	Madisonville
Sue Micheli	Madisonville
Susan Doucleff	Oakley
Don Gardner	Hyde Park
Jennifer Kaminer	Fairfax
Charlie Reid	Mariemont

Chartpack Notes

- Virginia Ave. – property adjacent to Sports Mall – support services w/ access to Red Bank office/industry
- General retail along Wooster w/ multi-family residential
- Economic development opportunity among corridor: Oakley, Madisonville, Fairfax, is extension of Ohio 32 primary catalyst?
  - Brownfields redevelopment (State issue)
  - Better access /resolve issues
  - Funding opportunities
- Fairfax positioning development opportunity w/ or w/o 32 improvements.
- Transit hubs-
  - Madison & Whetzel – redevelopment opportunity
  - Bike access/secure place to park it
- Rail stations
  - Where lines intersect – industrial area (Keebler…)
  - Parking location?
  - Mariemont looking for recreation area south of Fairfax & railroad along river; by swim club
    - Light rail and recreation may be problem
  - Across bridge (new) across from Keebler & Cincinnati Gear on Old Red Bank Road – possible redevelopment/station (blue block on map)
- Greenspace connection to Ault Park
  - Murray from Mariemont thru Fairfax – hike/bike trail in works – plans to link w/city trail (woodland thru park)
- Possible redevelopment at transit stop (blue box) – small warehouses – zoned industrial – could be commercial gateway
- Schools
  - Bramble overcrowded
    - Discussions of rebuilding on site
  - Anderson Place redevelopment?
- Safety
  - Transit stations – Crime/activity/design considerations
    - Also crime for schools
- Financing
  - Who pays for these ideas?

- Prefer to see hub at Red Bank & Madison – would rather keep business district as it is
    - Tight circulation for buses as is
- Madison & Whetzel
    - Mariemont like
    - Mixed use – office, retail, residential
    - Have design for senior citizens – affordable luxury for seniors – if funding comes thru (SE corner)
- Parks
    - Develop Duck Creek as recreation corridor
    - Fairfax has acquired houses along creek in some places
- Recreation Center
    - Multi purpose w/school?
    - Site near by adjacent to Columbia Township
- Industry
    - 35-40-50 employee businesses – good potential long term business
        - no real opportunity in city – incubator business
    - 40-45,000 sqft flex space
    - Clean businesses w/engineering/high-tech, 'campus' style
    - Swallen's site/drive-in
    - Synergistic
    - Take advantage of transit hub
    - Nutone & South Western have questionable features
    - Industrial ecology
- Greenspace
    - Little Duck Creek
    - Industrial Boulevard
    - Bike trail
    - Buffers between neighborhoods & arterials
    - West side of Red Bank along Fairfax – buffer w/ greenspace
        - Structures <u>not</u> allowed on culvert (coe flood project)
- Neighborhood & village centers need greenspace
    - Traffic square or circle – especially at Whetzel & Madison)
- Maintain Madison Road Post Office
- Wider sidewalks, mixed use, greenery
- Expansion of Stewart interchange to both north/south ingress/egress
- Plainville Road
    - Commercial district – mini neighborhood center should be upgraded

RED BANK AND WASSON FOCUS AREA MEETING #4
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Tuesday, February 19, 2002
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	**Red Bank:** Mark Alexander, James Anderson, Bob Beiting, Michael Benken, Harry Blanton, Mike Brandy, Jo Ann Brown, Bill Brayshaw, Pat Bready, Bob Burns, Kent Cashell, Jim Coppock, Officer Dawson, John Deatrick, Ron Docter, Ben Dotson, Susan Doucleff, Mary Dunlap, Sara Evans, Tom Fiorini, Bill Fisher, Altman Fleisher, Don Gardner, Tim Gilday, Patricia Haas, Tom Hagerty, Warren Hill, Amy Holter, Richard Hoekzema, Robert Horne, Ted Hubbard, Kenneth Hughes, Susan Hughes, Hans Jindal, J.J. Jioducci, Jennifer Kaminer, John Kammerer, Janet Keller, Doug King, Dacia Ludwick, Juanita Lynem, Mel Martin, Steve Mary, Kathy Meinke, Sue Micheli, Bill Miller, Thomas Moeller, Carl Monzel, Linda Murphy, John Murray, John Neyer, Curt Paddock, Carl Palmer, Victoria Parlin, David Perry, Doug Peters, Pamela Quisenberry, Charles Reid, Kirstin Rubinstein, David Sams, Theodore Shannon, James Siegel, Bob Steier, Lee Stone, Joshua Swain, Rick Veith, David Watlz, Randy Welker, Michael Whitney **Wasson:** Scott Adams, Sheila Adams, Bob Alsfelder, Jeff Anderson, Terry Barhorst, Pam Bowers, Delores Brown, Tom Brown, Edward Casagrande, Bill Davin, John Delaney, Charlie Desando, Rick Dettmer, Rene Dierker, Ron Doctor, Susan Doucleff, Jon Doucleff, Bette Evanshine, Ron Gardner, Kathryn Gibbons, Tony Giglio, Ed Goering, Joseph Hochbein, Richard Hoekzema, Ken Hughes, Tom Jones, Jennifer Kaminer, Charles Klingman, Cheryl Koopman, John Kucia, Donna Lake, Bob Lane, Mike McKeehan, Pat Mitchell, Charlene Morse, John Murphy, Sharon Muyaya, Carl Palmer, Tim Reynolds, Gilbert Richards, Barb Rider, Gwen Robinson, Susan Roescrun, Susan Roschke, Eric Russo, Trent Schade, John Schneider, Michael Self, Mark Sheppard, Reginald Victor, Dorothy Vogt, Alex Warm, Bob Zumbiel
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther, Vermorgan Ziegler, Patricia Haas, Robert Vogt, Matt Grever
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Rick Record, Merrie Stewart Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Todd White
PURPOSE:	11. To review the work done to date and its purpose 12. To review Focus Area Plans and Issues 13. To make any needed revisions, improvements, and/or additions to plan 14. To prioritize Focus Area Issues for review by the Vision Group 15. Supplement representation to the Vision Group 16. Identify individuals to present Focus Area recommendations to the Vision Group on 4/4/02 17. Evaluate the Land Use Vision Plan (LUVP) process
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Focus Area Issues Process Evaluation Form
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of the Land Use Visioning process ▪ Incorporating the LUVP Travel Demand Modeling ▪ Implementation Considerations o Special Economic Districts (JEDDs, CEDAs, TIFs) ▪ Economics Overview of Focus Areas
REVIEW OF LAND USE VISION PLAN	*Focus Area Characteristics* Wasson Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues ▪ Q&A ▪ Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

	Red Bank Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues ▪ Q&A ▪ Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

RED BANK FOCUS GROUP RESOURCE ALLOCATION EXERCISE RESULTS				
$ Allocated (in millions)	**Dots**	**# of allocaters**	**Avg. Allocation**	**Action Item**
17	**1**	**6**	**2.83**	Preserve existing parks and open space, and create new parks and open space for under-served areas (e.g., More Greenspace along Red Bank Road, Duck Creek, and Little Duck Creek; Parks in Madisonville, Fairfax, etc.)
14	**2**	**7**	**2**	Revitalize Madisonville NBD near Whetsel Ave. and Madison Road
14	**1**	**7**	**2**	Create bike trail connections (e.g., to Ault Park; along Murray Ave.; to Little Miami, Lunken, and Ohio River Bike Trails)
12	**3**	**6**	**2**	Encourage Office and Industrial uses in Red Bank Corridor while limiting Retail Development • **Develop Business incubators, perhaps in campus-type setting** • **Redevelop Brownfields and under-utilized sites**
9	**0**	**5**	**1.8**	Reduce Flood Hazards and moderate urban storm runoff
8	**0**	**5**	**1.6**	Create streetscape and gateway improvements along key corridors
7	**0**	**5**	**1.4**	Revitalize / Create smaller Madisonville NBD at Whetsel Ave. and Bramble
7	**0**	**5**	**1.4**	Explore the possibilities of creating Special Economic Districts that would mutually benefit the jurisdictions involved and facilitate implementing some of the LUVP recommendations
7	**0**	**4**	**1.75**	Create connectivity improvements. This could include any or all of the following (subject to recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Travel Demand Modeling and Engineering studies): **Basic Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study recommendations:** • Intersection / Interchange Improvements • Park-and-pool or park-and-ride lots • Expanded use of motorist information system message boards (ARTIMIS) • Better traffic signal coordination • Expanded bus transit system coverage (new routes) service • New rail transit service • Widened, expanded, or new roadways • New Road Alignments Other recommendations that came out of Focus Area discussions: • New or relocated barge terminals • Rail freight improvements • Water Taxi service (Ohio River) • Commuter air passenger service (Lunken) • Air freight (Lunken) • Maintain at-grade connection of Madison Road at Red Bank
6	**0**	**4**	**1.5**	Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
6	**0**	**4**	**1.5**	Preserve older buildings and neighborhood character
5	**1**	**3**	**1.66**	Create areas with multiple pedestrian-friendly destinations within walking distance. There are many areas that are experiencing development pressures, and if this development occurs haphazardly, as it has in the past, this could lead to many undesirable outcomes

				(congestion, multiple curb cuts, lack of pedestrian connections, etc.) Creating methods to guide and implement mixed use, pedestrian-friendly development can guide the future land use to be compatible with surrounding uses and minimize negative impacts. Examples of various types of mixed use development, having varying degrees of pedestrian-friendliness, include the following areas that currently exist within the Cincinnati Region: • Ludlow Avenue in Clifton • Rookwood Commons/Plaza • Hyde Park Square • Mariemont • Mt. Lookout Square • Downtown Cincinnati • Silverton • Norwood Business District near Surrey Square • Whetsel Ave. and Madison Road in Madisonville • Old Milford • Oakley Square • O'Bryonville Within this Focus Area, some of the areas that may be suitable for creating or enhancing pedestrian-friendly design include the following: • Near I-71 and Ridge Ave. • Madisonville • Fairfax
5	**0**	**3**	**1.66**	Revitalize / Create Fairfax NBD
2	**2**	**2**	**1**	Minimize the negative impacts of any connectivity improvements (see RB-16)
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Make neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens and youth

WASSON AND RED BANK FOCUS AREA - MEETING 4
FEBRUARY 19, 2002

Comments Regarding Land Use Vision Plan

Wasson

- Concern that new development will generate additional traffic and deter desirability/livability of the area.
- #6 - Is pedestrian circulation an issue?
- #5 – Wording is too "pro" development
    - Not going to remain residential
    - There is enough retail commercial in area already
    - Needs to be "guided" to be best developed in a coherent fashion
    - Should not endorse "blanket development"

Red Bank

- Madison Road/Red Bank Road intersection
    - Maintain/improve pedestrian and bike access
    - Possibly separate through-traffic on Red Bank Road
    - Add this recommendation to connectivity issue

APPENDIX C – Focus Area Meetings
Wooster Focus Area

Focus Area Meeting #1 - 3/20/01

- Meeting Summary
- Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #2 - 3/28/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #3 - 4/4/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Combined Ohio 32 / Wooster Focus Area Meeting #4 - 2/28/02

- Meeting Summary
- Prioritization of Action Items

WOOSTER FOCUS AREA MEETING #1
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, March 22, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	James Akins, Tom Albers, Chris Anderson, Jim Bell, Lou Bishop, Michael Burns, Don Burrell, Mark Caesar, Doug Cheney, Greg Curless, Paul Davis, Edward Dohrmann, Ben Dotson, David Duckworth, Larry Fronck, John Frye, Cathy Gatch, Jim Gradolf, Patricia Haas, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Patricia Henderson, Shelly Higgins, Jack Hodell, John Isch, Barbara Kadinger, Jennifer Kaminer, Dan Keefe, Don Keyes, Hank Kleinfeldt, Fredrick Koehler, Craig Kolb, Chuck Kubicki, Donald Kunkel, C.Michael Lemmon, Jennifer Liles, Susan Olson, Rick Patterson, Charles Reid, Loretta Rokey, Julie Rugh, Tom Ryther, Ted Shannon, J.D. Spinnenweber, Dave Spinney, Roger Stafford, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Tom & Amanda Stitt, Mary Walker, Otto Weening
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Gary Banfill, Carl Fernandez
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Catalina Landivar-Simon, Caroline Statkus, Bob Vogt, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To delevop a vision for future land use in the Wooster Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Planning Principles Handout Ahwahnee Planning Principles Handout Ground Rules Handout Consensus Process Handout Visioning Worksheet 11x17 Map of Focus Area Political Jurisdictions 11x17 Map of Focus Area Slope and Building Footprints *MetroMoves* brochure
MEETING SUMMARY	• Introductions • History of and Context of Eastern Corridor Land Use Visioning • Discussion of Land Use Visioning Methodology • Discussion of Goals and Ground Rules • Visioning Exercise for Future of Wooster Focus Area
INITIAL HOPES/FEARS REGARDING THIS PROJECT (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	• Hopeful that we can implement major elements of plan • Need to address impact of transportation on central area • Terrace Park needs to be involved more • Make sure we have needed perspectives and jurisdictions • Representatives from City are important • Need to coordinate • Hopeful this will be as effective as MetroMoves • Miami Twp. Needs more community connectiveness – less sprawl • Could add more development representation and property owners
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Visioning Summary

NEXT STEPS:
- Review Mailed Materials
- Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views
- Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Wooster Focus Area – Meeting 1
March 22, 2001

Key Images / Visioning Exercise

Group 1
Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry

Chartpack Notes
- Create & enhance green corridor
- Preserve wildlife corridor
- Relate transportation hubs to walkways & bikeways
- Create connections & facilities (i.e. lockers) for bikes
- Reduce "pass through" neighborhoods
- Reduce cut through access
- Business areas need revitalization
- Improve appearance of road edge
- Explore more creative transportational access ideas – shuttles along corridor – school & transit
- Communities need to work together
- Connect bikeways east + west
- Create more walkable town centers
- Don't force traffic into other communities
- Create "place" destination
- Expand necessary services to all communities/jurisdictions
- Create green boulevard along Wooster Pike
- Improve Mariemont square
    - Walkability
- Reduce accidents
- Reduce stress on roads
- Create more community gathering spaces
- New sewer will change Wooster pike development
- Connect parks/schools/library to provide safe walkable communty

Facilitator Notes
Cathy Gatch
- Connectivity of greenspace
- Bus hubs have bike/pedestrian links

Doug Cheney
- Move away from roadways only
- Create transportation opportunities for people to get out of their cars
- Tie in pedestrian w/ roadways (park and ride may be too far fetched?)
- Public/community spaces created

Don Keyes
- Identify customer base to gauge necessary structures
- "at will" transportation can be taken at anytime
- innovative shuttles to reduce congestion

J.D. Spinnenweber
- Rail that "cuts through" may be a problem…do more not to cut through communities
- Extend greenspace
- Recognize necessary facilities

- Aesthetic guidelines for retail

Susan Olson

- Safety of roadways (Alleviate congestion)
- Aesthetic considerations
- Tie bikeways into City
- Avoid "strips"
- Recognize opportunities

Ted Shannon

- Cross jurisdictional communication
- Don't force traffic into other communities
- Eliminate curb cuts & add green space

Group Notes

- Community participation (cross community/cross jurisdictional)
- Greenspace
- Boulevards
- Control traffic
- Aesthetic guidelines/avoid strips
- More pedestrian consideration
- Walkable cities w/shopping & amenities
- Gathering places for a sense of community not a thoroughfare
- Unify/control the development

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Brian Balsley

Group participants:

John J. Isch
Catalina Landivar
Gary Banfill
Mark Caesar
Jim Gradolf
Robert Vogt

Chartpack Notes

- Acknowledge the River
- Mass Transit
- Connecting communities through greenspace/parks
- Pedestrian & bike paths (exists on 2 ends already, need to connect the middle)
- Human scale 2&3 story building
- Socioeconomic & racial diversity
- Interjurisdictional collaboration
- Business within neighborhood hubs
- Not large new initiatives here, except in outlying areas like Ancor
- More equitable taxing
- How to handle the sprawl of Miami Township (discourage the 28 and Beechmont problem)
- Both an individual identity of the communities & a "regional" identity among them (i.e. my knothole league)

Facilitator Notes

- Mass transit – light rail or diesel rail (Terrace Park – we want it)
- Utilities underground or set back
- More green & park areas & river area development along Wooster Pike beyond where bridge crosses into Newtown
    - North side hasn't been disturbed

    - South side has gravel pits
- Bass Island was a highly developed area in past
- Not too many changes in Terrace Park
- Enhance perception of relationship of whole corridor to the river
    - Recreation scenic, wilderness, trails
- Establishing identifiable transportation nodes so there is a sense of connection to the larger community/ maybe in the Plainville area
- Connect communities more together
    - An interconnected/integrated grouping of community – focus on pedestrian, bikeways vs. roads (not on major roads)
- 7 separate neighborhoods & town centers
- Direct pathways connecting all parts including Lunken
- Joint or cross jurisdictional council to collaborate on this (ie Indianapolis model of unified gov't)
- Fewer cars: gas prices much higher, light rail & commuter rail (history: 2 commuter lines in past)
    - Mariemont old railroad station
- With more computer usage & internet, less stress on getting there
- Back and forth public transit a focus
    - Electric shuttle bus – fast charge
    - Hybrid electric bus
- Maintain community identity
- Mariemont integrated in terms of ethnicity
- Light rail
    - 24 hour/day
    - No driver
    - To get people out of their vehicle vs just serving the people who already ride mass transit
- Schools along size of Mariemont vs. the big schools
- Questions about Plainville area – risks that it could be a 28/Beechmont
    - Collaboration between municipalities will help

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Travis Miller

Chartpack Notes

- Red Bank/Eastgate connection for transportation
- Hillsides/river are predominant images – they 'create the space'
- Safe pedestrian connections to medical centers, parks, and other services
- Population is aging – need options for transportation
- Places for kids to play within walking distance to Little Miami River
- Transit Hubs in safe locations
- Need to move people to jobs
- Bike trail connecting destinations (i.e. to River, to communities)
- Smaller neighborhood schools
- Range of housing types in same community
- Community wide amenities
    - Community center
    - Daycare
    - Parks
- Regional parks/sports center
- Multi-jurisdictional recreation program
- State legislature to support pedestrian facilities on County, State, and U.S. highways
- Distinct villages remain identifiable yet have strong regional 'common good'
- Pooling public needs/services (i.e. Milford & Terrace Park fire departments)
- Public transportation in targeted areas – to sports/cultural regional attractions
- Public transportation operating from hubs
    - Safe travel at all hours (weekdays and weekends)

Facilitator Notes

Loretta Rokey – City of Milford

- Pedestrian friendly retail & restaurants (make cars optional)
- Local accounts (don't need to carry cash)
- Shuttles for access/mobility challenged
- Greenspace within ½ mile from home
- State funded transportation/transit options
- Mixed housing opportunities
- Community amenities
- Childcare network 6am-9pm (e.g. Minneapolis childcare in malls)
- Protected/separated Bike/pedestrian ways linking parks/amenities
- Well marked parks

Dave Spinney – Clermont County

- Corridor w/ distinct central places – "distinct villages"
- Transit hub at route 50/I-275 interchange
    - Bus route to south
    - Park and ride
- Office campus relating some how with Milford @ 50/275
- Transit hub in Fairfax; Multimedia connectors
- Hillsides remain intact and undeveloped
- Public access to Little Miami River
- Wooster Pike has no more traffic than currently
- Sidewalks along State and County routes
    - Entails change @ state level
- Improvements in water quality down stream from Terrace Park and on East Fork
    - Decommissioning of East Fort treatment plant

Patricia Haas – Fairfax Council

- Demographic shift toward older population
    - Need transportation (not able to drive)
    - Special housing needs
- Mixed housing opportunities
- Smaller corporate center on Dragon Way
- Access to Eastgate Mall
- Better weekend bus service/overall mobility
- Aesthetically enhanced River Plains
    - Better access; pedestrian walk through areas
    - Wildlife sanctuary
- Financing the vision regionally; property taxes might not be the best way
- Communities each have unique "flavor" – yet also have the goal of the common good

Don Burrell - OKI

- Connection between Red Bank & Eastgate
- 70-80% is already developed
- Not much change expected
- Terrace Park remain residential
- Viable business district in Milford
- Fears of pressure to develop land that should be left undeveloped
- Growth potential in uplands of Miami Township
- Wooster remains as it is now; free flowing arterial w/greenspace and residential
- Bike trail along rail line connecting Little Miami and Lunken

Charles Reid

- Slow traffic on Wooster; Mariemont is a community divided by highway
- Make real recreation areas along river
    - Small cafes
    - Canoe launches
- Recreation areas for kids
- Transportation to major employers in Clermont

- Create regional recreation center for sports to be shared (like Newtown)

