

Crescent Springs Small Area Study

Task Force Meeting Minutes

Location: NKAPC Commission Chambers

Tuesday, March 17, 2009

6:00 – 7:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE:

Bobbie Baker – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area

Joe Baker – Crescent Springs City Attorney

Jim Collett – Mayor of Crescent Springs

Matthew Damon – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Villa Madonna Academy

Eric Haaser – Crescent Springs Resident

Dawn Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident

Bob Mueller – Crescent Springs Resident

Louis Prabell – Crescent Springs Resident

George Ripberger – Crescent Springs City Employee

Mark Rogge - – Crescent Springs Resident / KCPC Representative

Scott Santangelo – Crescent Springs City Council Member

Greg Sketch – Crescent Springs Resident

Bill Toebben – Owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area

Tom Vergamini – Crescent Springs City Council Member

Edward Dietrich – NKAPC – Project Manager

James Fausz – NKAPC

ABSENT:

Ben Bratton – Local Resident

Bobby Chipman – Crescent Springs Resident Residing Within Study Area

Barrie Creamer – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area

Andy Eisner – Crescent Springs Resident

Matthew Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Covington Latin

Daniele Longo – Crescent Springs Resident

Scott Siefke – Co-owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area

1. OPENING COMMENTS

Mr. Dietrich began the meeting at 6:05 P.M. with a brief overview of how the meeting would run. He described that the task force would first discuss items remaining from last meeting such as the election of a Chair and Vice-Chair, discussion of attendance requirements, and the study name. Following that conversation would be a discussion of the market analysis and an opportunity for the task force to ask questions as necessary. Mr. Dietrich explained that he would review the topics of sustainability and green

infrastructure and then Jim Gibson from Sanitation District No. 1 would present information on their attempts to clean up the combined sewer overflow issues within the region.

2. REMAINING ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING

Election of Chairman

Mr. Dietrich entered into a discussion of Chair and Vice-Chair for the committee by calling for nominations. Mr. Santangelo. Nominated Tom Vergamini and John Baker seconded the nomination. After Mr. Vergamini was asked for comment the committee voted unanimously in favor of Mr. Vergamini being Chair.

Election of Vice-Chairman

Mr. Dietrich noted that the responsibility of the Vice-Chair would be to take over the duties of the Chairman when he was not in attendance. After brief discussion, Mark Rogge nominated Mr. Santangelo. And George Ripburger seconded the motion. Mr. Fausz called for the committee to take a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

Adoption of Minutes

Mr. Dietrich determined that there was not adequate time for review of the previous month's minutes. The committee decided to postpone adoption of the minutes until the next meeting so that the task force would have further time to review the minutes. Mr. Dietrich will send the minutes via email with a return receipt attached.

Introductions

Mr. Vergamini asked for Mr. GS to introduce himself since this was his first attendance at a task force meeting. Mr. Sketch gave a brief introduction of himself explaining that he is a Boone County Engineer and has been a resident of Crescent Springs for about 15 years.

Attendance Requirements

Mr. Dietrich and Mr. Fausz explained to the task force that creating an attendance requirement could be beneficial to the task force as a preventative effort to ensure that those voting on the final plan are those who have participated in the majority of task force conversations and are sufficiently educated on the issues faced by Crescent Springs. Mr. Fausz suggested that the committee could require attendance at market analysis meeting as well if they felt necessary. Mr. Dietrich added that NKAPC strongly encourages task force members to attend public meetings as well. Attendance at these meetings is helpful in explaining to the public the discussions which have already been covered at task force meetings and a better understanding of the thoughts of those who attend the public meetings.

Mr. Rogge questioned if excused absences should be considered. Mr. Vergamini asked if decisions are made on a majority rule, to which Mr. Dietrich responded that typically task forces use a simple majority rule on decisions. Mr. Santangelo suggested that it should be the discretion of the Chairman to determine if someone should be allowed an excused absence. After further discussion, Mr. Santangelo suggested that missing more than three meetings would disqualify a task force member from voting but the Chairman retains the right to provide excused absences. It was agreed through general consensus that Mr. Santangelo's suggestion would become the requirement and would only be required for regularly scheduled task force meetings.

