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Proceedings

Workshop 1 for OKI’s Regional Visioning Process, “Where do we grow from here?,” was held on June 10, 2002 at the Holiday Inn, Downtown Cincinnati. It was the first in a series of workshops for the Land Use Commission and its three working subcommittees (Land Use Planning and Policy, Environment and Infrastructure, and Economic Development and Funding). As such, it was designed so that participants could gain a common understanding of the current trends in the region as well as indicate their values on a range of topics. Sixty-one members of the Land Use Commission participated in the workshop (see Appendix E for a full list of participants).

The workshop marked the beginning of a series of workshops to address key regional land use and growth issues. Through a combination of workshops and public meetings, a preferred development scenario will be produced, strategic issues will be identified, and, ultimately, a strategic policy plan will be prepared to help local governments and the OKI Board implement the vision.

The policies and action steps included in the plan will encourage land use patterns that promote efficient travel patterns and the efficient use of land, natural resources, and public facilities and services throughout the region. The plan will be available for adoption by agencies and local governments at their discretion.

1 For the purposes of this report, references to the Land Use Commission include its three subcommittees.
As the first workshop in the series, the purpose of Workshop 1 was twofold:

- Demonstrate the current pattern of development, emphasizing the relationship between population growth, land consumption, and transportation; and
- Gather input on preferences for future growth patterns that will be used in shaping a preferred scenario.

These objectives were achieved through a Future Vision Assessment (FVA) questionnaire, two presentations, and tabletop mapping exercises. The agenda for the workshop is in Appendix A.

Summaries of the presentations and the results from the workshops are presented in the appropriate sections of this report. Overall, the sentiment among the participants was that the status quo is not desirable. This sentiment was expressed through the various activities undertaken during the workshop.

In general, reactions to the probable scenario recorded by facilitators expressed concern about current trends. In the land protection exercise, participants sought to determine the appropriate amount of land to be conserved in perpetuity. When considering how to accommodate the projected future growth for the region through year 2020, all working groups placed the majority of future development in presently developed areas, rather than on undeveloped land. Finally, in discussing the effect of their recommendations they indicated a desire to create positive impacts in the region by altering the course of the trends. Overall, the findings of the workshops imply that there is a strong sentiment among Land Use Commission members to modify current trends and to develop policies and strategies to accomplish that goal.

**Future Vision Assessment (FVA)**

The first activity of the workshop was the Future Vision Assessment (FVA), a qualitative questionnaire that has been successfully applied in a variety of processes to gauge participants’ initial values. The purpose of the FVA was to document participants’ reactions and preferences to a series of images and concepts related to the physical environment and to a range of regional issues identified by the Land Use Commission.

The participants scored 25 images and concepts on a questionnaire using a scale of one (the image/concept is not important) to five (the image/concept is very important). After a brief explanation of each image, participants were given seven to ten seconds to mark their responses on their questionnaire. The 25 questions were organized under five headings: land use, neighborhoods, transportation, social, and economics. The results of the FVA are summarized in Table 1.

This exercise was deliberately conducted prior to any presentation of current trends. It was intended to determine participants’ feelings for a range of issues that should be components of a preferred development
scenario. Purposely, there was no mention of the parameters such as cost, political viability, or regulatory controls, so that participants’ input would not be constrained in any way. Table 1 summarizes the results of the questionnaire.

Based on the scores assigned, it is clear that the concepts/images presented during the FVA are important to most of the respondents; 20 out of 25 concepts score 4.0 or higher. The concepts that received a score of 4.0 or higher, indicating their relative level of importance to the respondents, were:

- Natural resource protection (4.8)
- Coordinating utilities with development (4.8)
- Providing quality educational opportunities for all residents (4.8)
- Coordinating transportation with development (4.6)
- Providing a range of mobility choices (cars, buses, bikes, etc.) (4.5)
- Infill development (4.4)
- Awareness of true fiscal costs and benefits of development (4.4)
- Incentives for redevelopment (4.3)
- Mixed use town centers (office, retail, residential) (4.3)
- Connectivity among land uses (4.3)
- Coordination and cooperation among governmental entities (4.3)
- Regional cooperation for economic development opportunities (4.3)
- Pedestrian-friendly streets (4.2)
- Transit links throughout the region (4.2)
- Stabilization of housing stock throughout the region (4.2)
- Increasing density to better support transit (4.1)
- Housing choices (price) throughout the region (4.1)
- Sharing benefits of cooperative economic development (4.1)
- Hillside protection (4.0)
- Parks in neighborhoods (4.0)

In addition to the scores, respondents were able to add comments for each of the 25 concepts/images. These comments are included in Appendix B. The results of the FVA suggest that the participants recognize the importance of stewardship of natural resources and coordination among local governments, particularly in relation to infrastructure and land use. The participants also placed higher values on opportunities for quality education and a range of mobility choices.
Table 1: Future Vision Assessment (FVA) Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image/Concept</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAND USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources protection</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill development</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity among land uses</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use town centers (office, retail, residential)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and cooperation among governmental entities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside protection</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space preservation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting rural and scenic roads</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOODS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian-friendly streets</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks in neighborhoods</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small shops in neighborhoods</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed housing values</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic uses in neighborhoods</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating utilities with development</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating transportation with development</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a range of mobility choices (cars, buses, bikes, etc.)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit links throughout the region</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing density to better support transit</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing quality educational opportunities for all residents</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization of housing stock throughout the region</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing choices (price) throughout the region</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of true fiscal costs and benefits of development</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for redevelopment</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional cooperation for economic development opportunities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing benefits of cooperative economic development</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Perspectives Presentation

A presentation on Regional Perspectives provided an overview of issues affecting regions as well as alternative methods for addressing those issues. Regions throughout the nation are experiencing similar trends and attempting to deal with similar concerns. Outlined below is a summary of the key points of the presentation.

