

WESTFIELD TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Special Meeting – April 10, 2007 @ 3:00 p.m.

(Held in conjunction with Westfield Township Zoning
Commission Workshop and Medina County
Department of Planning Services Information Meeting,
124 West Washington Street, Medina, Ohio.)

Acting as facilitator for this meeting, Patrice Theken, AICP, Director, Medina County Department of Planning Services (MCDPS) called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Susan Hirsch and Tom Russell from MCDPS were also in attendance.

Jeffrey Plumer, Westfield Township Board of Trustees Chairman, called the trustees special meeting to order. In attendance were: Trustee Jeff Plumer and Trustee Carolyn Sims. Trustee Tim Kratzer was present as landowner for the purpose of this meeting, which he stated during panel introductions.

The information provided by the various agencies at different times during the meeting has been consolidated for purposes of summarizing the comments from each agency.

Theken – This meeting is being held today strictly to gather some information. The participants were invited by MCDPS to attend this meeting and to just provide us some information about the infrastructure in the area of I-71, I-76 and SR-224 (map of area provided to agencies by MCDPS). Our discussion today will be limited to the infrastructure – the existing infrastructure and any new infrastructure that would be required if any type of development would go on in this particular area. We are not going to talk specifically about any particular project that may be proposed or may soon be proposed or anything like that. We are not talking about any rezoning. We are not talking about any particular land uses that would be better for this area than other land uses. We are limiting our discussion to infrastructure and some environmental type of issues that might result if land in this area is developed.

Invited agencies and their representatives included:

- ODOT – Julie Cichello
- Medina County Sanitary Engineer – Jim Troike
- Medina County Highway Engineer – Mike Salay
- Medina County Soil & Water Conservation – Jeff VanLoon, District Manager
- Chippewa Watershed Conservation – Debbie Russell
- Muskingham Watershed Conservation – Mark Shultz
- Economic Development – Debbie Newman

Theken – Look at this particular area and share with us your thoughts about what kind of infrastructure would be required for this area should development occur.

Julie Cichello (ODOT) –

I'm not certain what would be required but we would probably ask for a traffic impact study showing how many trips would be coming in and out of the development. How much of an impact development will have on that intersection I can't answer but I could foresee deeper turning lanes and possible signal upgrade. We have improvements proposed at the intersection of SR-224 and Lake Road. When we did that intersection study (only SR-224/Lake Road, not any at Route 3) we did consider that additional development might occur on the SE quadrant where the old truck stop was at but that study did not include any additional proposed development. Our project right now is to add additional turn lanes and upgrade the signal at SR-224/Lake Road.

Our concern pertains to the roads that are state highways. We don't have any leverage and a developer could go in and develop a site without even coming to us but we would rather not do it that way. Typically what we do when a developer comes to us to develop a piece of land along a state highway, we would have them do a traffic impact study to show how much traffic they would bring to the site, where that traffic is coming from and then analyze those intersections that would be impacted and the developer would be responsible for making improvements to the roadways there.

Response to questions: ODOT prefers not to allow exits or a feeder road off one of our exit ramps.

Response to questions: The I-71 project is for widening I-71 over Greenwich Road. The bridges/lanes crossing Greenwich Road will remain two lanes. As to who would be responsible if there was a need to widen Greenwich Road, it was indicated that probably ODOT – it's their bridge and it's their structure (the pillars underneath that support the bridge).

Mike Salay (Medina County Highway Engineer) -

Without some data as to a proposal that would lead to a prediction of what trips would be generated, it would be hard to comment on what improvements might have to be put in as a result of any development. With reference to the Lake Road/224 intersection that was a project that came about as a result of development in Westfield Township. In 1998 the Travel Centers of America wanted to do a major expansion and the zoning commission required a traffic impact study. What was resolved at that time was they T/A was willing to close the old truck stop which would allow enough capacity for them to build their expansion on the NW corner. Negotiations also resulted in the project Julie referred to in that ODOT wanted to do an improvement at that intersection, the county wanted to do some improvement on Lake Road and T/A was willing to do some improvements on Lake Road as their contribution towards that construction so the end result was they got to build their facility, the truck stop on the SE corner was closed and the project just starting now was to build additional turn lanes. What that did was bring the level of service up at the intersection to what it should be with the T/A project and possibly some development at the old truck stop site. There are construction trailers being used at the old truck site now but it could get developed sometime in the future. I think the project maximizes what you could do at that intersection with turn lanes and signalization.

