Overview

Workshop 2 for OKI’s Regional Visioning Process, “Where do we grow from here?,” was held on August 23, 2002 at the Holiday Inn, Downtown Cincinnati (see Appendix C for a list of the participants). It was the second in a series of workshops for the Land Use Commission and its three working committees (Land Use Planning and Policy, Environment and Infrastructure, and Economic Development and Funding)¹ to develop a vision for the OKI Region. Workshop 2 was a critical session for the LUC to review the output of Workshop 1 and develop and review material for the upcoming regional public forums in September.

The main objectives of Workshop 2 were to:

- Review draft principle statements for land utilization and growth management in the region;
- Create an understanding of the local impacts, effects, and implications of the draft principles;
- Discuss regional application of the principle statements through four prototypical development patterns; and
- Present visuals to be used during Regional Public Forums.

¹ For the purposes of this report, references to the Land Use Commission include its three committees.
These objectives were accomplished through the following agenda.

**Agenda**

1. *Welcome and Charge*
2. *What Did We Learn From Workshop 1?*
3. *Articulation of Our Vision: Principle Statements*
   - Presentation of Principle Statements
   - Small Group Activity
     - Reviewing the Principles
     - Identifying Potential Concerns
     - Proposing Revisions
     - Reporting
   - Presentation of Stewardship Principle
4. *Public Forum Strategy*
5. *Closing Remarks*

Detailed summaries of the results from Workshop 2 are presented in the appropriate sections of this report (a copy of the Power Point presentation from Workshop 2 is included in Appendix E). Overall, the participants were supportive of the fifteen draft principle statements as representative of the future desired for the OKI Region. Their main concerns focused on the feasibility of achieving the future described in the principles.

In addition, the findings of the workshop imply that there is a strong sentiment among Land Use Commission members to modify current trends in development and land consumption. When asked to indicate how the participants would like to accommodate future growth in the region redevelopment ranked number one, followed by infill development, compact development on new land, and, finally, conventional development on new land.

**What did we learn from Workshop 1?**

An overview of Workshop 1 summarizing the content and results was presented. This presentation was important to provide Workshop 1 participants with the results of their small group work and the Future Vision Assessment (FVA) from the previous workshop. It also provided an orientation for Workshop 2 participants who were not in attendance at Workshop 1.

The summary of key trends in the OKI Region presented at the meeting included:
- The majority of residential and commercial growth will occur outside developed areas.
- Traffic congestion will continue to increase.
- Undeveloped land will continue to be consumed at a higher rate than population growth.
• The concentration of poverty in urban areas will increase.
In addition to the trends, LUC members were also reminded of the land consumption information used in Workshop 1, including the following:
• Existing Land Area (region) is 2,592 square miles.
• Total area of developed land is 832 square miles (32 percent).
• Total area used as parks/preserved land is 158 square miles (6 percent).
• An additional 214 square miles of land will need to be developed to accommodate the increased population anticipated in the next 20 years (306,000 additional residents).
Generalized recommendations from Workshop 1 participants that were reviewed at Workshop 2 included:
• Protect more land – increasing the current amount of 6 percent to 12.5 percent.
• Seventy-one percent of future development should be directed to already developed areas (average based on map exercise).
• Increase the intensity of land use.
• Minimize “leap frog” development patterns.
• Focus development on areas already served by infrastructure.

For a complete summary of Workshop 1 please refer to the Workshop 1 Summary Report submitted under separate cover to OKI.

Articulation of Our Vision: Principle Statements
Fifteen draft principle statements were developed based on the outcomes of Workshop 1 (the FVA, Reactions to the Probable Scenario, and How Our Recommendations will Affect the Region), the LUC’s list of issues, as well as ACP’s experience working with other regions. Fourteen of the fifteen draft principle statements deal with specific concerns such as transportation, housing choices, and educational opportunities. The remaining principle is broader and relates to stewardship.

The fifteen draft principles were presented in detail to the participants. After the presentation, the participants worked in small groups to discuss and review the draft principle statements.

Draft Principle Statements
The draft principle statements listed below describe the desired future of the OKI Region in fifteen key areas. They were presented as “strawman principles” to be used for the workshop exercises.

1. Stewardship: Land uses will be well managed with respect to timing, location, and costs of development and redevelopment. Some areas of the region will have higher densities of people and
more intense uses than other areas. Key areas, such as hillsides, floodplains, and forests, which add value to surrounding property and are intrinsically significant, are conserved, appropriately used and restored as green spaces.