Greg Curless

- DC suburbs illustrated in ULI video are good example of multiple housing types in one area
- Smaller schools/ neighborhood schools

WOOSTER FOCUS AREA MEETING #2
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, March 29, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	Chris Anderson, Jim Bell, Lou Bishop, Michael Burns, Don Burrell, Mark Caesar, Doug Cheney, Greg Curless, Paul Davis, Edward Dohrmann, Ben Dotson, David Duckworth, Larry Fronck, John Frye, Jim Gradolf, Patricia Haas, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Patricia Henderson, Shelly Higgins, Jack Hodell, John Isch, Jennifer Kaminer, Dan Keefe, Don Keyes, Hank Kleinfeldt, Fredrick Koehler, Chuck Kubicki, Donald Kunkel, Jennifer Liles, Susan Olson, Rick Patterson, Charles Reid, Loretta Rokey, Julie Rugh, Tom Ryther, Ted Shannon, J.D. Spinnenweber, Dave Spinney, Roger Stafford, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Tom Stitt, Almeda Stitt, Mary Walker, Otto Weening
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Gary Banfill, Carl Fernandez, Cathy Gatch, Carl Monzel, Vermorgan Zeigler
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Albert Nelson, Lorraine Shannon, Robert Shannon
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Catalina Landivar-Simon, Caroline Statkus, Bob Vogt, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Wooster Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis Opportunities Prioritization: SWOT Analysis 3/7
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning ▪ Land Use Images ▪ Brief Recap of Planning Principles ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Whole Group Area Assessment of Focus Area ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work
Additional Themes/Issues (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	▪ Balancing street calming with the need for emergency vehicle response time ▪ Jurisdictional planning zoning + land use + access ▪ History of corridor is fragmented – confusing to find places ▪ Respect all issues/viewpoints/and diverse problems-opportunities ▪ Return flood plains to natural habitat/prairie; preserve hillsides
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Wooster Focus Area – Meeting 2
March 29, 2001

Land Use – Area Analysis

Chartpack Notes

Issues:
- Preserve tax base for health of school
- Rivers must be preserved as asset into the future
- Make reasonable investments in infrastructure; fiber optics/sewer
- Management of traffic on roadways is issue/reduce division – relate to neighborhoods
- Better connection to rivers + greenspace access to
- Preserve character of each community
- Work together

- Mixture of business and residential
- Minimize demand on transportation
- Greenspace is important 'buffer space' between residential and business
- South side of Wooster in Fairfax; greenspace important
- Aging population need to be considered
- Be careful of hillsides
- Flooding is issue (especially Columbia township at Krogers)
- Much of corridor is already developed
- Greenspace is currently undevelopable land
- Corridor needs to be kept as 'free-flowing' arterial road
- No commercial zoning from Newtown Road to Terrace Park; prevents it from being 'over commercial'/strip
- Hamilton County has revised zoning code to include:
    - Overlay zoning
    - Exemptions for <5 acres have been eliminated
    - Restrictions on billboards
- Columbia Township
    - High traffic volumes from Wooster to Fairfax
    - Also coming south from Kenwood
    - Current proposals suggest concrete curbs/median; maybe not ideal solution
- Muchmore Road is 'short-cut' from north due to I-275 rush hour congestion
- Need to address flooding/sewer issues; infrastructure needs addressed prior to new pedestrian walks along low areas/floodplains, etc.
- New housing development in Columbia Township will create more traffic
- Sewage from Mariemont High School holding tanks create issue-how much more development can it handle? – capacity needs to be increased
- Hamilton County's sewage infrastructure is $2 billion under developed
- Traffic at Newtown bridge is threat
    - Multi-modal transportation alternative may be option
- Controlled development; yet allow enough revenue form new growth

Land Use – Area Analysis Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry/ Brian Balsley

Patricia Haas	Fairfax
Cathy Gatch	Milford
Don Burrell	OKI

Charles Reid	First Trends Business Center
Al Nelson	Terrace Park

Chartpack Notes

- What land can be developed?
- A lot of simple issues common to all communities
- Preserve area in Columbia Township as greenspace (between US 50 – LMR)
- Mariemont railyard use; potential transit center? Is Fairfax better?
- Hillsides prone to landslides – water recharge; preserve for safety
- Highway (US 50) widening vs. narrowing to preserve residential character
- Preserve Milford town center; extend bike trail into Milford
- Restore walkway across LMR in Milford
- Terrace Park favorable to bike trail thru community; lots of users go to Milford trial head
- Conserve agricultural lands in Miami Township along US 50 + LMR
- Keep greenspace to reduce runoff – flooding
- Reduce lighting at US50/I-275 area from businesses
- ODOT should let communities determine sidewalks + divider needs

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Darin Armbruster/Travis Miller

Ben Dotson	Columbia Township
Vermorgan Ziegler	Village of Fairfax
Almeda Stitt	Milford/Miami Township
Roger Stafford	Terrace Park
Jim Grodoef	City of Milford
Tom Ryther	Mariemont

Chartpack Notes

- Columbia Township is concerned about flooding downstream that forces water back up stream
- South Milford/Roundbottom bridge could be used more
- Raise floodplain for road bed along east fork river connecting bridge to parkway
- Current high traffic volumes along Cementary/Garfield Rd.
- Continue bike trail from Milford to Terrace Park
- Terrace Park is concerned about cost of maintenance
- Railroad bridge crossing Wooster (south of Milford trailhead) will need replaced/refurbished prior to pedestrian/bike trail use
- Community image of Terrace Park may be jeopardized if trail doesn't connect through
- Terrace Park is concerned about trail liability
- Median proposed through Plainville/Columbia Township needs to be 'green' w/ minimal stacking in turn lanes
- Abandoned gas stations w/ public road right-of-way (at Walton Creek Rd) is potential link to park property between railroad and river
    - Opportunity to connect gas station land to recreation (possible parking/ 'mini-hub' for bike trail)
    - Brownfield reclamation funding may be available
- Need sidewalk on south side of Milford bridge
- Need sidewalks and crosswalks in general (throughout area)
- Developers should be responsible for sidewalks/connections
- Complete inventory of ecological components within area is <u>critical</u>
- Mariemont; active recreation is desired for area along river/railroad (bottom of bluff)
- Miami Township; DANGEROUS roads
    - No sidewalks!
    - No berms!
    - 131 bridge crossing I-275 has <u>no</u> pedestrian access

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Stacey Weaks

Don Keyes	Mariemont
Jennifer Kaminer	Fairfax
Gregg Curless	Milford
John Isch	Mariemont
Susan Olson	Columbia Township
Tom Stitt	Milford

Chartpack Notes

- What happens to Wooster depends upon relocated OH 32
  - Would increase desirability of Wooster if relocated OH 32 is done properly

Fairfax (Columbia Township is moving in same direction)

- Boulevard effect on Wooster
- Central grass/trees/medians
- Neyer development; small retail on north/office, fast food, multi family on south
- Limited curb cuts
- Rear entrance roads
- Urban renewal district
- Use Pfeiffer Road from I-71 to Kenwood as example
- Extend Mariemont aesthetic from Red Bank to Newtown Road
- Serious traffic safety issues

Columbia Township

- SPI overlay – landscaping + streetscaping requirements
- Primarily retail along Wooster
  - A residential component is a possibility (probably condos)
- Ryan development (how it works out) will influence viability of more residential development
- Design relocated OH 32 to have minimal impact (noise, etc.) on existing + planned residential
- Return Wooster to residential character
- Connecting town centers and other destinations with bike trails
- Need a major medical center (urgent care)
- Better access to river
- Lower reach of Little Miami River (downstream from Newtown bridge) does not have much in terms of amenities for canoers

Milford

- Serious congestion problems near by pass 28
- Metro hub
- Lot of population moving along Beechwood
  - This traffic tends to go north and there is no direct route that direction
- Proposing 4 new elementary schools, distributed to address population growth
- Industrial redevelopment along 50 in Miami Township
- Lots of kids in Milford schools

WOOSTER FOCUS AREA MEETING #3
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, April 5, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Chris Anderson, Jim Bell, Ed Berkich, Lou Bishop, Michael Burns, Don Burrell, Mark Caesar, Doug Cheney, Greg Curless, Paul Davis, Edward Dohrmann, Ben Dotson, David Duckworth, Larry Fronck, John Frye, Cathy Gatch, Jim Gradolf, Patricia Haas, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Patricia Henderson, Shelly Higgins, Jack Hodell, Jeanne Hyden, John Isch, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Dan Keefe, Don Keyes, Hank Kleinfeldt, Fredrick Koehler, Chuck Kubicki, Donald Kunkel, Jennifer Liles, Susan Olson, Rick Patterson, Charles Reid, Loretta Rokey, Julie Rugh, Tom Ryther, Ted Shannon, J.D. Spinnenweber, Dave Spinney, Roger Stafford, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Tom Stitt, Almeda Stitt, Mary Walker, Otto Weening, Virmorgan Ziegler
PROJECT TEAM:	Linda Fabe, Catalina Landivar, Mel Martin, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Stacey Weaks, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To delevop a land use vision plan for the Wooster Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda/Land Use Goals (double-sided)
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Discussion of "Themes" for Wooster Focus Area ▪ Review of Land Use Goals ▪ Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Reviewed Whole Group Conceptual Land Use Plan ▪ Small Group refinement of conceptual land use plan ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work
Summary Ideas (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	▪ Preserve/infill the existing town centers ▪ Nature of US 50 should be scenic boulevard style (not high volume) ▪ Strengthen employment center in tech 50 area with rail/transit hubs ▪ Connectivity to River and greenspace with bike trails/pedestrian access
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Notes from Small Group discussions regarding land use
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Wooster Focus Area – Meeting 3

April 5, 2001

Land Use Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry

Dave Spinney	Clermont County
Ed Berkich	Mariemont
Jack Hodell	Mariemont/Fairfax
Charles Reid	Mariemont
Ted Shannon	Fairfax
Cathy Gatch	Milford
Don Burrell	OKI

Chartpack Notes

- Avoca Park area – add some usage geared toward young people's needs
- Any Little Miami bridging should keep a "wildlife corridor"/greenspace area
- Be mindful of impacts of 32/Red Bank roadways/new connection: could relieve pressure on rt 50
- Connect existing bike trails (Milford to Lunken) possibly expand Milford side back into town (downtown Milford and out along Roundbottom Road)
- Connect bikeway into surrounding neighborhoods
- Transit hubs should be equipped with bike lockers/racks
- Beechwood & Roundbottom road – possible pedestrian/bike (not vehicular) connection to rail hub for park & ride
- Miami Township bikeway/pedestrian path connections between school & 131 & library
- Potential for alternative hubs
    - Old Kroger's lot (currently used as a "park&ride") – main hub possibility(?)
    - North east of 275 & old 28
    - Beechwood Road and Roundbottom
    - Mulberry – north of 28 (between 28&275 lends itself to infill (retail/pedestrian area)
    - Potential hubs near Park 50 (industrial area) – also near Perintown
- Commuters (from 28, 131, & 50) how can hubs service these areas?
- Improve sidewalks/walkability of 131
- Possible revitalization of neighborhood center in Miami Township
- Revitalized center (between 28 & 275)
- Strengthen employment center (Perintown)

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Darin Armbruster/Travis Miller

Len Harding	Clermont League of Women Voters
Jim Gradolf	Milford City
Ben Dotson	Columbia Township
Tom Ryther	Mariemont
Virmorgan Ziegler	Fairfax

Chartpack Notes

- Route 28 zone
    - One long strip mall (Rt 50 is similar)
    - Access roads could move pressure away from 28 & 50
    - Character looks like Colerain or Beechmont
    - How to "control" property use
    - By pass is starving old 28
    - Pedestrian access built in to fabric
    - County/Township (government) cooperation to make intelligent planning decisions

    - Address zoning issues to incorporate/facilitate long term change/improvement
    - Commercial uses may be essential – "cluster" organization/ avoid "linear" development
    - Incorporate/change uses to non residential uses (strengthen tax base in general)
        - Office/warehouse
        - Light industrial
        - Office uses
    - Explore relationship of changed transportation & land use that follows
    - Industrial parks keep jobs close to home (reduces traffic) and increases tax base (mixed use desirable)
    - Balance types of jobs (pay$) with housing supply cost
- Western zones
    - Fairfax has most potential for change
    - Indian Hill/Mariemont are fixed
    - Columbia Township has potential for change – open land owned by Hamilton County parks- change could easily include improved/developed parks between US 50 & river – very desirable – bike path would be vital feature – "a reclamation"
    - Open space south of Mariemont should be developed – need access across railroad (perhaps create access @ time of re-routing Red Bank Rd (OH 32 extension)
- Columbian Township uses
    - Small retail servicing recreational uses
    - Canoe outfitters
    - Garden stores
    - Parking areas for recreational users
    - Recreation user "hub"
- Boulevard design on US 50 – extend as far as possible!
- Public transit to reduce traffic pressure
    - Limited left turns – more pleasurable to drive & shop
- Bus/metro hubs
    - Hub location in Mariemont
        - Close to town center
- Hub location at Newtown Road/Wooster Pike
    - Close to recreation for users
    - Buses deliver as well as pick-up
    - Buses between hubs
- Connection needed at Beechwood Road over (across) tracks to connect Milford Parkway and on to 50
- Hybrid vehicles
    - Public buses
    - Private vehicles
- Improved bus service in old town Milford
- General Comments
    - Stricter zoning in Miami township
    - More equitable mechanism to fund schools at state level
    - Sidewalk program to make connections @ 131 & Wolfpen-Pleasant Hill (i.e. Anderson Township)
    - Impact fees should be in place
    - Develop bike path connections especially from Roundbottom Rd to 28 along Wolfpen/ Mt. Pleasant
    - Involve all levels of government especially townships – cooperative efforts
    - Township form of government (especially in Miami Township) is understaffed with part time people in rapidly changing area
        - Staff may not be completely qualified to deal with new problems
        - Often conflict of interests
        - Miami – 3 part time trustees for 36,000 residents
        - Union – 3 part time trustees for 42,000 residents

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Stacey Weaks

John Isch	Resident Mariemont
Susan Olson	Columbia Township
Hans Jindal	ODOT
Mark Caesar	Mariemont 5/3 Bank
Lorretta Rokey	City Manager Milford
Robert Vogt	RSVP

Chartpack Notes

- Columbia Township – residential component south of Wooster (along river)
- Needs to be a connection for Mariemont & Columbia Township to rail station (shuttle buses)
- Bike trail connection to east, west, & south from Newtown bridge
- Limit curb cuts in Columbia Township on Wooster (make pedestrian friendly also)
- Difficult to acquire R.O.W. in Columbia Township
    - Reluctant property owners to south
    - Slope & heritage to north
- Will 32 create noise problems for Fairfax, Mariemont, Columbia Township, Anderson Township, and Newtown
- Newtown has resolution against relocated 32 going through center of Newtown
- ½ of County's property tax in Milford goes to schools
- Columbia Township
    - Want to avoid a 5 lane swath of concrete
    - People in favor of widening to north & south
    - Landscaping & median
- Neighborhood buffers
    - Noise mitigation will occur to address high speed traffic on relocated OH 32
- Columbian Township public interest overlay district addressing land use issues in place with new zoning
    - 2 main issues:
        - Relocation of sewers
        - ODOT's addressing of safety/traffic problems
- Perhaps make more use of river front
    - Cafes, other amenities geared toward river + bike path
    - Residential (depending on success of Ryan Homes; market driven)
- Would be best to create one service road alignment south of Wooster
- Align crossing streets to southern service roads (Muchmore/Walton Creek and Ashley Oaks)
- Milford
    - Trying to get better connection from bike trail to downtown
    - Pedestrian/bike connection to parks on east side of river
    - Old Mill Tavern available for redevelopment
    - Connection for ball parks near Milford Parkway to South Milford Road
    - Sidewalk connections in new development
    - New road alignment from South Milford to Garfield at stop sign near commercial
    - High density/cluster development on Gatch farm (between Garfield & South Milford Road)
    - Signal & roadway improvements at 5-points intersection
    - Making 50 between 5-points & Mohawk more pedestrian friendly (one lane each way w/ pedestrian median)
    - Installation of sidewalks
    - Reduce curb cuts
- More pedestrian/sidewalk connections in Day Heights
- Old Milford Lumber is key site in downtown Milford/desire mixed use w/residential component

Themes to be Added

- Focus on Little Miami River

Land Use Vision – Summary Ideas

Chartpack Notes

- Preserve town centers/infill town centers
- Nature of US 50 should be scenic boulevard style – not high volume
- Strengthen employment center in tech 50 area with rail/transit hubs
- Connectiveness with bike trails/greenspace and to the river

WOOSTER AND OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA MEETING #4
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, February 28, 2002
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 8:35 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	**Wooster:** Chris Anderson, Jim Bell, Ed Berkich, Lou Bishop, JoAnne Brown, Michael Burns, Don Burrell, Mark Caesar, Doug Cheney, Greg Curless, Paul Davis, Edward Dohrmann, Ben Dotson, David Duckworth, Larry Fronck, John Frye, Cathy Gatch, Jim Gradolf, Patricia Haas, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Patricia Henderson, Shelly Higgins, Jack Hodell, Jeanne Hyden, John Isch, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Dan Keefe, Don Keyes, Hank Kleinfeldt, Fredrick Koehler, Chuck Kubicki, Donald Kunkel, Jennifer Liles, Susan Olson, Rick Patterson, Charles Reid, Loretta Rokey, Julie Rugh, Tom Ryther, Ted Shannon, J.D. Spinnenweber, Dave Spinney, Roger Stafford, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Tom Stitt, Almeda Stitt, Mary Walker, Otto Weening, Jeff Wright, Virmorgan Ziegler **Ohio 32:** Paul Astles, Jeff Bieber, Bill Brayshaw, Charles Brown, Clark Carmichael, Tom Caruso, Jim Childress, Mary Anne Christie, Richard Combs, Brian Eliff, Keri Everett, Duane Ferguson, Ted Fischesser, LuAnn Freeman, Ken Geis, Jack Gordon, Ronald Gramke, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Jerome Heil, Tom Hmurcik, Tom Hoft, Suzanne Hopkins, Ted Hubbard, Bill Jenike, Hans Jindahl, Pinky Kocoshis, Chuck Kubicki, Anne Lyon, Patrick Manger, Molly McClure, Frank McCune, Jim McDonough, Suzanne Meruci, Mike Moore, Ken Moppin, Dean Niemeyer, Greg Noe, Melissa O'Farrell, Kevin Osterfeld, Doug Parham, Betsy Pierce, Jack Reed, Bob Repasky, Mike Rutenshroer, Dottie Scott, Charlie Shepard, William Showers, Steve Sievers, Jane Smelser, Wendy Smith, David Spinney, Caroline Statkus, Tom & Amanda Stitt, Patty Strassel, Jim Taylor, Charle Thomas, Matt Van Sant, Carl Walker, Michael Ward, Donald Washington, Bob Wendel, Mark Westermeyer, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ronald Yeager,
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther,
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Gary Meisner, Rick Record, Merrie Stewart Stillpass, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	18. To review the work done to date and its purpose 19. To review Focus Area Plans and Issues 20. To make any needed revisions, improvements, and/or additions to plan 21. To prioritize Focus Area Issues for review by the Vision Group 22. Supplement representation to the Vision Group 23. Identify individuals to present Focus Area recommendations to the Vision Group on 4/4/02 24. Evaluate the Land Use Vision Plan (LUVP) process
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Focus Area Issues Process Evaluation Form
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of the Land Use Visioning process ▪ Incorporating the LUVP Travel Demand Modeling ▪ Implementation Considerations o Special Economic Districts (JEDDs, CEDAs, TIFs) ▪ Economics Overview of Focus Areas
REVIEW OF LAND USE VISION PLAN	*Focus Area Characteristics* Wooster Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues

- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

Ohio 32 Focus Area

- Zones of Change
- Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations
- Important Focus Area Issues
- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

WOOSTER AND OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA - MEETING 4
FEBRUARY 28, 2002

Comments Regarding Land Use Vision Plan

Wooster

- Item #8 - incorporate public playfields in the 80 acres in south Mariemont
- Item #7 - Change wording to "Make certain that any development occurring in south Milford is done in an environmentally sensitive manner"
    - Recent residential development proposal was refused
- Item #14 - Part of the streetscaping improvements in this Focus Area should include creating a boulevard character with planted median, green strips on either side, and traffic calming measures to create a more pedestrian-friendly character
    - Too many curb cuts on south side of Wooster
    - Need pedestrian crossings, at least at both Walton Creek and Newtown bridge
    - This is the time and opportunity to address reducing curb cuts on the south side of Wooster, and to provide safe travel opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Item #16 - make this item more general, to include all incentives for implementation
- Item #17 - strike references to Lunken