The new reality of development is that the U.S. is becoming a nation of regions, as residential and economic growth continue outside of central cities. Increasingly, Americans live their lives at the regional scale – they reside in one community, work in another, shop in a different area, and attend cultural or sporting events in yet another. In fact, in Ohio, suburbs in the seven major metropolitan areas captured 90 percent of the job growth in the mid-1990s. This trend affects land consumption, concentration of poverty, and traffic congestion and has a range of fiscal implications.

Solutions to deal with these issues have been implemented in other parts of the country. The three states that comprise the OKI region have different regulatory environments/enabling legislation, but there are other multi-state regions that have had success confronting similar obstacles. Examples from other regions' efforts were provided during the presentation to give some perspective for the Land Use Commission. These examples included:

- Maryland’s Smart Growth Initiative;
- Land Protection in Montgomery County, Maryland;
- Moderately Priced Dwelling Units Ordinance in Montgomery County, Maryland; and
- Quality Development Principles in Kansas City, Kansas and Missouri.

These programs clearly show that quality development principles and policies, and tools that support those principles, are key to establishing a different pattern of development. The principles also provide choices other than conventional growth policies for local communities by mixing land uses, taking advantage of compact building and community design, providing choice of homes, and providing transportation choices. They also recognize the fiscal implications of development patterns.
The Probable Scenario Presentation

Assuming the current trends in population growth and land consumption continue through 2020, a probable development scenario was prepared for the OKI Region that described the general development patterns likely to occur if there is no change in the way we plan for growth in the region. The probable scenario examined:

1. Population dynamics and urbanization trends
2. Land use consumption
3. Transportation and traffic
4. Social issues
5. Economic issues

Important points related to these five areas were shared during the presentation on the probable scenario – the key trends for the region. The data for this presentation was drawn from a wide variety of sources.

Population dynamics and urbanization trends

- The population of the OKI region is projected to grow by 305,450 people (a 16 percent increase) between the years 2000 and 2020 for a total population of 2,192,100 by 2020. Overall, population growth in the region has been relatively consistent since the 1970s.\(^2\) (See Figure 1. Source: US Census and OKI projections)
- Population densities continue to decline. From 1970 to 1990 Cincinnati’s urbanized area population declined 28.5 percent.\(^3\)
- Ninety percent of the projected population growth through 2030 is expected in the five high growth counties of Butler, Clermont, Warren, Dearborn and Boone.\(^4\)

---

\(^2\) OKI Regional Transportation Plan, September 2001, p. 5-1.
\(^3\) Cincinnati Metropatterns, Metropolitan Area Research Corporation, September 2001, p. 19.
\(^4\) OKI Regional Transportation Plan, p. 5-3.
Population change from 1990 to 2000 shows that central cities’ populations are decreasing or are growing at a slower rate than the balance of their metropolitan statistical area (MSA). Of four cities in Ohio, this dynamic is most pronounced in Cincinnati. (See Figure 2. Source: US Census and Brookings Institution)

- Hamilton County lost nearly 10,000 residents in the past year.\(^5\)
- Residential construction is dropping faster in Hamilton County suburbs than any other central county in Ohio. If trends continue, no new homes would be built after 2010.\(^6\)

**Figure 2: Percent Population Change 1990-2000**

Central City vs. Balance of Metropolitan Statistical Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Balance of MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land use consumption**

- Land is being consumed approximately five times faster than population growth. From 1970 to 2000, land consumption increased 100 percent while population increased by 23 percent.\(^7\)
- Population density is decreasing in developed areas.\(^8\)

**Natural Resources**

- The natural environment in urban areas improved dramatically in the past 30 years: air became cleaner, water purer and aquatic life returned. Also, many communities now recycle.\(^9\)

---

\(^5\) Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission/U.S. Internal Revenue Service.


\(^7\) U.S. Census Bureau, OKI Regional Council of Governments, and ACP – Visioning and Planning, Ltd.

\(^8\) Ibid.