2. **Transportation Choices**: Transportation choices are available region wide, including walking, biking, public transit, and cars. Public transit and links to transit throughout the region maximize access and mobility choice.

3. **Density to Support Transit**: Communities will have areas that are developed with higher concentrations of people and activities to better utilize land resources and make public transit feasible.

4. **Connectivity**: Neighborhoods are linked by a network of interconnected streets and walkways as part of a larger system that provides motorized and non-motorized access to homes, businesses, schools, recreation facilities and services, and other destinations. These networks are designed to keep local traffic off major arterials and high-speed through-traffic off local roads.

5. **Local Streets**: Pedestrian-friendly and attractively designed local streets define the character of neighborhoods and commercial areas.

6. **Redevelopment and Infill Development**: Redevelopment of underutilized areas and infill development within existing areas will be promoted to better use land resources and manage growth.

7. **Mixed Use Center**: Centers that include a mix of integrated office, retail, residential, and civic uses are found throughout the region. These mixed-use centers – of a scale appropriate to their surroundings – concentrate uses in a manner that supports walking and transit.

8. **Mixed-Use Neighborhoods**: New and redeveloped neighborhoods include walkable small-scale retail, compatible business and civic uses, as well as a broad range of housing types and price levels.

9. **Environmental Quality**: Land development minimizes negative impacts on natural systems, such as air quality and water resources. There is a network of green spaces in the region that includes neighborhood parks and corridors.

10. **Housing Choices**: A diverse mix of housing choices – in terms of size, price, type and location – is available throughout the region. Every community in the region has a good quality housing stock, maintains newer subdivisions, and has stabilized and revitalized aging neighborhoods.

11. **Education Opportunity**: Quality education is available throughout the region for residents of all ages.

12. **Public Facilities and Services**: The public facilities and services such as roads, water, sewer, and parks, are necessary to support land development and redevelopment are well coordinated and are available concurrent with such development.
13. **Fiscal Responsibility**: Land development and redevelopment decisions and improvements to public facilities and services are made with a clear understanding of their fiscal costs and benefits to individual communities and the region.

14. **Economic Development**: Communities cooperate and coordinate on mutually beneficial economic development opportunities, on business retention and recruitment, and workforce development.

15. **Intergovernmental Cooperation**: Local governments effectively communicate, cooperate, and coordinate on issues of land use, transportation, natural systems, economic development and public facilities and services.

**Small Group Activity**

After the presentation of principles, the participants worked in small groups to review the principles, identify potential concerns, and propose content and editorial revisions. Each small group was assigned a facilitator (see Appendix D for a list of the facilitators) and two to three principles to review in detail. The facilitator asked the participants to consider whether the principle accurately reflects the future desired for the OKI Region.

After the small groups completed reviewing their assigned principles, there was a reporting period. One representative from each group presented a summary of the issues discussed relating to their draft principle statements. All workshop participants were given a comment form to provide them the opportunity to submit comments on all the principle statements, as well as to record any reactions to the presentations of the other small groups.

All comments collected during the small group activity are included in Appendix A. In general, the participants concurred with the essence of the principle statements and provided suggestions to clarify, strengthen, or refine the drafts. The participants’ major concerns with the statements related to their feasibility.

**Stewardship Principle Presentation and Questionnaire**

A special presentation and discussion was conducted for the Stewardship Principle Statement. The presentation included a review of the principle as well as an introduction to four prototypical development patterns that could be used to accommodate future growth in the region. After the presentation, the participants were asked to respond to the Stewardship Questionnaire (see Appendix B for questionnaire and results).

In regard to the four prototypical development patterns, the presentation focused on land consumption implications and relationship to existing land uses. The four prototypical development patterns considered the implications of accommodating 1,000 new households in...
one of the following ways. The following patterns express an order of magnitude of land needs based on the assumptions provided.

1. **Conventional development on new land:** Using recent land development and consumption trends, accommodating 1,000 new households under current trends would require 1,069 acres. This pattern assumes an average gross residential density of 1.2 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC) that would consume 833 acres. The balance of the 1,069 acres would include 28 acres for commercial use and 181 acres for institutional use. (Institutional land use was held constant for all options.)

2. **Redevelopment:** If 1,000 new households were accommodated through redevelopment of land, 399 acres would be needed. This option assumes residential land is developed at an average of 6.0 DU/AC, which would total 200 acres needed for residential land use. The balance of the 399 acres would include 18 acres for commercial use and 181 acres for institutional use.

