

UMCH DEVELOPMENT

A Multi-Use, Community-Centered Proposal

Presented by Project Community Park Worthington

August 2020



Table of Contents

UMCH Development Proposal	Page
Background & Purpose	2
Executive Summary	3
About Project Community Park Worthington (PCPW)	5
The Vision – Worthington’s Community Commons	6
Steps to Realize the Vision	11
Financial Impact Analysis	13
Additional Tangible Benefits	17
Negative Impacts of High-Density Development at UMCH	20
Conclusion	21
Appendices A, B, C	22

UMCH Site Development Proposal

Background & Purpose

This proposal, which we submit for public consideration, brings a new vision for the development of the United Method Children's Home (UMCH) property. It reflects the desires of Worthington residents to create a lasting legacy for the public good. Times are changing and bringing into sharp focus the need for new approaches and new solutions. We believe the residents of Worthington should finally experience the benefits that a community-centered development of this site will deliver.

The UMCH property, comprises roughly 44 acres, including the Methodist Church Conference Center at the corner of Wesley Blvd and High St. The UMCH parcel is located near the geographic center of Worthington, within one mile of over 50% of Worthington residents. It has been owned by UMCH (and its predecessors) since 1913, but ceased operations in 2010.

For more than a decade, this valuable parcel has been dormant and often the center of heated debates in our community. Initial plans posed by large developers received significant pushback from the community and were abandoned. Our group, Project Community Park Worthington, (PCPW) emerged to bring action transparently reflective of Worthington's citizenry and combined with a sound action plan. Through countless meetings and discussions, and a petition representing more than 1,000 Worthington resident signatures (see Appendix A), we present a culmination of these conversations in this proposal.

At the heart of our proposal is a large, community greenspace anchoring a new vibrant commercial corridor along High Street, and new residential housing that harmoniously integrates with Worthington Estates. We refer to it as Worthington Commons and envision a gathering place that is a point of pride for our community.

In May 2020, the Urban Land Institute held a webinar entitled, "Parks are Essential Business" which highlighted the importance of parks and greenspace, especially in light of the COVID-19 global pandemic. It argues not only for the physical and mental health benefits of large greenspace, but also makes the case for economic development implications. Parks are essential business – we couldn't agree more.

Consider one other central Ohio community: New Albany. It recently completed Rose Run Park after 20 years in the making, aspiring to provide "the physical, visual and emotional heart of the community." This is just one example of many in which a community prioritized the preservation of green or natural space, and purposefully integrated among other community assets. New Albany also demonstrates a project like this does not happen overnight.

We ask the city to adopt and genuinely pursue a community-centered solutioning process as the foundation for the UMCH site re-development going forward. This document is intended to aid this process, primarily by demonstrating (by using the city's own analysis) that high-density residential development is a significantly less viable financial alternative as compared to the PCPW multi-use approach presented in this document.

The UMCH site represents a "once-in-history" opportunity. It offers our community the chance to do something that's age-old and tried and true: preserve natural greenspace in the heart of our city for the well-being of residents and our natural world while layering in commerce, housing and amenities. We should maximize the value of the unique qualities found only at the UMCH site to create something that will energize and inspire both today, and future, generations of Worthington citizens.

We are grateful that you are willing to consider this proposal for our community, and we eagerly invite you to join our effort for the good of our entire community, for generations to come.

Executive Summary

Unlike prior efforts, this proposal is grounded on the needs and desires of essential stakeholders: first and foremost, our residents, but also the United Methodist Church, present owners of the UMCH property, and the City of Worthington itself. Meeting these stakeholder needs is achieved by utilizing a “multi-use” development approach comprised of three distinct development types:

- a robust commercial zone: fronting the park and running along High St., providing a vibrant retail and restaurant corridor with offices above;
- a residential zone: sized and scaled to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and
- a signature community commons: serving as the centerpiece, not just for this development, but the city as a whole.

It is critical to note that the financials of this proposal enable the city to ultimately acquire this property, develop and maintain it on a self-sustaining basis. This is accomplished based on three important features of this proposal

- The relatively large commercial zone, including new Class A office space, generates significant revenue in the form of city income tax.
- The relatively small amount of residential units (residential uses have a negative financial impact on city finances; see Financial Impact and Analysis section for additional details).
- We propose the city acquire the entire parcel and, along with professional services, act as master developer and sell off the commercial and residential portions (see Realizing the Vision section for additional details).

Alternative funding sources such as public/private partnerships, state and/or federal grants, endowments, and others should be explored to offset the city’s initial outlay.

This design leverages the synergy of co-locating a signature public greenspace with commercial office space and retail amenities like restaurants. Potential blue-chip tenants will find a premier business location abutting a signature community commons all located on High St. just minutes from I-270. The intent is to market this new opportunity to those seeking an ideal location for a corporate headquarters and recruit a destination dining establishment, à la Milestone 229 along the Scioto Mile in downtown Columbus.

At the heart of the property, taking advantage of the natural beauty of the Tucker Ravine watershed and surrounding environs, this proposal envisions a signature public greenspace, accessible to all. We tentatively call this space Worthington Commons, as its essential purpose is to further connect our community, provide a vibrant gathering space all and do so within a peaceful, natural setting in the heart of our city.