• In the same period, residential and business development have consumed significant open space and farmland. Wildlife habitat is lost and water quality threatened.\(^{10}\)
• Ohio’s metro counties lost 26 percent of their farmland acreage from 1959 to 1997. Counties in the OKI region lost 43 percent in same period.\(^{11}\)

**Transportation and traffic**\(^{12}\)
• Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are increasing disproportionately to population growth – 19.6 million VMT in 1982, 32.6 million VMT in 1999. This represents an increase of 66 percent in VMT while population increased by only approximately 13 percent.
• Increase in VMT is most pronounced on freeways, growing by 100 percent between 1982 and 1999.
• Per capita annual travel delays are increasing, from four hours in 1982 to 32 hours in 1999.
• According the Texas Transportation Institute, annual congestion costs in 1999 were estimated at $575 million.
• All counties except Butler and Hamilton export more than 50 percent of their workforce.\(^{13}\)
• Ground transportation will continue to be dominated by private vehicles and congestion will continue to increase.\(^{14}\)
• Declining population densities result in higher infrastructure costs on a per household and/or per development basis.\(^{15}\)

**Social issues**
• Racial and economic segregation is pronounced in the region. Overall racial segregation is greater in the Cincinnati region than all but one of the 25 largest metropolitan areas in the country.\(^{16}\)
• Decentralizing employment opportunities disproportionately affect poor, inner city residents. Many of these residents cannot afford to live near the job centers and because they lack dependable transportation these employment opportunities are not easily accessible.\(^{17}\)

\(^{10}\) Ibid, p. 43.
\(^{11}\) Ibid, p. 29.
\(^{12}\) All transportation related data is from the Texas Transportation Institute’s 2001 *Urban Mobility Study* unless otherwise indicated.
\(^{13}\) OKI Regional Transportation Plan, September 2001, p. 5-7.
\(^{14}\) OKI Transportation Plan and ACP – Visioning and Planning, Ltd.
\(^{15}\) Cincinnati Metropatterns, Metropolitan Area Research Corporation, September 2001, p. 18.
\(^{16}\) Ibid, p. 5.
\(^{17}\) Ibid, p. 18.
• Income disparity is pronounced in the region. Only six of the 25 largest regions in the country had a higher rate of income disparity.\(^{18}\)
• Seventy-two percent of non-Asian minority elementary students attend just one of the 77 school districts in the region (Cincinnati public school district).\(^{19}\)

**Economic issues**

• The region is expected to lead Ohio’s major metro areas in job growth (1996-2006) at 14 percent with the most diversified economy.\(^{20}\)
• From 1992 to 1997, the City of Cincinnati lost 6.3 percent of its jobs while suburbs gained 25.1 percent.\(^{21}\)
• Fast-growing areas of the region can expect fiscal stress as many of them maintain a fragile balance between revenues and expenditures.\(^{22}\)
• Mature communities face fiscal challenges as they lose population, jobs and tax base, and their infrastructure ages.\(^{23}\)

**Summary of Probable Scenario**

Through the year 2020, the region can expect population and economic growth exceeding that projected for most other regions in Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana. The majority of residential and commercial development will continue outside of the urban core or already developed areas. Traffic congestion will increase as population grows and more people travel between work and home and travel further distances. Undeveloped land will continue to be consumed at a rate disproportionate to population growth. If current trends continue, in the next 20 years alone, nearly ten percent of the region’s currently undeveloped land will be consumed to accommodate the projected population. The concentration of poverty in urban areas will continue.

**Reactions to the Probable Scenario**

After the presentation of the probable scenario and the current trend in growth and land utilization in the region, participants shared their reactions to the probable development scenario. This discussion took place in small groups (seven to ten participants) and comments were recorded on flipchart

\(^{18}\) Ibid, p. 4.
\(^{19}\) Ibid, p. 5.
\(^{20}\) State of Ohio’s Urban Region’s, Executive Report, The Ohio Urban University Program, February 10, 2000, p. 16.
\(^{22}\) Cincinnati Metropatterns, Metropolitan Area Research Corporation, September 2001, p. 13.
\(^{23}\) Ibid, p. 13.
paper by facilitators. It is important to note that these comments represent initial reactions to the probable scenario; it will take time for participants to process and internalize the information presented.

There were some common reactions discussed by participants regarding the probable scenario. Almost all groups expressed considerable concern over the trends presented, while a small minority of respondents was unconcerned. For those concerned about the probable scenario, their reactions centered on the issues listed below. Please note these are the items mentioned most often and are not presented in any specific order.

- Transportation and traffic congestion will continue to worsen.
- The quality of the natural environment will decline.
- Land consumption is aggressive and inefficient.
- There is a need for redevelopment and investment in older communities.
- Construction and maintenance of infrastructure will continue to be challenging to provide, particularly for local governments.
- Too many jurisdictions make identifying and implementing solutions difficult.
- The need for increased sharing and coordination at all levels of government is obvious.
- There is growing awareness that issues described in the probable scenario concern an area larger than the eight counties of OKI.
- Balancing revenue and expenditures will become increasingly challenging for local governments.
- The range of housing options that provide choice and affordability are limited.
- Social concerns, particularly those related to educating young people, need to be addressed.

The reactions shared during this portion of the workshop were consistent with the list of Regional Issues accepted by the Land Use Commission in November 2001. A full report of the participants’ reactions is included in Appendix C.

**Tabletop Exercise**

The small group tabletop mapping exercise allowed participants to analyze the information discussed during the presentations and synthesize it with their knowledge and understanding of the OKI Region. It is important to note that the tabletop exercise was an illustrative process tool to examine the magnitude of dealing with land consumption in the region. The results of the activities may be used as an input to developing a preferred scenario, but will not be used for developing land use plans for the region.

The 61 participants were divided into nine small groups for the activity. The exercise comprised three main steps:

- Activity 1: Mapping Exercise
• Activity 2: How will our recommendations affect the region?
• Activity 3: Reporting

Activity 1: Mapping Exercise

Participants worked with a map of the region illustrating currently developed land, undeveloped land, and parks and preserved land to consider where additional lands should be protected and future growth accommodated through the year 2020. The land use classifications that guided the activity are defined below.