Ohio 32

- Add as Item #20 - Create a neighborhood center at Clough Pike and Eight Mile Road

WOOSTER FOCUS GROUP RESOURCE ALLOCATION EXERCISE RESULTS				
$ Allocated (in millions)	**Dots**	**# of allocaters**	**Avg. Allocation**	**Action Item**
26	**2**	**7**	**3.71**	Create connectivity improvements. This could include any or all of the following (subject to recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Travel Demand Modeling and Engineering studies): **Basic Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study recommendations:** • Intersection / Interchange Improvements • Park-and-pool or park-and-ride lots • Expanded use of motorist information system message boards (ARTIMIS) • Better traffic signal coordination • Road Widenings • New and expanded bike lanes and trails • More frequent service on existing bus routes • Expanded bus transit system coverage (new routes) service • New rail transit service • Widened, expanded, or new roadways • New Road Alignments **Other recommendations that came out of Focus Area discussions:** • Transit service to neighborhoods by smaller shuttle buses • New or relocated barge terminals • Rail freight improvements • Water Taxi service (Ohio River)
20	**4**	**9**	**2.2**	Create areas with multiple pedestrian-friendly destinations within walking distance. These would be areas that could effectively be served by modes of transportation other than only automobiles, or could serve to reduce the amount of automobile travel necessary to accomplish multiple purposes. There are many areas that are experiencing development pressures, and if this development occurs haphazardly, as it has in the past, this could lead to many undesirable outcomes (congestion, multiple curb cuts, lack of pedestrian connections, etc.) Creating methods to guide and implement mixed use, pedestrian-friendly development can guide the future land use to be compatible with surrounding uses and minimize negative impacts. Examples of various types of mixed use development, having varying degrees of pedestrian-friendliness, include the following areas that currently exist within the Cincinnati Region: • Ludlow Avenue in Clifton • Rookwood Commons/Plaza • Hyde Park Square • Mariemont • Mt. Lookout Square • Downtown Cincinnati

				• Norwood Business District near Surrey Square • Whetsel Ave. and Madison Road in Madisonville • Old Milford • Oakley Square Within this Focus Area, some of the areas that may be suitable for creating or enhancing pedestrian-friendly design include the following: • Miami Township along State Route 28 • Miami Township near Day Heights and High School • Milford along US 50, east of State Route 28 / Five Points • River's Edge development, west of I-275 / US 50 interchange • Perintown vicinity • Near the planned new elementary in South Milford • Columbia Township, along Wooster Pike, east of Mariemont
19	**1**	**4**	**4.75**	Design any new development in south Milford in an environmentally sensitive manner
14	**1**	**8**	**1.75**	Preserve existing parks and open space, and create new parks and open space for under-served areas (e.g., in new developments, improved access to recreation along the Little Miami River, public playfields on the 80 acres in south Mariemont, etc.)
14	**0**	**7**	**2**	Preserve hillsides, Little Miami River's edge and visual quality along US 50 along the Little Miami River
11	**0**	**6**	**1.83**	Redevelop along US 50 corridor in Milford to be more pedestrian friendly
11	**0**	**7**	**1.57**	Create bike trail connections (e.g., from existing Little Miami Trail to Lunken, and Ohio River Bike Trails)
9	**0**	**4**	**2.25**	Create streetscape and gateway improvements along key corridors • US 50 (Columbia Twp., Milford, Miami Twp.) • State Route 28 (Milford, Miami Twp) • Create planted median in Columbia Township with green strips on either side of Wooster Pike and create provisions for bicycle traffic and connections to planned hike/bike trails o Reduce curb cuts on south side and create shared parking opportunities
9	**1**	**3**	**3**	Reduce congestion to enhance pedestrian-friendly character: • Fairfax (Wooster Pike) • Mariemont (Wooster Pike) • Columbia Township, east of Mariemont on Wooster Pike • Newtown
8	**0**	**6**	**1.33**	Redevelop Columbia Township along Wooster Pike east of Mariemont with a mix of housing & neighborhood retail
6	**0**	**3**	**2**	Redevelop along Ohio 28 corridor in Miami Township as mixed use pedestrian friendly development

4	**0**	**4**	**1**	Minimize the negative impacts of any connectivity improvements and make sure they are done in an environmentally and aesthetically sensitive manner (see WO-17)
4	**0**	**4**	**1**	Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
4	**0**	**3**	**1.33**	Make neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens and youth
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Develop the US 50 corridor from Milford to Perintown with a mix of office and industrial uses
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Develop the area around Perintown with mixed use pedestrian friendly development
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Explore the possibilities of creating Special Economic Districts that would mutually benefit the jurisdictions involved and facilitate implementing some of the LUVP recommendations

APPENDIX C – Focus Area Meetings
Ohio 32 Focus Area

Focus Area Meeting #1 - 5/7/01

- Meeting Summary
- Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #2 - 5/15/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #3 - 5/21/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Combined Ohio 32 / Wooster Focus Area Meeting #4 - 2/28/02

- Meeting Summary
- Prioritization of Action Items

OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA MEETING #1
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Monday, May 7, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Paul Astles, Jeff Bieber, Clark Carmichael, Tom Caruso, Jim Childress, Mary Anne Christie, Richard Combs, Brian Eliff, Keri Everett, Duane Ferguson, LuAnn Winkle, Ken Geis, Jack Gordon, Ronald Gramke, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Jerome Heil, Tom Hmurcik, Tom Hoft, Suzanne Hopkins, Ted Hubbard, Bill Jenike, Hans Jindahl, Chuck Kubicki, Anne Lyon, Patrick Manger, Molly McClure, Frank McCune, Jim McDonough, Suzanne Meruci, Mike Moore, Dean Niemeyer, Melissa O'Farrell, Kevin Osterfeld, Doug Parham, Betsy Pierce, Jack Reed, Mike Rutenshroer, Dottie Scott, Charlie Shepard, William Showers, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Caroline Statkus, Tom & Amanda Stitt, Patty Strassel, Jim Taylor, Charle Thomas, Matt Van Sant, Carl Walker, Michael Ward, Donald Washington, Bob Wendel, Mark Westermeyer, Emily Witte, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ronald Yeager, Dave Zaidain
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Heather Quisenberry, Merrie Stillpass, Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Ohio 32 Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Aspects of Smart Growth/Standards for Recreational Activities (double-sided) Planning Principles Handout Ahwahnee Planning Principles Handout Ground Rules Handout Consensus Process Handout Land Use Planning Issue Areas Visioning Worksheet 11x17 Map of Focus Area Political Jurisdictions 11x17 Map of Focus Area Slope and Building Footprints *MetroMoves* brochure
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ History of and Context of Eastern Corridor Land Use Visioning ▪ Discussion of Land Use Visioning Methodology ▪ Discussion of Goals and Ground Rules ▪ Visioning Exercise for Future of Ohio 32 Focus Area
INITIAL HOPES/FEARS REGARDING THIS PROJECT (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	Hopes - Multi-modal transportation important o Transit o Bikes - Sense of place - Improve connectivity to old subdivisions - Create access option – traffic off clough - Great potential land use & multi-modal - Continue improving connections for bikeways - Consider case studies from other areas - Bring success to Cincinnati through a process that works Fears - We don't explore & incorporate "sense of place" into vision - Not just connectors – by-pass Anderson - Don't lose sight of "place & connections" - We may spend too much time on transportation details – don't get bogged down
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	*Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements.* *The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.*
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Ohio 32 Focus Area – Meeting 1
May 7, 2001

Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Linda Fabe/Brian Balsley/Emily Witte

Group participants:

Mike Moore	Senco Products
Thom Caruso	Anderson TAC
Melissa O'Farrell	Clermont Transportation Connection
David Spinney	Clermont County
Ken Geis	Union Township
Bill Showers	Resident of Union Township
Patrick Manger	Clermont County Engineer's Office
Len Harding	Clermont League of Women Voters

Chartpack Notes

- Awareness of cost of transportation – public transit use
- Politics transist – "we are Americans" – not just white
- Jobs – multi-modal hubs are opportunities for change
- Housing – new energy options; solar, passive solar, siting
- Limited resources to create solutions
- Partnerships important
- Mt. Carmel develop residential & retail/building + recreation + hybrid cars + light rail
- East of I-275 – new development - ideal area for large offices/medical facilities and "higher value" level
- Good planned development ½ acre lots
- Develop with "smart growth" principles
- Parks & recreation important / storm water retention
- Preserve wetlands/ greenspace/ wildlife areas
- Consider Little Miami greenspace + "Indian heritage" preservation
- Large lot residential development west & northwest then reinvestiment in higher density infill development later
- Infill commercial
- Transit/bus system expand – connect to better system
- Expand secondary road system
- Heavier industrial & mining gravel & mineral resources in Anchor area and influence Mt Carmel
- Two nodes in corridor
  - 1. Union Township (south of 32/east of I-275)
    - Library/Township facilities & development
    - Connect together/central place
    - Connect to Eastgate "newmode"
  - Newtown
    - Job creation/development
    - Transit through Newtown to Eastgate & Milford to jobs
    - Enhanced jobs & industrial vs. mining extraction
- Beautification of Eastgate! Theme/unification
- Access/bus – improvements metro hub at Eastgate
- Needs of people 1st
- Parks, pools nearby

- Facility diversity community
- Affordable access/housing
- Newtown is "artsy" / architecturally unique
- Anchor/light industrial/offices
- Bike & pedestrian friendly roads
- Create "place"/ and town center (S. Mercy)
    - Transit hub/ cultural facilities/ lake
- Connect neighborhoods together – subdivision to subdivision
- Newtown is center
- Questioning bike and pedestrian access
- We need to jointly pay for some improvements (mineral resources?)
- Connect with sidewalks
- Hillsides/reforestation – cooling effect
- Break-up parking lots with green
- Need new tech buses (elec. Hybrid)/smaller buses
- Industry – small businesses will come back
- Energy consciousness will be more important in future

Common Themes

- Connections important
- Reinvestment in Newtown + Eastgate
- Go back to multimodal transportation
- Residential/reinvestment and infill may respond to energy cost and distances
- New cities of future
    - Newtown
    - Eastgate/Union Township
- Strengthen town centers/identity

Facilitator Notes

- Awareness of public resources, transit-oriented
    - Not relying so much on automobiles
- Diversity/socioeconomic/racial
- Economic – small businesses again
- Housing – more sustainable – solar power
    - Environmentally friendly
- Limited resources many desires, need to partner up to make the most of $
- Mixed-use/well laid out neighborhood with recreation in Mt. Carmel & beyond
- Hybrid cars/light rail very important
- Make the most out of the land
- Too many apartments
- Smart growth
- Retain some farmlands/greenspace
- Take care of wildlife so it's here in 50 years
- Preserve Little Miami River archeologically/culturally
- Continue large lot developments
- More of a re-investment on higher-density areas /Residential infill
- Expansion of bus system into region
- Secondary roads will be more congested
- Heavy industry/mining in Anchor area
- Infrastructure improvements
- Transportation nodes/neighborhood centers
- Focus on schools, small business to create a sense of place
- Mobility/connectivity
- Redevelopment of Newtown area/new jobs/rail through here & Milford
- Industrial jobs/good employment opportunities
- Beautification of Eastgate
- Coordination of aesthetic theme

- Better landscaping/transit hubs
- Needs of people should be assessed & addressed first
- Family-oriented recreation areas
- Affordable fuel options
- Newtown – artsy/restaurants/cultural area for region/entertainment
- Trails expanded to bike & pedestrian friendly/county roads connected
- Anderson town center = transit hub/entertainment/lake
- Neighborhood connectivity/subdivisions
- Small areas like Mariemont
    - Newtown could be similar
- Multi-modal / how far people willing to walk/bike – would it be used?
- Are people going to be willing to shell out $ for this vision? How do you get people to do it?
- Preserve hillsides/plant more trees, especially heat islands
- Electric/hybrid buses

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Stacey Weaks/Merrie Stillpass
Group participants:

LuAnn Freeman	Clermont County Planning
Patricia Strassel	Citizens Against the Parkway
Jack Gordon	Anderson Township Resident/Business Owner
Ted Hubbards	Hamilton County Engineer's Office
Suzanne Hopkins	Center for Independent Living Options
Jack Reed	Anderson Township Resident
Richard Combs	Anderson Park District
Jane Smelser	ODOR – Office of Transit
Dean Neimeyer	Clermont County Planning

Chartpack Notes

- Connectivity
- Neighborhoods w/sidewalks, street lights, bikeways
- Greenspace - connected
- Residential diversity – housing types/ages
    - Cars not prominent – drive/alleyway behind
- Public transportation – accessibility
- Planned development
- Walk to amenities
- Brownfield sites redeveloped – with good access

Facilitator Notes

LuAnn Freeman
- Small town atmosphere
- Build new communities to be like rural towns
- Walkable/Bikable schools
- More pedestrian-oriented communities; opportunities for window shopping
- Able to walk to recreation/parks
- Convenient transit options (Vancouver, BC, as an example)
- Shop owners know local residents
- More family-owned stores

Patricia Strassel
- More walkable communities
- More East-West connections

Jack Gordon

- Lots of potential in north part of Anderson Township
- Recreation areas around gravel pits
- Better bike/pedestrian connections to recreation areas
- Planned development (unlike (Beechmont
- Better East-West connections
- Better public transit
- Need more sewer and utility connections around Ancor area

Ted Hubbard

- Better efficiency
- Better connected neighborhoods (less cul-de-sacs)
- Walkable neighborhoods
- Brownfield revitalization (e.g., Red Bank corridor)
- Make transportation more human-friendly (greener, better aesthetics, more amenities to make it convenient and user-friendly)
- Pedestiran easements between neighborhoods

Suzanne Hopkins

- Using Westwood (west side neighborhood of Cincinnati) as an example:
    - Accessible for people with physical disabilities
    - Good ethnic mix
    - Good recreational opportunities
    - Good mix of churches
    - Neighborhood shopping

Jack Reed

- Currently, people are isolated by the way communities are designed
- Sidewalks in neighborhoods
- Autos don't dominate neighborhoods (cars parked in rear, potentially accessed through alleys)
- Housing opportunities convenient for more senior residents
- Mix of housing opportunities
- Pathways/Pedestrian easements along all roads
- Light Rail would require convenience and safety (shuttle buses serving region around rail stations
- Better handicap access for public facilities
- Redevelop Brownfields
- Mixed-Use developments

Richard Combs

- Recreational development
- Develop Ancor with light industry or office
- Newtown develops an historic character similar to Lebanon
- Bass Island area was a recreation mecca in the late 1920's
- Sidewalks incorporated with new development

Jane Smelser

- Agrees with previous comments
- Streetlights along sidewalks (for safety)
- There needs to be pedestrian connections between neighborhoods (cul-de-sac – type development creates a situation where you have to drive 2 miles to a location that you could walk to much more quickly, if the connections were there
- Better mobility options for seniors, youth, and disabled people

Dean Neimeyer

- Transportation/Pubic Transit is important
- Efficient low-emission vehicles, alone, are not the answer because there would still be traffic congestion
- Need better planned communities and zoning to allow these plans to come to fruition
- Have connections built in from new developments to connect to future developments (reducing cul-de-sac developments)

OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA MEETING #2
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Tuesday, May 15, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Paul Astles, Jeff Bieber, Clark Carmichael, Tom Caruso, Jim Childress, Mary Anne Christie, Richard Combs, Brian Eliff, Keri Everett, Duane Ferguson, Ted Fischesser, Ken Geis, Jack Gordon, Ronald Gramke, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Jerome Heil, Tom Hmurcik, Tom Hoft, Suzanne Hopkins, Ted Hubbard, Bill Jenike, Hans Jindahl, Chuck Kubicki, Anne Lyon, Patrick Manger, Dian Martin, Molly McClure, Frank McCune, Jim McDonough, Suzanne Meruci, Mike Moore, Ken Moppin, Dean Niemeyer, Greg Nue, Melissa O'Farrell, Kevin Osterfeld, Doug Parham, Betsy Pierce, Jack Reed, Mike Rutenshroer, Dottie Scott, Charlie Shepard, William Showers, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Caroline Statkus, Tom & Amanda Stitt, Patty Strassel, Jim Taylor, Charle Thomas, Matt Van Sant, Carl Walker, Michael Ward, Donald Washington, Bob Wendel, Mark Westermeyer, LuAnn Winkle, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ronald Yeager, Dave Zaidain
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Caroline Statkus, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Wooster Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis Opportunities Prioritization: SWOT Analysis 3/7 "Developing Around Transit" article (ULI 4/01) copied on back of above
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning ▪ Land Use Images ▪ Brief Recap of Planning Principles ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Whole Group Area Assessment of Focus Area ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work
Additional Themes/Issues **(as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)**	▪ Balancing street calming with the need for emergency vehicle response time ▪ Jurisdictional planning zoning + land use + access ▪ History of corridor is fragmented – confusing to find places ▪ Respect all issues/viewpoints/and diverse problems-opportunities ▪ Return flood plains to natural habitat/prairie; preserve hillsides
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Ohio 32 Focus Area – Meeting 2
May 15, 2001

Area Analysis
Additional Strengths/Opportunities and Weaknesses/Threats

Area Analysis
- Put heavy industrial near highway to reduce access and disturbance – put commercial by industrial and residential by commercial
- Reinvestment/redevelopment of mall
- Infill undeveloped land along 32 east of 275 and south along 275 – little land use change
- 32 east – limit access – remove at grade intersections
- Preserving and protecting the greenspace and utilizing the Little Miami River – Bike paths, walking

Strengths/Opportunities
- Sustained growth despite lack of planning
- Rivers are opportunity for Clermont/Hamilton County and Union Township
- Anderson willing to put multi-million $ into addressing land use and transportation needs of corridor
- Jurisdictions are embarking on trust
- Commitment of volunteers who are here and involved
- Tremendous investment in infrastructure: water, sewer, roads – continuing investment
- Rail lines
- Ancor industrial opportunity

Weaknesses/Threats
- Access issues between Anderson Township and points north
- Retail/parking lot sprawl – many blacktop, concrete
- Topographical – bridging area between Little Miami and Ohio
- One side of Anderson Township is surrounded by rivers
    - Don't utilize rivers
- This process is based on trust

Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Group 1
Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Brian Balsley

Group participants:

John Stillpass	VIG
David Spinney	Clermont County
Almeda Stitt	League of Women Voters/CCR
Lu Ann Freeman	Clermont County Planning
Mary & Greg Noe	Profession Business Service
Diana Mantin	ODOT
Patricia Strassel	Union Township – CAP
Ted Fischesser	Anderson Township Resident
Jack Reed	Anderson Township Resident

Chartpack Notes
- Bike path proposed to go across the Newtown bridge
- Newtown a recreational service center

- Ancor employment center – light industrial, office, connected through multi-modal fashion
    - Use rail line that goes through as commuter rail
- How many live in Newtown vs. work
- Newtown – a transit hub?
- Case for Commuter rail
    - Precision Lens, Midland – projected 4,000 more jobs
    - 10% of trips go downtown
    - People coming in from Brown County
- Park-n-ride in Ancor

Discussion

Q: Why can't jobs be filled from residents in area?
Response: Specialization of jobs-can't take just anyone
- Possibility of Ancor being retail – nearer than Kenwood
- Ancor as light industrial creates employment near residential and greenspace trails contribute to desirable community

Q: With flooding of Ancor area, is light industrial/commercial feasible?
- Redevelop gravel pits for light industrial or recreational (ball fields)
    - Satisfy existing residents needs vs. employment center which requires and attracts more commercial services/traffic
- Connect nature center to other greenspace – build on connection to Roundbottom Road by Presbyterian Church

Q: If Ancor grows in size, where do people see other neighborhood centers?
    - Newtown
    - Other?
- Neighborhood center potential plan for south of 32/275 intersection – east along 275

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Merrie Stillpass
Group participants:

Len Harding	Clermont League of Women Voters
Ken Moppin	Resident
Jack Gordon	Anderson Township Resident/Business Owner
Jerome Heil	Resident
Tom Stitt	CCR, Milford
Jack Gorden	Union Township
Paul Astles	
Ken Geis	Union Township
Pat Manager	Clermont County Engineer's Office
Kevin Osterfeld	

Chartpack Notes

Strengths

- Good diversity of uses
- Strong residential base for work force
- Anderson Township/Clermont are growing quickly
- Ground water aquifer recharge area
- Anderson Township Parks
- Nature Center
- Gravel extraction is a strength
- River basin
- Clermont County Airport
- Great location – close to strong urban area, airport, good shopping
- Proximity to rural area; very scenic
- Terrain makes area scenic