Mr. Rogge asked about the requirement of a quorum for task force meetings. Mr. Dietrich noted that it is preferable to have a quorum, but not a requirement for this process. Given the sixteen member task force nine members would form a quorum. The only time a quorum will be completely necessary for a decision on the final plan unless the task force decides another issue has come up that will require a vote.

Study Name

Mr. Dietrich turned the conversation to the official study name and the importance of drawing people from the community to the public meetings for input into the study. Mr. Santangelo suggested working with the existing city logo of “gateway study”. Ms. Baker liked the city logo idea. Mr. Vergamini suggested that the name should include part of the city name and Mr. Santangelo felt the need to differentiate this study from other studies. Ms. Johnson asked Ms. Baker if any of the local residents had any preference for the name of the study. Ms. Baker noted that thus far the residents do not feel the name of the study is important. Residents seem to be more concerned with the fear that their homes will be taken from them. Mr. Fausz reassured Ms. Baker that that is not the intention of this study. General consensus was reached to name the study “Crescent Springs Gateway Study”.

3. MARKET STUDY

Mr. Dietrich asked the committee if they had any questions left from the last presentation of the market analysis. Mr. Vergamini asked why “food stores” were shown as a need which could be fulfilled in the area when Remke’s is currently located within the study boundary. Mr. Dietrich clarified that Remke’s reports their numbers via the location of their headquarters and not from the store location itself. Ms. Johnson asked if the income numbers were skewed based on a higher income for the entire city of Crescent Springs and if the information can be filtered for the study area. Mr. Dietrich responded that there are a lot of higher income residences within Crescent Springs. It does not appear that it is a minority of residents. Mr. Vergamini noted that there has been a huge jump in income from 1990 to 2000. Growth accelerative over those ten years and Mr. Vergamini asked for Mr. Harnish to supply information pertaining to the accelerated growth in income of the area based on the 1990 census data information. He noted that many housing units were built after 1990.

Mr. Dietrich noted that the county and the entire area have no real need in many areas for additional commercial uses. It would not be preferable for a business to close its doors in one area to open in a nearby area based on visibility. That is not the same as bringing in new business. There are a low percentage of single family homes in the area and Mr. Dietrich would be interested to see the changes since 1990.

The question was posed about the length a market study could be considered valid. Mr. Dietrich answered that generally the time frame of a study is five years, however, with the slowing economy it could last as long as eight years. Mr. Santangelo noted that he is cautious about focusing all attention on the market analysis because the information may become irrelevant further down the line.

Ms. Johnson asked if there has been any attention or movement to mass transit for the area through the stimulus package. Mr. Dietrich responded that nothing has been discussed specifically for the study area but some things have been discussed across the river. Mr. Dietrich also noted that transportation will be the topic of the next task force meeting as the traffic analysis for the study area will be completed at that time.

Adam Kirk, from NKAPC, will be present at the next task force meeting to present that information. Mr. Dietrich also noted that keeping regional mass transit in mind will be important to this area as the study area may lie in close proximity to future projects which may run parallel to the interstate.

4. SUSTAINABILITY

Mr. Dietrich began his presentation about sustainability by noting that sustainability will be a much larger part of the upcoming comprehensive plan than in previous updates. He presented some common definitions of sustainability and explained that the definition has grown over time to include more than just an environmental prospective. It now sometimes includes economic and social factors. Some of the concepts of a sustainable economy include diversity, green materials, products designed for reuse/recycling, use of local materials, less packaging, and reduction in shipping. The elements of a sustainable society include affordable housing, education for all, health care for all, walkable communities, mass transit, live, work, and play communities, and meaningful employment. The elements of a sustainable environment include expanded natural habitat, reduction/elimination of pollution, renewable energy, stormwater management on individual sites, increased tree canopy, and a balance of urban development vs. suburban development.

Mr. Dietrich described NKAPC's role in sustainability as a primary element of the upcoming 2011 countywide comprehensive plan. The goals of NKAPC are to make buildings more energy efficient, provide opportunities for more trees to cool the heat island effect, utilization of green stormwater management techniques, reduction of impervious surfaces, balance of urban development vs. suburban development, and provide affordable housing in convenient locations.

5. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Dietrich described that the NKAPC definition, per the most recent comprehensive plan update is as follows – “a network of vegetated or non-paved area(s) that sustains the diversity and quality of natural systems and contribute to the health, economic vitality, and quality of life for the community and people”. Green infrastructure is primarily the environment of the location. In any new development or redevelopment NKAPC is pushing for more thought to be made to green infrastructure issues. Some of the efforts to improve green infrastructure include maintaining existing natural habitats, enlarging habitats if possible, building connecting corridors between habitats, linking habitats to built environments, managing stormwater on site, increasing tree canopy and reducing impervious surfaces.

Mr. Dietrich also reviewed ideal percent tree canopy cover for different development areas based on standards created by American Forests and adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency. Downtown and industrial areas should maintain 15% tree cover, urban residential and light commercial should maintain 25% tree cover, and suburban areas should maintain 50% tree cover. Mr. Dietrich estimated that the study area is somewhat between the urban residential and suburban categories. As NKAPC has begun the existing conditions analysis of the study area and has found the study area to maintain only 5% of tree canopy cover versus 29% for the entire city. Additionally, NKAPC has reviewed the amount of impervious surface in the study area and found it to be at 54%. The study area is a part of the Ohio River watershed and therefore impervious surface within this area affects the Ohio River.

Questions

Mr. Santangelo asked Mr. Dietrich what types of strategies can be used to reduce impervious surfaces. Mr. Dietrich noted that some areas can be designed to manage stormwater by allowing water to filter through faster than simple grassy areas. Mr. Dietrich added that another way to reduce impervious surface is to build “up” rather than “out”. Permeable pavement is not always the answer to this issue. While pervious pavement does not increase the amount of impervious surface in an area, it can not be used for all uses. Currently, roadways are not constructed out of permeable pavement. Most commonly, permeable pavement is used in parking lots. Mr. Santangelo also asked about the use of green roofs. Mr. Dietrich noted that the expense of green roofs typically too high to see immediate benefits.

Mr. Santangelo and Mr. Toebben both asked questions pertaining to impervious surface numbers in the area. Mr. Dietrich noted that the hillside was left out of the study area because it was virtually undevelopable but noted that this area would increase tree canopy percentages if considered as part of the study area. Mr. Vergamini asked if the railroad was considered to be impervious surface based on the fact that water flow changes near the railroad bed. Mr. Dietrich explained that the railroad acts as a barrier to where the water flows but is not considered to be impervious surface.

Mr. Toebben asked if NKAPC encourages reduction of impervious surface rations through zoning. Mr. Dietrich explained that this is something NKAPC is currently looking into but does not currently make official recommendations for nor has attempted to regulate through zoning.

Mr. Mueller asked if there are any target numbers for canopy cover with respect to aesthetics and Mr. Vergamini asked if there are any advantages of canopy as a noise insulator. Mr. Dietrich noted that the ratios presented are not code they are recommendations used as a general standard for redevelopment. There have been some studies which show that trees and landscaping aesthetics improve land values as well as the psychology of the people who live close to these areas. Ms. BB noted that the proper vegetation needs to be used to cut down on noise; not just any trees or brush will do.

Mr. Vergamini noted the 54% impervious surface for the study area and asked if there is a recommended percentage. Mr. Dietrich noted that they only recommendations he has are for watersheds. The amount of impervious that is currently in the area contributes to the flooding problems that many areas now see. Mayor Collett noted that the issues with Dry Creek and Eubanks Rd. needs to be observed throughout this study to ensure that the problem is not made worse. Mr. GS noted that the Interstate contributes to the flows of stormwater and communities should be working with this now to fix the problem. Mr. MC asked if there are specific goals which this task force should aim to achieve. Mr. Dietrich said that there are no specific numbers at this time to aim for and considered this to be a good time to turn the conversation over to Jim Gibson from SD#1 to give his presentation.

6. SANITARY DISTRICT #1

Mr. James Gibson, Director of Water Resources, gave a brief overview of the consent decree they are currently under to improve the water quality. SD #1 is the first to use a watershed approach to address the

consent degree. He explained the difference between combined sewers and separate source sewers. The consent decree requires SD #1 to eliminate all separate source sewer overflows and manage combined sewer overflows to certain levels. Crescent Springs does not have combined sewers. Another problem Jim showed was creek and stream erosion. Erosion has caused streams to shift and enlarge their waterways so much that sewer pipes once running along the stream are now in the stream. The erosion problem also threatens roads running along some streams. Jim explained the impact of lost vegetation along the stream; how it slowed run-off entering the streams and held the bank in place reducing erosion.