• Developed land is currently being used for residential, commercial, industrial, and some institutional uses.
• Undeveloped land is in agricultural use, is vacant, or is unclassified by the respective local jurisdiction.
• Parks and preserved land includes all public and private parks in the region, plus cemeteries, historically designated properties, conservation easements, and golf courses.

Results for Protecting Land

As a first step, participants agreed on a percentage of the region’s total land they would want to protect from development through year 2020. Currently, approximately six percent (156 square miles) of the region’s total land area (2,592 square miles) is protected as public and private parks and preserved land.

Table 2 shows that the desired average level of protected land for the OKI Region (for all nine groups) was 16.9 percent. Since the percentages ranged so widely, from nine percent to 36 percent, the median provides another way of looking at the data. The median for the average percent of protected land was 12.5 percent. Overall, the groups wanted to preserve from 325 square miles (207,000 acres) to 440 square miles (280,000 acres) of the region’s total land area from development.

Table 2: Percent of Protected Land by Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Average Percent of Protected Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the participants determined an amount of land to preserve, they placed green “chips” on the map of the region to indicate where they believed land should be protected. Each chip represented one square mile of protected land. Based on how participants located protected land there seems to be interest in creating more urban parks and increasing access to recreational areas in already developed communities, connecting parks and preserved land to create green corridors, protecting steep slopes, and protecting land along streams and rivers.

**Results of Accommodating Future Growth**

In this step, the participants were given brown “chips” that represented the amount of land needed to accommodate the region’s projected growth through year 2020. These chips represented an aggregate amount of land needed for development; no distinction was made for separate land uses (residential, office, retail, industrial, etc.). Participants indicated where they believed growth should occur by placing their chips on the map.

It is projected the region’s population will increase by 305,450 people between year 2000 and 2020, requiring an additional 214 square miles of developed land for commercial, residential and industrial development if current trends in development and land consumption continue. This figure was calculated by correlating the change in urbanized area from 1990 to 2000 (as defined by the Census) with the change in developed land, based on the land use maps collected by OKI from the region’s jurisdictions.

The intent of the exercise was to explore general concepts of how participants believe growth should happen in the region rather than exactly where they would locate growth on the map. The exercise was designed to create understanding of the magnitude of land use issues and to gather participants’ ideas on how to approach these issues. Although the tables were deliberately organized to mix participants from throughout the region, it is impossible for a small group of seven to nine people to have a comprehensive and intimate knowledge of the entire region. For the purposes of the exercise, the participants did not have any economic or regulatory constraints.

On average, the nine groups placed 71 percent of future growth in already developed areas (see Table 3 on the following page). In addition, some participants layered chips on top of one another suggesting a desire to increase the intensity or density of development. The results of the exercise indicate a tendency toward promoting redevelopment, infill development and preserving undeveloped land.
Table 3: Accommodation of Future Growth: Percentage of future growth accommodated in developed & undeveloped land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Percent of growth on developed land</th>
<th>Percent of growth on undeveloped land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 2: How will our recommendations affect the region?

This step provided participants with the opportunity to reflect upon their approach to utilizing land and how their recommendations, as represented on their maps, will affect the region. Overall, the groups expressed concern over the current trends and recommended changes to how land is used. Their recommendations suggest that altering the trends is essential and a different approach to development is needed. Only one out of the nine groups expressed some sentiment that the status quo was acceptable.

The participants’ comments were recorded by the facilitators on flipchart paper. A complete list is included in the Appendix D.

The mapping recommendations suggest a strong desire that the region could grow very differently in the future. Listed below, in no particular order, are some observations that were common among most of the groups on how their recommendations will change the current trends:

- Increase revitalization and redevelopment of existing development and brownfields,
- Increase density of development,
- Minimize leapfrog development through the promotion of infill development,
- Decrease development in greenfields and undeveloped areas through promotion of redevelopment,
- Limit sprawling land use patterns,
- Define urban edges and establish contiguous growth,
- Focus development on existing transportation and infrastructure,
- Preserve land (hillsides, flood plains, rivers, environmentally sensitive areas, greenbelts, linkages and corridors)
- Increase parks and recreation opportunities in both urban and exurban areas, and
- Improve environmental quality.
Along with the potentially positive effects of the recommendations, group members also expressed concerns related to their work. Most of these concerns centered on the:

1. Ability to pay for the recommendations,
2. Fiscal inequities and tax implications of concentrating development in certain areas,
3. Need for transportation alternatives, and
4. Mechanisms to implement the recommendations since land use power is vested in local communities and there is relatively weak state enabling legislation.

Activity 3: Reporting

One participant from each group shared a brief summary of their mapping exercise. This step was an important opportunity for groups to share their work from the tabletop exercise and their reactions to the entire workshop. They presented the percentage of land their group chose to protect, briefly described the rationale used to identify land for protection and for accommodating future growth, and enumerated how their recommendations would affect the region. The information provided throughout this report summarizes for each activity much of what the participants presented during the reporting.
Appendices

The appendices include the detailed output from each of the activities conducted during Workshop 1.