3. **Infill development:** “Infill” is development of undeveloped land adjacent to developed land. It assumes a more compact pattern than conventional development but less than redevelopment. If 1,000 households were to be accommodated in an infill development pattern, 821 acres would be needed. This option assumes 60 percent of residential use is developed at 1.2 DU/AC and 40 percent at 4.0 DU/AC, which together would total 600 acres needed for residential land use. The balance of the 821 acres would include 40.5 acres for commercial use and 181 acres for institutional use.

4. **Compact development on new land:** If 1,000 new households were to be accommodated on new land in a compact development pattern a total of 459 acres of land would be needed. This pattern assumes an average gross residential density of 4.0 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC) that would require 250 acres. The balance of the 459 acres would include 55 acres for commercial use and 181 acres for institutional use.

After the presentation, the Stewardship Questionnaire was administered to the participants to determine the degree to which they believed the four development patterns could be employed in the region to accommodate future growth and support the principle statements. The participants listed the percentage of all future growth\(^2\) they believed

\(^2\) 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.
should be allocated to each of the four categories. It is important to note that this was an intuitive exercise; it was not intended to be constrained by market demands, environmental constraints, etc.

The results of the questionnaire indicate that the LUC is interested in changing the current trends in land use, which have been dominated by conventional development and seeking to encourage redevelopment, infill development, and compact development on new land, in that order.

In response to the question, “what percentage of new growth would you allocate to the following four prototypical development patterns?” the averages were as follows:

1. Redevelopment: 30.2%
2. Infill development: 25.3%
3. Compact development on new land: 24.3%
4. Conventional development: 20.1%

In addition to indicating how they would allocate future growth to the four prototypical development patterns, all participants were given the opportunity to make comments on the Stewardship Principle Statement. The questionnaire asked participants to indicate if the draft principle on stewardship accurately reflects the future desired for OKI. Of those who responded to the question, 67 percent said yes it accurately reflects the desired future and 33 percent said it somewhat reflects the desired future. Not one participant expressed opposition to the Stewardship Principle Statement. The participants did suggest revisions that they felt would improve the principle statement.

Complete documentation of all the participants’ responses to the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.
Appendices

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

A. Results from the Small Group Activity
B. Stewardship Questionnaire and Results
C. Participants
D. Facilitators
E. Presentation
Appendix A:
Results from Small Group Activity

Listed below are the results from the small groups’ review of the 15 draft Principle Statements. For each Principle Statement, the draft statement, the tables that reviewed the principle, potential concerns, and proposed revisions are listed. Also listed are comments from other workshop participants who submitted their reactions on the comment cards provided.

Principle 1: Stewardship
Land uses will be well managed with respect to timing, location, and costs of development and redevelopment. Some areas of the region will have higher densities of people and more intense uses than other areas. Key areas, such as hillsides, floodplains, and forests, which add value to surrounding property and are intrinsically significant, are conserved, appropriately used and restored as green spaces.

Reviewed by Table: 8

Concerns:
- KEY AREA ADDITION: Established village and neighborhood centers
- Keep concern #1 for stewardship open for use in other areas as applicable
- Well-managed? Needs discussion – “commitment” well-managed through shared commitments with respect to…
- Add a reference to “future park land” to the key area section.
- Well-managed cooperatively by government, the public, the private sector, and other stakeholders
- Stewardship of established neighborhoods including industrial and commercial urban areas
- Will be shared by whom? Commitment of governing entities and be well-managed? Well-managed & coordinated cooperatively
- Include “river corridors” “improve & protect air and water quality”
- Include “reuse” of developed land
- Add farmlands after forests. Maybe change “and” to “or” in last phrase.

Proposed Revisions:
- Land uses will be well managed and coordinated prioritizing cost of development, location, and timing.
- Key areas, such as hillsides, flood plains, and forests, and other designated future park land...
- Land uses will be well managed by a regional entity of stake holders responsible for updating changes in the long range plan update every five years, with respect to timing.
- Through shared, recognized commitment and cooperation from all sectors, land uses will be well-managed with respect to timing, location, and costs of development and redevelopment. Some areas
of the region will have more intense uses than other areas. Key areas such as historic/established neighborhoods, hillsides, flood plains, forests, and farmlands, which all value to surrounding property and are intrinsically significant, are conserved, appropriately used, or restored.