Mr. Gibson stressed that SD #1 could not do this alone. So many factors go into this problem. One of the biggest is impervious surfaces. The more impervious surfaces in a watershed the more stormwater enters the system causing overflow problems. Land use and impervious surfaces drives what SD #1 does to address it overflow problems. Most impervious surfaces are within the commercial land use category even though it is a relatively small land use. The biggest pollution problem is not overflows but stormwater run off.

Greg Sketch, using Big Bone drainage basin in Boone Co. as an example, pointed out that much of runoff is natural and that the goal is to maintain those levels when development occurs. Mr. Gibson agreed.

Mr. Vergamini asked if there were standards for stormwater run-off. Mr. Gibson said no.

Mr. Gibson went on to discuss grey infrastructure and how this is needed. Green infrastructure can not be the only way to fix the problem. More and large tunnels are going to have to be built along with more treatment capacity. He urged green infrastructure to be used to minimize the grey infrastructure necessary to be built. Green infrastructure can also increase base load. In the summer with low rainfall there is not enough water in the streams.

Mr. Gibson gave a list of places where pervious surfaces are being used. SD #1 gives a credit for installing pervious materials and does not count these areas when it is calculating the rate of the parcel.

Mr. Sketch asked if the pervious surfaces have been studied over time. Mr. Gibson said there are studies and SD #1 is monitoring some of the sites in the area. So far the pervious concrete is doing fine. It is still pervious. The preparation underlying the pervious surface is critical to the success of the material. The pervious asphalt in their parking lot is not looking good.

Mr. Gibson went on to show examples of other green infrastructure techniques. Bio-retention swales are very effective. Native plants are used, they are the best suited to the soils in the area; showed examples on reducing pavement by replacing under used pavement with green areas; stream buffers and reforestation are other techniques.

By studying the aquatic insects in streams SD #1 is able to determine the condition of the stream. Dry Creek is rated as very poor and not able to support aquatic life. Pleasant Run is similar. Dry Creek has some serious erosion problems as well.

Mr. Vergamini asked about modifications in what use to be crescent Park and Lakeside Park. That area is upstream from Crescent Springs. Mr. Gibson acknowledged that SD #1 is planning to do work in that area but was not familiar with the project. What ever they do should improve water quality down stream. Mr.

Vergamini asked if it is possible to put into the regulations of the study area that these green infrastructure techniques be the preferred way of managing stormwater.

Mr. Ripburger asked if it was possible to retrofit green infrastructure techniques and Mr. Gibson said yes to this and also said SD #1 has a credit policy that can reduce the amount of money a property owner has to pay if they do reduce the amount of stormwater flow into system.

7. RAP-UP

Mr. Dietrich said the next meeting will be on May 27th at 6:00pm.

Mr. Vergamini asked about the next public meeting and Mr. Dietrich said it would be in June or July. He also asked if there is a targeted audience for the public meeting and Mr. Dietrich said as much of the public as we can attract. He also said that the staff will try and get a news story in the paper about the meeting and place notices in public places and signs along the road if possible. He also said NKAPC could send out a notice in the mail to people in the study area but not to everyone in the surrounding area.

Ms Johnson asked about publicity and Mr. Haaser asked about web site and Facebook. Mr. Dietrich said the meeting will be publicized on the NKAPC web site and that NKAPC is discussing whether to have a presents on Facebook.

Mayor Collett asked about PUD zoning. Mr. Dietrich explained that it is a zoning technique usually designed for a large mixed use development. They can be a broad or as detailed as wanted. They usually say they require a certain amount of different uses. It could be used for the study area.

Mr. Toebben said that his company does not like PUD's because of all the requirements. He said that currently the PUD has too many hoops to jump through. He said PUD's can work but his company avoids them. Mr. Sketch said a PUD is usually an overlay zone that can be applied to an area. Mr. Sketch went on to say that changing the zoning of an area can not take place without the consent of the land owner. Mr. Dietrich and Mr. Vergamini disagreed with this statement. Zoning can be changed without the land owners consent.

Mr. Santangelo moved to adjourn the meeting, Joe Baker second the motion. The meeting was adjourned by a unanimous vote.