A. Agenda
B. Future Vision Assessment (FVA) Results
C. Reactions to the Probable Scenario
D. How will our recommendations affect the region?
E. Participants
F. Facilitators
G. PowerPoint Presentation
## Appendix A: Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM</td>
<td>Welcome and Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Conduct Future Vision Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Regional Perspectives: Issues and Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Baseline and Probable Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>Reactions to the Probable Scenario (20 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Tabletop Mapping Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Mapping Exercise (45 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How will our recommendations affect the region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reporting (25 minutes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Future Vision Assessment (FVA) Results

The results of the Future Vision Assessment (FVA) are presented in the table below. The 25 concepts/images are organized under five headings (land use, neighborhoods, transportation, social, and economics). Included in the table is the average score for each concept on a scale of one (the image/concept is not important) to five (the image/concept is very important). The concepts are also ranked from most important to least important under each heading. Participant comments from the questionnaires have been merged and are listed in the last column of the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image/Concept</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources protection</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adds to value of real estate and quality of life; Critical-the basis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural resources ensure long-term sustainability; lakes rivers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakes water protection; Water is critical; Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill development</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Builds sustainable inner communities; Redevelop existing developed areas; Infill is an answer to multiple concerns; Mix if use is best way to live; Especially in urban core and older suburbs; This action would reduce sprawl; Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This is what helps maintain pedestrian feel; Will help hold population in counties; More hiking &amp; biking; One stop shopping not necessary; This is where we came from it still works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only if appropriate/compatible; Builds sustainable communities; Connectivity; Especially as it relates to traffic; Need more mixed used developments; No connection to progress; Efficient use of all resources; Mixed use best; Mechanism to protect; Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and cooperation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Only if they are competent, and results oriented/bigger government isn’t always better; Coordination would help solve many issues; Such coordination is always strived for, rarely achieved; Lack of this lead to current position; Vital; If conducted effectively; impossible; depends on scale of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside protection</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>They cause other problems; It’s our unique quality; Very important-our heritage; Hillside have multiple benefits; from erosion?; Vital and increasingly endangered; Can destroy what is below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space preservation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sometimes open spaces can be inside developed areas; Reduces sprawl; Open spaces are key; I don’t want to connect with Dayton; Open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and scenic roads</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nice visitor attraction; What’s the use with billboard clutter?; People need speed; Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian-friendly streets</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Easily ”doable”…zoning; Not everyone drives; Need safe way to get from place to place; Want to promote families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>An important issue; Parks are essential; Easily ”doable”…zoning; Kids need recreation-get them off the street; Natural need; Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small shops</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide unique vitality; This is a forgotten need; Adds to character/quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed housing values</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>One of the most important-mixed housing; Critical for social changes-stability; Cost prohibitive; Difficult to change attitude; Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic uses</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not every neighborhood; Civic space is critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Too obvious importance; Sewers should be planned; Coordination a must; This is critical departure point for sprawl; Water sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating utilities</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Too obvious importance; We must go beyond a car culture; Otherwise traffic doesn’t flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating transportation</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This is the only way to improve/decrease congestion; Established as population acres; Mobility choices-we lack them; Depending on affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility choices</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>At least link central 2/3; Admirable but difficult; People need to be able to get to work; Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit links</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Biased question?; Best way to leverage investment; makes assume re transit; Affordability; They go hand in hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing density</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Essential opportunity; Education a cornerstone; Closely tied to development; section 13; Many people will not capitalize on education opportunities; Good for everyone; Focus on children; Most important key; Preserve green space via this; Mechanism for high tech investment; Public &amp; private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization of housing</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Or infill with modern product; Critical; Stabilizing with homeownership vs. rental; Private funds; Deterioration/rental big reason for decay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing choices</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Best way to access jobs; Moderately priced must be throughout; Section 13; Not everyone can afford $200,00 homes; Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of fiscal impacts</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Must build such awareness; Debatable with housing PACS; Very difficult to measure value, should be known to elected officials and citizens; Good luck; Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for redevelopment</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Report on Cincinnati in courier says may say something; define incentives; We must pop the myth about tax base; It takes money; Important or the might sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>In order to compete globally it’s required; A fair amount currently exist; Probably not realistic; South bank- 6 cities 3 counties, Must be locally organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing benefits</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In order to compete globally it’s required; Define rewards; probably no realistic; joint venture agreements; Important in getting support from others; Work together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Reactions to the Probable Scenario

Table 1
1. Bring land absorption and population growth in to parity.
2. How to control/overcome political & economic pressure to zoning.
3. The board of every jurisdiction should hear this presentation.
4. The social & economic impact on the inner city.
5. Land owner rights vs. planning & zoning.
6. The sense that the current of development is not sustainable & won't give us a place we want to live.
7. Illustrates that importance of economic cost/benefit critical to understanding the consequences of decisions.
8. Victim of bigger seems to be better-more balance of infrastructure between city & suburbs.
9. Scenario doesn’t take into account demographics (aging population) & technology changes.
10. Cheap gas $ is encouraging growth patterns.
11. Infrastructures needs of older & new communities.
12. Market place will determine where development will go.
13. Need to create full service, autonomous community centers for the aging population.
14. Political leaders look out only for the benefits to their own communities (too many jurisdictions).
15. Determine reason for flight from the inner city.
16. Current sprawl patterns make public transportation challenging (lack of high density).