Multi-Use Definition

This proposal defines “multi-use,” as the following:

- 10 acres Commercial & Retail
- 3 acres Residential
- 31 acres Greenspace, including:
 - 27 acres of parkland
 - 4 acres Tucker Creek watershed

Acquisition Costs & Net-Revenue

FINANCIAL ASSUMPTIONS

Fair Market Total Purchase Price The acquisition of the total UMCH property (one-time)	- \$12,378,900
Sale of Select Parcels (one-time)	+ \$9,750,000
Park Development Initial Costs Services, Infrastructure, Capital Costs	- \$455,750

ANNUAL FINANCIAL PROJECTION

Total Annual Costs Financed loan of purchase	- \$285,659
Total Annual Revenue From Commercial Income Tax	+ \$668,400
Annual Net Revenue	+ \$382,741 / year

Important Notes: The fair market total purchase price is detailed in the Financial Impact and Analysis section. We’ve received feedback this is above market and too high of price. In an effort to demonstrate fairness to the property owner and not undervalue the parcel, we’ve kept the high number. This also demonstrates the “math” still allows for ultimately a self-sustaining model. The detail behind these figures, largely informed by the City’s own 2018 cost-to-serve financial analysis, are further outlined in the Financial Impact and Analysis section.

Community-Centered

Our core belief is that the UMCH parcel is a valuable, indeed an irreplaceable, asset and it must be used for the greatest common benefit to the residents of Worthington. Given its size and location it will be a natural focal point of the city. Beyond the residential and commercial functions, it could be available for any manner of community event, from weddings to Shakespeare in the park, sports from soccer to softball, corporate “get-a-way” meetings, community gardens, nature trails and the like. The community should participate in determining what specific amenities to include. We also see it as an “island of green” providing the ideal locale to unwind, relax and soak up the surrounding natural beauty of the park.

And its benefits go beyond the “feel good” variety as it will bring commerce to this city in the form of new businesses, new shoppers and new tourists (wishing they had a park like ours, no doubt!). Most importantly, will be accessible to all, available to all, and enjoyed by all.

About Project Community Park Worthington (PCPW)

Our Organization

PCPW is a true grassroots organization of citizens that built this effort step-by-step beginning in 2018. Neighbors and friends gathered for a backyard cookout shared concerns about development proposals for the UMCH site and wondered what they could do. After holding numerous house gatherings to discuss the site, it became obvious there was consensus around a better vision for the site. A working group led by four co-chairs – Kacey Brankamp, Roger Beck, Andy Hutter and Scott Taylor – formed to advance the work of the group which is dedicated to preserving and transforming the contiguous greenspace within the UMCH property into a self-funding community commons, playing the role of Worthington’s Central Park.

Mission

In accord with our city’s long history, we advocate for bequeathing to future generations a valuable public asset at the UMCH property— a signature, multi-use community greenspace— for the benefit and enjoyment of all.

Principles

- We embrace this goal because the UMCH property is a uniquely important site—due to its location, size, and physical features—for the future of our city, and we have just one opportunity to get it right.
- We believe that the developed site should reflect the interests and values of our city’s residents— those who have sunk roots, made their homes, and both know and express the character of our city.
- We are committed to obtaining full disclosure of relevant information, in the service of informing a robust and reasoned public dialog about the future of this property and its impact on our community.

City-wide Surveying and Petitioning

Our group gathered citizen input and built a vision of a community commons from dozens of community meetings and our booth at the Worthington’s Farmer’s market. We launched a website as a part of an outreach to Worthington residents, continuing this dialogue and refining our proposal. In the summer of 2019, we completed a literature drop, visiting every house in Worthington, raising awareness and gathering feedback. The result was a petition signature initiative which gathered over 1,000 signatures in support of the basic vision and mission. These signatures were presented to Worthington City Council on October 07, 2019.

The Vision

PCPW strongly supports mixed use development because it can result in a financially desirable scenario for city finances and a far superior outcome better benefiting all Worthington residents (compared to apartment-heavy alternatives).

Our vision features a community commons at the heart of the property with commercial along the High St. corridor, and modest residential along the northern perimeter.

1. **Commercial** development along High St. We propose Class A office with ground-level retail and outdoor space adjacent to greenspace:
 - Parking is an important topic that PCPW acknowledges and recognizes as a real challenge. Parking (for both the public amenities and the commercial office) should be addressed by design professionals.

2. **Greenspace** featured in the center and the Tucker creek ravine. Our vision is for an “active” park with a variety of amenities that would provide recreation and relaxation for visitors. The type of amenities, their location and the timing of their installation can be completed in phases based on input from residents, city’s finances and other considerations. We have staged these amenities into:
 - near term - could be developed in the timeframe of the park purchase, at low cost; and
 - extended term - based on public feedback and priorities, built and delivered over time once the city acquires the site.

3. **Residential** along northern edge of site:
 - Dedicate a 3-acre parcel along Larrimer Ave. We leave the type of housing, whether affordable, for seniors or others, out of this proposal. We suggest this be determined as part of the community-centered planning effort.
 - We suggest exploring earmarking a portion of the income tax generated by the commercial strip to support either senior or affordable housing should the community determine one of those uses is appropriate for the site.

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

PCPW believes the blueprint for a signature development should be grounded in the expressed desires of Worthington's citizenry. We look forward to the results of the Visioning process to gain further insight in to the specifics of these desires. That said, we have put together this visual illustrating what could be done with this space. Our intent is to stimulate thinking and creativity, not necessarily dictate specific amenities for which we're advocating as part of this proposal. **By acquiring the site, the city and its residents have control over the types of amenities available to our community.**



This conceptual design illustrates structured parking (in tan color) within the Commercial Development corridor along High St. It is acknowledged that additional parking will be needed for park visitors. There are many parking options to be considered:

- where parking should be located,
- whether several small parking areas are preferable to one large parking lot,
- weighing the pros and cons of surface parking versus a multi-story parking structure, etc.

We opted to **not** define these parking option herein, but rather resolve this as part of the detail design phase of the park project.