- Land uses will have the shared commitment of the public with respect to timing, location, and costs of development and redevelopment. Some locations in the region will have higher density of people and more intense uses than others. Key areas, such as established villages and neighborhoods, hillsides, river corridors, flood plains, forests, farmland and parks which add value to surrounding property and quality of life are conserved or restored.

- Land uses will be coordinated throughout the region with respect to timing, location, and costs of development and redevelopment in order to improve and protect air and water quality, to revitalize established communities, to protect existing and future green space, and to enhance economic growth in the Tri-State. Key green space area, such as parks, river corridors, hillsides, flood plains, farms, and forests will be preserved and protected for the future.

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
None

**Principle 2: Transportation Choices**

Transportation choices are available region wide, including walking, biking, public transit, and cars. Public transit and links to transit throughout the region maximize access and mobility choice.

Reviewed by Tables: 1, 8

Concerns:
- “Transportation choices are available within the region, where feasible…”
- Balanced transportation choices
- “Appropriate” choices – NOT UNIVERSAL
- Goal is not to “maximize” but to provide choice
- Can’t look at single principle without all the rest
- Greater transportation choices should be provided to support and encourage efficient, mixed use, compact development patterns (8)

Proposed Revisions:
- “Balanced” transport
- To optimize instead of maximize
- When feasible goes after cars
- Available within the region – instead of region wide
- Leave out “where feasible”

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. Connect to both lead and follow land use
Principle 3: Density to Support Transit

Communities will have areas that are developed with higher concentrations of people and activities to better utilize land resources and make public transit feasible.

Reviewed by Tables: 2, 6

Concerns:
- “In place public transportation will promote increase in density”
- “Title ignores key goal in this principle – better utilization of land resources”
- “Plan to be coordinated with planned development and redevelopment”
- “More compact development encourages use of transit, allows choice of access.”
- “Should not be jurisdiction by jurisdiction”
- Is feasible the right word? (2)
- Density, yes, but what about park and rides?
- Vague; poor wording; is this feasibility

Proposed Revisions:
- “Get the word ‘feasible’ out”
- “Communities will have areas of opportunities for better utilization of land resources as density increases around public transit hubs & centers.”
- ADD TO END: “and support public transit.”
- “Communities will have areas that are developed with higher concentrations of people and activities to better utilize land resources and support public transit”
- Replace “feasible” with “efficient” (2)
- … of housing and activities to better utilize land and make public transit feasible
- For “people” substitute “businesses and housing”

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. As discussed, it’s a “chicken and the egg” problem, but the consensus was that density is not always required to make transit feasible. Also, use of the word “communes” implies cell jurisdictions.
2. Need something to address use of public transit – not just density, need flexibility

Principle 4: Connectivity

Neighborhoods are linked by a network of interconnected streets and walkways as part of a larger system that provides motorized and non-motorized access to homes, businesses, schools, recreation facilities and services, and other destinations. These networks are designed to keep local traffic off major arterials and high-speed through-traffic off local roads.

Reviewed by Table: 3
Concerns:
- Can lead to more segregated communities (i.e. income, ethnic, etc.)
- Improve local road systems BUT maintain each community’s individual independence
- Not In My Backyard (Some people’s views)
- Laws, Regulations Maintenance/Upkeep Finance of this system

Proposed Revisions:
- INCLUDE IN LAST SENTENCE: “Social & Economic impact of changes in traffic movement, patterns.”

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. There should be a role for “gated” communities. That is just another housing option that should be available if viable in an area. This not a moral/social issue, but a diversity/choice issue.

Principle 5: Local Streets
Pedestrian-friendly and attractively designed local streets define the character of neighborhoods and commercial areas.

Reviewed by Tables: 2, 4

Concerns:
- Public facilities & services more important than local streets
- Could elaborate on linking pedestrians with parks and other land uses (connectivity)
- Some governments have construction standards. Others do not.
- Principle should address all streets, including arterials, sub-collectors, and collectors (expand definition)
- “Pedestrian friendly” should be a function of density
- Commercial areas should be appropriate to the street hierarchy
- “Attractively designed” is subjective to locale
- Incorporate traffic calming
- “Character”? (2)
- Vague; lacks action; limited land uses
- Yeah? So what? Seems meaningless in that it’s usually a “given”
- What was intended? By this principle? Not clear what its purpose is.
- What about privacy, safety, yet convenience to major arteries?
- Define term “local street”