Table 2
1. How important is personal choice.
2. Assume there are trends which will continue.
3. Traffic congestion & air pollution.
4. How will people get to jobs?
5. Was model tested against historic data?
6. Need more emphasis on fiscal data- where money goes.
7. Personal frustration.
8. Assumes conditions we cannot control (i.e. economy fiscal resources).
9. Stranded costs from areas left behind.
10. Existing infrastructure not fully utilized.
11. Ensure development pays full costs.
12. New creative thinking regarding large parcel dev.
13. How we redevelop older communities infrastructure.
14. Build the new and rebuild the old infrastructure. How do we pay for this?

Table 3
1. Unplanned growth coordination in the region.
2. Decision making power all jurisdictions have home rule- Ohio has home rule.
3. Traffic growth/congestion will slow development down.
4. Growth will occupy areas away from the Cincinnati CBD and Ohio River corridor.
5. No formal rules and development policies.
6. Impact on social/fiscal/environmental and educational concerns.
7. Short term growth will have an impact on affordable housing.
8. Protect natural resources (flood zones, hill sides).
9. Infrastructure not provided in concert with development.
10. To development close if we need to provide for good schools update infrastructure.
11. Transportation hubs with higher densities near them / regional city.
12. Center city has the best development sites and transportation facilities.
13. Lack of coordination.
14. Limits funds to handle growth.
15. Regional port authority that shares resources.
16. Lack of state enabling legislation in Ohio.
17. Create development impact fees.
18. The trend needs to be slowed and reversed.
20. Diversity in decision-making.

Table 4
1. Overusing interstates for local travel.
2. Transportation costs increasing.
3. Problem bigger than 8 county area.
4. Strained infrastructure.
5. Small amount of parkland.
6. Our migration higher than national average.
7. Predictable, unnecessary & modifiable.
8. Land consumption seems to indicate minimal infill.
9. Is cost of government services changing in relation to increased growth.
10. Major commercial / industrial growth developments locating near interstates and major arterials.
11. Major commercial / industrial development consume large areas of land.
12. Density keeps decreasing for all land uses.
14. Political difficulty to get beyond giving up service to change.
15. Driven by economics.
16. Regional governance.

Table 5
1. We are more developed than they (the statistics) said we were.
2. Map too little, we should be analyzing North Kentucky to Dayton problems not confined to this map.
3. Loss of natural areas result in a loss of functions they provide.
4. Concerned about the loss of population in urban core.
5. Need coordinated regional policy related to agriculture.
6. Concern about to how serve--provide quality services throughout the region (fiscally).
7. Without strong urban core, will not be able to attract and retain young professionals.
8. Population, traffic flow out pacing the development of new roads.
10. Need massive education effort to explain to public why we can't continue the way we have done things.
11. Think strategically to preserve ecosystem functions--maximize preservation (10-1-acre plots vs. 1-10-acre plot).
12. How do we get 300 subdivisions to work together?
13. Probable scenario is not negative enough to cause change in our community.
Table 6
1. Things don’t look good but no effort to coordinate regional initiatives.
2. Improper funding of impacts of local government-disproportionate.
3. Need to be done on a smaller scale local level.
4. Need to understand how we got to this state before we can solve it.
5. Need to have better understanding of what caused current situation.
6. We are in reactive rather than proactive mode- must have vision for localities to support.
7. How will politics affect?
8. How will OKI vision go from that to reality (not all jurisdictions are represented)?
10. Need clear integration of land use planning analysis in transportation planning.
11. Indication of failure to integrate land use & transportation planning is storm water management problems.

Table 7
1. We need to focus on land use efficiency.
2. Encourage municipalities & townships to control their own growth.
3. Control growth with infrastructure planning.
4. This is not a surprise at all (probable scenario).
5. Creating housing diversity is politically difficult.
6. It is crucial that the region address the concentration of poverty.
7. Need to protect more land.
8. Expand purchase of development rights for farmland.
9. All communities trying to do the same thing not focusing on unique features.
10. Communities getting defensive about development.
13. Require new development to be on public utilities.
14. Do away with mortgage deduction.
15. Legal & financial aid to find redevelopment.

Table 8
1. Nothing wrong with this scenario- didn’t see it as a bad thing.
2. These trends will likely continue.
3. If they continue we will have gridlock (traffic-economic-higher taxes-failing services).
4. Need to revitalize inner city thru better housing and schools-stop people from leaving the city.
5. Trends likely to continue unless there is an incentive or disincentive.
   Education and revenue sharing (debt w/sprawl).
6. Convince people living in city is a good thing available space, homes, service, can be attractive- pr needed.
7. Speed of growth is a drain on taxes- can’t keep up on residential taxes alone.
8. "I refuse to take responsibility for what has happened in the city” why are suburbs responsible?
9. People are reluctant to change.
10. To change how things happen, we need to be in better contact with movers/shakers-scenario known years ago.
11. Must get started on regional transit.
12. Push brownfield development!-as incentive.
13. Need public transit but it can't be on the street- use RR tracks.
14. Absentee landlords have lots of responsibility for downfall & rebuilding of city.