A LOOK AT TWO OF CENTRAL OHIO'S ICONIC PARKS – GOODALE AND SCHILLER

We take much inspiration from two grand, old, “signature” parks in our surrounding neighborhoods, specifically Goodale Park in Victorian Village and Schiller Park in German Village. Both parks were established in the latter half of the 19th century and over the last 100-plus years, both have become popular, indeed integral, fixtures within the communities they serve.



Goodale Park



Schiller Park

One point of interest is their relative size compared to the size of their surrounding communities:

- Goodale Park
 - Victorian Village acreage: 316.9
 - park acreage: 32.7
 - park as percent of community size: 10.3%
- Schiller Park
 - German Village acreage: 233.0
 - park acreage: 23.5
 - park as percent of community size: 10.0%

Of note, in both cases, these parks constitute approximately ten percent of the acreage of the community in which they are located.

PCPW is asking our city council to set aside 27 acres (not including the Tucker Creek watershed) in central Worthington. These 27 acres constitute 8.3 percent of

Worthington's acreage. Note, the Tucker Creek acreage was excluded as it is a protected watershed and therefore will be part of any and all UMCH development proposals. This analysis is informative in that it demonstrates that this proposal is squarely in line with that of other iconic parks in the area – certainly not too big, and yet not too small.

Further, we feel that Worthington Commons has the critical mass in term of its geographic footprint to support a wide variety of amenities (as detailed below) and to offer the needed “insulation” from the thrum of city life to positively impact public health, civic well-being, and ultimately both residential property values and new business development.

For more than a century Schiller and Goodale parks have proven to be immensely popular civic assets - true crown jewels to their communities. As Worthington comes to a decision on the UMCH property, let us imagine what future citizens, in 20, 80, or 160 years, will be telling others about their hometown ...

We love our life in this quaint New England village. I think my favorite part about living here is our grand old park with huge trees and oodles of space for us to really get away from the hustle and bustle of the day, even if it's just for 30 minutes. And, best of all, it's right in the middle of the city; I walk to it every day!

EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE NEAR-TERM, LOW COST AMENITIES:

Paths & Trails

Walking paths and trails offer a low-cost, low-maintenance amenity to be enjoyed by all citizens. The terrain of the UMCH parcel offers the ideal physical location for paths and trails to both challenge our younger residents and provide a leisurely stroll for seniors. These trails would connect the Tucker ravine area in the south to the proposed 55-plus residential development at the north end of the park.



Sports Fields

Soccer Moms and Dads agree ... Worthington *really* needs more playing fields. One of the biggest items of feedback we received from our constituents is a community park with ample space suitable for soccer, and other athletic, events.

Enabling our children to walk or ride a bike to soccer practice is a welcome alternative to Mom or Dad driving 15-30 minutes, one-way, to ferry their junior athletes to, and then from, practice. It is noted that sport fields are cost effective, as they are very low maintenance for Worthington's Parks & Recreation department



Community Gardens

Worthington has a proud tradition of community gardens and many residents show a strong desire to work the soil. We propose a new set of gardens, augmenting those located at Worthington's community center.

There is ample room for the development of additional community gardens within the UMCH greenspace, at little, or no, cost to the city.



The Big Park Experience

Tot lots and pocket parks serve a purpose and are found today in multiple locations across Worthington. Only a substantial park, one that surrounds you in green, one that offers 360 degrees of insulation from the hustle and bustle of the modern world, can provide that special sense of tranquility to recharge and refresh. That perfect Spring morning, when you have the rising sun all to yourself is what a big park is all about.



EXAMPLES OF EXTENDED TERM AMENITIES:

Event Venue

Dedicated space for weddings, corporate meetings, or other social events is not available today in Worthington. These centers have proven popular in neighboring towns across central Ohio. As one example, Upper Arlington's facility is currently booked eighteen months in advance and generates approximately \$50,000/year in revenue. Revenues from facility rentals offset other park expenses.



Amphitheater

Shakespeare in the park, afternoon music concerts, alfresco weddings ... the potential uses of an outdoor amphitheater are somewhat endless.

A small, and quite rundown, amphitheater already exists on the UMCH property. PCPW proposes to upgrade this facility to enable seating for an audience size of 80-100 landscaped into the existing slope.



Food Truck Venue

The park plan envisions a road separating the commercial from the greenspace that is "double-wide", meaning one lane for traffic and a second lane for food trucks.



Outdoor Education & Natural Play Areas

The Tucker Creek ravine flows through the southern section of the UMCH property and offers a beautiful natural setting. Nature has proven important in children's development in every major way – emotionally, intellectually, socially, spiritually, and physical (Kellert 2005).

Natural play areas have been gaining in popularity. The Columbus and Franklin County Metro Parks offer off-trail natural play areas at eight of their parks. There is opportunity to provide passive natural play and also more structured outdoor education in this lovely setting.



REALIZING THE VISION – THE ACTION PLAN

Achieving the vision of a Worthington Commons – our community’s Central Park – must involve the city taking a leadership position to make this happen. We believe it is time for the city to proactively act on behalf of its citizens and do what is best for this community.

Phase 1: Planning

- Council hold a public meeting on the topic
- Prepare an alternate vision for the use of UMCH site, including necessary resolutions from Council. This could include freezing zoning at the property.
- Identify funding sources for professional services
- Retain appropriate professionals to guide the City through all phases and contingencies
- Negotiate with UMCH property owner for acquisition of the site
- Explore additional funding sources for initial purchase of property such as state/federal grants, donations, sponsorships, and endowments
- Pass resolutions for approving plan, including the purchase, sales and improvements of UMCH property

Phase 2: Acquisition

A municipality can acquire real property in any manner that a private corporation might, including by purchase, gift or lease. Worthington’s Charter (Section 2.16) requires any determination *“to proceed with any public improvement, purchasing, leasing or transferring [of] property***shall be taken by ordinance.”* Purchase of the property may also be completed through Worthington’s Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) as the representative of Worthington.