Proposed Revisions:
- Neighborhood streets are appropriately designed
- Streets should be designed to accommodate all forms of transportation, land uses, and building densities
- Neighborhood-oriented commercial In neighborhoods only
- Incorporate language-expanding definition beyond local streets and utilizing standards of construction.
- Pedestrian-friendly streets define the character of neighborhoods & commercial areas with appropriate density.
- Streetscapes are appropriate to density and street function
• Pedestrian-friendly in appropriate areas and defined to character of neighborhoods and commercial areas
• Local streets are pedestrian-friendly, attractive, and clarify use. (2)
• Pedestrian – local streets in residential and business areas of neighborhood. (Keep all works in here, just delete “local” & modify end of sentence as shown)
• Once they help shape community character, L.S. should be pedestrian-friendly and well-designed.

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. Poorly worded. Commercial areas within neighborhoods cannot be general or regional in nature! Need to incorporate traffic calming.
2. Attractive? Trees, type of pavement? Through pattern?

**Principle 6: Redevelopment and Infill Development**
Redevelopment of underutilized areas and infill development within existing areas will be promoted to better use land resources and manage growth.

Reviewed by Table: 5

Concerns:
• OMIT: “to better use land resources and management.” Make fewer words.
• “managed, or manage?”
• “The impact of “promoting infill” could impact existing sense of community.
• “to actively promote” “DELETE: ‘to better growth’”

Proposed Revisions:
• CHANGE: “to better” to “more use efficiently.”
• OMIT all words after promoted.
• Actively promoted
• DELETE: “to better use … growth”

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. Add Brownfields as a term goal – it generally connotes an environmental improvement

**Principle 7: Mixed Use Centers**
Centers that include a mix of integrated office, retail, residential, and civic uses are found throughout the region. These mixed-use centers – of a scale appropriate to their surroundings – concentrate uses in a manner that supports walking and transit.

Reviewed by Tables: 3, 6

Concerns:
• Achievement requires “flexible zoning” … as a principle, if we support mixed uses, we must also support this idea of “flexible zoning” (3)
• Historic preservation

Proposed Revisions:
• ADD: “… walking, bicycling, and transit.”
• Achievement requires “flexible zoning” … as a principle, if we support mixed uses, we must also support this idea of “flexible zoning” (3)
• Sensitive to value of historic resources

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. bicycling

**Principle 8: Mixed-Use Neighborhoods**

New and redeveloped neighborhoods include walkable small-scale retail, compatible business and civic uses, as well as a broad range of housing types and price levels.

Reviewed by Table: 7

Concerns:
• Change “small-scale” to “appropriately-scaled”
• Buffered retail with residential
• Will existing neighborhoods be retrofitted with retail centers?

Proposed Revisions:
• Change “small-scale” to “appropriately-scaled”
• … Compatible, well-buffered business …

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
None

**Principle 9: Environmental Quality**

Land development minimizes negative impacts on natural systems, such as air quality and water resources. There is a network of green spaces in the region that includes neighborhood parks and corridors.

Reviewed by Tables: 1, 5

Concerns:
• “The wording is negative – change to a positive statement”
• “Does it exclude Brownfields & effects of residential development” (1)
• “Such as sentence needs more”
• “Maintaining normally functioning ecosystems in the region”
• “Minimize” is she with word – is that enough

Proposed Revisions:
• CHANGE: “minimizes negative impacts” to “protects the health and viability of”
• “Land development strives to complement natural resources”
• “An extensive network of green …”
• “Neighborhood and regional parks”
• CHANGE: “improve land development Impacts on natural systems”
• OMIT: “such as air …” to end of sentence.
• “Focus on balance” (1)
• “Minimizes or improves”
• “Add habitat to ‘such as’”

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. Incorporate erosion/sediment control, storm water management and quality
2. Add habitat presentation – that improves or minimizes
3. Do not forget storm water runoff – this has not been mentioned all session

**Principle 10: Housing Choices**
A diverse mix of housing choices – in terms of size, price, type and location – is available throughout the region. Every community in the region has a good quality housing stock, maintains newer subdivisions, and has stabilized and revitalized aging neighborhoods.

Reviewed by Table: 2

Concerns:
• Feasibility and generality of second statement
• Every community does not have/maintain new subdivisions

Proposed Revisions:
• A diverse mix of quality housing… - is or is made… STRIKE SECOND SECTION
• Communities dedicated to maintaining quality housing
• Choices regionally, housing stock maintained, whatever the price range.
• Quality of housing should be clarified
• Every community in the region maintains quality housing whether newer developments or revitalized aging methods.

