

Roberto, Cheryl

From: Joe Martin [JTMartin@MartinSoftware.com]
Sent: August 28, 2000 11:11 AM
To: Roberto, Cheryl
Cc: Doutt, John
Subject: CMFPU Stakeholder Comments



Revisions to Columbus
ESDA - 8...

Cheryl,

First I would like to thank you for such a professional presentation the evening of 8/24/2000 and for the opportunity to provide comments. As discussed, I am submitting three (3) comments relating to the Environmentally Sensitive Development Area (ESDA) of the Draft Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update:

1. REVISIONS

Please strengthen the language concerning protection of the ESDA and add other agencies and jurisdictional bodies to the service determination process as specified in Section III, Item B-1. As you requested, I have attached revised text (with all marked revisions) in Microsoft Word format for your use. I feel that this revised text is accurate, reasonable, and appropriate as a replacement for the draft text presented.

2. CITIZENS UTILITIES CORRECTION

A reference to a third Citizens' Utilities facility located in along the Big Darby Creek, just south of Interstate 70 was omitted in Section III, Item 5. This plant has been re-permitted several times by OEPA in the recent past to support increased development, enabling a pocket of urban sprawl within the ESDA.

3. STUDIES

Many studies have been previously conducted in the ESDA area which support the ongoing limitation on development for this area. Many of these studies were sited during the creation of the Environmental Conservation District policies and boundaries in the 1993 Columbus Comprehensive Plan and the Brown Township Comprehensive Plan Update in 1998. These studies include:

- A. Franklin County Comprehensive Plan, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, December, 1969
- B. Water-Related Facilities Plan, Burgess & Niple, Ltd. For Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, December, 1969
- C. Big Darby Creek Corridor Study, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, August, 1974
- D. Area Study #4, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Staff Report), 1974
- E. Sewage Plan for Southwestern Franklin County (Preliminary Engineering Report), Malcolm Pirnie, Inc., January, 1974
- F. Brown Township Drainage and Land Use Policy Study, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, March, 1982
- G. West Columbus Interim Development Concept: 1991, Dick Ritchie, Area Planner, 1991

H. Hellbranch Run Drainage Improvement Study, Burgess & Niple, February,
1994

Joe Martin
8601 Morris Rd.
Hilliard, OH 43026
(614) 870-9601 home
(614) 875-8733 Ext. 31 work
(614) 870-0150 fax

PROPOSED REVISIONS
SECTION III, ITEM B1

1. *Environmentally Sensitive Development Area (ESDA)*

While development pressures remain strong in the western part of Franklin County, This area is particularly sensitive to negative impacts from development because of the presence of area's proximity to the Big Darby Creek Watershed (a State and National Scenic River system), extensive hydric soils, and minimal slope. Of particular concern is the potential for wastewater and stormwater pollution that could would come from with haphazard growth. Creation of the Environmentally Sensitive Development Area (ESDA) is consistent with the 1993 Columbus Comprehensive Plan's provision for an Environmental Conservation District. Unplanned growth poses a treat to the Big Darby Creek Watershed and its unique aquatic and prairie land ecosystem.

It is recognized that some future development of this area, specifically in Brown, Prairie, and Pleasant townships, may occur. While the City of Columbus will ultimately provide centralized services within it parts of the ESDA, no service whatsoever shall be provided within the ESDA until the City of Columbus, Brown, Prairie, and Pleasant Township trustees, City of Hilliard, Darby Partners, Franklin County Commissioners, Franklin Soil and Water Conservation District, Metro Parks, Darby Creek Association, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, Nature Conservancy, and the OSU Extension Office has determined come to a joint determination that such service is in the area's best interest and that the following conditions are met for the area to be serviced:

- ☒ Riparian buffer restrictions along the Darby Creeks and their tributaries including the Hellbranch Run, Clover Groff Ditch, and Hamilton Ditch;
- ☒ Comprehensive stormwater management planning, funding, and implementation;
- ☒ Conservation developments restrictions are in place which involve the concepts of clustering development to maintain preserve tracts of open space and farmland; and
- ☒ Adequate public facilities, including roadways, fire, and police protection, exist or are planned and funded to support any proposed development.

Roberto, Cheryl

From: Carrel, Donna M. [Donna.Carrel@qwest.com]
Sent: August 29, 2000 4:36 PM
To: CLRoberto@cmhmetro.net
Cc: JDoutt@cmhmetro.net
Subject: CMFPU Stakeholder Comments

Cheryl,

Thank you for the presentation on the 24th. Many of those present were very familiar with some of the information, however to a committee, such as ours in Brown Township, this information was extremely informative.