Phase 3: Sale of Targeted Portions of Property

The sale and development of the commercial corridor along High St. and residential parcels bring revenue back to the city after acquisition and provide the self-sustaining funding model. Through work with retained professionals, the City can require relatively strict design criteria to meet housing desires determined in a community planning process, for example.

Phase 4: Improvement and Maintenance of Property

Improvements and maintenance to the dedicated park space could be undertaken by the City, CIC or separate entity to be determined. Proceeds from the sale of the commercial and residential could be used initially to fund park development. We also recommend viewing park development in short term and long term phases or based on funding and community desires.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ZONING



Zoning serves to protect and enhance the community's interests in land-use decisioning. As applied to the UMCH parcel, our view is that zoning can be the "one small step" our city council takes which becomes the "one giant leap" for Worthington and its citizens. In the case of the UMCH parcel, given its relatively large size and central location, prudent zoning becomes critical to Worthington's future in terms of livability, tax revenue, attractiveness to business and quality of life.

The current city zoning map was established in 1971. The UMCH parcel, is currently comprised of three zoning segments:

- **S-1/Special (blue):** allows for public and semi-public use including parks, and educational, religious, charitable or philanthropic purposes.
- **C-2 & C-3/Commercial (pink):** provides use for businesses such as shops, offices, banks restaurants, etc.
- **SC (aqua):** occupied by the Bickford Senior Living Center and not part of this proposal.

Note the R-10/Residential (green) zones lie outside of the footprint of the UMCH parcel. The boundaries of this parcel include:

- North: Longfellow Ave.
- East: High St (east);
- West: the back line of the residential lots along Evening St
- South: the north lot line of the residential development around Greenbrier Ct.
- Additionally, the small parcel of land south of Larrimer, where it intersects High St., was recently purchased by Lifestyles Community and is not part of this proposal.



Unlike the 2015 Lifestyle's proposal, which would rezone nearly all of the S-1 acreage to residential, this proposal seeks to add a modest strip of residential running along the south side of Larrimer.

Our goal is to maximize the amount of this acreage not paved over in the name of development for two key reasons:

- the unique and irreplaceable nature of this undeveloped parcel – there is nothing else like it in central Ohio, and

- the potential for residential at multiple other sites in Worthington.

Note that the southern portion of the S-1 is delineated as the Tucker Creek Ravine. We make this distinction to call out that this protected watershed cannot be developed, nor is it suitable for certain park amenities like sports fields, public gardens, etc.


Financial Impact Analysis

The City of Worthington can afford this, and it is more profitable for the City than any other plan that has been presented by a developer, to date.

Previous development proposals have not offered a financially solvent proposal because only 4% of property tax dollars go to the City of Worthington (roughly 75% of this goes to the schools), and this makes up only 10% of the City's revenue.

For this reason, dense residential housing will actually create a strain on city services and not create the income Worthington needs. Income tax from jobs is a revenue source for Worthington, when balanced against modest residential and low-cost green-space.

This example (right) from Dublin clearly illustrates this general theme. There are many forms a development plan for this site may take and it's important to acknowledge that a thorough analysis of each must be conducted.



Below is a summary of the financial outcome of our Proposal.

FINANCIAL ASSUMPTIONS

Fair Market Total Purchase Price The acquisition of the total UMCH property (one-time)	- \$12,378,900
Sale of Select Parcels (one-time)	+ \$9,750,000
Park Development Initial Costs Services, Infrastructure, Capital Costs	- \$455,750

ANNUAL FINANCIAL PROJECTION

Total Annual Costs Financed loan of purchase	- \$285,659
Total Annual Revenue From Commercial Income Tax	+ \$668,400
Annual Net Revenue	+ \$382,741 / year

Important Notes: The fair market total purchase price is detailed below. We've received feedback this is above market and too high of price. In an effort to demonstrate fairness to the property owner and not undervalue the parcel, we've kept the high number. This also demonstrates the "math" still allows for ultimately a self-sustaining model. The detail behind these figures, largely informed by the City's own 2018 cost-to-serve financial analysis, are further outlined below.

The financial projections above are intentionally conservative and do not assume any speculative revenue from alternative sources. While the City can afford this proposal as outlined above, it is prudent to explore other funding sources such as state and federal grants, sponsorships and private donations, public/private partnerships and others.

City of Worthington Revenue (Taxes)

On average over the last several years, Worthington has derived 73% of its revenue from income taxes, and 9% from property tax.

Income Tax

- Worthington's income tax rate is 2.5%.
- A job in the City of Worthington paying a \$50,000 salary generates approximately \$1,250 per year in tax revenue for the city.

Property Tax

- Worthington's property tax is 5 mills, which is 5/1,000th of the assessed value, which is 35% of the appraised value. So, the calculation is [appraised value] * 0.35 * 0.005 = \$175
- Therefore, a residential unit worth \$350,000 generates, on average, approximately \$612.50 per year in tax revenue for the city.

City of Worthington Expenses

Worthington's largest expenditure category is public safety at 44.29% of our budget.

- This amounts to just over \$12.1 million per year.
- Our population is 14,725. This equates to a public safety cost of \$827 per person.
- Worthington has an average of 2.46 persons per household.
- The average Worthington home costs the city ~\$2,034 to serve.