Table 9
1. Gobbling up land -address with smarter growth through incentive programs revitalization of already developed areas.
2. Disparity in income across region must be dealt with.
3. Destructive-low density land use.
4. Region looks like donut (development).
5. Spend too much time in cars.
6. Growing regional economy but continued social inequality.
7. Development moving from orderly to scattered.
8. Transportation gridlock-outlying communities become victims of tax incentives.
9. Little public transit or info on it fewer choice available.
11. Lack of the economic "invisible hand" balance between common good & private interests not manifest.
Appendix D: How will our recommendations affect the region?

Table 1
1. Create more personal wealth that will lead to renovation of the inner city.
2. Redevelopment and higher density.
3. Higher density in suburban preservation of land as well as industrial development, etc. –
4. Concentrate preservation in hillside and flood plains.
5. Increase size of existing state parks (Caesar creek, Hueston Wood, etc.).
6. Slopes need to be taken into account before development is approved (Kentucky – Kenton and Campbell Counties).
7. Preservation corridors along rivers (Ohio, Licking, Miami, etc.).
8. Emphasis on infill in existing urban areas.
9. Take advantage of existing infrastructure.
10. User fees needed to pay for development of new infrastructure.

Table 2
1. Fiscal challenges.
2. Protect hillsides.
3. Difficult to consider all the factors.
4. Who pays to preserve land?
5. Positive impact on air quality.
6. Parks follow natural resources.
7. Not affordable.
8. Relationship between housing and commercial development.
9. Good job with in-fill development.
10. How will the development track with jobs?

Table 3
1. Concentration of infill housing with existing infrastructure.
3. Redevelopment of Miami TWP along S.R. 78.
4. Preserve developmentally sensitive areas.
5. Urbanization/privatization renting positively to outcome.
6. Modifications/upgrades of infrastructure in redevelopment areas.
7. Fair share affordable housing district including social services.
8. Urban core redeveloped; fewer green fields developed.
9. Guided growth by governments working together.
10. Compact high-density development.
11. Increase safety, enforce existing laws, and hire more cops.

Table 4
1. Have mega-industrial development site outside the 8 county area/supplier spin off
2. Big investment in brownfield areas.
3. New development filling in gaps between already urbanized areas.
4. Keeping development in existing urbanized areas.
5. Utilize existing infrastructure.
6. Add residential in suburban areas to provide wider range of housing choices.
7. Preserve floodplain areas.
8. Green space linkages.
9. Doubled amount of parkland.
11. Establishing some urban boundaries (growth contiguous).

Table 5
1. Strong inner city is required to achieve our recommendations.
2. Strong protection of green space along rivers, lakes, flood plains and parks.
3. Lot of people in close proximity to green space.
4. We are trying to limit urban sprawl.
5. Non-core areas need to develop retail jobs and housing to prevent increased traffic.
6. Put development along existing transportation system.
7. Green space corridors are connected.
8. Need more mass transit to accommodate denser population in urban area.
9. Taxes consolidated in small area so limiting tax base in non-core areas.
10. Look at planning and zoning differently then traditional.
11. Existing development nodes are expanded.
12. Ultimately save money by development of flood plains.

Table 6
1. Sprawl will continue but at a lesser rate.
2. Existing green areas will be expanded.
3. Certain environmentally sensitive areas will be preserved.
4. Further development of Fields-Ertel exchange will make worse congestion and fiscal inequalities.
5. Conscious effort toward redevelopment efforts exception–Fields-Ertel.
6. Emphasis on corridor type development.
7. Positive effect on social issues (recreation).
8. Demonstrates lack of cohesive vision.
9. Inadequate protection of natural systems.

Table 7
1. Protect floodplains, river, corridors, hillsides > 20, aquifers.
2. Encourage infill and redevelopment (in particular along transportation corridors).
3. Increase efficiencies in infrastructure utilization.
4. Improve developed areas & protect items in #1.

Table 8
1. Industry will start to mirror where the houses are – support residential migration.
2. Recreation in inner city; residents need to "see trees" access to parks/schools.
3. Park areas in flood plains, steep areas – serve dual purpose to protect environment-flood issues, etc.
4. Our recommendations won’t have effect because we don’t have any authority. Nice exercise but no organization to make it so.
5. Will provide employment and housing for increased population – politically the people responsible for the trends are not buying into our ideas.
6. Our scenario is pretty much status quo – really haven't changed anything. Next time we do this exercise there will be more counties from a larger area.
7. Didn't suggest new highways because the money isn't there.
8. It is impractical to do regionally because of what already exist development-wise. Needs to be left up to local people – encourage and assist.

Table 9
1. Serious changes to legislation in all three states necessary.
2. Revitalization/redevelopment of existing urban areas.
3. More regional cooperation.
4. Makes public transportation plans easier.
5. Restructure of tax code needed.
6. Revenue sharing.
7. Preserve more hillsides, riparian corridors, flood plains.
8. Preserve green space in neighborhoods.
9. Greenbelt and green corridors.
10. Increase density of already developed areas.
Appendix E: Participants

There were a total of 61 participants at Workshop 1. Of the 61 participants, 32 were OKI Board/Land Use Commission Members (including two alternates) and 29 were members of the Land Use Commission subcommittees. Sixty-seven percent of the participants were from Ohio, 30 percent represented Kentucky, and three percent represented Indiana.