I do have one item that I would like to comment on concerning the document titled 'DRAFT' of the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. On Page 3 of 6, the second paragraph under Environmentally Sensitive Development Area. There is a sentence that reads, "..... no service whatsoever shall be provided within the ESDA until the City has determined that the following conditions are met for the area to be served.....". As a very active member of the above mentioned community and a resident within that very area, I believe that the decisions concerning the ESDA should be broader that the City of Columbus.

Below I have included language from the 1998 Brown Township Comprehensive Plan:

1. Environmentally Sensitive Development Area (ESDA)

While development pressures remain strong in the western part of Franklin County, This area is particularly sensitive to negative impacts from development because of the presence of area's proximity to the Big Darby Creek Watershed (a State and National Scenic River system), extensive hydric soils, and minimal slope. Of particular concern is the potential for wastewater and stormwater pollution that could would come from with haphazard growth. Creation of the Environmentally Sensitive Development Area (ESDA) is consistent with the 1993 Columbus Comprehensive Plan's provision for an Environmental Conservation District. Unplanned growth poses a treat to the Big Darby Creek Watershed and its unique aquatic and prairie land ecosystem.

It is recognized that some future development of this area, specifically in Brown, Prairie, and Pleasant townships, may occur. While the City of Columbus will ultimately provide centralized services within it parts of the ESDA, no service whatsoever shall be provided within the ESDA until the City of Columbus, Brown, Prairie, and Pleasant Township trustees, City of Hilliard, Darby Partners, Franklin County Commissioners, Franklin Soil and Water Conservation District, Metro Parks, Darby Creek Association, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, Nature Conservancy, and the OSU Extension Office has determined come to a joint determination that such service is in the area's best interest and that the following conditions are met for the area to be serviced:

Riparian buffer restrictions along the Darby Creeks and their tributaries including the Hellbranch Run, Clover Groff Ditch, and Hamilton Ditch;

Comprehensive stormwater management planning, funding, and implementation;

Conservation developments restrictions are in place which involve the concepts of clustering development to maintain preserve tracts of open space and farmland; and

Adequate public facilities, including roadways, fire, and police protection, exist or are planned and funded to support any proposed development.

Your 'DRAFT' of the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update states that, Columbus will ultimately provide centralized service. So please do not make this a annexation issue.

If it looks like annexation, smells like annexation, it is probably annexation. This area could be one of large lots and something really unique. Let's sit down and really plan this area out. It should be and could be a win win for us all.

Sincerely,
Donna Carrel
Resident of Brown Township

September 4, 2000

Comments
Policy Unit
Office of the Mayor
City of Columbus
90 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Comments Regarding City of Columbus Facilities Update Plan

To Whom it May Concern:

As a resident of Brown Township, living approximately two miles from Darby Creek and twenty-five miles from downtown Columbus, I take great interest in the City of Columbus Facilities Update Plan regarding extension of sewer lines into western Franklin County. In my opinion, there are several areas of concern and inconsistency in the proposed plan, thus making it unacceptable. I would also note that, having attended the August 24, 2000 update meeting with city representatives, there is a great deal of skepticism around the entire county regarding the actual intent of this plan. It is unfortunate but in offering the Update document, the city is politicizing the Ohio EPA. I will summarize the points of interest I see below:

- I applaud Columbus facilities planners for extending the Environmental Conservation District as defined by 1993 Columbus Comprehensive Plan to a larger "Environmentally Sensitive Development Area" (ESDA). However, in laying claim to being the singular provider of sewage treatment for this district, we in the townships face a reality that Columbus annexation plans are not far behind. The city is on record repeatedly that it does not extend water and sewage treatment to property not annexed to, or contracted with the City of Columbus. ***Assuming Columbus plans annexation of Brown Township in the future, Columbus zoning is distinctly at odds with the Brown Township Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 1992, updated in 1998), especially regarding population density in the Darby Watershed.***
- Columbus appears to be (over) reacting to the potential of alternative wastewater systems. These systems have scientific backing on many fronts, and acceptance would cost the city little in lost revenue. This is a control issue for Columbus. ***Were the Ohio EPA to offer regulation of these alternative systems "post-permit", Columbus should have little argument against them if their concerns are strictly environmental.***
- Page three of the Columbus Metro Facilities Plan Update, Item B1, paragraph 2 states that no service shall be provided within the ESDA until the *City* (my italics) has determined that certain conditions are met. ***Clearly, the City is not the entity to decide the future of the townships.*** Development within the context of Franklin County zoning regulations and, in my case the Brown Township Comprehensive Plan will continue. Alternative wastewater systems should be considered viable alternatives during such time if deemed appropriate by the County and Township involved.
- Page six of the Columbus Metro Facilities Plan Update, Item C. states that Columbus will not provide sewer service to the Madison County area because "this area will not be developed at densities greater than 2 people per acre". I applaud the City's sensitivity to the population density desired by Madison County. However, the Brown Township Comprehensive Plan, adopted 1992 and updated in 1998, calls for lower population density than the Madison County Ohio Farmland Preservation Plan cited by Columbus. ***If the***

September 6, 2000

city has no interest in these lower density districts, it should exclude Brown Township from its plan as well.