- Good schools in area
- Eastgate commercial area
- Agriculture in floodplains

Weaknesses

- No pathways or shoulders along roads – very dangerous for walking
- Anderson Township/Clermont are growing quickly
- Culturally homogeneous (lack of diversity)
- Road system
    - Ancor area through Newtown
    - Clermont secondary road system
        - No shoulders on roads
        - Need to make safer
- Terrain limits some travel routing options
- Lots of people pass through the area
- Undersized roads and utilities because development on hillsides was not foreseen to the extent it is occurring
- Stormwater management from new development needs to occur
- 32 intersection at old 74

Land Use Visioning

- Agriculture preservation in floodplains
- Congestion relief in Newtown
- Newtown as revitalizing historic town
- Recreation opportunities with lakes east of Newtown
- Preserve character of residential from hillside east of Newtown to top of hill

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Emily Witte
Group participants:

Suzanne Hopkins	CILO
Jane Smelser	ODOT
Melissa O'Farrell	Clermont Transportation
Dean Niemeyer	Clermont Planning
William Showers	Architect/CAP
Scott Kravetz	VIG
Thom Caruso	TAC
Ted Hubbard	Hamilton County Engineer's Office

Chartpack Notes

Opportunities and Themes

- Brownfields area not as appropriate infill area
- Greenspace value
- Strong urban core
- Interjurisdictional dialog important to make
- Reduce dependency on tax abatement
- Roads are improvement
- Multiple access options!
- Insure tax base for schools
- Connect people with destinations
    - Multi-modal options
- Addressing congestion in Newtown
- Diversity of economic opportunity
- Enhance opportunity to create workplaces near local employee base

Area Analysis

- Greenspace resources

    - Preserve greenspace (natural areas) in Anderson
    - Agricultural preservation along River – sod farms/floodplain
    - Could $ be used to ensure preservation of sod farms or other greenspace?
    - Development issues, land trust, restrictions, etc.
    - Possibility of Newtown to be developed for recreational use
    - Are some smaller wooded areas open for development?
    - Quarry in Newtown – what will happen to it in 20 years? Restoration issue – re-use?
    - New recent development in Newtown – possibly recreational use
    - Preservation of hillsides, protect them from development (steep slopes, unstable, low economic potential)
    - Streams at base of hills lead to unstable slopes, bad for development
    - East of Newtown, north of 32, there are developments on top of hills
- Ancor area
    - Brownfield –redevelopment for industrial/commercial uses?
- Anderson
    - Very residential community
- Recent zoning change in Newtown/Anderson to office
- Land gets donated for park use
    - Many times undevelopable anyway – not always
- Land use depends on what type of transit is there – how accessible it is
- By improving connectivity to existing areas we encourage infill and discourage sprawl (at least don't force people out by not connectivity)
- High housing density would probably be located at stations along light rail line
- Metro Moves hubs will also have an effect on economic development around it
- Lots of cul-de-sacs, only one way out of a place, not grid-like for many options
    - Do we change them or leave them? This leads to a lot of congestion problems
- Cul-de-sacs are desirable places to live – though bad for connectivity
- Pedestrian connection/bikeways – connect cul-de-sacs
- Change it where its most needed
- Other access roads
- Before new development occurs, coordinate transportation to ensure effectiveness
- Satellite cities option
- Local efforts to work on pedestrian/bike connectivity within communities
- Topography limiting in options some areas
- Management of utilities/infrastructure
- Metro hubs will lead to change in density/land use
    - This could be good or bad
- Zone of change north of 32
    - Possible infill – currently zoned office and light industry
- Northern Newtown poorly connected
    - With connection could become like Montgomery
    - Potential rail/transit hub
    - Certain flood prone areas in Newtown may not benefit from this
    - Anything built there over the River would need to be built on piers
        - 'statement' bridge
        - environmentally sensitive/unique
- Commercial developments occurring around rail/bus hubs
- Potential for heavy rail for freight (south of Fairfax, north of Newtown?)
- Where would stops go?
    - Mt. Carmel
    - Ancor area
    - Broadwell
    - Eastgate
    - Newtown
        - north east – above 32/preserve it as a historic area – rehab buildings nearby
- Neighborhood shuttles to get to rail hubs

OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA MEETING #3
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Monday, May 21, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Paul Astles, Jeff Bieber, Charles Brown, Clark Carmichael, Tom Caruso, Jim Childress, Mary Anne Christie, Richard Combs, Brian Eliff, Keri Everett, Duane Ferguson, Ted Fischesser, Ken Geis, Jack Gordon, Ronald Gramke, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Jerome Heil, Tom Hmurcik, Tom Hoft, Suzanne Hopkins, Ted Hubbard, Bill Jenike, Hans Jindahl, Chuck Kubicki, Anne Lyon, Patrick Manger, Molly McClure, Frank McCune, Jim McDonough, Suzanne Meruci, Mike Moore, Ken Moppin, Dean Niemeyer, Greg Nue, Melissa O'Farrell, Kevin Osterfeld, Doug Parham, Betsy Pierce, Jack Reed, Mike Rutenshroer, Dottie Scott, Charlie Shepard, William Showers, Jane Smelser, David Spinney, Caroline Statkus, Tom & Amanda Stitt, Patty Strassel, Jim Taylor, Charle Thomas, Matt Van Sant, Carl Walker, Michael Ward, Donald Washington, Bob Wendel, Mark Westermeyer, Luann Winkle, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ronald Yeager, Dave Zaidain
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Heather Quisenberry, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Ohio 32 Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work of last meeting ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work
Additional Themes/Issues (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	▪ Air and water quality
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Ohio 32 Focus Area – Meeting 3
May 21, 2001

Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Brian Balsley

Group participants:

Greg Noe	Profession Business Service
Ted Fischesser	Anderson Township Resident
Hans Jindal	ODOT – District 8
Matthew Van Sant	Clermont Chamber
Robert S. Vogt	RSVP
Charles C. Brown	Resident – Union Township
Frank McCune	Anderson Township

Chartpack Notes

- "New" 32 should be 4 lane & high speed
- Separate bikes/automobiles
- Need for north south connections from Beechmont (i.e. extend Five Mile Rd.)
- One solution to reduce transit needs is to create more self sufficient communities so people in Anderson don't have to go to Kenwood Mall.
- Ancor: best use is industrial- office not a good choice
    - Heavy industry will serve existing residents
    - Light industry will impact neighboring communities less
- Mt Carmel's challenge is to get west across 275 and get North across 32
- Differing views of Mt. Carmel:
    - Keep mixed use – works with what is currently there

      Vs.
    - Encourage mall development to bring it more accessible to Mt. Carmel residents
- Clough and State neighborhood business center has been discussed for several years
- Re-use Five Mile extension lands for bike path to connect Turpin High School and Mercy area and library

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Merrie Stillpass

Group participants:

Len Harding	Clermont League of Women Voters
Ken Moppin	Resident
Jack Gordon	Anderson Township Resident/Business Owner
Jerome Heil	Resident
Dottie Scott	Anderson Township
Jack Reed	Anderson Residence
Dick Combs	Anderson Park District
LuAnn Freeman	Clermont County Planning

Chartpack Notes

- Metro hub @ Eastgate
- Bypass around Eastgate area
- Need to address local service and access roads to address traffic around Eastgate
- Air quality issue in 45244
- New highways bring in truck traffic
- Elevated road likely to freeze

- Relocated 32 would be beneficial to Midland and other users
- Does light rail to Eastgate make sense?
- Need to buffer residential areas from impacts of roads (in Mt. Carmel)
- Sidewalks linking development
- Create zoning to encourage planned development
- Need to consider the need to create infrastructure that will meet the needs of people in future
- Provide places for kids to play locally
- Create self-sufficient communities (groceries, daycare, parks, etc.)
- Employers should provide spaces for some of these services (daycare and other facilities)
- Need to address air/water/noise concerns
- Mixed use neighborhood center near office development @ Eastgate south
- Should examine use of commuter rail to Afton through Park 50

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Emily Witte

Group participants:

Suzanne Hopkins	CILO
Jane Smelser	ODOT
Melissa O'Farrell	Clermont Transportation
Dean Niemeyer	Clermont Planning
William Showers	Architect/CAP
Thom Caruso	TAC
Clark Carmichael	Anderson Township
Mike Moore	Senco Products

Chartpack Notes

- Community and Neighborhood Resources
  - Congestion inhibits infill development in Newtown
  - Mt. Carmel – good potential for development
- Economic Development
  - Newtown potential with transit hubs
- Natural and Cultural Resources
  - Shademore recreation potential
  - Elimination of some houses by flooding?
- Infrastructure
  - Clermont County especially

Newtown

- Preservation of Agricultural Use – sod farming
  - Economic viability, seems to be best use
- Ohio 32 alignment – goes through some parts of sod farms
- Wetland property difficult to maintain, on fringes possibility of development
- Turpin lake recreation area
- South of 32 possibility for development (residential)
- Nice homes being built on hillsides
  - Also archaeological sites
- Gravel, topsoil extraction possibilities for other uses in floodplain. Not necessarily preferable or economically feasible
  - Pollution abatement qualities
- Vision – same use (agricultural/sod farm/recreation)
  - Could be pressure for commercial development along Batavia Road
  - Necessary to keep wetlands for their function, water, pollution, all environmental issues
- Reforestation along River would lower water temperatures (over time) healthier ecosystem
- Possibility of purchasing development rights to ensure greenspace preservation
- Infill housing and commercial in Newtown
- Hope that Anderson and Newtown develop systematically
  - Uses that don't compete

        - Proper zoning & planning/cooperation between Anderson & Newtown
    - Preservation of historic character of Newtown
    - Make sure there are buffer zones between commercial and residential
    - Utilize lake to increase land value – recreation surrounding lakes
    - Spur from Anderson to Ancor area w/relocated 32

    Ancor
    - Infill where logical
    - Potential railstop
    - Minimize truck traffic
    - Increase accessibility

    Potential rail/metro hubs (major & minor hubs)
    - Beechmont Mall
    - On 5 Mile
    - Behind Anderson Township center
    - Newtown
        - Stations should be flood protected or moved to the east w/pedestrian/bike access
    - Transit stops based on demographics/jobs
    - All hubs don't have to be a neighborhood center
    - Rail stop (hub?) west of Mt. Carmel, south of 32
    - Serve Newtown with all options

    Concern with increase in traffic on roadway
    - Old 32 may be used heavily as bypass
    - Disperse & connect Newtown (Ancor), north/south traffic and 32 congestion to allow traffic better flow
    - Explore options to make it most effective (as free-flowing as possible)
    - 32 in Clermont County has been discussed as a freeway
    - Multi-modal – gives people options
        - Cost benefit – ridership may not make complete sense at this point
        - People do want expanded/more bus routes connecting city & suburbs/Clermont County
        - Light rail should follow realigned roadway
        - May stimulate new mixed use development
        - Service roads, bridging of roadways, explore options to ease congestion – don't want it to turn into interstate highway
            - Example – Kemper & Reed Hartman / Brotherton & Red Bank
        - Make sure light rail doesn't make too many stops

Mt. Carmel
    - Potential to be a solid neighborhood center

Eastgate
    - East of 275 already being developed heavily
    - Light rail to serve existing mall?
        - ODOT – I-275/32 interchange

Facilitator Notes

- Newtown potential transit center
- Mt. Carmel holds potential to be reinvented
    - 'tremendous potential' that will take some infrastructure improvements
- Questions regarding Shademore in the River plains area – floodplain – how is it currently used? Will this continue?
- Sod farming areas may be best use of land – agriculture uses well fitted for floodplain location
- How will 32 realignment affect the sod farms? Farmers feel its not so negative if it is done properly
- If sod farms were to not be here in the future – possible alternative land uses:
    - Residential south of 32 (nothing more aggressive than that)
- Future of sod farms themselves? Too far into floodplain, sinking ground
- Development must accept ecological factors and (re)act accordingly

- Agricultural and/or greenspace is best use for wetland area (even if only to maintain clean air and meet State requirements
- May be suited for recreation
- Mining in this area may reduce the possibility for the south 32 area to be developed as residential (ruining views, noise)
- Keeping wetlands serves regional uses (waterways connect to other areas in region and should remain greenspace)
- Preserve their functions of absorbing floods and recharging aquifer
- Possible reforestation at River's Edge for stream ecology
- Zone along 32 (currently office/commercial) Anderson/Newtown – potential zone of change
- Newtown should be redeveloped in a systematic way – to save architecture, arts, restaurants, etc. – don't make competing businesses nearby (Anderson)
- Cross jurisdictional cooperation (Anderson/Newtown) could help create a good mix that is non-competitive; actually complimentary
- Keep land uses buffered & compatible in new/infill development
- Recreational use to possibly surround lake in Newtown (may raise everyone's property values) possibly connect two lakes

Ancor area:

- Infill where logical
- Better accessibility
- Potential rail stops
- Create Ancor spur that goes from 32 realignment out to area
    - Possibly bottom of 32 and going north to Ancor
    - Important to minimize access traffic from Ancor area through other areas
- Potential transit hubs – (type of transit makes a large difference in actual location of hub)
    - Beechmont Mall
    - Behind Anderson Center
    - Five Mile
- If traffic doesn't flow smoothly through the valley (new 32 alignment) – then other traffic headaches may be created. In order for it to be a good roadway it will have to disperse traffic with minimal exits to reduce back-ups. Needs a creative design, road must effectively reduce congestion or it will maybe go back to original levels (Newtown)
- What purpose does the new 32 alignment really serve with light rail in the picture?
- Newtown transit hub should look at flood protection (possibly be moved further east) if so, make sure there is pedestrian accessibility to hub
- Road alignment (new 32) should look to possibly support light rail – encourage mixed use development
- Reasonable solutions for roadway must be considered (in engineering) to maintain a good traffic flow
- Keep rail stops minimal so that it flows well (too many stops defeat the purpose of speed)
- Mt. Carmel potential neighborhood center
- Topography really doesn't lend itself well for Mt. Carmel rail / bus hubs could possibly need 1-2 stops (based on demographics) in Newtown/Ancor area; maybe that's all
    - (no consensus on this view)
- Eight Mile/32 - good spot for pick-up/drop-off area for rail/bus
    - Needs to be reconstructed anyway
    - May lend itself well for Mt. Carmel accessibility – can work well with shuttle service
- Eastgate area
    - Light rail
        - Possibly a spur for both scales of 275 (although this is dependant on where the $ is)

WOOSTER AND OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA MEETING #4
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, February 28, 2002
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 8:35 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	**Wooster:** Chris Anderson, Jim Bell, Ed Berkich, Lou Bishop, JoAnne Brown, Michael Burns, Don Burrell, Mark Caesar, Doug Cheney, Greg Curless, Paul Davis, Edward Dohrmann, Ben Dotson, David Duckworth, Larry Fronck, John Frye, Cathy Gatch, Jim Gradolf, Patricia Haas, Leonard Harding, Gerald Harris, Patricia Henderson, Shelly Higgins, Jack Hodell, Jeanne Hyden, John Isch, Hans Jindal, Jennifer Kaminer, Dan Keefe, Don Keyes, Hank Kleinfeldt, Fredrick Koehler, Chuck Kubicki, Donald Kunkel, Jennifer Liles, Susan Olson, Rick Patterson, Charles Reid, Loretta Rokey, Julie Rugh, Tom Ryther, Ted Shannon, J.D. Spinnenweber, Dave Spinney, Roger Stafford, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Tom Stitt, Almeda Stitt, Mary Walker, Otto Weening, Jeff Wright, Virmorgan Ziegler **Ohio 32:** Paul Astles, Jeff Bieber, Bill Brayshaw, Charles Brown, Clark Carmichael, Tom Caruso, Jim Childress, Mary Anne Christie, Richard Combs, Brian Eliff, Keri Everett, Duane Ferguson, Ted Fischesser, LuAnn Freeman, Ken Geis, Jack Gordon, Ronald Gramke, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Jerome Heil, Tom Hmurcik, Tom Hoft, Suzanne Hopkins, Ted Hubbard, Bill Jenike, Hans Jindahl, Pinky Kocoshis, Chuck Kubicki, Anne Lyon, Patrick Manger, Molly McClure, Frank McCune, Jim McDonough, Suzanne Meruci, Mike Moore, Ken Moppin, Dean Niemeyer, Greg Noe, Melissa O'Farrell, Kevin Osterfeld, Doug Parham, Betsy Pierce, Jack Reed, Bob Repasky, Mike Rutenshroer, Dottie Scott, Charlie Shepard, William Showers, Steve Sievers, Jane Smelser, Wendy Smith, David Spinney, Caroline Statkus, Tom & Amanda Stitt, Patty Strassel, Jim Taylor, Charle Thomas, Matt Van Sant, Carl Walker, Michael Ward, Donald Washington, Bob Wendel, Mark Westermeyer, Catherine Wuerdeman, Ronald Yeager,
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther,
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Gary Meisner, Rick Record, Merrie Stewart Stillpass, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	25. To review the work done to date and its purpose 26. To review Focus Area Plans and Issues 27. To make any needed revisions, improvements, and/or additions to plan 28. To prioritize Focus Area Issues for review by the Vision Group 29. Supplement representation to the Vision Group 30. Identify individuals to present Focus Area recommendations to the Vision Group on 4/4/02 31. Evaluate the Land Use Vision Plan (LUVP) process
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Focus Area Issues Process Evaluation Form
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of the Land Use Visioning process ▪ Incorporating the LUVP Travel Demand Modeling ▪ Implementation Considerations o Special Economic Districts (JEDDs, CEDAs, TIFs) ▪ Economics Overview of Focus Areas
REVIEW OF LAND USE VISION PLAN	*Focus Area Characteristics* Wooster Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues

- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

Ohio 32 Focus Area

- Zones of Change
- Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations
- Important Focus Area Issues
- Q&A
- Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

WOOSTER AND OHIO 32 FOCUS AREA - MEETING 4
FEBRUARY 28, 2002

Comments Regarding Land Use Vision Plan

Wooster

- Item #8 - incorporate public playfields in the 80 acres in south Mariemont
- Item #7 - Change wording to "Make certain that any development occurring in south Milford is done in an environmentally sensitive manner"
    - Recent residential development proposal was refused
- Item #14 - Part of the streetscaping improvements in this Focus Area should include creating a boulevard character with planted median, green strips on either side, and traffic calming measures to create a more pedestrian-friendly character
    - Too many curb cuts on south side of Wooster
    - Need pedestrian crossings, at least at both Walton Creek and Newtown bridge
    - This is the time and opportunity to address reducing curb cuts on the south side of Wooster, and to provide safe travel opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Item #16 - make this item more general, to include all incentives for implementation
- Item #17 - strike references to Lunken

Ohio 32

- Add as Item #20 - Create a neighborhood center at Clough Pike and Eight Mile Road

OHIO 32 FOCUS GROUP RESOURCE ALLOCATION EXERCISE RESULTS				
$ Allocated (in millions)	**Dots**	**# of allocaters**	**Avg. Allocation**	**Action Item**
18	**3**	**4**	**4.5**	Create connectivity improvements. This could include any or all of the following (subject to recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Travel Demand Modeling and Engineering studies): **Basic Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study recommendations:** • Intersection / Interchange Improvements • Park-and-pool or park-and-ride lots • Expanded use of motorist information system message boards (ARTIMIS) • Better traffic signal coordination • Expanded bus transit system coverage (new routes) service • New rail transit service • Widened, expanded, or new roadways • New Road Alignments Other recommendations that came out of Focus Area discussions: • Transit service to neighborhoods by smaller shuttle buses • New or relocated barge terminals • Rail freight improvements • Water Taxi service (Ohio River) • Commuter air passenger service (Lunken) • Air freight (Lunken)
16	**1**	**5**	**3.2**	Reduce Flood Hazards and moderate urban storm runoff
15	**1**	**7**	**2.14**	Preserve land in river plains for agriculture or open space. Reestablish forested streamside corridors along the Little Miami River to preserve and enhance water quality
11	**0**	**6**	**1.83**	Develop Ancor and Northeast Newtown area with a mix of office, industrial, and recreation • Preserve environmentally sensitive areas and link them with green space corridors, creating an office park atmosphere with recreational opportunities
9	**0**	**3**	**3**	Revitalize / Create Newtown Neighborhood Business District
8	**1**	**2**	**4**	Create areas with multiple pedestrian-friendly destinations within walking distance. These would be areas that could effectively be served by modes of transportation other than only automobiles, or could serve to reduce the amount of automobile travel necessary to accomplish multiple purposes. There are many areas that are experiencing development pressures, and if this development occurs haphazardly, as it has in the past, this could lead to many undesirable outcomes (congestion, multiple curb cuts, lack of pedestrian connections, etc.) Creating methods to guide and implement mixed use, pedestrian-friendly development can guide the future land use to be compatible with surrounding uses and minimize negative impacts. Examples of various types of mixed use development, having varying degrees of pedestrian-friendliness, include the following areas that currently exist within the Cincinnati Region: • Ludlow Avenue in Clifton

				• Rookwood Commons/Plaza • Hyde Park Square • Mariemont • Mt. Lookout Square • Downtown Cincinnati • Batavia Village • Old Milford • Oakley Square Within this Focus Area, some of the areas that may be suitable for creating or enhancing pedestrian-friendly design include the following: • Mt. Carmel • Clough Pike and Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road • Various areas around Eastgate • Newtown / Ancor • Beechmont Mall • Clough and Bach-Buxton
8	**0**	**4**	**2**	Preserve existing parks and open space, and create new parks and public open space for under-served areas (e.g., new developments occurring in Union Twp., Anderson Twp., etc.)
7	**1**	**4**	**1.75**	Revitalize / Create Anderson Township Town Center at Beechmont Mall site
6	**0**	**5**	**1.2**	Create bike trail connections (e.g., from Beechmont Mall to Turpin High School; connections from neighborhoods to Little Miami, Lunken, and Ohio River Bike Trails)
6	**1**	**3**	**2**	Preserve/Enhance air, water, and visual quality in the region
6	**0**	**2**	**3**	Explore the possibilities of creating Special Economic Districts that would mutually benefit the jurisdictions involved and facilitate implementing some of the LUVP recommendations
5	**0**	**3**	**1.66**	Revitalize Neighborhood Center in Mt. Carmel, along Old 74 and Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road
3	**0**	**3**	**1**	Minimize the negative impacts of any connectivity improvements and make sure they are done in an environmentally and aesthetically sensitive manner (see OH-19)
3	**0**	**2**	**1.5**	Create streetscape and gateway improvements along key corridors
2	**1**	**1**	**2**	Consider the creation of pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development in appropriate locations in Union Township. These may include the following: • Near Clough Pike and Gleneste-Withamsville • Near Clough Pike and Bach-Buxton • Near Aicholtz and Ferguson
2	**0**	**2**	**1**	Neighborhood Center at Clough & Mt. Carmel-Tobasco
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Reduce congestion to enhance pedestrian-friendly character: • Eastgate / Eastgate South • Newtown • Mt. Carmel
1	**0**	**1**	**1**	Develop the area along Clough Pike near Bach-Buxton with a mix used development. Primarily a mix of office and industrial to the east.