Conclusion

From a purely financial standpoint, it would be most profitable to build as much commercial office space as possible at the UMCH site rather than high density residential:

-- A single job paying \$50,000 in salary *generates* \$1,250 per year in tax revenue for the city. --

-- The average Worthington home costs the city ~\$2,034 to serve. --

However, we believe Worthington residents do not wish to see only a commercial office park, as this single use does not reflect the desires of the community, nor would this be classified as the highest and best overall use for such a unique property. Our proposal includes as much commercial as appropriate for the site, maximizing revenue for the city and offsetting the property acquisition as described next.

Acquisition & Financing

Below, we illustrate how short-term financing and long-term income tax revenue will actually create a net-positive revenue stream for the City.

We use the City's own 2018 cost-to-serve financial analysis of the property to illustrate this.

Valuation Method	
1- The Harding property (zoned S-1) recently appraised at	≈ \$1.9mil (or \$139,000/acre)
Add a 30% premium for the prime location	≈ \$180,700/acre
2- Franklin County Auditor recently appraised the UMCH commercial zones at	≈ \$6,000,000.
Acquisition, Sale & Financing	
<u>Parcels</u>	
10 acres, C-3, C-2	-\$7,500,000 (fair market value)
27 acres, S-1	-\$4,878,900 (above comparable fair market)
Total Purchase Price	\$12,378,900 (recent appraisal of \$12.5M)
<u>Sale of Select Parcels</u>	
10 acres, C-3, C-2, to commercial developer	+\$7,500,000
3 acres to residential developer (1 / 5 acre lots @ \$150,000 each)	+\$2,250,000
Total	+\$9,750,000
Net Property Acquisition Cost	\$2,628,900
<u>Additional Development Costs</u>	
<i>according to the City's own cost-to-serve analysis</i>	
Projected Services Impacts (police, EMS, fire)	\$155,000 (one time)
Infrastructure Consulting & Fees	\$145,000 (one time)
Parks & Rec Capital Investment & Services	\$155,750 (annual)
Total	\$455,750
<u>Total Financial Burden</u>	
Capital Expenditures (purchase + 1-time expenses)	\$2,928,900
Financed on a 30 year loan @ 2.0%	\$3,897,282
Total Annual Cost (the financed loan + annual costs)	\$285,659

Breaking Even and Generating Revenue

The figures in the following analysis are informed by the City’s own analysis, “Evaluation of the Cost to Serve the UMCH Property Under Various Hypothetical Development Scenarios”, presented by City Manager Matt Greeson to City Council, on January 22, 2019.

Of the 4 different hypothetical development scenarios the city analyzed, “Scenario 4” is the closest to the PCPW proposal. An excerpt of the City’s expenditure and revenue projections for Scenario 4, looking out 25 years, is attached as Appendix B.

This Scenario calls for:

- 27 acres of parkland (currently S-1 zoning)
- 6.5 acres of office, with 130,000 sq. ft. of class A office (currently C-1 + C-2 zoning)
- 5 acres of residential*

The City’s own analysis projects an annual total income of \$879,400 (without incentives). Should incentives be offered, the city projects an annual income of \$668,400.

<u>Total Cost</u>	
financed balance from property purchase	
+ city consultant fees & infrastructure	
+ annual passive park maintenance	- \$285,659
Projected Income	+ \$668,400
<hr/>	<hr/>
Annual Net Income	+ \$382,741 / year

In Summary

After purchasing the land from UMCH for a fair-market price, selling portions of the property to carefully chosen developers, and financing the balance, the City can still make money from this development plan. The City can acquire a premier multi-use property, with a large contiguous greenspace, with very little long-term financial burden.

We believe with conviction that this scenario represents both the best possible financial outcome for the City of Worthington, and the best possible development outcome for our citizens. The City could obtain a signature property that would benefit Worthington for generations, while also maintaining cash-flow positive finances.

We believe the most financially responsible solution to the UMCH site is for the City to acquire the parcel and control its redevelopment.

Additional Tangible Benefits


Reasons Why the City of Worthington Should Control UMCH Development

Parks are Essential Business

The Urban Land Institute hosted a webinar in May 2020 called “Parks are Essential Business” presented by MKSK. Presenters Chris Hermann and Andrew Overbeck made a convincing case for the importance of parks especially in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. They presented data supporting the following facts about parks, greenspace and walkable communities:

- Improved health outcomes both physically and mentally, with more quantitative data available to support these claims
- Generate economic development through retail spending and employment
- Increase property values

They also pose the question, “do we have enough big parks?”



Attracting New Business

Both locally and nationally, co-locating green space and commercial development is viewed as a boon to business.

Our neighbors understand this. One example comes from the opening of the Scioto Mile along the Scioto River in Downtown Columbus. As part of the grand opening ceremony, Tony Collins, Director of Columbus Recreation & Parks, stressed that this greenspace was “an amenity that will attract new business development,”

Following this lead, our plan fronts the signature UMCH greenspace with a long commercial strip along High St. This is purposeful as it enables tenants in this strip to gain full commercial leverage from what we call “park power”!



Taking Ownership of Our Future

This proposal serves as a call to action to our City Council to take charge of our shared future and chart a clear path forward for the city.

Given the significant value of the UMCH grounds, the largest undeveloped urban parcel in Central Ohio, it is incumbent upon our council to listen to its residents and then respond with the leadership necessary to best utilize this precious asset.



Increasing Residential Property Values

With a signature park and greenspace established, it is reasonable to estimate that Worthington homeowners will experience an increase in the value of their homes.

For the purposes of this analysis, if home values were to increase by an average of just 1%, the total impact would be a \$18.7m increase in total home value to Worthington residents¹.

It goes (almost) without mentioning, the city, county and school system will additionally benefit from increasing home values which will correspondingly lift property tax revenue.