- I quote the Columbus Comprehensive Plan, adopted by Columbus City Council in 1993 regarding the Environmental Conservation District: "It is the recommendation of the Columbus Comprehensive Plan that the city of Columbus:

Protect the district from inappropriate uses.

Discourage development in the district.

Not extend the Big Run subtrunk or any other centralized facilities to serve any portion of the district.

Not extend water distribution facilities into the district.

Support the efforts of Brown and Prairie Townships to preserve open space and discourage high-density development within the district.

Support the creation of a Metro Park along Big Darby Creek in Brown Township.

Cooperate with current and future efforts to preserve the environmental quality of the Big Darby watershed."

The Facilities Plan Update is greatly at odds with the 1993 Columbus Comprehensive Plan. The only reason for extension of the sewage system is high-density development in the Darby Watershed.

In summary, I suggest the Ohio EPA reject the Columbus Plan, and where possible, remove itself from the politics of Columbus growth plans. Under an environmental mask, the City states that annexation and facilities planning are separate issues, but sewer and water plans are the backbone of annexation, irrespective of township plans. If Columbus is serious in this "separation of issues", it should offer its services, not by decree, and without the attached annexation requirement. I suggest the EPA and city of Columbus study the low-density, Brown Township Comprehensive Plan, and its effect on the Darby watershed. The Plan has been constructed by thoughtful citizens, in conjunction with township trustees and MORPC, and with numerous technical and environmental inputs. I believe its development plan best fits the Darby Watershed requirements. It is consistent with Columbus stated goals in its own Comprehensive Plan regarding the Environmental Conservation District.

Sincerely,



Lawrence Baumgartner
Brown Township Resident

CC: The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Attn: Christopher Jones, Director
Lazarus Government Center
P.O. Box 1049
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1049

Franklin Count Commissioners
Attn: The Honorable Arlene Shoemaker
373 South High Street, 26th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

John Tetzloff
606 Woodbury Ave.
Columbus, OH 43223
276-4550
7 September 2000

Cheryl Roberto, Policy Advisor
Office of Mayor Michael Coleman
90 W. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Mayor Coleman and Ms. Cheryl Roberto;

I wish to comment on Columbus's draft Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. I will restrict my comments to one particular aspect of the plan, its impact on the Big Darby Creek watershed. My qualifications for giving testimony about the creek stem from over 3 years of research for an upcoming book on Darby's aquatic ecosystem. I am also currently working with a state grant to study the freshwater mussel community of the lower Big Darby Creek.

The Darby watershed is in danger of a loss of biodiversity because it lacks an overall watershed protection plan. For this reason, I am generally supportive of having a facilities plan that could contribute to a broader level of planning in the watershed.

In reviewing the draft, however, I am concerned about what I consider to be several shortcomings. These are: 1) The Environmentally Sensitive Development Area (ESDA) does not include all of the Franklin County portion of the Darby watershed. 2) Though the plan mentions riparian buffers, comprehensive stormwater management, and "conservation development" restrictions, it does not go into enough detail about what "environmentally sensitive development" would look like, or, in lieu of details, what process the city would use to determine if a development is environmentally sensitive; 3) the plan does not specifically say that Columbus embraces the goal of ensuring Darby's biodiversity against the effects of future development; and 4) the plan does not explain what annexation policy Columbus will pursue in its implementation. I will expand on these concerns below.

1. The Darby watershed is an aquatic ecosystem of global significance. Thirty-six rare or endangered fishes and mussels have been recorded in its waters, and the Nature Conservancy has named it one of the Last Great Places of the Western Hemisphere. Columbus has wisely stated that the Darby watershed should be developed in an environmentally sensitive way.

However, for unexplained reasons a portion of the watershed east of Hellbranch Run has been left out of the ESDA. Ironically, this is the most threatened area of the watershed, and there certainly is no good reason for its omission. It is well-documented that Hellbranch Run has *already* been heavily impacted by development. Therefore the

appropriate stance for the city to take would be to target Hellbranch for restoration, not further development exempt from special environmental standards.