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
None

**Principle 11: Education Opportunity**
Quality education is available throughout the region for residents of all ages.

Reviewed by Table: 3

Concerns:
• Quality is difficult to determine – Conditions and Surroundings
• Learning Styles/Methodology
• Vague… methods of teaching available to diverse students

Proposed Revisions:
• Comprehensive Quality Education is available throughout the region for all age groups and in consideration of cost, convenience and local culture
• Facility subject content methods for teaching

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants: None

Principle 12: Public Facilities and Services
The public facilities and services such as roads, water, sewer, and parks, are necessary to support land development and redevelopment are well coordinated and are available concurrent with such development.

Reviewed by Table: 4

Concerns:
• Reads like current law: development drives facilities. Should be other way around: facilities drives development
• Taken literally, the principle allows sewers only without regard to other alternatives (e.g. community WWTPs, constructed wetlands)
• Lacks language on adequacy of services and phrasing

Proposed Revisions:
• Urban service boundaries
• Address waste-water disposal options
• Public facilities and services for development and redevelopment are intelligently planned
• The public … are well coordinated with the government and private entities involved
• Public facilities and services (such as roads, water, sewer, & parks) drive land development and redevelopment, are well coordinated & are available concurrent with desired development. (i.e. development conforming to plan)
• Public facilities and services should be available or planned to be available to support new development or redevelopment.
• Facilities drive development (reverse statement). Sewer -> sewage disposal

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. Development shouldn’t pull utilities... this model is the problem with sprawl. “Urban Growth Boundaries” should delineate the extent of public investment for utilities. This forces private developer to adjust development to match market and costs thereby more likely to create more sustainable development (environmental responsibility) and not shift resources from urban (under-utilized) to exurbia.
2. No mention of storm water problems, which is a real danger as we “hardpan” more land.
3. Infrastructure is extended only to those areas where development is desired and not to areas to be protected.
4. No wastewater disposal options! Consider urban services boundaries.

**Principle 13: Fiscal Responsibility**

Land development and redevelopment decisions and improvements to public facilities and services are made with a clear understanding of their fiscal costs and benefits to individual communities and the region.

Reviewed by Table: 5

Concerns:
- “Too many words – can be misused easily.”
- ADD: “and allocate costs among those who benefit most (financially) from development.” (impact fees)
- “Are fiscal costs known?”
- “Fiscal costs must include cost or benefit of changes to ecosystems.” (Ex: What are the costs in losing the benefits of a wetland to reduce sedimentation, flooding, etc.)

Proposed Revisions:
- “Benefits … both direct and indirect … to individual”
- ADD: “all” OMIT the words: “land” and “improvements to public facilities and services” “Their” “individual communities and the region”
- … with a clear understanding (ADD: “and allocation of”) fiscal costs & benefits …
- “Costs should be standardized to include capital, ongoing, full environmental impact, etc.”
- “Clear and commonly agreed upon understanding of direct and indirect costs.”

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. Shared decisions, shared revenues
2. Standardized cost impact studies include capital and operating cost and the full environmental costs of loss of natural habitat. (Ex. Loss of wetlands increases sedimentation, increases flooding, and decreases surface water quality)

**Principle 14: Economic Development**

Communities cooperate and coordinate on mutually beneficial economic development opportunities, on business retention and recruitment, and workforce development.

Reviewed by Table: 6

Concerns:
• “Can’t instantly understand principle in title”

Proposed Revisions:
• ADD: “… cooperate, coordinate, and share …”
• TITLE: “cooperative economic development”

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. Consider tax revenue sharing
2. Economic development is balanced with environmental impact and quality of life

**Principle 15: Intergovernmental Cooperation**

Local governments effectively communicate, cooperate, and coordinate on issues of land use, transportation, natural systems, economic development and public facilities and services.