0	**0**	**0**	**0**	Make neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens and youth

APPENDIX C – Focus Area Meetings
Eastern Avenue/Lunken Focus Area

Focus Area Meeting #1 - 4/19/01

- Meeting Summary
- Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #2 - 4/26/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #3 - 5/3/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Combined Eastern Avenue/Lunken and River Plains Focus Area Meeting #4 - 3/7/02

- Meeting Summary
- Prioritization of Action Items

EASTERN AVENUE/LUNKEN FOCUS AREA MEETING #1 SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, April 19, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	Bob Bibb, Liz Blume, Joanna Brown, Peter Bruemmer, Cooper Burchenal, Betty Burns, Kent Cashell, Theresa Conover, Jim Coppock, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Pat DeWine, Dan Dickten, Nancy Dranbarean, Melissa English, Clare Evers, Marina Fendon, Bob Fischer, Anne Fogel-Burchenal, Ed Fox, Patty Fox, Tony Giglio, Jack Goodwin, Diane Havey, Sarah Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Michelle Holmes, Dick Huddleston, Kent Kamphaus, Tony Kountz, Claudia Krysiak, Randi Mathieu, Suzanne Meruci, Phil Montanus, Mike Niehaus, Carl Palmer, Ron Plattner, Dave Prather, Alicia Reese, Ron Regula, Thea Reis, Dave Ross, Rob Rubin, William Schrock, Steve Schuckman, Ian Scott, Tony Selvey-Maddox, Mike Setzer, Steve Sievers, George Stewart, Kathy Tyler, John Van Volkenburgh, Dorothy Vogt, Jim Walls, Bob Wessell, Benjamin Wetherill
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Merrie Stillpass, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To delevop a vision for future land use in the Eastern Ave./Lunken Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Aspects of Smart Growth/Standards for Recreational Activities (double-sided) Planning Principles Handout Ahwahnee Planning Principles Handout Ground Rules Handout Consensus Process Handout Visioning Worksheet 11x17 Map of Focus Area Political Jurisdictions 11x17 Map of Focus Area Slope and Building Footprints *MetroMoves* brochure
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ History of and Context of Eastern Corridor Land Use Visioning ▪ Discussion of Land Use Visioning Methodology ▪ Discussion of Goals and Ground Rules ▪ Visioning Exercise for Future of Eastern Ave./Lunken Focus Area
INITIAL HOPES/FEARS REGARDING THIS PROJECT (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	Hopes - Improve effectiveness of transportation system - Inform people of alternatives - Hubs must be in right locations - We will create real places - We will create wider diversity in our vision for the future - Social equity - Potential for tourism in this area Fears - We have resistance to improving transportation - Are plans to big/rail biases - Will we get biggest bang for buck - Early plans did not locate "hubs" well - We have not created enough places - Tax abatements use must be balanced - may not benefit **Additional Themes** Quality of life
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	*Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements.* *The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.*

NEXT STEPS:
- Review Mailed Materials
- Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views
- Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Eastern Avenue/Lunken Focus Area – Meeting 1
April 19, 2001

Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Group 1
Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Darin Armbruster/Travis Miller

Group participants:

Thea Reis	Linwood
Bob Wessel	Lunken Airport
Ed Fox	Downtown
Patty Fox	Downtown
Theresa Ervin Conover	Columbia Tusculum
Betty Burns	East End

Chartpack Notes
- P.U.D. – density of housing relates to width of street
  - Grocery store
  - Florist
- View protection
- Tree planting
- Lighting
- Noise issues (with Lunken)
- Infrastructure to support densities
- Public transit
- Bike Path on River
- Eastern Avenue
  - Industrial growth
  - Commercial growth
- Eastern Avenue will be major connector of eastern suburbs & downtown
  - Light rail
  - Linwood would be ideal hub location
- New technology could radically change infrastructure requirements
- Urban area thrives as people return to live in the city
- Light industry development in Lunken area between Eastern & Kellogg
- Revitalize existing residential areas
  - Infrastructure, pedestrian links, sidewalks, etc.
- Transit Oriented Development
- Peaceful earth where everyone lives happily
- Mix of uses already exist
  - Grid and infrastructure is there already/just need to fill in and connect
- Smaller lots/living areas
- Future technology will effect how we use land
  - Grocery, shopping, etc.
- Don't want to live next to business/industry
  - Maintain separation
- As corridor provides quality of life/services/amenities
  - Less need to commute
  - Less need for transportation expansion
- River is major asset
- Deal with moving on river in smaller ways

- River generates noise
- Front porch society returns
- Quality within neighborhood that allows senior/aging population amenities
    - More creative housing solutions
    - Sensitive to River views
    - More flexible in zoning (i.e. Sausalito, CA / Portland, OR)
    - Walkabilty in community
- Residents should be able to stay in their community as they age
- Area should not be just for other communities to use to get downtown/not a transportation corridor
- Transportation corridor may be developed that respects noise levels
- Transportation corridors divide communities / Area is divided by Columbia Pkwy and Eastern Avenue
- Incorporate hillsides into corridor
- Separate bike & pedestrian pathways
- Linear composition of area leads to a 'shredded' area
- People must flow through area to access work downtown from eastern suburbs (Mt. Washington, Mariemont)
- Industry needs to offer jobs to community without noise, pollution, etc.
- Target certain industries (desirable)
- Tax abatement not necessarily a bad thing; as long as business remains viable
- Businesses should have to 'give back' to communities
- Shortage of diversity of recreation
    - Senior outdoor center on Cinergy site (field to east of bldg.-will tie to east fields)
- Need smaller recreational amenities (i.e. tennis courts)

Facilitator Notes

- Industrial commercial growth – all along Eastern Ave.
- Elimination of transportation corridor / creation of a series of communities linked together where people will walk to work, bike to work
- Adverse effect of Eastern Avenue which serves suburbia; but hurts our community; don't give anything back to mitigate the noise & site pollution

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Merrie Stillpass/Brian Balsley

Group participants:

Randi Mathieu	League of Women Voters
Jim Coppoch	City of Cincinnati
David Ross	California Development Corporation
JoAnna Brown	City of Cincinnati
Sarah Hippenstal	Little Miami River Partnership
Nancy Drambarean	Linwood
Steve Schuckman	Cincinnati Park Board

Chartpack Notes

- Neighborhood centers
    - Columbia Tusculum arts center
    - Stanley/Kellogg
    - California (Lebo's, Bill's Bait)
    - + others with character of sub-center
- Distinct character to neighborhoods = identity
- Community center in Linwood (Linwood at Eastern)
- Redevelopment of school site
- Bike trails
- Parks

- Walkable neighborhoods
- Community center integrate all ages (i.e. vision for new k-12 school in Linwood)
- Riverfront park / Ohio and Little Miami River
    - Access
    - Physical
    - Character
- Seasonal waterfront transport/taxi integrating area attractions
- Mix of neighborhood housing opportunities
    - Diverse population + economics (retain existing population)
- Mitigation of impacts of Lunken Airport
    - Quality of life issue
- Increase opportunity for access to alternative forms transportation + hub(s)
- Diverse neighborhood population
- Creation of economic development plan for area
- Insure adequate infrastructure for new economic development
- Balance of land use (+ development, etc.) = quality of life for neighborhood
- Creating healthy environment – noise, water, air, etc.
- Racial diversity

Facilitator Notes

Steve Schuckman
- Spines of green w/linear parks
- Mixed use community centers
- Bike trials
- Canoes
- Infill development
- Mass transit

Nancy Drambarean
- Afraid Lunken becoming mini Midway
    - Noise, jet fuel, overtaxing of local areas (roads)
- Noise mitigation
- More trees on industrial sites (noise mitigation)
- Reduce cargo traffic
- Neighborhood center Kellogg & Stanley
- Bike trails

Sarah Hippenstal
- Passive recreation opportunity
- Fewer cars
- Smaller streets/large sidewalks
- Children walking and biking to school
- Mix of races and ethnicities
- Mix of housing opportunities (affordable)
- Active communities
- Places for children to play

JoAnna Brown
- Affordable housing
- Transit
- Racial diversity
- Buffering residential neighborhoods
- Better aesthetics/community identity
- Better connections between neighborhoods
- Mixed use

David Ross
- Public access to River
- Neighborhood centers (California)
- Tourist type reaction opportunities w/bike trail
- Keep 52/Kellogg from becoming major highway

Jim Coppock
- Scenic byways
- "Fort Washington Way" of bike trails
- NO riverfront gambling

Randi Mathieu
- Parks along River
- Water taxis

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Emily Witte

Chartpack Notes

- Transportation is key
- Neighborhoods/schools/shopping
- Connection to Downtown important
- Riverwalk/bikeway connection important
- Rail & truck route 50 are function issues – can't go away
- Freight line may have potential to go away with planning
- Eastern Avenue connection to 2nd Street
- Rail + bike + walk + park on River
- Housing on platform above flood level (100 year)
- Create flood "platforms" new housing
- Need good space for industrial land along River
- Quality of life + towne centers
    - Solidify greenspaces/unbroken
    - Diminish industrial uses
    - More offices/housing
    - Diminish truck & freight transportation
    - Light rail and bike trails along River
    - No build in floodplain
    - Create formal town center (existing/historic)
- Large beautiful homes on hills
- Concentrated residential
- No Columbia Parkway – tubes transit to take people; system of bike/walk
- All utilities underground
- Lunken may go/open up land
- Lunken new development zone
- Lighter land uses/beauty emphasized
- Industry further out
- Greenspace/bikeways/walkways
- Elevated transit parallel to Columbia Parkway – drops to ground level
- "New Lunken" – different mode of air travel
- Amenities key in future
- Multi model system is important
    - Mini bus
    - Rail
    - Bus
- Medical complex diversify to include shopping and other uses
- Improve parks/greenspace
- Look back/high density urban neighborhood
- Old interurban
- Light rail not feasible
- 10-20 years long time to development
- Heavy density return to Eastern Avenue
- Rebuild "on stilts" – find new options to allow building affordable housing difficult to build – how do you pay for it
- Hope we could get industry/housing/shopping back together

- Mixed use
- Lunken stays/quieter/shorter runways (reduce impact)

Themes/Land Use

- Mix of land uses good
- Preserve greenspaces
- Maintain functional road/rail for freight
- Bike + walking + parks are doable
- Concentrate mixed uses/higher density
- More public transportation

Facilitator Notes

- Focus is on transportation
- Shopping for everyday things closer
- Oasis line is good opportunity for riverwalk
- Railroad & truck route create problem: no other way for them to get around coming from interstate/ minimize impact
- Possible trolley? Streetcars, pedestrian movement through area
- Transportation hubs
- Better mix of uses/grassy, residential, work
- Housing on platforms to reduce flood risk – denser housing
- Bikeways to downtown
- Tax issues/logistics
- Quality of life
    - Towne centers
    - Solidification of greenspace along Little Miami
    - Diminishing industrial along that route/replace with office and housing
- Light rail following River
- Bike trail/recreation areas
- No more building in flood plain
- Historic towne center/revitalized
- Body of water between Beechmont and Newtown with recreation area between 32 & 50 for boating, etc.
- Large expensive homes
- Diverse townhouses/population
- Elevated tubes instead of roads. Mass transit no so many autos. Environmentally correct. Jetson-type system of transit in tubes
- Underground utilities
- Lunken Airport gone – instead would be town center
- Non-industrial employment in area
- Utilizing natural beauty
- Elevated transit system
- Greenspace along River
- Bike/walking paths
- Areas defined by amenities, and how they get around them. Decentralized bus system
- Medical complex mixed in with shopping
- More trees/landscaping
- Revitalize some of the old things that used to make Cincinnati more desirable place
    - Don't see light rail, though
- Rebuilding in floodplain (elevated)
- Large growth/return to high density in housing in area
- Problem of affordable housing/who would pay for it? Equity-system
- Mixed use developments along Eastern Ave (hopefully)
- Lunken Airport quieter/shorter runways

Major Themes

- High density/more of a mix

- Planned locations/connections
- Preservation of greenspace
- Elimination of congestion
- Bike/walking paths/connecting parks

EASTERN AVENUE/LUNKEN FOCUS AREA MEETING #2 SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, April 26, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Bob Bibb, Liz Blume, Peter Bruemmer, Cooper Burchenal, Betty Burns, Kent Cashell, Theresa Conover, Jim Coppock, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Pat DeWine, Dan Dickten, Nancy Dranbarean, Melissa English, Clare Evers, Marina Fendon, Bob Fischer, Anne Fogel-Burchenal, Tony Giglio, Jack Goodwin, Diane Havey, Sara Hippensteel, Michelle Holmes, Dick Huddleston, John Hudson, Kent Kamphaus, Tony Kountz, Claudia Krysiak, Lin Laing, Randi Mathieu, Suzanne Meruci, Dean Miller, Phil Montanus, Mike Niehaus, Carl Palmer, Ron Plattner, Dave Prather, Alicia Reese, Ron Regula, Thea Reis, Dave Ross, Rob Rubin, William Schrock, Steve Schuckman, Ian Scott, Tony Selvey-Maddox, Mike Setzer, Steve Sievers, Anita Stewart, George Stewart, Kathy Tyler, John Van Volkenburgh, Dorothy Vogt, Jim Walls, Bob Wessell, Benjamin Wetherill
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Robert Roark
PROJECT TEAM:	Darin Armbruster, Brian Balsley, Quentin Davis, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Caroline Statkus, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Wooster Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis Opportunities Prioritization: SWOT Analysis 3/7 "Developing Around Transit" article (ULI 4/01) copied on back of above
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning ▪ Land Use Images ▪ Brief Recap of Planning Principles ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Whole Group Area Assessment of Focus Area ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work
Additional Themes/Issues **(as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)**	▪ Balancing street calming with the need for emergency vehicle response time ▪ Jurisdictional planning zoning + land use + access ▪ History of corridor is fragmented – confusing to find places ▪ Respect all issues/viewpoints/and diverse problems-opportunities ▪ Return flood plains to natural habitat/prairie; preserve hillsides
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work

NEXT STEPS:
- Review Mailed Materials
- Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views
- Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Eastern Avenue/Lunken Focus Area – Meeting 2
April 26, 2001

Land Use Discussion

Group 1
Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Travis Miller

Group participants:

Steve Sievers	Anderson Township
Bob Wessel	Lunken Airport
Theresa Ervin Conover	Columbia Tusculum
Betty Burns	East End
Bob Vogt	RSVP

Chartpack Notes
- Lunken - increase flights/commuters
  - CVG is heading toward capacity and Lunken is less cost
  - Doesn't affect change in land use of Lunken
  - Is asset to business (i.e. P&G, Firstar)
  - Transportation hub of eastern Cincinnati
- North rail taken out along Eastern Ave
  - Use for bike way (separate from pedestrian)
  - Connect downtown to eastern connections
- Light industrial (vs. heavy) in 52 corridor adjacent to airport (south-east)
  - [some diverse views on this]
- NBD/office/flexspace on Eastern, very underutilized (planned for phase II)
- Up hill, Stanley, Hammond, Tusculum, Hogue – much upscale in-fill house
- Area has much market rate housing that is affordable
- Area has a range of housing prices
- Small commercial area at base of Collins off Eastern
- Small commercial/retail area at Bains
- Infrastructure needed in East End
  - Need for sewer connections are holding up development (how else can infill housing occur?)
- Extend Stanley Ave to River to better utilize River (Need access to River)
- East End plan: Walking along river. Biking above it on former rail line
  - Connect the paths at various Spokes such as Kemper, Torrence
- Access between Eastern Avenue and Columbia Parkway is needed
- Much pedestrian traffic across Parkway at Torrence
- Need to consider how 32 extension will impact the Parkway and the residential areas
- Existing neighborhoods shouldn't cater to suburban/traffic commuter
- Tourist/entertainment area being planned north of Kellogg at Riverbend/River Downs vicinity
- On Elston, larger residential homes are planned
- Potential towncenter at Skytop Pavilion – higher density development/mixed uses

Group 2
Group Facilitators: Todd White/Merrie Stillpass

Group participants:

Randi Mathieu	League of Women Voters
Jim Coppoch	City of Cincinnati
David Ross	California Development Corporation
David Prather	Cincinnati Parks
Anne Fogel-Buchenal	Columbia Tusculum
Nancy Drambarean	Linwood
Kathy Tyler	Lunken Users Committee

Chartpack Notes

- Bus hub near airport; improved bus service
- Hotels across from airport by sewage treatment plant
- Upgrade farmer's market
- Water taxi service from downtown to California
    - Connection near airport (park & cruise)
    - In conjunction w/bus park-n-ride
- Nice residential
- Greenspace in floodplains
- Bed & Breakfast along Ohio River (California, East End)
- Bike trail (2 options) along rail or riverfront in East End
- Potential development site a school in Linwood
    - Needs connection to rest of neighborhoods
- Would like to eliminate junk yards along Eastern
    - Scenic byway funds might possibly be used
- Need fiber optic connections (perhaps in bike trail R.O.W) through the area
- Improved access from west bound traffic across levy w/ramp directly to Columbia Parkway and from southbound Columbia Parkway to Linwood
    - Would have to be done w/o further dividing Linwood
- Eliminate rail line in East End and Linwood (would reunite neighborhoods)
- Light rail might also be desirable
    - But might not be feasible
    - Rail is more desirable than buses
- D.C. is good example of effective system (w/o rough terrain)
- Lunken as multimodal transportation hub
- Art center a possibility near Lunken and Columbia Tusculum
- Public recreation opportunities need to be created along Ohio River
    - Possibility near Queen City Terminal
    - Also in California
- Mixed use; artists; high tech west of Wilmer along Eastern
    - Considerate to existing residential
- Desire for running trail that does not cross traffic
- East End community centers somewhat dependant on market forces
    - Perhaps at Bains
- Infill housing and development opportunities
- Lots of "useless, ugly" buildings along southside of scenic byway (US 52)
    - Develop north side more compactly
- Commuter traffic on River

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Brian Balsley

Group participants:

Marina Fendon	Anderson Township Transportation
Clare Evers	UDF – Real Estate
Ken Kamphaus	Lunken Users Committee
George Stewart	Sawyer Place
Anita Stewart	Sawyer Place