Hellbranch Run is the only major tributary in the lower half of Big Darby, and as such it has great impact on the Darby mainstem. It is worth taking a moment to outline this impact.

By far the most profound effects Hellbranch has on Darby are due to changes that have occurred in the hydrology of the Hellbranch watershed--in particular changes in how stormwater behaves when it passes through the Hellbranch system. Historically the Hellbranch area retained much of the precipitation it received in hydric soils and wetlands. This water was filtered and then slowly released through surface or subsurface flow into Hellbranch, and eventually to Darby.

With changes in land use in the area--first from agriculture, and now increasingly from development--this pattern began to change. Water that was once held back in storage is now encouraged to drain as quickly as possible across impervious surfaces and through ditches and storm sewers into Hellbranch and its tributaries. This has resulted in a destructive pattern of high flows immediately following rains, followed by unnaturally low flows in dry periods between precipitation.

What are the effects of this altered hydrology? In general, they cause Hellbranch and Darby Creek to behave like they are larger streams, since they must accommodate greater and more frequent peak flows. This results in bank erosion and substrate instability as the streams struggle to find a new balance between their physical shape and their new flow rates. Erosion and instability have already drastically changed Darby's stream channel and imperiled its aquatic life. Bank erosion causes the stream channel to widen and water to become shallower and warmer. It also introduces tons of sediments into the creek. Substrate instability leads to the destruction of the natural riffle-pool structure of the creek, and disruption of the food web through displacement of aquatic insects and the scouring out of mussel beds.

Today the lower 20 miles of Darby are practically devoid of freshwater mussels, at least in part due to hydrologic alterations upstream. And although some of these alterations are attributable to agriculture, the worsening of the problem in the last several decades makes it clear that development pressures are now the chief threat.

For these reasons no area of the watershed should be exempt from environmentally sensitive development. The Hellbranch Greenways Plan recommends that all development in the Hellbranch drainage mitigate further hydrologic alterations through sophisticated development design. I ask you to please include all of the Franklin County portion of the Darby watershed in your proposed ESDA.

2. The devil is always in the details. If "environmentally sensitive development" means simply riparian buffers, stormwater retention ponds, and cluster housing, this

almost certainly will not be enough to preserve the hydrology and water quality of the watershed. State-of-the-art environmental development is required to preserve one of the most sensitive natural resources left in the state. It would be unreasonable to request that you predict in detail how and where development will be pursued in the watershed. However, at the least Columbus should state its intention to contract for an environmental study to provide these details, and to use the results in planning how negative impacts can be avoided.

3. The importance of Darby Creek is not that it is a pretty stream or a nice place to have a picnic: Its importance is that the creek is home to a relatively intact ecosystem that still harbors rare and endangered species, many of which have disappeared from all but a handful of Midwestern streams. This means that it is our responsibility to protect a nationally, and even globally significant biosphere. As you state in your video: "Darby is Ohio's Grand Canyon." Having an Environmentally Sensitive Development Area is only meaningful if Columbus specifically commits itself to the goal the shielding Darby's animals from the impacts of development. This simple objective should be plainly stated in your facilities plan.

4. Already we have seen negative response to Columbus's proposal from the county and townships. There is obviously a good deal of distrust in rural areas of the county stemming from the perception, sometimes justified, that Columbus will unilaterally pursue its own interests. Fears of annexation in rural sections of the county are rampant, and occasionally well-founded. For example, Columbus's intention to annex into the Darby watershed along Rt. 40 and develop the property is seen as evidence that the city will pursue its own objectives whenever it likes, even as it preaches cooperation and environmental sensitivity. This inconsistency does not suit the putative leader of the metropolitan area. Your facilities plan seeks to unify policy throughout Franklin County. As such it must be a cooperative effort between Columbus, Franklin County, local townships and municipalities, and other interested groups (MORPC, environmental groups, Metro Parks, etc.). I would agree that Columbus is the obvious entity to take the leadership role; however, Columbus must be a benevolent leader.

Clarification (and negotiation) of Columbus's annexation policy would be an obvious place to start mending fences. Presumably Columbus is proposing to expand sewer and water lines into some areas not specifically mentioned in the plan without annexation? While I cannot presume to give advice on the exact policies Columbus should pursue, I would urge the city to pursue its dialogue with local entities in a spirit of compromise for the common good.

I will close with an anecdote that highlights my concerns about development in the Darby watershed. In the course of my research I have closely monitored Columbus's statements and actions with respect to Darby. I have been encouraged to see Columbus evolve from the domineering bully that considered damming Darby its inalienable right, to

the entity that first set aside an area of the watershed as an environmental conservation district.