Reviewed by Tables: 1, 7

Concerns:
• Too broad & idealistic
• How do you implement that?
• Principle stops too short – extend to public consensus to support elected officials & decision-making
• Regional citizenry
• Add consolidation (7)
• Consolation with Autonomy

Proposed Revisions:
• EXCHANGE: “effectively” for “willingly”
• ADD: “where feasible”
• Local government accept potential value of regional achievement as well as its own locality
• Encourage statesmanship
• Accept relationship of impact of local decisions on the region
• Think locally, act regionally
• Cooperate, coordinate, and, where appropriate, consolidate… (7)

General Comments from Other Workshop Participants:
1. “Consolidate” excellent addition
Appendix B: Stewardship Principle Questionnaire and Results

Stewardship Principle Questionnaire

Table Number: ___________  Name: ______________________________________ (Optional)

What percentage of new growth would you allocate to the following four prototypical development patterns? (Please note, total for all four prototypical development patterns cannot exceed 100 percent.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypical Development Pattern</th>
<th>Conventional Development</th>
<th>Compact Development on New Land</th>
<th>Infill Development</th>
<th>Redevelopment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of New Growth Allocated to Development Pattern (Total for all four cannot exceed 100 percent.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Facilitator Use Only:  Response number ___________

If you would like to submit additional comments on the Stewardship Principle please detach this comment card. Return the top portion to you facilitator now so your responses will be included in the table tally. Return the Comment Card to your facilitator before you leave the workshop today.

Stewardship Principle Comment Card

Table Number: ___________  Name: ______________________________________ (Optional)

1. Thinking about what you heard this morning, does the draft principle on stewardship accurately reflect the future we desire for the OKI region?

   1 – Yes  2 – No  3 – Somewhat  4 – Undecided

2. If you have reservations about the Stewardship Principle, what are your potential concerns?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

3. What revisions would you propose to the Stewardship Principle?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________
Results of the Stewardship Questionnaire

What percentage of new growth would you allocate to the following four prototypical development patterns?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Development on New Land</th>
<th>Compact Development on New Land</th>
<th>Infill Development</th>
<th>Redevelopment</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>1071.3</td>
<td>1115.3</td>
<td>1328.4</td>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stewardship Principle Comments

Stewardship - Draft Principle
Land uses will be well managed with respect to timing, location and costs of development and redevelopment. Some areas of the region will have higher densities of people and more intense uses than other areas. Key areas, such as hillsides, floodplains and forests, which add value to surrounding property and are intrinsically significant, are conserved, appropriately used and restored as green spaces.

Stewardship Principle Comments
1. Thinking about what you heard this morning, does the draft principle on stewardship accurately reflect the future desire for the OKI region?

Yes 18 responses
No 0 responses
Somewhat 9 responses
Undecided 0 responses
No answer 5 responses

2. If you have reservations about the Stewardship Principle, what are your potential concerns?
1. Maybe add the word "public" on the first line between "and" and "costs"
2. Water and the Ohio River have been left out. Water is so critical a need get it in there
3. Add "and improve quality of life after "add value to surrounding property"
4. Who identifies "key areas"? Micro-scale exam of regional area needed using acceptable criteria
5. Define "well-managed"
6. Add to 3rd sentence- farmland and future park land
7. Also discuss regional coordination of the effort.
8. Costs of development should be changed to value. This should reflect cost related to benefit to the community
9. Inclusion of historic and agricultural areas, that they be conserved appropriately used and restored or maintained
10. The principle doesn't explain how to accomplish
11. Need to include an emphasis on reuse or redevelopment of existing neighborhoods. We need to revitalize the urban core and restrain/restrict urban sprawl
12. Well-managed by who or what? Elected officials, commissions, or zoning & planning regulations? Maybe a composite of all
13. Possibly include language about future generations and a suitable and viable community
14. Preservation of historic structures
15. It doesn't seem to get out a value on the land itself. It has more emphasis on use of land. Once "used up" it's gone
16. We need to address farms as well as run-off and flooding of waterways - Also historic preservation needs to be considered
17. Well-managed is a vague word. Difficult to compare all areas in OKI region, but I agree in essence!
18. Reservation is primarily that any diverse people don't cause an interpretation of this "stewardship" principle to previous development
19. Fails to address concepts of alignment between adjacent governments and levels of government.
20. "Well-managed" should be defined in terms of consistency with adopted plans - vision, goals, objectives
21. Better use-reuse of our existing older housing stock commercial and industrial reuse
22. The application of the principle to shaping and altering development policies, planning and funding mechanisms. The inappropriate application of policies to all communities within the region that may be applicable to only certain communities.