The intersection project is not creating new trips – just handling trips that exist. For any potential development project that would access onto Greenwich Road, a traffic impact study would be needed. An impact study takes the proposal and estimates what the trip generation of that proposal might be and then distributes it to the area infrastructure. The intersections of Greenwich Road/Lake Road, Greenwich Road/Ryan Road and Greenwich Road/Route 3 – those are the intersections that would have to be evaluated to see what impact any new project would have at those intersections and whether or not improvements would be needed there.

Response to questions: Greenwich Road is a county road and any improvements to Greenwich Road would depend upon the scale of the project. If you are talking about a major project then, if nothing else, at the entrance of that project you would have to put some additional pavement for turning lanes and that type of thing. A lot depends on whether Greenwich Road would have to be widened. Route 42 North of Medina is a two-lane road but it has some additional turning lanes. I think most of the additions that you would add would be turning lanes for capacity.

Jim Troike (Medina County Sanitary Engineer) –

There are no sewer or water facilities there right now so lines would have to be extended. The county does have plans coming this way eventually to run down Greenwich to take the emergency water line to Seville. As far as sanitary sewer this is an area outside of our Chippewa District but it's an area within our service area so it would be our responsibility. Discussions were held with Westfield Center Village about constructing a pump station to serve the old truck stop and to pick up some of this commercial area but it would take a meeting of the minds between the Village, the Township and this office to see what everyone wanted served to see if that was available. The Village has limited capacity in their plant but they do have capacity available. So there is potential for expansion of water and sewer but there are some limitations and it would depend on what the proposal was and the volume that would be required.

In response to questions: The water line running down Greenwich to Seville would be an emergency line that is proposed for the future, not immediately. When people want the water lines and petition for them then we'll build them. If a developer or someone else decides to build the line, does the engineering and pays for the construction, then we accept the lines and accept the responsibility.

Bill Hudson (Village Law Director) –

As to the potential of future infrastructure for sewer/water in this area, we've had some discussions, as Troike said, but it's all a matter of capacity. We had discussions with the developer at the UniCal and if that would go forward they would absorb a certain amount of capacity that the Village has available and then we would have to see what excess would be available. It's hasn't been posed to the Village yet. There is some potential for sewer but with some limitations. We have not committed to anything with anyone.

Debbie Newman (Economic Development) –

Ohio Edison services the infrastructure in the area we are talking about. Mr. Troike has already addressed the water. I contacted Time Warner to see what the Internet connection would be. They assured me they have service up to the 5700 number on

Greenwich Road but they would have to do an actual survey to see if it goes down to 5600 but they feel certain they could connect them with cable, Internet and phone services there. The 5700 direction is probably toward Seville. I do not know if the cost of installment would be to the developer or Time Warner.

Jeff VanLoon (Medina Soil & Water Conservation District Manager) -

These soils are partially floodplain soils. There is some history of drainage issues and there are probably tile lines out there that would have to be taken into account. The bigger issue is the Chippewa maintained channel and they are here to speak to that issue. On the storm water runoff issues the county engineer's office would be heavily involved with that and well lineation and anything like that and inclusions for soils that may have some potential wetland type of characteristics. As far as the ground water we don't have any information to provide other than what the wells would be providing around there. Depending on elevations the lineation of the floodplains certainly would be something to be cognizant of and be aware of as far of location of things, storm water etc. Whatever the development project would be all those provisions would be under review by various entities.

Debbie Russell (Chippewa Watershed) and Mark Shultz (Muskingham Watershed) –

We have concerns with the channel because we have an easement along the Chippewa channel. The easement extends along the channel from the top of the bank itself out 100' on each side. The channel construction was back in the 1960's. The easement gave us the right to maintain the channel and any work that is done on the channel, the berms, etc. We also need to have ingress/egress so we can get into that area off of Greenwich Road. We have structures along that channel (culverts, drain tiles, etc) that are reaching their life expectancy and need to be replaced. We hope to replace them in the near future but we would be concerned those are not removed or that the drainage would not be blocked in any way.

Response to questions: There are no standards that we have as far as drainage from retention basins other than we don't want any more water – it needs to be controlled at least. Any impervious materials could affect all areas and would have to be part of the study. Originally there were studies done to determine what sizes of culverts would be needed to drain things efficiently and effectively. Anytime you put impervious materials down the water is going to go at a different rate and that would need to be part of any new storm water management study.

Questions from Russell to VanLoon – (a) What about the capacity of the soils to hold the weight of structures, is that something to be looked at? (b) How much is the current construction by ODOT going to affect the floodplains.

VanLoon – (a) From the developer's side borings would be needed and those type of questions would have to be looked at. (b) There are several items to discuss in this regard. One is the county commissioners are involved in reviewing the floodplain guidelines and that could have some point of interest in the timing of things, the grandfathering in, etc. Also the ODOT project they are working on I'm sure has had to take into consideration their filling, etc. and rerouting of water and those kind of things around the interchange area. As to what might need to be replaced or something new this

would be determined by whatever the project would be. Storm water management studies would need to be done prior to doing any kind of improvement.