For this reason I was surprised one day to drive by a new Columbus development on Johnson road, just south of Bolton Air Field. This residential complex, named Grasshopper Creek, was a study in how *not* to develop in an environmentally friendly way. There was no stormwater mitigation--storm sewers led directly into a Hellbranch tributary--and construction had turned the landscape into a well-drained moonscape. The riparian border along the creek had mostly been removed, and no silt screens, mulch, or grass seed had been used to stop massive erosion from pumping tons of mud into the waterway. (See enclosed photos.)

But the biggest surprises were yet to come. I immediately called the Ohio EPA to report the problems. I was assured that the site would be looked at. I also alerted the Nature Conservancy, who I believe also contacted the EPA. Several weeks went by, and one day I happened to drive by the site again. To my amazement absolutely nothing had been done. I called the EPA again and was told that they were overworked and usually let Columbus monitor projects within its border (I have no idea why I wasn't told this the first time around). When I called an official with Columbus's office of Sewer and Erosion (I'm not sure if this is the exact name of the department), I quickly realized I had not reached a environmentally enlightened public servant.

I noted the shortcomings with the site in what I considered to be a polite tone. This official's response was to ask me if I thought I knew how to do his job better than he did. The official insisted that there was no problem with the site. I insisted that I had been to the site and was not imagining things. He then stated that his department tried to do what we (environmental nuts, I suppose) wanted, but we were never satisfied. He argued with me over the condition of the site, asking me exactly how many trees were left along the creek. When I stumbled in answering (I hadn't counted them), he suggested I was a liar. He even mentioned that the developer was having financial problems, implying that he shouldn't be pushed into expensive mitigation measures or he might go bankrupt. The official finally grudging said he would look into it, but made it clear that I was wasting my time.

Later in the day he called back and apologized profusely. I took him at his word that he had simply overreacted. I later received a call from my EPA contact, and found out that he had called the Columbus official. At this point the correctable problems with the development site were addressed. The result of this episode was that I was no longer confident that Columbus's public stance toward Darby would be translated into oversight in the field. I think you can see why I am anxious to get explicit commitment from the city for detailed environmentally sensitive development. The creek can't handle too many more Grasshopper Creeks.

Sincerely,



John Tetzloff

①



Grasshopper Creek development off of Johnson Road, spring of 2000. Note that riparian vegetation has been removed, the land has been graded to "improve" drainage, and no silt screens, mulch, or grass seed have been used along the creek.



Another section of Grasshopper Creek. Some riparian vegetation has been left, but part of the stream bank has been shorn and graded.

2



A view of the upland portion of the development illustrates how the entire property has been graded to drain into the storm water sewers, which drain to the creek. Note also the extreme erosion visible on sloped land. Again, no silt screens (except around the drain), mulch, or grass seed have been used to control erosion.



Silt screen around drain. These are rarely effective when they are the only method of control. This one has an obvious leak; but even when they slow the sediments, these sediments pile up around the drain and eventually wash in when, after construction is completed, screens are removed. All of the soils visible in these pictures will eventually wind up in Darby Creek.

Send petition to:

Office of the Mayor
C/O Policy Unit
City of Columbus
90 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Send a copy to:

The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Attn: Christopher Jones, Director
Lazarus Government Center
P. O. Box 1049
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1049

Franklin County Commissioners
Attn: The Honorable Arlene Shoemaker
373 South High Street, 26th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

PETITION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, being residents of the unincorporated area of Plain Township, support the position of the Franklin County Board of Commissioners and the Plain Township Board of Trustees in opposing the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. This Plan is not responsive to the needs and goals of Plain Township. Moreover, the obvious purpose of the Plan is to continue the annexation policy of Columbus by conditioning the provision of sewer services only upon annexation to the city. For these and other reasons, we request that the Plan proposed by Columbus be disapproved.

Date	Name	Address
9-29-00	A. Rozella Barber	5608 Babbitt Rd New Albany, Oh
9/30/00	Dean Long	5607 BABBITT RD NEW ALBANY, OH
9/30/00	H.R. Wiggins	5633 BABBITT RD New Albany, OH
9/30/00	Hilda Jean Wiggins	5633 Babbitt Rd New Albany, Oh.
9/30/00	Patricia Bailey	5760 Babbitt Rd, New Albany, OH
9/30/00	William R. Zuby	5760 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio
9-30-00	R. Rustad	5782 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio
9-30-00	Andrea Gray	5782 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio
9-30-00	Douglas L. Martin	5853 Babbitt Rd New Albany, Ohio
9-30-00	James McCall	5853 Babbitt Rd New Albany OH 43059
9-30-00	Daniel C. Cox	5933 Babbitt Rd New Albany OH 43059
9-30-00	Margaret Hanna	6015 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio 43054
9-30-00	Maria & Cadell	6015 Babbitt Rd New Albany 43054
9-30-00	Jane Pearson	5597 Babbitt Rd N.A.
9-30-00	Patricia Pearson	5597 Babbitt Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9-30-00	Stanley Pearson	5597 BABBITT RD New Albany Ohio 43054
9-30-00	Uma Cheadle	5566 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio 43054
9-30-00	Raymond Monney	5566 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio 43054
9-30-00	Kenneth W. Washington	5500 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio 43054
9-30-00	Margaret Washington	5500 Babbitt Rd New Albany Ohio 43054
9-30-00	Robert Stoneman	5496 BABBITT RD New Albany 43054
9-30-00	Ben Stenecker	5496 Babbitt Rd New Albany, OH
9-30-00	Daniel J. Stover	4830 Babbitt Rd New Albany 43054