Increased Health Benefits

The Lancet Medical Journal published an article in November 2019 noting a strong correlation between increasing greenspace and decreasing mortality (see Appendix C). Further, it concludes, **“interventions to increase and manage green spaces should there be considered as a strategic public health intervention.”** In addition to the obvious physical health benefits of outdoor activities, simply having access to nature can alleviate some of the most important problems in public health (American Public Health Association). Benefits include improved relaxation and restoration, increased neighborhood cohesion, greater pro-social behavior, and increased feelings of happiness.

Within this footprint, the plan calls for trails, gardens, and sports fields all of which promote the types of outdoor activities, across generations, which offer proven health benefits.



Ensuring Educational Excellence

As part of a 2019 internal assessment, a school board task force stated: “Worthington Schools’ current growth rate is unprecedented. Add to that our aging facilities and ... we are addressing some serious challenges.”

Building a significant number of new housing units at UMCH will bring additional students to the district at a time when it is already under strain.



Promoting Environmental Stewardship

Trees, plants and preserved natural spaces are not only good, but vital for our environment. They improve our air quality, absorb rainwater, and provide habitats for wildlife. Conversely, significant development of hard surfaces at the UMCH site can cause negative environmental outcomes such as “heat islands”, flooding in Tucker Ravine and sewer issues, in addition to stressing the watershed downstream.




Consummating Worthington’s Legacy

A core component of the original Worthington plan was a New England-style village commons where all could gather, interact and strengthen the bonds of friendship, community and public spirit. Thankfully, that footprint is still very much in place! It has served our 19th and 20th century population, numbering in the hundreds, then thousands, quite well indeed.

Today, Worthington is a city nearing 15,000 residents. Our major city-wide events typically must block off High St in order to provide the needed elbow room for all off us to participate and socialize.

Offering a combined total of some 31 acres of greenspace, the new Worthington Commons we propose will serve to meet the needs of our growing city and consummate the legacy of our town at its foundation. Worthington Commons will become the civic asset that will take us into the 22nd century.



Negative Impacts of High-Density Development at UMCH

Traffic Impact

High density residential development at UMCH would dramatically impact traffic, both by increasing the overall number of cars on the roads and by building a new access road onto Evening St.

Note that Evening St. is the main drop-off / pick-up point for school buses and parents of Evening Street Elementary. It is also the primary access between the Estates neighborhood and Thomas Worthington HS.



Environmental Impact

As Medick Estate residents know, the lower stretch of Tucker Rd. regularly floods during heavy rains, typically once or twice a Spring.

Any form of large scale residential development upstream at UMCH can only exacerbate this existing issue, potentially overwhelming an already stressed watershed.



School Over Crowding

As part of a 2019 internal assessment, a school board task force stated: "Worthington Schools' current growth rate is unprecedented. Add to that our aging facilities and ... we are addressing some serious challenges."



Once it's gone ... it's gone forever

- There is no other place in central Ohio with approximately 34 acres of contiguous greenspace.
- Residential development can be located in multiple locations across Worthington and in many more locales adjoining our community.
- A signature park, within walking distance of many of our residents, is a once in a lifetime opportunity to create a lasting legacy of a Community Commons for generations to come.



Conclusion

We, the members PCPW, and our large base of supporters, believe strongly that now is the time for our city council to bring strong leadership to transform the UMCH site into a multi-use asset featuring a large community commons, vibrant commercial corridor along High Street, and a residential enclave integrated into the surrounding neighborhood.

In acquiring a thousand-plus signatures, as well as conducting individual conversations with our council members and other leaders, we have gained many insights. One that stands out in particular is that, regardless of your view of the property and what should become of it, as a broader community **we are not that far apart in our desires for the UMCH property.**

Certainly, all sides want to gain closure and move forward. We present this proposal to the community and city leadership, for inclusion and consideration in this very important dialogue.

On behalf of the members of PCPW, and the 1,000+ residents who have signed the petition, thank you for your consideration of our proposal.