Jerry Bargo	Bike PAC/RETA
Dotty Vogt	East Walnut Hills

Chartpack Notes

- Overlay plan for entire area that has all elements
- Build infill housing on flood plain fill
- Eliminate Lunken airport for housing
- Eliminate Oasis line; Delta to I-471 for developable land with views
- Airport plan, neighborhood plans need to consider airport/downtown link
- Rail stop at Sawyer Point
- Stops at Kemper, Torrence, Collins
- Tubes vs. Light/heavy rail
- Monorail connection between CBD & Lunken
- Access/crossing issue along rail line is freight incompatible
- Rail freight is important to keep freight off interstates
- Relocate industry along river into zones with barge/rail farmers market
- Stop at Columbia/Tusculum
- Bus hubs at Columbia/Tusculum
- Bus hubs at Columbia/Tusculum or Linwood
- Park-n-ride at Coney-water taxis

Opportunities & Themes

- Some communities are more impact by some land uses (public utilities, etc) than others; some consideration should be given
- Need to provide multiple options for mobility
- Need to incorporate future expansion of Lunken in considering impacts on surrounding area
- Provide transportation options to alleviate traffic in Lunken area
- Interjurisdictional cooperation
- Freight mobility needs to be considered
    - Buffer residential from impact
- Enforce historic preservation regulations
- Good public schools are most important
    - Safety is very important in relation to bring families to this area
- Lots of local parks that are lesser known (Pioneer Cemetery, T.M. Berry Int'l Friendship Park, Wires-Anderson, Lunken, Alms, California, Ault, Eden, Old Coney)
    - Greatly enhances quality of life, but it has limitations
- Need to emphasize parks and historical character
- Linking parks would greatly enhance each of them
    - Emerald necklace concept
- Opportunity to create/enhance scenic byway
    - Creates more incentives for improvements
- Town center opportunity on Columbia Parkway between Delta and Tusculum; create boulevard feel to the area (similar to Hyde Park Square or Mt. Lookout)
- Opportunity for high end housing along Eastern Avenue area
- Opportunity to address affordable housing through sweat equity
- Parks / Greenspace
    - Do not generate tax $
    - Little to bring awareness to Pioneer Cemetery and other parks
    - Parks could be better connected/inter-linked
- Traffic speed Delta/Tusculum – Columbia Parkway
    - Slow down/Boulevard
    - Poor traffic flow
    - Can't walk along/patronize business
- We're visioning the change of land uses that we don't have "control" or "rights" to
- Eliminate railroad (elevated) between Stanley and Delta to allow higher density residential to River
    - Railroad removal will impact commerce

- Affordable housing – cost to build/Land engineering/construction costs = more expense/gov't/city subsidy
- People who need larger industrial space moving north – space/ground/efficiency
- Incorporate existing community plans (Columbia-Tusculum, East End
- City needs more housing and jobs
- Parking:
    - Homes lack garages/driveways
    - Towncenters will need parking

Potential Areas of Change

- Walnut Hills – revitalize housing and neighborhood centers
- Airport and its fringe
- Linwood
- Entire Ohio Riverfront
- California, along Kellogg Avenue
- Old Coney/Riverbend/Riverdowns
- Railroad corridor from Torrence to Delta
- From Adams Landing to Kemper between Columbia Parkway and Eastern
- Elston Road

EASTERN AVENUE/LUNKEN FOCUS AREA MEETING #3
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, May 3, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Bob Bibb, Liz Blume, Peter Bruemmer, Cooper Burchenal, Betty Burns, Kent Cashell, Theresa Conover, Jim Coppock, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Pat DeWine, Dan Dickten, Nancy Dranbarean, Melissa English, Clare Evers, Marina Fendon, Bob Fischer, Anne Fogel-Burchenal, Ed Fox, Tony Giglio, Jack Goodwin, Diane Havey, Sara Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Michelle Holmes, Dick Huddleston, John Hudson, Kent Kamphaus, Tony Kountz, Claudia Krysiak, Lin Laing, Randi Mathieu, Suzanne Meruci, Phil Montanus, Mike Niehaus, Carl Palmer, Ron Plattner, Dave Prather, Alicia Reese, Ron Regula, Thea Reis, Rob Rubin, William Schrock, Steve Schuckman, Ian Scott, Tony Selvey-Maddox, Mike Setzer, Steve Sievers, Anita Stewart, George Stewart, Kathy Tyler, John Van Volkenburgh, Dorothy Vogt, Jim Walls, Bob Wessell, Benjamin Wetherill
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Dilip Tripathy, Mike Nappi Reggie Victor, Rick Record, Ron Docter
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the Eastern Avenue/Lunken Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Transportation Comparison Charts
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Discussion/explanation of transportation conversion resource charts ▪ Report out of last week's Small Group Visioning Work ▪ Small Group refinement of land use vision ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work ▪ Whole group discussion – consolidation of visions
Additional Themes/Issues **(as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)**	▪ Efficient freight/commercial transport (River & rail corridors) No consensus at this point in the meeting
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

Eastern Avenue/Lunken Focus Area – Meeting 3
May 3, 2001

Theme Discussion

- Efficient freight/commercial transport (River & rail corridors)
    - No consensus at this point in the meeting

Land Use Vision Consolidation

- West rail 4.5 mile
- Consolidation
- Area of further discussion:
    - Barge traffic – truck – route?
    - As not to impact Linwood
- Agreement on barge terminal (if traffic can be worked out)
- Who would control?
- Impacts – positive and negative to city

Focus Groups Supports:

- Keep airport quiet
- Keep airport (buffer)
- Keep sewage plant from smelling
- Neighborhood school/community school (K-12)/community services/ focal point
- Capitalize on Park system
    - Add on to/ enhance – River, biking, links
- R.O.W. of Oasis line retained/ preserved
    - Narrow property highest/best potential for redevelopment opportunities in City
    - Possible Oasis R.O.W. relocation
- Restudy Beechmont 'circle'/Wooster protect neighborhoods and improve circulation
- Include study of truck traffic
    - Especially Wilmer at Beechmont 'circle' and connect to terminals
- Tourism and recreation opportunities from California to Anderson Township
    - Water taxi
    - Other
- Protect/preserve hillside fringes
    - Housing – design for site
    - Hillside Trust
- Floodplains – Greenspace, bikeways,
    - New development – built with flood protection

Land Use Discussion

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Todd White/ Merrie Stillpass/Travis Miller

Group participants:

Nancy Drambarean	Linwood
Dilip Tripathy	Columbia Tusculum
Robert Vogt	RSVP
Richard Hoekzema	Firstar
George Stuart	Sawyer Place Co.

Randi Mathieu	League of Women Voters
Reggie Victor	City of Cincinnati

Chartpack Notes

- Linwood physically divided; difficult to develop neighborhood center
- Columbia-Tusculum neighborhood center at Delta to Stanley/Columbia Pkwy to Eastern Ave.
    - Small businesses (no drive-thrus)
    - 2 plans for Columbia-Tusculum
    - Area is divided by Columbia-Tusculum
- Develop large concentration of residential units along Eastern
    - Potentially served by monorail or light rail
- Desirable to eliminate rail line from along Eastern
    - Railroad might be amendable if revenues could be maintained
- City has rights to track but has to honor Rail Tec shipping contracts
    - Currently in year 9
    - After 20 years money must go back to feds if rail line is not made use of
- Industrial development around airport
- Noise complaints around airport; don't bring in lots of business creating more cargo flight noise
- Barge to rail hub south of airport
    - Would require road improvements form Lunken to I-275 on US 52
- Get trucks out of residential area off 50 and onto 52 to Wilmer
- Metro hub at Beechmont and Wooster/Wilmer
- Improve intersection at Wooster/Wilmer & Beechmont
- Locate industry that process materials brought in by barge near a barge terminal
- Art center along Eastern Ave.
- Streetscape
- Bike trail connections
- Boulevard design on Eastern and other residential streets
- Low cost loans for current residents
- More parks along river
- Odor problem with sewer plant
- Difficult to tap into trunk sewer
- No back flow protection on sewers
- K-12 community school
- Bring Wooster Road out of 100 year floodplain
- Sewer improvements have been made near Friendship Park
- Streetscaping in California
- Bury utilities along major thoroughfares
- Community schools prevent gentrification
- 3 year old East End health clinic at Airport Road & Eastern

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Brian Balsley/Emily Witte/Linda Fabe

Group participants:

Clare Evers
Anita Stewart
Ed Fox
Ken Kamphaus
Mike Nappi
Marina Fendon
Bob Bibb

Chartpack Notes

- K-12 school/community center day care in Linwood near Firstar
- New park along Little Miami River/Beechmont/Wooster
- New school could drive economic development along Eastern Avenue in Columbia-Tusculum

- Foot of Beechmont (Bigg's Place) serves as "town center" for Linwood Mt. Washington and Anderson Township
- Rebuild Mt. Adams Incline
- Future neighborhood nodes along Eastern: Bains, Collins
- Junkyards
    - Under flight lines
    - Related businesses close by (body shops, welding)
    - Relocate? or "spruce up/camoflage"
- Improve visual quality of US 52 to extend scenic byway west into Cincinnati
- Enhance scenic views of Ohio River
- Lunken Airport: control/minimize noise – not 24/7
- Consolidate industry – eliminate certain rail
- Reserve Oasis Corridor
- Pedestrian bridges over Eastern Avenue

Facilitator Notes

- Shifting industrial/barge traffic
- School/mixed use/neighborhood towne center/meeting place
    - Floodplain problem
- Columbia-Tusculum town center planning – pedestrian access/but there's lots of traffic
- Cost of building in floodplain
- Have to centrally locate things for better access (towne center)
- Using recreation area by Linwood school to study floodplain issues by UC scientists, etc
- Many residents don't mind the traffic near Columbia-Tusculum, they still walk around there, school would enhance it
- California 'Town Center' – efforts underway
- Neighborhood nodes – Collins a possibility
- Linwood community center – want K-12 school to be focus of area
- Many smaller areas (nodes) or one bigger one?
- More commercial development along Linwood/Eastern Avenue? (some want it/some do not)
- Bottom of Beechmont hill, new commercial development (retail, etc) big investment – not seen as a neighborhood center
- Mt. Washington is more of neighborhood center
- Topography separates areas
- Railroad may prevent new park along river
- What about junkyard?
- Things are functional, but maybe not the most desirable use, what do you do then? – Have to be practical at some point. Junkyard industry has to go somewhere
  Buffering/consolidation/landscaping/upgrade appearance
- 52 scenic road – preservation of rural character
- Scenic River view has to be major attraction to entire area
- Airport = problem or not?

EASTERN AVENUE/LUNKEN AND RIVER PLAINS FOCUS AREA MEETING #4 SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, March 7, 2002
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 8:35 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	**Eastern Ave / Lunken:** Bob Bibb, Liz Blume, Peter Bruemmer, Cooper Burchenal, Betty Burns, Kent Cashell, Theresa Conover, Jim Coppock, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Pat DeWine, Dan Dickten, Nancy Dranbarean, Melissa English, Clare Evers, Marina Fendon, Bob Fischer, Anne Fogel-Burchenal, Ed Fox, Tony Giglio, Jack Goodwin, Diane Havey, Sara Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Michelle Holmes, Dick Huddleston, John Hudson, Kent Kamphaus, Pinky Kocoshis, Tony Kountz, Claudia Krysiak, Lin Laing, Randi Mathieu, Suzanne Meruci, Charlene Metzger, Phil Montanus, Mike Niehaus, Carl Palmer, Ron Plattner, Dave Prather, Ed Ratterman, Alicia Reese, Thea Reis, Dave Ross, Rob Rubin, William Schrock, Steve Schuckman, Ian Scott, Tony Selvey-Maddox, Mike Setzer, Steve Sievers, Anita Stewart, George Stewart, Kathy Tyler, Reggie Victor, John Van Volkenburgh, Dorothy Vogt, Jim Walls, Bob Wessell, Benjamin Wetherill **River Plains:** Mark Alexander, Chris Anderson, Jerry Bargo, Marty Bartlett, Jim Bell, Rachel Belz, Bob Bibb, Bruce Branstetter, Bill Brayshaw, Jo Ann Brown, Ruth Ann Busald, Richard Combs, Stephen Dana, Paul Davis, Bob Deck, Henry Dolive, Benjamen Dotson, Keri Everett, Jim Farfsing, Robert & Mary Fischer, Kevin Flowers, Paul Fox, Mike Fremont, Susan Gibler, Rick Griewe, H. Hafner, Linda Hafner, Holly Halcomb, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Diane Havey, Charlene Hetzger, Sarah Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Bill Hopple, Gretchen Hurt, Roland & Claire Johnson, Barbara Kadinger, Dan Keefe, Steve Klein, Craig Kolb, Chuck Kubicki, C. Michael Lemmon, John Liken, Anne Lyon, Anne McBride, Molly McClure, Charlene Metzger, Sue Micheli, Anastasia Mileham, Dory Montazemi, Dan & David Motz, Edmund Motz, Carolyn Motz, Rick Oberschmidt, Eric Partee, Chris Patton, Thea Reis, Betty Rhodes, Loretta Rokey, Don Rostofer, Greg Schrand, Ian Scott, Vic Shaffer, William Showers, Gates Smith, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Caroline Statkus, John Stevens, Patty Strassel, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Ryan Taylor, Reggie Victor, Benjamen Wetherill, Emily Witte, Steve Wood, Catherine Wuerdeman, Tim Zelek
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Merrie Stewart Stillpass, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	1. To review the work done to date and its purpose 2. To review Focus Area Plans and Issues 3. To make any needed revisions, improvements, and/or additions to plan 4. To prioritize Focus Area Issues for review by the Vision Group 5. Supplement representation to the Vision Group 6. Identify individuals to present Focus Area recommendations to the Vision Group on 4/4/02 7. Evaluate the Land Use Vision Plan (LUVP) process
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Focus Area Issues Process Evaluation Form
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of the Land Use Visioning process ▪ Incorporating the LUVP Travel Demand Modeling ▪ Implementation Considerations o Special Economic Districts (JEDDs, CEDAs, TIFs) ▪ Economics Overview of Focus Areas
REVIEW OF LAND USE VISION PLAN	*Focus Area Characteristics* Eastern Ave / Lunken Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues ▪ Q&A

	▪ Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions River Plains Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues ▪ Q&A ▪ Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

EASTERN AVE / LUNKEN AND RIVER PLAINS
FOCUS AREA - MEETING 4
MARCH 7, 2002
Comments Regarding Land Use Vision Plan

Easter Ave / Lunken

- Item #21 - ARTIMIS is perceived by Dorothy Vogt as being useless and a waste of money
- Item #15 - Is "congestion reduction" and "traffic calming" at cross purposes?
- Item #21 - Revisit possibilitiesof transit that does not necessarily follow current Rights-of-Way, perhaps running in airspace above the ground surface. Incorporate this suggestion, and the suggestion to think about incorporating other transit alternatives, into the Focus Area recommendations portion of Item #21
- Item #21 - Seems to be a catch-all, doesn't fit with other issues
- Item #13 - Add discussion of historic architectural sensitivity in California along Kellogg

River Plains

- Item #6 - Important to maintain recreational opportunities with lakes in Ancor
- Item #4 – How are we talking about flood-proofing the residential development?
- Item#7 – modify to read: "Develop, or find existing, criteria to evaluate and assess proposed development in South Milford so that it is done in a manner that is sensitive to the environment."
- Item #12 – vary vague, a motherhood and apple pie kind of issue

Concluding Comments:

- Dorothy Vogt says schools, or somebody, need to teach kids to drive better

EASTERN AVENUE/LUNKEN FOCUS GROUP RESOURCE ALLOCATION EXERCISE RESULTS				
$ Allocated (in millions)	**Dots**	**# of allocaters**	**Avg. Allocation**	**Action Item**
17	**2**	**4**	**4.25**	Reduce congestion and create traffic calming enhancements to enhance pedestrian-friendly character: • Eastern Ave. (East End, Columbia Tusculum, Linwood) • Columbia Parkway (Columbia Tusculum)
13	**2**	**6**	**2.17**	Create areas with multiple pedestrian-friendly destinations within walking distance. These would be areas that could effectively be served by modes of transportation other than only automobiles, or could serve to reduce the amount of automobile travel necessary to accomplish multiple purposes. There are many areas that are experiencing development pressures, and if this development occurs haphazardly, as it has in the past, this could lead to many undesirable outcomes (congestion, multiple curb cuts, lack of pedestrian connections, etc.) Creating methods to guide and implement mixed use, pedestrian-friendly development can guide the future land use to be compatible with surrounding uses and minimize negative impacts. Examples of various types of mixed use development, having varying degrees of pedestrian-friendliness, include the following areas that currently exist within the Cincinnati Region: • Hyde Park Square • Mariemont • Mt. Lookout Square • Downtown Cincinnati • Norwood Business District near Surrey Square • O'Bryonville Within this Focus Area, some of the areas that may be suitable for creating or enhancing pedestrian-friendly design include the following: • Linwood • Columbia Tusculum • California • East End • Lunken Airport Area
12	**1**	**5**	**2.4**	Preserve existing parks and open space, and create new parks and open space for under-served areas (e.g., improved access to recreation along the Ohio River, etc.)
11	**0**	**5**	**2.2**	Create connectivity improvements. This could include any or all of the following (subject to recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Travel Demand Modeling and Engineering studies): **Basic Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study recommendations:** • Intersection / Interchange Improvements • Park-and-pool or park-and-ride lots

				• Expanded use of motorist information system message boards (ARTIMIS) • Better traffic signal coordination • New and expanded bike lanes and trails • More frequent service on existing bus routes • Expanded bus transit system coverage (new routes) service • New rail transit service • Widened, expanded, or new roadways • New Road Alignments Other recommendations that came out of Focus Area discussions: • Transit service to neighborhoods by smaller shuttle buses • New or relocated barge terminals • Rail freight improvements • Water Taxi service (Ohio River) • Commuter air passenger service (Lunken) • Air freight (Lunken) • Consideration of other transit options such as transit that may not follow existing rights-of-way, but could run in air-space above the ground surface. Views of the Ohio River could be an amenity associated with this
9	**2**	**4**	**2.25**	Create diverse neighborhoods with housing opportunities for all
8	**0**	**5**	**1.6**	Redevelop / Create Columbia Tusculum Neighborhood Business District (along Columbia Parkway and to the south, between Stanley and Delta) as mixed use pedestrian friendly development
8	**0**	**5**	**1.6**	Create bike trail connections (e.g., from Ohio River Bike Trail to existing Little Miami Trail and Lunken)
7	**1**	**2**	**3.5**	K-12 School and Community Center along Kellogg Avenue, near Delta or Stanley
7	**0**	**4**	**1.75**	Minimize the negative impacts of any connectivity improvements and make sure they are done in an environmentally and aesthetically sensitive manner (see EL-21)
7	**0**	**5**	**1.4**	Preserve hillsides and visual quality of US 52 along the Ohio River
7	**0**	**6**	**1.17**	Encourage attractive light industry / office development near Lunken Airport
6	**0**	**3**	**2**	Create streetscape and gateway improvements along key corridors • US 52 / Eastern Ave. (East End, Columbia Tusculum, Linwood, California) • US 50 / Columbia Parkway (Columbia Tusculum)
5	**0**	**3**	**1.67**	Explore the possibilities of creating incentives such as Special Economic Districts that would mutually benefit the jurisdictions involved and facilitate implementing some of the LUVP recommendations
4	**0**	**2**	**2**	Redevelop / Enhance California Neighborhood Business District along Kellogg Ave
4	**0**	**3**	**1.33**	Make neighborhoods accessible for physically disabled, senior citizens and youth
4	**0**	**3**	**1.33**	Reduce Flood Hazards and moderate urban storm runoff (East End, California, East End, Linwood)

3	**0**	**3**	**1**	Expand residential opportunities along the Ohio River in a way that they are kept away from flood hazards
2	0	1	2	Redevelop / Create Neighborhood Center (s) in East End • Near Eastern Ave. and Kemper • Near Eastern Ave. and Collins
2	0	1	2	Preserve / Expand the Farmer's Market on Wilmer Ave., near Kellogg
0	0	0	0	Bed + Breakfasts in California, Columbia Tusculum, and East End
0	0	0	0	Redevelop / Create Linwood Neighborhood Center along Eastern Ave., north of Beechmont

APPENDIX C – Focus Area Meetings
River Plains Focus Area

Focus Area Meeting #1 - 5/9/01

- Meeting Summary
- Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #2 - 5/16/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Focus Area Meeting #3 - 5/22/01