PETITION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, being residents of the **unincorporated area of Plain Township**, support the position of the Franklin County Board of Commissioners and the Plain Township Board of Trustees in opposing the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. This Plan is not responsive to the needs and goals of Plain Township. Moreover, the obvious purpose of the Plan is to continue the annexation policy of Columbus by conditioning the provision of sewer services only upon annexation to the city. For these and other reasons, we request that the Plan proposed by Columbus be disapproved.

Date	Name	Address
10/1/2000	Nonna E. Chalongo	7475 New Albany Condit ^{New Albany}
10/1/2000	Mike Brown	6675 Albanyview ^{Dr. Westerville, OH}
10-1-00	Mustin Brown	6675 Albanyview ^{Dr. Westerville, OH}
10/1/00	Esther Reinbover	7950 Central College Rd ^{N.A.}
10/1/00	Killian A. Maydon	7541 N.A. Condit Rd, ^{New Albany, OH}
✓ 10-1-00	Rebecca Caudill	7672 E Granville Rd ^{New Albany}
10-1-00	Doree Cox	5933 Babbitt Rd. ^{New Albany}
10-1-00	Jean Biddison	5431 Babbitt Rd ^{New Albany}
10-1-00	Fred Biddison	5431 BABBITT RD. ^{NEW ALBANY}
10-1-00	Chris Van Meter	5285 Babbitt rd. ^{New Albany}
10-1-00	Marsha Denton	5266 Babbitt Rd. ^{New Albany}
10-1-00	Doyle Deats	5266 BABBITT RD ^{NEW ALBANY}
10-1-00	William H. Bandy	5233 Babbitt Rd ^{New Albany}
10-1-00	Carolyn Bandy	5233 Babbitt Rd, ^{New Albany}
10-1-00	Margaret Spencer	5126 Babbitt ^{NA}
10-1-00	David Spencer	5126 Babbitt, ^{NA}
10-1-00	Donny R. Calaman	5125 "



PETITION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, being residents of **the unincorporated area of Plain Township**, support the position of the Franklin County Board of Commissioners and the Plain Township Board of Trustees in opposing the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. This Plan is not responsive to the needs and goals of Plain Township. Moreover, the obvious purpose of the Plan is to continue the annexation policy of Columbus by conditioning the provision of sewer services only upon annexation to the city. For these and other reasons, we request that the Plan proposed by Columbus be disapproved.

Date	Name	Address
10/1/00	Nichole E. Lyons	8002 Morse Road
10-1-00	Say, Ronald	8010 Morse Rd.
10-1-00	Arthur Martin	8014 Morse Rd
10-1-00	Mildred Martin	8014 Morse Rd
10-1-00	Allen Jenkins	8056 Morse Rd
10-1-00	Bichi Monongy	8078 Morse Rd.
10-1-00	WJ Jr	8090 Morse Rd
10-1-00	David Adams	4220 Avis Rd
10/1/00	Jerry Andrews	4220 Avis Rd
10/1/00	Frank Zollinger	8092 Morse Rd
- 10/2/00	Stanley Adams	3925 PINE MEADOW RD.
- 10/2/00	Wendell Miller	3930 Pine Meadow Rd.
10/2/00	Bryce Bell	3871 Pine Meadow Rd. N.A.
10/2/00	Valerie Kendall	7764 PINE MEADOW Dr. N.A 43054
10-2-00	Vicki Baird	3872 PINE MEADOW RD.
- 10/2/00	Jim Kohank	3840 Pine Meadow Rd
10/2/00	Sharon D Roberts	3840 Pine Meadow Rd 43054
- 10/2/00	Grace R. Slopator	3774 Pine Meadow Rd 43054
- 10/2/00	Dave Myers	3756 Pine Meadow Rd. 43054
- 10-2-00	Bob My	3756 Pine Meadow Rd. 43054
10/2/00	Keith Barnham	3773 PINE MEADOW Rd 43054
10/2/00	Glenn Kutridge	8008 Morse Rd N.A. 43054

PETITION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, being residents of the unincorporated area of Plain Township, support the position of the Franklin County Board of Commissioners and the Plain Township Board of Trustees in opposing the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. This Plan is not responsive to the needs and goals of Plain Township. Moreover, the obvious purpose of the Plan is to continue the annexation policy of Columbus by conditioning the provision of sewer services only upon annexation to the city. For these and other reasons, we request that the Plan proposed by Columbus be disapproved.