The participants represented a broad range of professional affiliations:

- Education (5%)
- Citizens (7%)
- Business (10%)
- Non-profit groups (10%)
- Planning Agencies (18%)
- Government (51%)

There were five types of representatives within the government category:

- Special purpose district (3%)
- Townships (13%)
- Other – HUD, ODOT, KYTC (13%)
- Municipalities (35%)
- Counties (35%)

Following is a complete list of all participants in Workshop 1 of OKI’s Regional Visioning Process.

Workshop 1 Participants

1. Tim Bachman, City of Fairfield, Butler County
2. Daniel Batta, Dearborn County Commissioner, Dearborn County
3. John Bowling, Procter and Gamble
4. Paul Braasch, Clermont County OEQ, Clermont County
5. Glen Brand, Sierra Club,
6. William Brayshaw, Hamilton County Engineer, Hamilton County
7. Elizabeth Brown, HUD
8. Ed Burdell, AIR, Inc.
9. Barry Burke, NKAPC, Kenton County
10. MaryAnn Burwinkel, City of Norwood, Council member, Hamilton County
11. Kay Clifton, Price Hill Civic Center, Hamilton County
12. Kevin Costello, Boone County Planning Commission, Boone County
13. Robert Craig, Warren County Regional Planning Commission, Warren County
14. Stephen Dana, League of Women Voters, Greater Cincinnati
15. Tom Dix, Clermont County Township Trustees Assoc, Clermont County
16. Carol Erickson, Director, Dearborn County Chamber of Commerce, Dearborn County
17. Danny Fore, Tri-County Economic Development Corp
18. Haynes Goddard, University of Cincinnati, Hamilton County
20. Robert Haney, Kenton County Board of Education, Kenton County
21. Dave Hart, City of Alexandria, Campbell County
22. Catherine Hartman, Village of Evendale, Hamilton County
23. Chuck Heilman, Campbell County Planning & Zoning Commission, Campbell County
24. Hans Jindal, ODOT
25. Michael Juengling, Butler County Dept of Development, Butler County
26. Barbara Kalb, City of St. Bernard, Hamilton County
27. Pat Karney, Metropolitan Sewer District, Hamilton County
28. Peter J. Klear, Campbell County Fiscal Court, Campbell County
29. Ed Knox, City of Springdale, Clerk of Council, Finance Dir., Hamilton County
30. Janet Korach, Montgomery Citizen, Hamilton County
31. Henry Mann, Lakeside Park Resident, Kenton County
32. Diana Martin, ODOT
33. Mel Martin, Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission, Hamilton County
34. Chris Matacic, Liberty Township Board of Trustees, Butler County
35. Patrick Merten, J-II Homes, Inc.
36. Ron Miller, Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission, Hamilton County
37. Gary Moore, Boone County Fiscal Court, Boone County
38. Mary Moore, Butler County Dept of Environmental Services, Butler County
39. Chris Moran, League of Women Voters
40. Pamela Mullins, Cincinnati Public Schools, Hamilton County
41. Richard Murgatroyd, Kenton County Fiscal Court, Kenton County
42. Dean Niemeyer, Clermont County Planning & Development, Clermont County
43. Wally Pagan, South Bank Partners
44. Ronald Pandorf, City of Lebanon, Warren County
45. Joseph Price, Kenton County Planning & Zoning Commissioner, Kenton County
46. Kenneth Reed, Butler County RTA, Director of Administration, Butler County
47. Peggy Reis, Hamilton County Township Assoc, Anderson Twp., Hamilton County
48. Elmo Rose, Warren County Trustees Assoc., Warren County
49. Bill Scheyer, City of Erlanger, Kenton County
50. Tony Simms-Howell, Ohio Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs
51. Marshall Slagle, NKAPC, Kenton County
52. J.T. Spence, City of Covington, Kenton County
53. Harry Stone, Cincinnati Resident, Hamilton County
54. Neil Tunison, Warren County Engineer, Warren County
55. Bernadette Unger, City of Oxford, Butler County
56. Matt Van Sant, Clermont County Chamber of Commerce, Clermont County
57. Dotty Vogt, Cincinnati Resident, Hamilton County
58. Mary C. Walker, Clermont County Board of Commissioners, Clermont County
59. Melissa Williams, Campbell County Fiscal Court, Campbell County
60. Lisa Wilson, Boone County Planning Commission, Boone County
61. Bob Yeager, KYTC, District 6
Appendix F: Facilitators

OKI would like to express its appreciation to all those who volunteered their time and expertise to be trained and to facilitate the tabletop mapping exercise. Their efforts were key to the success of Workshop 1. It is hoped members of the OKI professional community will continue to participate in and support the entire regional visioning process.

Workshop 1 Facilitators:

Table 1: Catalina Landivar-Simon, HCRPC
Table 2: David Fehr, Butler County Department of Development
Table 3: Bill Simon, Housing Authority of Covington
Table 4: Caroline Statkus, HCRPC
Table 5: Mary Luebbers, OKI
Table 6: Larisa Hughes, NKAPC
Table 7: Paul Smiley, HCRPC
Table 8: Dave Geohegan, Boone County Planning Commission
Table 9: Tommie Thompson, City of Cincinnati and Brian Goldstein, HCRPC

Other facilitators trained but not utilized:
1. Barbara Milon
2. Bruce Koehler, OKI
3. Doug Smith, OKI
4. Mark Paine, OKI
5. Nicole Anderson, OKI
6. Sarah Woller, OKI