

KRISTEN ATHA
Director



June 26, 2026

Greg Kufahl, PE
Project Engineer
Kimley-Horn
7965 N High St., Suite 200
Columbus, Ohio 43235

RE: Stormwater Drainage Manual (SWDM) Type II Variance Request – 3833-E, Sancus Blvd Widening

Mr. Kufahl:

This letter is in response to the subject variance request Type II (Non-Stream) to the 2024 SWDM Section 3 *Stormwater Control Practices*. More specifically, exemption is being sought from the SWDM Section 3.4.3.1a requirement of providing a green infrastructure SCP upstream of a City-owned underground SCP in the public R/W.

The SWDM variance application was submitted to the City on April 7, 2026. As part of the Variance review process, the subject Variance request was posted on the City website on May 7, 2026 to solicit public comments. No public comments were received by the posted due date. The Variance Review Committee has met and reviewed the subject variance application on June 24, 2026.

The submitted Variance Request was found by the Variance Review Committee to be in compliance with the SWDM Type II Non-Stream Protection Variance application requirements.

The project is located on Sancus Blvd between Worthington Woods Blvd up to Lazelle Rd, and portions of Park Rd and Worthington Woods Blvd adjacent to Sancus. The purpose of this City funded project is to widen the roadway to provide a consistent three lane section and provide a new sidewalk and shared-use path (SUP) throughout the corridor. Additionally, the project will provide street lighting, drainage improvements, and traffic control improvements along the corridor. This project will install stormwater management facilities to handle both quality and quantity control following the proposed improvements, adhering to the 2024 City of Columbus Stormwater Drainage Manual and the Ohio EPA General Construction Permit – OHC000006.

Three alternatives were considered within the application - Full Compliance, Minimal Impact and the Preferred Alternative.

Full Compliance Alternative – The Full Compliance Alternative consists of an underground detention system paired with upstream bioretention areas at each inlet location. Additional Bioretention. Due to



KRISTEN ATHA
Director



the sizing requirements for the proposed bioretention cells and the slope of the proposed ditch line, the sidewalk and SUP needed to be pushed out beyond the existing R/W to be able to grade in a flat bioretention area with adequate treatment volume. One bioretention cell was adequately sized to treat the contributing drainage area but was not deep enough with the proposed design to provide enough storage volume. The SUP adjacent to this bioretention cell needed to be pushed out beyond the existing R/W limits to provide additional grading limits to provide the required storage volume. The bioretention areas shown in the full compliance alternative would meet the GI requirements associated with the underground system but would result in significant R/W, tree, utility, and grading impacts beyond the impacts associated with the project. Due to these conflicts and high costs, this Alternative was found to be not feasible.

Minimal Impact Alternative – The Minimal Impact Alternative consists of an underground storage system paired upstream bioretention areas at each inlet location. This alternative would remove the additional grading and impacts identified with the full compliance alternative but without this additional area, the bioretention cells would not meet the standard design requirements for a bioretention cell. Some bioretention cells could be installed under the ditch line in this area, but a flat bottom would not be able to be provided as the longitudinal slope of the ditch line would need to be maintained, resulting in a storage volume that is less than the requirement based on the tributary areas. One bioretention cell could be added as currently graded but would be limited to ~3” in depth and would not provide adequate treatment volume to treat the full contributing drainage area. While these bioretention cells would not be able to meet all of the design standards for a standalone SCP practice, they would provide the pretreatment required for the underground systems without the additional impacts beyond the existing R/W including several trees, fences, and landscaping. The additional bioretention SCPs would also require utility relocations at all additional inlet locations and would increase the total cost of the project. The bioretention cells shown in the minimal impact alternative would meet the pretreatment requirements for OEPA standards but would not meet the SWDM requirement of pairing the underground detention system with a GI practice. Similarly to the Preferred Alternative, this alternative was also found to be not feasible due to described above issues.

Preferred Alternative – The Preferred Alternative is very similar to the Minimal Impact Alternative and includes bioretention cells where feasible and replaces the bioretention facilities with a grass swale and sump structures where cells could not meet design standards. Grassed swales would be designed to meet pretreatment requirements for a grassed swale found in the OEPA Rainwater and Land Development Manual, and additional sump inlet structures would be provided for additional pretreatment capacity. This alternative reduces the additional impacts beyond the existing R/W shown in the Full Compliance alternative and reduces cost and utility impacts shown in the Minimal Impact Alternative. The SWDM quantity and quality control requirements will be met with this design alternative except the SWDM requirement to fully pair the underground system with a GI practice. This requirement would be partially met with the inclusion of some bioretention areas, but a GI practice would not be able to be constructed at all inlet locations.



KRISTEN ATHA
Director



After considering pros and cons of the above alternatives, and based on the recommendation of the Variance Review Committee, the Preferred Alternative is conditionally approved contingent upon the following stipulation:

- E-3833 plan and corresponding Stormwater Management Report must be submitted and approved by the City of Columbus.

No approval contained herein relieves or absolves the applicant of any provisions of applicable state or federal laws. Please contact PR/SRM Section Manager Greg Fedner, P.E. at 614-645-8072 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

Robert Priestas by Paul W. Wilson

ED92EB9A20DC429...

Robert S. Priestas, P.E., Administrator
Division of Water Reclamation

ec: Variance Review Committee
File