Date	Name	Address
09-29-00	Clodith E. Jerry	7575 Central College New Albany
09-29-00	Carol Jerry	7575 Central College Rd New Albany
9/30/00	Matthew Jones	7585 CENTRAL COLLEGE NEW ALBANY
9/29/00	Lachrya Cornell	7601 Central College NEW ALBANY
9/29/00	Sienna Mergoff	7621 Central College IN 43054
9/29/00	A Mergoff	7621 Central College IN 43054
9/29/00	D K Elliott	7700 Central College 43054
9-29-00	Leann Alice Kellatt	7700 Cent College 43054
9-29-00	Thomas W Danner	7730 CENT. Coll. Rd., NA 43054
9-29-00	Diana Danner	7730 Cent. Coll Rd NA 43054
9-29-00	Hubert Kellatt	10237 Johnston Rd IN 43054
9-29-00	Clara C. Har	10289 Johnston Rd Albany 43054
9/29/00	Keith M. Farland	5214 Central College Rd 43081
9-29-00	R D McFarland	5214 Central College Road 43081
9-29-00	Virginia Frost	5230 Central College Rd 43081
9-29-00	Paul Frost	5230 Central College Rd 43081
9-29-00	Brittany Frost	5230 Central College Rd 43081
9-29-00	Ryan M. Lin	5364 CENTRAL COLLEGE RD
9-29-00	Laura Stron	5364 Central College Rd 43081
10-1-00	Deanna M. Coffman	7585 Central College Rd 43054
10-1-00	Shay K. Coffman	5370 Central College Rd 43081

PETITION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, being residents of **the unincorporated area of Plain Township**, support the position of the Franklin County Board of Commissioners and the Plain Township Board of Trustees in opposing the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. This Plan is not responsive to the needs and goals of Plain Township. Moreover, the obvious purpose of the Plan is to continue the annexation policy of Columbus by conditioning the provision of sewer services only upon annexation to the city. For these and other reasons, we request that the Plan proposed by Columbus be disapproved.

Date	Name	Address
9/29/00	Laurance L Becken	5708 Babbitt Rd 43054
9-29-00	Mary Joann Becken	5708 Babbitt Rd 43054
9/30/00	Bob Livingston	4224 Avis Rd.
9/30/00	Nancy Livingston	4224 Avis Rd.
9/30/00	James M. Lawler	4124 Avis Rd
9/30/00	Patricia Schmitt	4110 Avis Rd
9/30/00	Wm Smith	4110 Avis Rd
9/30/00	JL Law	4076 Avis Rd.
9/30/00	Subank	4141 Avis Rd
9-30-00	C. H. A. Schilly	4103 Avis Rd
9/30/00	Richard D. Myers	3875 Avis Rd
9/30/00	Terry Rankin	7650 Morse Rd
10-1-00	Betty Haughey	7690 Morse
10/1/00	Cheryl A. Kamm	7730 Morse Rd
10-1-00	Ludwick J. Kamm	7732 Morse Rd.
10-1-00	Lillian Shannon	7802 Morse Rd.
10-1-00	Val Kamm	2892 Morse Rd
10-1-00	Robt R. Taylor	7908 Morse Road
10-1-00	Kevin Kibler	7944 Morse Rd.
10-1-00	Jane Kibler	7944 Morse Rd.
10-1-00	Margaret E. Hatem	7990 Morse Rd.
10-1-00	Michael E. Hatem	7990 Morse Rd.
10/1/00	Michael D. Lucas	8002 Morse Rd

PETITION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, being residents of the unincorporated area of Plain Township, support the position of the Franklin County Board of Commissioners and the Plain Township Board of Trustees in opposing the Columbus Metropolitan Facilities Plan Update. This Plan is not responsive to the needs and goals of Plain Township. Moreover, the obvious purpose of the Plan is to continue the annexation policy of Columbus by conditioning the provision of sewer services only upon annexation to the city. For these and other reasons, we request that the Plan proposed by Columbus be disapproved.