- Meeting Summary
- Area Analysis Exercise

Combined Eastern Avenue/Lunken and River Plains Focus Area Meeting #4 - 3/7/02

- Meeting Summary
- Prioritization of Action Items

RIVER PLAINS FOCUS AREA MEETING #1
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Monday, May 9, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Mark Alexander, Chris Anderson, Jerry Bargo, Marty Bartlett, Jim Bell, Rachel Belz, Bob Bibb, Bruce Branstetter, Bill Brayshaw, Ruth Ann Busald, Richard Combs, Stephen Dana, Paul Davis, Bob Deck, Benjamen Dotson, Keri Everett, Jim Farfsing, Robert and Mary Fischer, Kevin Flowers, Paul Fox, Mike Fremont, Susan Gibler, Rick Griewe, H. Hafner, Linda Hafner, Holly Halcomb, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Diane Havey, Charlene Hetzger, Sarah Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Bill Hopple, Gretchen Hurt, Roland & Claire Johnson, Barbara Kadinger, Dan Keefe, Steve Klein, Craig Kolb, Chuck Kubicki, C. Michael Lemmon, John Liken, Anne Lyon, Anne McBride, Molly McClure, Sue Micheli, Anastasia Mileham, Dory Montazemi, Dan & David Motz, Edmund Motz, Carolyn Motz, Rick Oberschmidt, Eric Partee, Chris Patton, Thea Reis, Betty Rhodes, Loretta Rokey, Don Rostofer, Greg Schrand, Ian Scott, Vic Shaffer, William Showers, Gates Smith, Daniel Startsman, Jr., John Stevens, Patty Strassel, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Ryan Taylor, Benjamen Wetherill, Steve Wood, Catherine Wuerdeman
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Caroline Statkus, Stacey Weaks, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the River Plains Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Aspects of Smart Growth/Standards for Recreational Activities (double-sided) Planning Principles Handout Ahwahnee Planning Principles Handout Ground Rules Handout Consensus Process Handout Land Use Planning Issue Areas Visioning Worksheet 11x17 Map of Focus Area Political Jurisdictions 11x17 Map of Focus Area Slope and Building Footprints *MetroMoves* brochure
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ History of and Context of Eastern Corridor Land Use Visioning ▪ Discussion of Land Use Visioning Methodology ▪ Discussion of Goals and Ground Rules ▪ Visioning Exercise for Future of River Plains Focus Area
INITIAL HOPES/FEARS REGARDING THIS PROJECT (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	Hopes ▪ Hope something will divert through traffic around neighborhoods ▪ Balance to include agriculture ▪ Farmland has multiple benefits ▪ Need powerful incentives to make this happen ▪ Time and money is crucial – hope we put together an effective public transportation system ▪ Give higher priority to mass transit over roads ▪ Create satellite cities and reinvent with light rail and good transportation system ▪ Little Miami river floodplains need to be preserved in agriculture when highway is planned ▪ Hope that we can put limited experience with public transit aside to look at better examples nationwide and give new ideas a try Fears ▪ Too big a challenge ▪ Afraid to lose sense of existing places – are we breaking down necessary boundaries ▪ Four lane highway may bisect communities

	▪ Is it too late ▪ Agriculture is put at bottom of priority list ▪ 'Exodus' to Clermont will be controlled by developer "greed" - may interfere with overall community plan process ▪ We don't make 'greenspace' synonymous with 'agriculture' and lose the tax revenue from farmland.
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	*Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements.* *The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.*
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

River Plains Focus Area – Meeting 1
May 9, 2001

Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry

Group participants:

Chris Patton	Fifth Third Bank
Marty Bartlett	CCR
Dan Motz	Motz Sod Farms
Linda Hafner	H. Hafner & Sons
Jerry Bargo	Riverfront East Trail Association – Bike/PAC
Steve Dana	League of Women Voters of Greater Cincinnati
William J. Showers	Architect
Rick Oberschmidt	Anderson Township
Charlene Metzger	Village of Fairfax
Don Rostofer	ODNR

Chartpack Notes

- Need HOV lanes on new and existing roads
- Explore new travel option for business – helicopters
- Create better connections between neighborhoods
- Route 32 "Parkway" – green
- Newtown – expansion
- Batavia – growth and expansion
- Anderson – moratorium
- New highway has taken most of traffic off US 50 – safer and less pollution
- River area regulations to hold back development 120' or more where possible
    - Enhance water quality
    - Enhance greenspace
    - Preserve and create bikeway for passive use
    - Reinstate forest corridor
- Very minimal development in floodplain
- Road would have to be an unusual design – soils and flood
- Newtown bridge – widen
- Bus (and transit) option needs emphasis
- Some of highways need to be expanded
- Need additional system
- Public transportation system – with many modes for all people
    - Comprehensive
    - Connectivity meet needs
- Bus and rail terminals along retail and office, etc
- Greenspace along River
- Walk from office to organic produce stand
- People and public officials need to play together
    - Multi-modal
- Mixed use communities – "new urbanism"
- Nurture floodplain – allow well planned industry into community
- Communities diverse/affordable and economically diverse
- Preserve flood lands for greenspace
- Highway difficult to build
- Keep light rail north

- Build housing along hills
- Newtown gravel pits can be developed in light industry
- Agriculture land needs to be preserved
- Mt. Carmel – developable – mixed use
- Ohio 32 – create 'parkway'
- Gravel pit area has great potential for development
- Preserve Newtown as village
- Road connecting Red Bank to 32
- Rail and bus along Red Bank Road
- Connect Fairfax

Group Ideas

- Bicycle system is important
- Research ridership of transit
    - 26% do not own autos in Cincinnati
    - 24% do not in Hamilton County
- Eliminate bridge crossings on scenic river – coincide bike and walkway bridges onto one "smart growth for bridges"
- If you want light rail you need another bridge
- Entire road system important
- Take into account new development and new industry; access for
- Add new River/bike trails on park and other old rail line R.O.W. (Newtown, 50, 32, Clear Creek)
- Wider Newtown Road bridge will bring problems –"traffic" in Newtown

Facilitator Notes

Chris Patton
- HOV lane to help with traffic (new roads & existing roads)
- Helicopter transit from Dayton to Cincinnati to relieve traffic at Lunken (intra urban helicopter centered on business travel)
- Rapid transit that forces people together rather than pulling them apart – a central control (hub) is important

Marty Bartlett
- Rt. 32 parkway: crossing river with greenspace: Newtown & Anderson township experience growth
- Highway/bus/light rail alleviate congestion and takes away traffic from rt 50/makes areas less polluted & safer

Don Rostofer
- Zoning regulations for flood plain development (120-1000 feet to either side of River; where possible)
- Reinstate forest corridor
- Enhance water quality/greenspace
- Preservation as well as recreation/passive recreation in preservation areas

Dan Motz
- Very minimal construction space available – be mindful of flood plain
- Avoid development where impacts of River are unavoidable.
- Talk about bus first/then road
- Be mindful of dangers to development

Linda Hafner
- Some highways should be widened (Newtown)
- Rerouting of bottlenecked traffic
- Give people options for transit
- Use existing roads & transit & add additional options

Jerry Bargo
- Public transportation system with complete system of options with multi-modes that meets travel needs of most people most of the time
- The bus to retail/multi modes
- Preserve undeveloped natural places

- Be able to go from office to street vendors to greenspace

Stephen Dana
- (piggy-back all of Jerry's comments)
- For better quality of life
- Public officials should unite under these ideals-cross jurisdictional teamwork
- Mixed use communities (Newtown) with amenities available within walking/bike distances
- Nurture the flood plain; but allow legitimate industry that contributes to the tax base
- Sensible development; integrate industry & ecology
- More communities are ethnically diverse
    - Montgomery County, Maryland
    - Single family owned homes with least cost housing

William Showers
- Preserve land along 32 for recreation, natural resources (since its not buildable)
- Try not to cross river
- Light rail along route 50
- Good potential for hillsides development on 32 – Newtown
- Some light industry along old gravel pits (32)
- Use rest of space for agricultural lands – preserve farmland
- Develop areas in Mt. Carmel

Rick Oberschmidt
- Try to development 32 "parkway" idea
- Do some development in gravel pit area where its possible
- Visualize Newtown back as a "village" – with so much traffic going through – try to create opportunities with 32 parkway
- Not sure of what to do with Roundbottom; unique opportunities-may be alternate uses available

Charlene Metzger
- A road from Red Bank to 32 to fulfill need of traffic flows
- Rail and bus routes on Red Bank Road (connect to Farifax industry) this could be advantageous to community
- Connection of community

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Travis Miller

Group participants:

Vic Shaffer	Resident
Dick Combs	Anderson Park District
Eric Partee	Little Miami, Inc.
Edmund Motz	Motz Farms/Hamilton County Farm Bureau
Mark Alexander	Citizen's Land Conservancy
Ben Dotson	Columbia Township
John Stevens	Neyer Properties
Anne Lyon	Little Miami Partnership

Chartpack Notes

- Do not promote floodplain development
- Explore light rail (as only choice)
- Areas closest to city are settled (little potential for change)
- Utilize brownfields and existing industrial parks
- Little Miami River for recreation purposes

Facilitator Notes

Eric Partee
- What we have is valuable – not everything needs to be changed
- River plains need incentives to foster agricultural land use

- Anchor area potential for some new development
    - Mixed use potential/pedestrian bike trails

Mike Anderson
- Region needs vision to create a better quality of life for residents
- Needs to be a balance between development and greenspace
- Little Miami could be tied to Ohio River protection initiatives – restoration of forests & wetlands
- Potential for bringing/attracting businesses to/for uniqueness of the area

Edmund Motz
- Need to keep environment along River compatible to the River
- Recreational activities are bringing people from other regions/communities to use (traffic is congested on 32)
- Existing rail could be used for transit
- Overflow issues along River prevent building
- Need to develop brownfields in City before creating new development
- Need to protect the 'recharge' lands for aquifer

Ben Dotson
- Keep floodplain areas undeveloped
- Possibly place floodplain areas under public ownership to maintain
- Don't envision new development will happen between Fairfax and Milford 20 years out.
- Light rail connection between Cincinnati and 32 (possibly elevated)

Vic Shaffer
- Transportation issue is critical to new growth
- Highways and agriculture can co-exist (i.e. areas in Ontario, Canada)
- Combined highway/transit light rail connection Cincinnati to east (can be elevated above floodplain and agricultural land
- Area needs to be defined to allow for us to maintain farm/agriculture – to prevent development pressures
- Americans need mind set changes needed to use transit

John Stevens
- Uses are limited by floodplain
- Locations is attractive to businesses/industries
- Road connection to east side of Cincinnati is vital

Anne Lyon
- Cincinnati environmental issues (auto emissions/cost of fuel) + costs to maintain infrastructure is problem
- Light rail should be top priority
- Little Miami is a 'blessing' to area – needs to be protected from transportation development – recreational uses
- Neighborhoods/communities need to be preserved
- Don't throw money at roads if light rail is the future

Richard Combs
- Today best use is found along River plains (agriculture & greenspace)
- Potential charges along Ohio River – Downtown to Coney Island
- Environmental concerns need to be protected

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Stacey Weaks

Group participants:

Jim Bell	Mariemont
Rick Greiwe	Downtown Cincinnati Inc
David Motz	Motz turf farms
Jack Sutton	Hamilton County Park District
Ryan Taylor	East Fork Watershed
Patricia Strassel	Union Township/CAP
Len Harding	Clermont League of Women Voters
Susan Gibler	Anderson Township TAC

Ruth Ann Busald Madisonville

Chartpack Notes

- River valley
  - 1st priority agriculture
  - Asset to area
  - Open space/recreation
- Transit Oriented Development
  - Transit
  - Light rail/bus – better option than road
  - Bikeway

Facilitator Notes

David Motz
- Expanded bus service; little use of rail
- Expand existing roads for buses
- Bike trails (mostly recreational)
- Economically; little reliance on government
- Self-sufficient communities
- Promotion of agriculture
- Preserve agriculture

Jack Sutton
- Fear that roadways would fragment recreational area
- Priority on greenspace, agriculture, open space, wildlife corridors

Rick Greiwe
- Transit oriented development
  - Walking distance to transit
- This area is desirable for residential development
- Use Wasson line for rail and remove rail from Oasis line
- Stations below Fairfax/Mariemont, Newtown, Anchor

Ruth Ann Busald
- Maintain current use; road wouldn't do any good

Jim Bell
- What does the City of Cincinnati envision its future
  - What do we need to be informed by this
- Specific identifiable communities, surrounded by greenspace

Susan Gibler
- Big roads encourage development and create corridors for people to pass through
- Building more roads is not a solution because it generates more traffic
- Reduce impact of roads on local residents
- Need better transit system (faster, more convenient)
- Light rail may be more convenient/quicker than buses

Ryan Taylor
- Rural character
- Agriculture preservation area
- Light rail could help this vision happen
- Neighborhood centers/gathering places near rail stations, bike trails
- Recreational trails connecting parks
- Recreational connections to Little Miami River
- Revitalization of existing – make connections to rural/recreation area of River plains

Patricia Strassel
- Maintain status quo
- Non-flood sensitive businesses
- Park northwest of Newtown
- Maintain existing roads before building new ones
- Expand public transportation through education and incentives
- Coney/River Downs area conference center/hotel

Len Harding

- Against creating a new road across the River
- Road bypass causes decline of existing business districts (Newtown, Mariemont, etc)
- Preserve River Plains as natural area
- Put public transportation on to of list
- Agriculture preservation
- New road poses serious environmental threat
- Both bus (hybrid/electric) and rail transit
- I-71 not ready to handle influx of road traffic for new 32

RIVER PLAINS FOCUS AREA MEETING #2
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, May 16, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Mark Alexander, Chris Anderson, Jerry Bargo, Marty Bartlett, Jim Bell, Rachel Belz, Bob Bibb, Bruce Branstetter, Bill Brayshaw, Ruth Ann Busald, Richard Combs, Stephen Dana, Paul Davis, Bob Deck, Benjamen Dotson, Keri Everett, Jim Farfsing, Robert and Mary Fischer, Turpin Fischer, Kevin Flowers, Paul Fox, Mike Fremont, Susan Gibler, Rick Griewe, H. Hafner, Linda Hafner, Holly Halcomb, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Diane Havey, Charlene Metzger, Sarah Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Bill Hopple, Gretchen Hurt, Roland & Claire Johnson, Barbara Kadinger, Dan Keefe, Steve Klein, Craig Kolb, Scott Kravetz, Chuck Kubicki, C. Michael Lemmon, John Liken, Anne Lyon, Anne McBride, Molly McClure, Sue Micheli, Anastasia Mileham, Dory Montazemi, Dan & David Motz, Edmund Motz, Carolyn Motz, Rick Oberschmidt, Eric Partee, Chris Patton, Thea Reis, Betty Rhodes, Loretta Rokey, Don Rostofer, Jennifer Schaub, Greg Schrand, Ian Scott, Vic Shaffer, William Showers, Gates Smith, Daniel Startsman, Jr., John Stevens, Patty Strassel, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Ryan Taylor, Reggie Victor, Bill Vorst, Benjamen Wetherill, Steve Wood, Catherine Wuerdeman, Tim Zelek
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	Tom Ryther
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Heather Quisenberry, Caroline Statkus, Stacey Weaks, Todd White
PURPOSE:	To delevop a vision for future land use in the River Plains Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Preliminary Themes derived from SWOT Analysis Opportunities Prioritization: SWOT Analysis 3/7 Standards for Recreational Activities Land Use Information Sheet (Draft)
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Economic and Environmental Considerations of Land Use Planning ▪ Land Use Images ▪ Brief Recap of Planning Principles ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Whole Group Area Assessment of Focus Area ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan
Additional Themes/Issues (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	Additional Underlying Themes ▪ Riverplains – environmentally sensitive areas ▪ Cost benefit from greenspace ▪ Development limited in floodplain Strengths/Opportunities ▪ Existing open space is asset ▪ Floodplain is limiting development ▪ Diversity of area as it is (greenspace, separate identifiable communities, etc) ▪ Sod farms serve local landscapers and generate lots of employment ▪ Reinstate some of natural ecology along River ▪ Create natural buffer between adjacent lands and the River ▪ Good use being made of floodplains currently ▪ Benefits of River, aquifer recharge, ecology ▪ Linwood and Newtown are unique communities being near farms, river, and open space ▪ Good flat area for bike trails (all the way to Cleveland)

	Weaknesses/Threats ▪ Limitations to expanding parks in area ▪ Floodplain limit development ▪ Floodplain doesn't guarantee development will not occur ▪ Agriculture on the floodplain has potential to contaminate/pollute the River ▪ No 'accounting process' for natural features such as the River in terms of overall benefit (i.e. recharging aquifer, etc) ▪ We aren't treating River as a 'resource' but as an 'obstacle' to overcome
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	*Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements.* *The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.*
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

River Plains Focus Area – Meeting 2
May 16, 2001

Land Use Visioning Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Heather Quisenberry/Caroline Statkus

Group participants:

Bob Bartlett	Mariemont
Dan Motz	Motz Sod Farms
William J. Showers	Architect
Rick Oberschmidt	Anderson Township
Charlene Metzger	Village of Fairfax
Turpin Fischer	Turpin Farms
Ben Wetherill	RETA/Bike PAC

Chartpack Notes

- New recreation uses generate lots of traffic – people outside area
- Open space is asset, but impacts "locals" quality of life
- Concentration of recreation creates traffic problems (except soccer fields)
    - Concentration of soccer complexes reduces overall traffic since parents don't have to travel all over from 1-2-3 fields
- No pre-planning for recreation uses
- Light rail – best mode of moving people with least amount of impact
- Problem with trucks traveling on roads not designed for them
- Expand I-275 to 3 lanes in Eastgate area
- Bypass Newtown for through traffic
- Bike trails don't concentrate traffic
- Accident rate on 32 skyrocketing
- Reduce number of soccer fields used at a time – 22 fields
- Some Newtown businesses impacted by soccer field traffic
- Added new roads means more maintenance
- Could use old rail corridor area behind new Kroger's in Columbia Township – would avoid another bridge
- Why widen Newtown Road bridge since it feeds into a 2 lane road?
- Relocated 32 could divert local traffic
- Industrial area to east
    - Unless new collector road added – don't put more uses
    - Benefit to maximize uses on Broadwell
    - Create jobs closer in (sprawl fighter) and increase tax base
- Mt. Carmel's neighborhood center has potential expansion
- Brewer-Cote area
    - Newtown trying to push east and off 32
    - Move to Roundbottom Road
    - Make retail
- Another five years for gravel mine
- Goal is to connect LMT from Terrace Park into Anderson
- Want bike path through Fairfax
- Bike trial should get to Beechmont
- Bike trail is recreational, no significant alleviation of traffic
- Newtown – opportunities for small businesses
    - Nice that it's still 2 lanes – preserves small town character
    - Impossible to protect Newtown form floods

- Location in floodplain limits redevelopment options

Facilitator Notes

- Recreational uses may create traffic congestion; outside traffic (not residents)
- Recreational uses is still an asset; but may lower quality of life for residents
- Pros and cons to recreational development; should avoid mass groupings of recreational uses
- Thoughtfulness must be applied to the way people get in and out of recreational uses; light rail is a good choice (alternative to car traffic)
- Light rail best mode with least impact
- Problem with large vehicles traveling on roads not wide enough/designed for them (leads to back-ups)
- Milford to Eastgate – I-275 expanded to 3 lanes (both direction)
- Bypass for Newtown makes sense: to avoid 2 lane roads, etc.
- Avoid mass complex of recreation use
- Soccer complexes may cut down on interstate traffic though- keeps all games at one place instead of hopping from field to field
- Build Avoca Park – back-up; give considerations to traffic
- Reduce number of soccer fields used at one time
- Old railroad corridor (rt50 along river) as a potential light rail?
- Anchor area has potential to relieve traffic
- Relocation/addition of 32 could help relieve traffic
- Industrial area (near Ivy Hills) zone of change
    - Unless there is a new connector, development really isn't an option (traffic is too bad)
    - New roads must be wide enough to move the current traffic
    - Roads need to come first – access is key
    - Can't add more development unless there is a way to move people
- Lots of recreational existing in this focus area (Newtown, Fairfax, etc.) strong asset
- Newtown internal planning process may push industrial use on 32 (near Brewer-Cote) to the east (Broadwell Rd) and turn 32 into more retail
- Significant economic development available by connecting bike trails
- Bike path connection through Fairfax possible
- Bike paths (along flat routes) can encourage some to ride bikes to work, school, etc. and contribute to traffic alleviation – still mostly recreational
- Newtown holds opportunity for "old town" feel development with small business owners
- Preserve the small town fell of Newtown
- Area of Newtown generally "fixed"-doesn't seem to hold much potential for development
- Limitations in Newtown to development also due to floodplain/zoning regulations for floodplains

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Linda Fabe/Travis Miller/Brian Balsley

Group participants:

Tim Zelek	Hamilton County Park District
Dick Combs	Anderson Park District
Eric Partee	Little Miami, Inc.
Edmund Motz	Motz Farms/Hamilton County Farm Bureau
Mark Alexander	Citizen's Land Conservancy
Bob Fischer	Turpin Farms
Bill Vorst	ODOT

Chartpack Notes

- Existing agriculture and recreational uses to remain
- Agricultural to recreational conversion only if needed
- Shademore:
    - No new residential
    - Potential prairie and wetland restoration?
- Anchor Area:
    - Increase greenspace between river and industrial sites