3. **What revisions would you propose to the Stewardship Principle?**

1. Add cultural and historical preservation
2. Historical - View/Vista
3. Farms, parks, etc. should be added to key areas. What about link to resources identified in the environmental quality statement
4. Add concept of natural habitat corridors connecting public and private greenspace. Prioritize re-development of brown & gray fields
5. Add water to the list
6. After "intrinsically significant", add "and economically viable"
7. Add "riparian corridors" to list of key areas. Very important. We are blessed with 3 rivers plus the Ohio River and all of them should be valuable gems in our landscape
8. Broad and general enough
10. Add references to farmland and future park land to sentence 3
11. Historic and cultural significant features
12. Rural character
13. Established neighborhoods (TND)
14. Add to key areas - agricultural lands and riparian zones
15. Preserved, not conserved
16. Well managed by a regional entity responsible for adopting a long plan updated every 5 years on which to use loud decision thru a well-defined due process
17. Maybe "responsible" could be used?
18. Key areas" - preservation is very limiting. Worse, maybe suffer it to less potentially restrictive language.
19. Provide incentives at state, federal, and local level to encourage reuse of our existing resources by making better use of our existing older structures
20. Need to add areas of soil erosion, water runoff, detection/prevention and water quality-discharger
21. Land uses will be coordinated throughout the region with respect to timing, location, and costs of development and redevelopment in order to improve and protect air and water quality, to revitalize re-established communities, to promote greater transportation choices, to protect existing and future greenspace, and to enhance sustainable economic growth in the Tri-State (keep existing 2nd sentence)... 
22. Key greenspace areas - such as parks, rivers corridors, hillsides, floodplains, farms and forests will be preserved and protected for future generations.
Appendix C: Participants

There were a total of 81 attendees at Workshop 2, 53 of whom were participants. Of the 53 participants, 70 percent were from Ohio, 21 percent represented Kentucky, and 8 percent represented Indiana.

The participants represented a broad range of professional affiliations:

- Elected officials (30%)
- Planning officials (21%)
- Local government staff (does not include planning) (11%)
- Private sector business representatives (11%)
- Nonprofit organization representatives (9%)
- Citizens (8%)
- Transportation agencies (6%)
- Education representatives (4%)

Following is a complete list of all participants in Workshop 2 of OKI’s Regional Visioning Process.

**Workshop 2 Participants**

Table 1: Mary Moore, Dan Batta, Gerri Harbison, Andy Kuchta, Bob Yeager, Ed Burdell, Harry Stone
Table 2: John Bowling, Hans Jindal, Peter Klear, Corinne Gutjahr, Ken Reed, Pat Timm
Table 3: Walt Powers, J.T. Spence, Mary Ann Burwinkel, Tom Yeager, Chris Matacic, Pam Mullins
Table 4: Bob Craig, Ron Miller, Bryan Behrmann, Henry Mann, Ken Bogard, Kevin Costello, Janet Korach
Table 5: Mike Snyder, Dottie Vogt, Bill Scheyer, Chris Moran, Catherine Hartman, Mike Hammons
Table 6: Mel Martin, John Maxwell, Tim Reynolds, Marshall Slagle, Tom Pennekamp, Jane Anderson
Table 7: Judge Murgatroyd, Bill Lewis, Paul Braasch, Mike Juengling, Liz Blume, Stan Hedeen, Bernadette Unger
Table 8: Gary Moore, Glen Brand, Rick Griewe, Barbara Kalb, Carol Erickson, Barry Burke, Peg Moertl

The following people were observers who sat at the visitors’ table:
Bob Temple, RGI; Mark Alexander, RGI; Erin Donovan, Fairfield staff; and Ron Docter, City of Cincinnati.
Appendix D: Facilitators

OKI would like to express its appreciation to all those who volunteered their time and expertise to be trained and to facilitate the small group activity. Their efforts were key to the success of Workshop 2. It is hoped members of the OKI professional community will continue to participate in and support the entire regional visioning process.

Workshop 2 Facilitators:
Table 1: Ms. Larisa Hughes
Table 2: Ms. Caroline Statkus
Table 3: Mr. Paul Smiley
Table 4: Mr. Bruce Koehler
Table 5: Mr. Carlos Greene
Table 6: Ms. Catalina Landivar-Simon and Ms. Patty Bachman
Table 7: Mr. Brandon Wiers and Ms. Courtnee Carrigan
Table 8: Mr. Manning Baxter
Appendix E: Presentation

The PowerPoint presentation used during Workshop 2 is included on the following pages. Some slides have graphics animation that is not visible in hardcopy format.