Salay – Typically any new tile would be smaller but that would be offset by the storages within the retention basins. There are rules about developing on undeveloped sites regarding storm water quantity, which is what we are talking about now. If you don't do something to store the water on impervious surfaces it will get there too fast and overload the channel so you have to accommodate for that. There are also rules about storm water quality that have to be taken into consideration with new projects. Sometimes this is done in combination with the storm water quantity basins where you build storm water quality components along with the storm water quantity basins. The retention basins would be holding back the flow so that the peak rate of discharge could be less than what it is in precondition.

Salay – Currently you can build in the flood plain but there are restrictions as to what elevations you can build to. What is regulated is what is called a floodway – that's the cross sectional area that you basically can't touch, you can't fill that area but the floodplain fringes are allowed to be filled and that's FEMA rules. The county hasn't superceded FEMA rules yet. The county commissioners are reviewing new floodplain language drafted by committee but it needs to go to a public hearing process. One of the basics they have looked at is something called compensatory storage. What that means is that you build a flood storage, you fill the floodplain area, which you are allowed to do now, and local rules might say that you have to replace that flood storage area with your project but that is something the committee is closely looking at so the commissioners may or may not adopt that kind of language. If you fill floodplain area you may not have an impact on your site but within the watershed you are taking away some of the natural flood storage space that is in that floodplain and the FEMA rules don't prohibit that at this time.

In response to several questions at different times during the meeting, landowner Tim Kratzer responded: There is one gas well on my particular property. In addition the land down in the floodplain area is humus soil, muck soil, so development would be limited in that area. As to the question about the 100' easement, a few years back Ohio Edison put a substation in this lower section to the south of Chippewa Ditch and they have a 138,000 volt line running down along Chippewa Ditch within that 100' easement. In discussions with Ruhlin Construction they were told there couldn't be anything within 200' of the ditch line in the way of borrowing soil or putting in retention basins, etc. so I don't think Muskingham or Chippewa Watershed has anything to worry about in their structures; I believe there are four 12" drain tiles that run from that 100' down into the base of the creek line on the west side.

Theken – It's almost time for the meeting to end but we'll open it to questions from the audience until 4 p.m.

Tom Bombard – I live in Westfield Township and I own property on both ends of Greenwich Road – the property past DeerPass Golf Course and property in LC and HC area and I live down the other end, which is RR. What is proposed right now? Will any of this impact any of the property that I own – on Lake Road at Greenwich and down Greenwich Road?

Theken – We're just talking about the area that is shown on this map in the vicinity of I-71, I-76 and SR-224. We know there is an unofficial potential proposal off of Greenwich Road. As to the Omni property, we know that ODOT is currently using that property for some of its trailers.

Troike – If you are talking, Tom, about sewer and water, it would be the area as a whole and it would impact your property.

Sims – If I can jump in I think the obvious is that we all have been placed in an uncomfortable situation here. I would like the record to show that I'm in attendance here to represent residents of Westfield Township and I actually object to this meeting being held but it was going to move forward so I decided to attend. I think it's premature and we have no information to discuss anything. The services that you do offer are appreciated and that is your job. I'm aware that our township zoning initiated the contact and I understand your situation but I wanted to be on record. We are trying to talk without talking.

Theken – It's not unusual for the Department of Planning Services to have meetings to be proactive about properties that are under consideration. We understand that the zoning commission as a result of some discussions that they have had may be looking at this area as far as proposing different kinds of uses in this whole area. We know there is a proposal that may be on the table sometime so the idea is for us to be able to gather information so that as time goes on and in whatever way it is presented to us we will be able to review it with that information in hand.

Comment from a person whose name was unclear – I wanted to add one piece of information. The proposed county fiber optic route would also come down Greenwich Road and it could be within 12-18 months. The fiber optic county loop being proposed is principally for commercial/industrial although nothing would prevent Armstrong or other Time Warner's to utilize it to expand to residential but the loop itself is principally being designed to service government, schools, the local industries and businesses.

Theken – Thank you. I'll now allow time for the trustees and zoning commission to close their meetings.

Westfield Township Trustees – A motion was made by Carolyn Sims to adjourn the special meeting, duly seconded, and unanimously approved.

Patrice Theken thanked everyone for attending and participating in this information meeting. Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

APPROVED July 16, 2007

(Note: Minutes Approved By Township Trustees on 7/16/07)

Marlene L. Oiler, Certified PP, PLS
Westfield Township Zoning Commission Secretary