    - Preserve large wetland area in Anchor west of Mt. Carmel Road
    - Need direct access to OH 32
    - Consider "lighter" uses
- Increase width of green buffer along entire length of River
- Gravel pits:
    - Potential light industrial/office (would generate taxes)
    - 'Employment center'
    - Natural restoration (if viable)
        - More info needed to decide best use for gravel pits
- Soccer Fields – are more needed or are all existing school fields being used?
- Preserve greenspace west of county line and south of Roundbottom
- Implement transit and rail before new roads or improving roads
    - People will get used to mass transit so when/if roads are built/expanded won't have to use cars
- Preserve wooded riparian corridors
- Retain mixed use for Newtown
- Consider small businesses (space needs) in all proposed office/commercial
- Transit hub/rail station close to Newtown mixed use area
- Benefit of agriculture land:
    - Air cleansing and temperature cooling
- Bike trails along stream corridors (corridor establishment and preservation is primary)

Group 3

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Stacey Weaks

Group participants:

Jim Bell	Mariemont
Reggie Victor	Cincinnati
Scott Kravetz	VIG
Jack Sutton	Hamilton County Park District
Ryan Taylor	East Fork Watershed
Patricia Strassel	Union Township/CAP
Len Harding	Clermont League of Women Voters
Susan Gibler	Anderson Township TAC
Ruth Ann Busald	Madisonville

Chartpack Notes

- Limit development on hillsides
- New highways will limit use of transit
- No way to account economically for cost to greenspace of a river crossing
- Traffic problem would be moved to I-71/Red Bank
- Highways require a lot of resources for upkeep and maintenance
- Emphasize transit first
- Minimize number of crossings of Little Miami River – try to keep all transportation modes in the same R.O.W.
- Keep character of the region rural
    - Limit any development along a highway being built – limit access
- Keep bus stops out of R.O.W. to keep traffic flowing
- New road (32) would put more traffic on Newtown Road and create more pressure for 5 mile connector
- 32 interchange needs to be addressed
- Town center area around Beechmont Mall
- Residential and mixed use along Eastern Ave
- Hotel/conference center near Coney Island

RIVER PLAINS FOCUS AREA MEETING #3
SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Tuesday, May 22, 2001
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 9:00 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: **ATTENDEES:**	Mark Alexander, Chris Anderson, Jerry Bargo, Marty Bartlett, Jim Bell, Rachel Belz, Bob Bibb, Bruce Branstetter, Bill Brayshaw, Jo Ann Brown, Ruth Ann Busald, Richard Combs, Stephen Dana, Paul Davis, Bob Deck, Benjamen Dotson, Keri Everett, Jim Farfsing, Robert & Mary Fischer, Kevin Flowers, Paul Fox, Mike Fremont, Susan Gibler, Rick Griewe, H. Hafner, Linda Hafner, Holly Halcomb, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Diane Havey, Charlene Hetzger, Sarah Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Bill Hopple, Gretchen Hurt, Roland & Claire Johnson, Barbara Kadinger, Dan Keefe, Steve Klein, Craig Kolb, Chuck Kubicki, C. Michael Lemmon, John Liken, Anne Lyon, Anne McBride, Molly McClure, Charlene Metzger, Sue Micheli, Anastasia Mileham, Dory Montazemi, Dan & David Motz, Edmund Motz, Carolyn Motz, Rick Oberschmidt, Eric Partee, Chris Patton, Thea Reis, Betty Rhodes, Loretta Rokey, Don Rostofer, Greg Schrand, Ian Scott, Vic Shaffer, William Showers, Gates Smith, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Caroline Statkus, John Stevens, Patty Strassel, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Ryan Taylor, Reggie Victor, Benjamen Wetherill, Emily Witte, Steve Wood, Catherine Wuerdeman, Tim Zelek
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Linda Fabe, Gary Meisner, Heather Quisenberry, Merrie Stillpass, Bob Vogt, Stacey Weaks, Todd White, Caroline Statkus
PURPOSE:	To develop a vision for future land use in the River Plains Focus Area
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of last meeting ▪ Discussion of preliminary themes/issues/opportunities for this focus area ▪ Ecological Analysis Status Report ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work of last meeting ▪ Small Group development of conceptual land use plan ▪ Presentation of Small Group Work
Additional Themes/Issues (as discussed among the focus area group during the meeting)	▪ Agricultural Lands should be delineated from general Green Spaces
DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT:	Our Mission is to create a land use vision plan that will guide environmentally and economically sustainable development in the Eastern Corridor of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. A cross-jurisdictional, collaborative process will be used to build consensus and create strategies to leverage limited public resources and ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits and impacts of improvements. The plan will be informed by the multi-modal transportation and access recommendations of the Eastern Corridor MIS.
ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary of Small Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

River Plains Focus Area – Meeting 3
May 22, 2001

Visioning For Tomorrow / Visioning Exercise

Group 1

Group Facilitators: Todd White/Linda Fabe/Brian Balsley
Group participants:

Tim Zelek	Hamilton County Park District
Ruth Ann Busald	Madisonville Community Council
Eric Partee	Little Miami Inc.
Richard Combs	Anderson Park District
Ben Dotson	Columbia Township
Anne Lyon	Greenacres Foundation and Resident
Edmund Motz	Owner - Motz Farms / Agriculture lands
Vic Shaffer	Anderson Township Resident

Chartpack Notes

- Forested area along Little Miami River
- East End building concerns due to flooding
- Better public access to Ohio River; better signage
- Preserve forested flood plain at mouth of Little Miami River
- Limit development on south side of Eastern Ave. due to flood potential
- Residential along Ohio River viable only if elevated above flood levels
- Flooding concerns at Rt. 32 / Rt. 125 / US 50
- Red Bank Rd. area a destination for rail transit
- Consider using Railroad parallel to Red Bank Rd. for transit
- Blue Ash might be more of a destination for travelers from the East
- How do rail stations serve existing residential? Possibly through feeder bus system
- Creation of forested buffer along river
- More public access to river (e.g. behind Kroger's)
- More visual connection to river
- Preserve water recreation opportunities around Ancor
- Office development in Ancor (as well as some light industrial) should be done with sensitivity to the environment; preserving greenspace, especially wetlands
- Concerns about development near new school east of Milford
- Concerns about traffic from US 50 / I-275 interchange to Roundbottom Rd. that might come from new roads connecting to South Milford Rd.
- Need more land available for industrial
- Potential for more industrial use in Milford near US 50 interchange, because of rail and highway access
- Concerns about industrial uses in river bottoms
- Look for more locations for infill for heavy industry rather than pushing it further out (sprawl)

Group 2

Group Facilitators: Gary Meisner/Merrie Stillpass/Heather Quisenberry
Group participants:

Charlene Metzger	Village of Fairfax
Rick Oberschmidt	Anderson Township
Marty Bartlett	CCR
Stephen Dana	Citizen's Land Conservancy of Hamilton County, Inc.

William Showers	CAP / Union Township
Leonard Harding	Clermont League of Women Voters
Don Rostofer	ODNR / Scenic Rivers
Jo Anna Brown	City of Cincinnati

Chartpack Notes

- Retain agricultural land uses
- Reforestation along river edge
- Retention of existing excavation businesses until "mined out"
- Place economic value on vision – especially green space values / resources (e.g. Muskingham Study)
- Enhance local zoning to protect greenspace / flood plain
- Once vision collectively approved, share with private property owners – get their "vision" for their property to respect their property and rights - educate them, get them to share their vision
- Do this early, to get "buy in"
- Open house, invitation
- Transformation of property due to new road
- Might encourage (less desirable) land uses that ultimately degrade environment
- Congregation of specific land uses (i.e. industrial in Anchor / Newtown area) could relive pressure in other areas and result in increased land values
- Number of property owners affected by right of way of development (?)
- Property owners rights west of Newtown Rd.
- Respect Shademore development
- Voluntary setbacks from river to reforest
- Is agricultural land use restrictive of pig farming (?)
- Public transit options and better through connections
- Respect California reasidents' choice of location
- Rail / barge terminals to reduce truck traffic
- Mutual agreement prohibits Roundbottom Rd. from connecting to I-275, but zoning encourages truck traffic north of I-275
- New developments on fill close to river edge impacts water quality
- CUC development / Kerry Dodge – light pollution
- Goal – encourage local governments to buy land as it becomes available for protection purposes
    - Ballot issue, tax
    - Park districts / agencies / state
    - Inter – governmental cooperation
    - Educate populace to benefits – may lead to donations of land
    - Tax credits for easements
  - Incentives to property owners to protect flood plain & reforest
    - Payment to agricultural land uses to remove some land from production
    - Soil & water conservation service
    - Tax credits
  - North bank of river, (north to Milford) is steep, greenspace
    - Any asphalting could lead to more "hardening" of watershed
    - Could lead to erosion / runoff
  - Cutting edge / East Fork at the Little Miami – affected by watershed development; higher water table
  - Maintenance issues to "repair" river banks
  - Base density on carrying capacity of land
  - Opportunity to improve Fairfax, Columbia Township and Newtown community / neighborhood centers with new roads

Facilitator Notes

- Don't want to "force out" long standing businesses (gravel / sand mines)
- Hard to put an economic value on ecological resources, but some numbers and research are available; study this as a part of the visioning process
- Possibly passive recreational uses (if no longer agricultural) in changed areas

- Make sure to include ideas on implementation in accordance with local zoning refinements / changes / amendments; this takes cross jurisdictional cooperation
- Obtain development rights before placing roads; to avoid property values going up for development of wetlands
- Increased buffers along river for watershed management; as some areas may "thin out" residentially (Shademore, Old fort) fill in with plantings
- As gas prices rise, new highways may not yield a high return on investment; public transit is important to have as an option
- What is our market in the future for providing / using more transit options (ex: P.R.T?)
- Limit accessibility (from proposed roads) to only the areas of new development (ex: Anchor) to keep pressure off of greenspaces and agricultural uses
- Possibly "fan out" use near Kerry Dodge (Milford / Roundbottom Rd) to add commercial, light industrial uses further away from river
- Preserve areas closest to river as greenspaces and areas for reforestation
- Keep through connectors in mind, with possible incentives to property owners for right of way development (Roundbottom Rd.)

EASTERN AVENUE/LUNKEN AND RIVER PLAINS FOCUS AREA MEETING #4 SUMMARY

MEETING DATE:	Thursday, March 7, 2002
MEETING TIME:	START 6:00 END 8:35 p.m.
FOCUS GROUP INVITEES: ATTENDEES:	**Eastern Ave / Lunken:** Bob Bibb, Liz Blume, Peter Bruemmer, Cooper Burchenal, Betty Burns, Kent Cashell, Theresa Conover, Jim Coppock, John Cranley, John Deatrick, Pat DeWine, Dan Dickten, Nancy Dranbarean, Melissa English, Clare Evers, Marina Fendon, Bob Fischer, Anne Fogel-Burchenal, Ed Fox, Tony Giglio, Jack Goodwin, Diane Havey, Sara Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Michelle Holmes, Dick Huddleston, John Hudson, Kent Kamphaus, Pinky Kocoshis, Tony Kountz, Claudia Krysiak, Lin Laing, Randi Mathieu, Suzanne Meruci, Charlene Metzger, Phil Montanus, Mike Niehaus, Carl Palmer, Ron Plattner, Dave Prather, Ed Ratterman, Alicia Reese, Thea Reis, Dave Ross, Rob Rubin, William Schrock, Steve Schuckman, Ian Scott, Tony Selvey-Maddox, Mike Setzer, Steve Sievers, Anita Stewart, George Stewart, Kathy Tyler, Reggie Victor, John Van Volkenburgh, Dorothy Vogt, Jim Walls, Bob Wessell, Benjamin Wetherill **River Plains:** Mark Alexander, Chris Anderson, Jerry Bargo, Marty Bartlett, Jim Bell, Rachel Belz, Bob Bibb, Bruce Branstetter, Bill Brayshaw, Jo Ann Brown, Ruth Ann Busald, Richard Combs, Stephen Dana, Paul Davis, Bob Deck, Henry Dolive, Benjamen Dotson, Keri Everett, Jim Farfsing, Robert & Mary Fischer, Kevin Flowers, Paul Fox, Mike Fremont, Susan Gibler, Rick Griewe, H. Hafner, Linda Hafner, Holly Halcomb, John Hammon, Leonard Harding, Diane Havey, Charlene Hetzger, Sarah Hippensteel, Richard Hoekzema, Tom Hoft, Bill Hopple, Gretchen Hurt, Roland & Claire Johnson, Barbara Kadinger, Dan Keefe, Steve Klein, Craig Kolb, Chuck Kubicki, C. Michael Lemmon, John Liken, Anne Lyon, Anne McBride, Molly McClure, Charlene Metzger, Sue Micheli, Anastasia Mileham, Dory Montazemi, Dan & David Motz, Edmund Motz, Carolyn Motz, Rick Oberschmidt, Eric Partee, Chris Patton, Thea Reis, Betty Rhodes, Loretta Rokey, Don Rostofer, Greg Schrand, Ian Scott, Vic Shaffer, William Showers, Gates Smith, Daniel Startsman, Jr., Caroline Statkus, John Stevens, Patty Strassel, Eric Stuckey, Jack Sutton, Ryan Taylor, Reggie Victor, Benjamen Wetherill, Emily Witte, Steve Wood, Catherine Wuerdeman, Tim Zelek
ALTERNATES ATTENDEES:	
PROJECT TEAM:	Brian Balsley, Gary Meisner, Travis Miller, Merrie Stewart Stillpass, Todd White, Emily Witte
PURPOSE:	1. To review the work done to date and its purpose 2. To review Focus Area Plans and Issues 3. To make any needed revisions, improvements, and/or additions to plan 8. To prioritize Focus Area Issues for review by the Vision Group 9. Supplement representation to the Vision Group 10. Identify individuals to present Focus Area recommendations to the Vision Group on 4/4/02 11. Evaluate the Land Use Vision Plan (LUVP) process
DISTRIBUTED ITEMS:	Agenda Focus Area Issues Process Evaluation Form
MEETING SUMMARY	▪ Introductions ▪ Brief Recap of the Land Use Visioning process ▪ Incorporating the LUVP Travel Demand Modeling ▪ Implementation Considerations o Special Economic Districts (JEDDs, CEDAs, TIFs) ▪ Economics Overview of Focus Areas
REVIEW OF LAND USE VISION PLAN	*Focus Area Characteristics* Eastern Ave / Lunken Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues ▪ Q&A ▪ Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

	River Plains Focus Area ▪ Zones of Change ▪ Opportunities for Multi-Purpose Pedestrian-Friendly Destinations ▪ Important Focus Area Issues ▪ Q&A ▪ Items to Emphasize clarifications, Differing Opinions, Additions

ENCLOSURES:	▪ Summary Group Work
NEXT STEPS:	▪ Review Mailed Materials ▪ Keep your constituents informed and ask for their views ▪ Be aware of your surroundings with an eye toward what you would like the area to develop into

EASTERN AVE / LUNKEN AND RIVER PLAINS
FOCUS AREA - MEETING 4
MARCH 7, 2002
Comments Regarding Land Use Vision Plan

Easter Ave / Lunken

- Item #21 - ARTIMIS is perceived by Dorothy Vogt as being useless and a waste of money
- Item #15 - Is "congestion reduction" and "traffic calming" at cross purposes?
- Item #21 - Revisit possibilitiesof transit that does not necessarily follow current Rights-of-Way, perhaps running in airspace above the ground surface. Incorporate this suggestion, and the suggestion to think about incorporating other transit alternatives, into the Focus Area recommendations portion of Item #21
- Item #21 - Seems to be a catch-all, doesn't fit with other issues
- Item #13 - Add discussion of historic architectural sensitivity in California along Kellogg

River Plains

- Item #6 - Important to maintain recreational opportunities with lakes in Ancor
- Item #4 – How are we talking about flood-proofing the residential development?
- Item#7 – modify to read: "Develop, or find existing, criteria to evaluate and assess proposed development in South Milford so that it is done in a manner that is sensitive to the environment."
- Item #12 – vary vague, a motherhood and apple pie kind of issue

Concluding Comments:

- Dorothy Vogt says schools, or somebody, need to teach kids to drive better

RIVERPLAINS FOCUS GROUP RESOURCE ALLOCATION EXERCISE RESULTS				
$ Allocated (in millions)	**Dots**	**# of allocaters**	**Avg. Allocation**	**Action Item**
15	**4**	**6**	**2.5**	Preserve land in river plains for agriculture or open space. Reestablish forested streamside corridors along the Little Miami River to preserve and enhance water quality
12	**0**	**4**	**3**	Reduce Flood Hazards and moderate urban storm runoff (Fairfax, Newtown, Linwood, etc.)
11	**1**	**6**	**1.83**	Preserve existing parks and open space, and create new parks and public open space for under-served areas (e.g., better recreational access to Little Miami and Ohio Rivers, etc.)
10	**1**	**4**	**2.5**	Create connectivity improvements. This could include any or all of the following (subject to recommendations of the Eastern Corridor Travel Demand Modeling and Engineering studies): **Basic Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study recommendations:** • Intersection / Interchange Improvements • Park-and-pool or park-and-ride lots • Expanded use of motorist information system message boards (ARTIMIS) • Better traffic signal coordination • New and expanded bike lanes and trails • More frequent service on existing bus routes • Expanded bus transit system coverage (new routes) service • New rail transit service • Widened, expanded, or new roadways • New Road Alignments Other recommendations that came out of Focus Area discussions: • Transit service to neighborhoods by smaller shuttle buses • New or relocated barge terminals • Rail freight improvements • Water Taxi service (Ohio River) • Commuter air passenger service (Lunken) • Air freight (Lunken)
9	**0**	**5**	**1.8**	Create bike trail connections (e.g., connections from neighborhoods to Little Miami, Lunken, and Ohio River Bike Trails)
7	**1**	**4**	**1.75**	Create areas with multiple pedestrian-friendly destinations within walking distance. These would be areas that could effectively be served by modes of transportation other than only automobiles, or could serve to reduce the amount of automobile travel necessary to accomplish multiple purposes. There are many areas that are experiencing development pressures, and if this development occurs haphazardly, as it has in the past, this could lead to many undesirable outcomes (congestion, multiple curb cuts, lack of pedestrian connections, etc.) Creating methods

				to guide and implement mixed use, pedestrian-friendly development can guide the future land use to be compatible with surrounding uses and minimize negative impacts. Examples of various types of mixed use development, having varying degrees of pedestrian-friendliness, include the following areas that currently exist within the Cincinnati Region: • Hyde Park Square • Mariemont • Mt. Lookout Square • Downtown Cincinnati • Norwood Business District near Surrey Square • O'Bryonville Within this Focus Area, some of the areas that may be suitable for creating or enhancing pedestrian-friendly design include the following: • East End • Columbia-Tusculum • Lunken Area • Linwood • Fairfax, Mariemont, Columbia Township • Ancor / Newtown • River's Edge in Milford
7	**0**	**4**	**1.75**	Reduce congestion, create traffic claming measures, and enhance pedestrian-friendly character: • Wooster Pike (Fairfax, Mariemont, Columbia Township) • Ohio 32 (Newtown) • Eastern Ave. (East End, Columbia Tusculum, Linwood) • Columbia Parkway (Columbia Tusculum)
6	**0**	**2**	**3**	Develop Ancor and Northeast Newtown area with a mix of office, industrial, and recreation • Preserve environmentally sensitive areas and link them with green space corridors, creating an office park atmosphere with recreational opportunities
6	**0**	**3**	**2**	Preserve/Enhance air, water (surface and ground), and visual quality in the region
5	**0**	**3**	**1.67**	Minimize the negative impacts of any connectivity improvements and make sure they are done in an environmentally and aesthetically sensitive manner (see RF-16)
4	**0**	**2**	**2**	Develop industrial uses on brownfields and create industrial infill development where industrial uses are already established
3	**0**	**3**	**1**	Revitalize / Create Newtown Neighborhood Business District along Ohio 32 near Church Street (Newtown Road)
3	**0**	**1**	**3**	Redevelop / Create Columbia Tusculum Neighborhood Business District (along Columbia Parkway and to the south, between Stanley and Delta) as mixed use pedestrian friendly development
2	**0**	**1**	**2**	Develop, or find existing, criteria to evaluate and assess proposed development in South Milford so that it is done in a manner that is sensitive to the environment.
2	**0**	**1**	**2**	Explore the possibilities of creating incentives and mechanisms such as Special Economic Districts and Conservation Easements that would mutually benefit the parties involved and facilitate implementing some of the LUVP recommendations
0	**0**	**0**	**0**	Expand residential opportunities along the Ohio River in a way that they are kept away from flood hazards