Date	Name	Address
9-29-00	William H. Powell	7280 MORSE RD, NEW ALBANY, OH, 43054
9-29-00	Frank M. Brown	7280 Morse Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9-29-00	William H. Flannery	3973 Avis Rd. New Albany OH 43054
9-29-00	Michael S. Davis	3993 Avis Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9-29-00	Myron, Lisa	7300 Morse Road New Albany, Ohio 43054
9-29-00	Cynthia Mulvey	7300 Morse Road New Albany, OH 43054
9-29-00	Daniel J. Goronky	700 Morse Road New Albany, Ohio 43054
9-29-00	Theresa Fuller	7200 Morse Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9-29-00	Michael Brainer	7321 Morse Rd. New Albany 43054
9-29-00	George Klyce	7150 Morse Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9/29/00	Beverly A. Olyffe	7150 Morse Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9/29/00	Edith Osborne	7254 Morse Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9/29/00	Charles Osborne	7354 Morse Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9/29/00	John Klyce	7276 Morse Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9/29/00	John Klyce	3961 Avis Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9/29/00	Mark Klyce	3961 Avis Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9/29/00	Wanda E. Rosen	4111 Avis Rd. New Albany, Ohio 43054
9-29-00	James V. Rest	4111 Avis Rd. New Albany 43054
9-29-00	Jeffrey Klyce	4533 Avis Rd. New Albany, OH 43054
9-29-00	Camille Stalger	4230 Avis Rd. New Albany, Ohio 43054
9-29-00	Elizabeth Stalger	4230 Avis Rd. New Albany, Ohio 43054
9/29/00	James J. Rak	4216 Avis Rd. New Albany, Ohio 43054
9/29/00	Madonna B. Rak	4216 Avis Rd. New Albany, Ohio 43054

Ohio's Greatest Home Newspaper

The Columbus Dispatch



• [Search dispatch.com](#)

[Back to the Editorials-
Letters to Editor index
page](#)

• [How to
send letters
to the editor](#)

Centralized sewers are safest option for central Ohio

Saturday, August 12, 2000

Over the next two decades, it is estimated that more than 300,000 additional people will choose to make central Ohio their home. Our communities must begin to act now to build a stronger, safer region through responsible growth.

One of the key issues to be addressed is how to deliver safe, clean water and sewer service. If our region is to grow and prosper, we must make decisions that protect our environment and residents' quality of life for the long term.

Cities' investments in centralized sewers have paid off with several decades of safety and reliability.

Some groups now propose alternative sewage-treatment methods for Franklin County, known as land-application systems. The treated waste water from these plants is sprayed onto the land, and can easily make its way into the ground water and streams.

After reviewing the new proposals, we believe these land-application systems should not be used in our area.

The first problem is that the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency does not provide oversight for safe operation of these plants.

There is no permit to set the operational standard, no system for the early detection of problems and no enforcement authority if problems do arise. Despite the efforts undertaken recently by Franklin County commissioners to adopt some basic standards, there is still no independent public regulation of the disposal of wastes in these operations.

Even a well-maintained, perfectly operating system can spawn another serious problem: haphazard, unplanned growth.

Package plants allow the rapid, unchecked development that has plagued our communities with environmental degradation and increased traffic congestion, in contrast with common-sense growth in areas where roads, sewers, schools, police, fire and other necessary services can be made available.

History shows that the consequences are much worse in cases where waste-water treatment plants fail. Since these alternative systems spawn random development far from any backup sewer system, rescuing a failed package plant unnecessarily drains public resources. Columbus faced this situation in 1987 after the Franklin County Sewer District announced it had more than a dozen failing sewer-treatment plants. Eleven of these areas were then connected to Columbus' centralized sewer system in order to provide residents with the basic service they required and to protect the environment.

The use of package plant systems in central Ohio can and should be stopped. We encourage all concerned citizens to join us in urging the Ohio EPA to adopt a waste-treatment plan for our region that bans the use of land-application sewer systems. We are committed to work together to protect our water and our neighborhoods and to promote common sense growth. Please join us.

New Albany Mayor Colleen H. Briscoe

Columbus Mayor Michael B. Coleman

Obetz Mayor Louise W. Crabtree

Editor's note: The mayors of Canal Winchester, Gahanna, Grandview Heights, Grove City, Hilliard, Reynoldsburg and Westerville and the city manager of Dublin also signed this letter.

[HOME](#) | [SPONSORED EVENTS](#) | [CLASSIFIEDS](#) | [ONLINE YELLOW PAGES](#) | [SUBSCRIBE](#) | [CONTACT US](#)

Copyright © 2000, The Columbus Dispatch