Roger Beck



Scott Taylor

Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name
Abell	Annie	Bates	Paul R	Brollier	Gordon
ackley	lloyd	Baumgartner	David	Brown	Kathryn
Adrion	Diane	Beard	Robert	Brown	Nathan
Albert	Karen	Beard	Ronda	Brown	Brittney
Albright	Peggy	Beck	Heidi	Bruck	Kelsey
Aldrich	Alison	Beck	Ryan	Bucher	Pete
Alexis	Ryan	Beck	Roger	Budkin	Mary
Allen	Pongsun C.	Beech	Chris	Buford	Lelie
Allen	Andrew	Beery	Sam	Burnham	Laura
Allen	Nancy	Belcher	Patrick	Burris	Kathryn
Allen	Phil	Bell	Randolph	Burton	William
Allender	Cory	Bender	Donna	Bush	Philipp
Alwood	Amy	Bendoly	Laura	Buss	Kristen
Ambro	Laura	Bennett	Barbara	Byard	Paul
Ament	John M	Bennett	Andrew	Byard	Phyllis
Ament	Tamara H	Bennett	Lindsay	Byrne	Megan
Andersen	Maria	Bent	Lee	Byrnes	John
Anderson	Stephen	Berg	Erin	Callender	Margaret
Anderson	Mariah	Berger	Megan	Campagnoli	Paul
Anderson	Jennifer	Bergman	Beth	Campbell	Sheila
Anspaugh	Andrew	Berkley	June	Campbell	Bob
Arcaro	Liz	Bertram	Jamie	Campbell	Susan
Armitage	Doug	Bertram	Mathew	Campbell	Christian
Armitage	Maria	Bidlack	Janna	Cantzler	Ryan
Armitage-Olson	Suzanne	Bidlack	Eric	Carter	Ellen
Armstrong	Erin	Birinyi	Frank	Caruso	Leslie
Armstrong	Mary Jane	Birmingham	Daniel	Caso	Francoise
Armstrong	Maureen	Birnie	Deborah	Caso	Luis
Arrasmith	Daniel	Bixler	Maren	Casson	Nicki
Arthmire	Mary	Blevins	Jason	Caughell	Alexandria
Ashley	Phillip	Blevins	Kelly	Caughell	John
Ashley	Pamela	Blevins	Dawn	Cavin	Cliff
Ashworth	Jeanne L.	Blevins	Jason	Cermak	Kay
Ashworth	Rob	Boes	Penny Masters	Cesario	Jean
Askin	Amy	Boriin	Pete	Cesario	Hayley
Athy	Don	Boucher	Todd	Chadwell	Sharon
Axelson	Chase	Bowman	Ben	Chakalis	Diane
Axelson	Katie	Bowman	Michelle	Chakalis	Arthur
Bachert	Ben	Bowman	Vicky	Chakroff	Jason
Bader	Anthony	Boyer	Drew	Chakroff	Chris
Bader	Victoria	Bradburn	Jennifer	Chaney	Michael
Baker	Amy	Bradley	Patricia	Chaney	Susan
Balch	Bradley	Bradley	L Richard	Chavez	Lindsay
Balogh	Mary	Brankamp	Adam	Cihla	Michelle
Barden	Curt	Brankamp	Kacey	Cinadr	Edward
Barden	Alicia	Brannon	Brandy	Clark	Karen
Bare	Daniel	Breedlove	Diane	Clark	Henry & Joyce
Barkhurst	Katherine	Brewer	William	Clark	Toni
Barnum	Peggy	Brewer	Janet	Clarke	Anne
BARR	THOMAS	Britcher	Andrea	Clauer	Allan

Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name
barta	john	Britcher	Stephen	CLEVENGER	DIANE
Batcheck	Mark	Brock	Thomas	Cline	Holly
Susan	Bates	Brogan	Barbara	Clingan	Cynthia
Clingan	Paul	Dooley	Sarah	FINNERTY	ELIZABETH
Cly	Andrew	Dopkiss	Jessica	Fischer	Eric
Cochran	Allen	Dorman	Stephen	Fischer	Richard
Conover	Ryan	Dotzauer	William	Fischer	Beth
Conover	Breanna	Dougherty	Margaret A.	Fisher	Brian
Cooksey	Elizabeth	Downs	Jeff	Fitch	Brenda
Cooper	Kirk	Downs	Ashley	Ford	Stephen
Cooper	Deborah	doyle	sharon	Foust	Sarah
Cooper-Whitman	Matt	Dray	Cheryl	Foust	David B.
Corcoran	Lisa	Dudley	Lyndsey	fox	janet
Corcoran	Shawn	Dugan	Megan	Franks	Allan D
Couch	Kim	Dulgar	Amy	Franta	Philip J.
Couch	Phil	Dunn	Mary Ann	Frantz	Emily
Cox	Mary	Dunn	Thomas	Freeman	Julie
Cox	Lou	DuPuy	Rachel	Froehlich	Patrick
Cropper	Frankie	Dyas	Adam	Froh	Courtney
Cropper	John	Dyas	Lauren	Fubj	Joshua
Cross	Susan L.	Dye	Shawn	Fuller	Rachel
Crumpton	Jillian	Dye	Courtney	Gallagher	Sean
Culp	Leah	Eader	James	Gallagher	Amy
Cummings	Anne	Edison	Susan	Gallanis	Katelyn
Cunningham	Emily	Edison	Karen	Ganoom	Corey
Curtiss	Judith	Edwards	Jane	Ganuchseau	Valcour
Curtiss	Dan	Eganhouse	Jennifer	Gardner	Susan
Dale	Eva	Elder	Ann R.	Gardner	Andrew
D'Amico	Lisa	Ellingson	Carol	Gardner	JoLee
Damsel	Kaley	Emery	Gregg	Gardner	Jeff
Damsel	William	Erickson	Matt	Garee	Charlotte
Damsel	Carol Lee	Erickson	Pete	Garee	Gail
Danhoff	Lindsey	Erickson	Tami	Garrard	Carol
Davis	Connie	Ervine	Beverley	Garrett	Philip
Davis	Stewart	Esch	William	Garris	Eric
Davis	Linda	Esch	Pamela	Garrison	Melissa
Davis	Carol	Estep	Rachael	Garrison	Kellie
Davis	Richard	Evans	Marie	Gath	Chris
Dawson	David	Evans	Lacramioara	Gedrich	Ronald
Decker	Amber	Evans, Sr.	Grady F.	Geissbuhler	George
Decker	Lisa	Everhart	Emily	Geissbuhler	Michelle
Degroff	Valerie	Fahy	Kristi	Geizer	Karen
Demick	Chandra	Fanning	Casie	Gerardi	Elizabeth
Denny	Mark	Farrell	Susan	Gerber	Bruce
DeNoemer	Rachel	Feister	Katharine	Gerbes	Angelika
DiBartola	Michael	Ferris	Karen	Gharbo	Christa R.
Dicken	Emily	Ferris	Emma	Giampouranis	Amie
Dieken	Laurel	Ferris	Nathan	Gibb	Louis Raymond
Dipaolo	Darla	Ferris	Beth	Gibson	Adam
DiSabato	Kelly	Ferris	Brandy	Gifford	David
DiSabato	Eric	FIELD	Corinne	Gifford	Marion
Distel	Lin	FIELD	JUSTIN	Gilbert	Robin
Doherty	Heather	Finch	Joanna	Givens	Willard & Dona
Dolle	Laura	Finefrock	Lori	Gjostein	Rebecca

Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name
Dollinger	Susan	Finley	Cortney	Glowacki	Erin
Gnezda	Eric	Haybron	Shawn	Hushak	Leroy
Goeller	Scott	Hayden	Deborah	Hushak	Virginia
Goeller	Allison	Hayes	Chris	Huss	Breanne
Gold	Sarah	Hayes	Natalie	Huss	Kyle
Gonzalez	Claudio	Hedberg	Carl	Hutter	Andrew
Goshe	Matthew	Hedberg	Angel	Hutter	Anne
Gould	Iulia	HEFNER	JENNIFER	IMMELT	JAMES
Graef	Michelle	Hein	Kasey	Ingham	Maureen
Grangaard	Dan	Heise	Emberly	isaac	susan &
Grangaard	Erin	Helling	Carol	Isaacson	Jack
Granger	Geri	Helling	Henry	Jackman	Jane
Granger	Mark S.	Henkaline	Gary	Jackman	Chris
Graven	Kirk	Hennigan	Laura	Jackson	Doris
Graven	Katie	Hess	Andrew	Jacobs	Susan
Gray	Priscilla	Hester	Patrick	Jaggers	Elizabeth A
Gray	William	Heyman	Martha	Jakes	Kathryn
Graziano	Erin	Heywood	John	James	Randy
Greco	Jessica	Hicks	Benjamin	Jennings	Patricia
Green	Lynn	Hicks	Mary	John	Chandy
Green	Stephen	Highley	Chris	Johnson	Keith
Greene	Kimberly	Hinson	Barbara	Johnson	Jared C
Greene	Merydith	Hipes	Steve	Johnson	Frank & Kit
Greene	Robert	Hiss	Amy	Johnson	April
Guitry	Noel	Hoag	David	Johnson	Zach
Guitry	Janet	Hoffmannbeck	Sue	Johnson	David
Guitry	Amy	Holden	Elizabeth	Johnson	Alycia
Gunther	Linda	Holden	Kay	Johnson-Ballinger	Christina
Guy	Suzanne	Holden-Harper	Quinn	Johnston	Sarah
Haager	Carl	Holdren	Carol	Jones	Katie
Hadden	Chris	Hollback	Kelly	Jones	Susan
Hall	brian	Holliday	Klli	Joseph	Amanda
Hall	Kathleen	Hollis	Lesley	Joseph	Marc
Hall	Kelly	Holsinger	Frederick	Judd	Sue
Hamer	Kathryn	Hoover	Rosalie	Jung	Catherine
Hamer	Thomas	Hoover	Shauna	Jurkowitz	Marianne S.
Hamilton	Matthew	Hoover	Eric	Kaminski	Kayleigh
Hamilton	Lauren	Horgan	Patrick	Karafa	Kasey
Hamilton	Matthew	Householder	Amy	karafa	nicholas
Hamric	Danielle	Howat	Erica	Karapetsas	Katie
Harden	Erik	Howat	Ian	Kasten	Brian
Harmeyer	Karen	Howell	Sandra	Kaszar	Suzanne
Harper	Jeff	Hubbard	Sherry	Keister	Anna
Harper	Bessie	Hudoba	Doug	Keister	Kent
Harper-Hess	Anna	Hudson	David	Kellenberger	Stephanie
Harris	Katie	Hudson	Nicolette	Keller	Ken
Harris	Alyssa	Huffman	Jaime	Keller	Kay
Harris	Sean	Huffman	Robert	Kendall	Dawn
HARRISON	ROBERT	Huffman	Tera	Kennedy	Wesley
Hart	Nannette	Hughes	Richard	Kennedy	Melissa
Hartley	Ethan	Hull	Kathy	Kigaraba	Noel Zawadi
Hartley	Maryann	Hunt	Hannah	Kimbrel	Sue
Harty-Morrison	Karina	Huntington	Susan	Kimchi-Woods	Judith
Hastrich	Kristan	Huntington	John	Kington	Cindy

Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name
Kington	Bob	Lipstreu	Rich	McChesney	Ryan
Kipp	Ann	LITTLE	CAROLYN	McCourt	Nicole
Kirkbride	Judye	Litton	Noah	McCracken	Kate
Kirker	Heather	Loar	Tim	McDaniel	Jeff
Kleinhenz	Peter	Loar	Brenda	McELWEE	JUDITH
Kleinhenz	Jill	Long	Meghan	McEnery	Stephanie
Kleoudis	Natalie	Losey	Dustin	McGriff	Jennifer
Kleoudis	James	Losey	Jackie	McGuire	Mary
Kline	Dennis	Lothes	Kayla	McKee	Jim
Kline	Catherine	Lucas	Amanda	McKinney	Jack
Knapp	Bill	Lumsden	Luke	McKirnan	Alex
Knapp	Valerie	Iundman	jean	McLaughlin	Maryellen
Kneedler	Susie	Lyons	Julie	McNabb	Heather
Kocel	Charles	Machle	Kathi	McNabb	Ben
Kocel	Elizabeth	MacLean	Jeff	McVey	Carly
Koch	Emily	MacLean	Meghan	Mead	Trista
Kociba	Lori	Maggiore	Fred	Meilton	Brian
Kocsis	Fran	Mahlin	Dave	Melville	Elizabeth
Koenig	Jennifer	Maier	Jennifer Lane	Mercadante	Linda
Konster	Eric	Main	Jordan	Mickey	Emma
Kort	Kathryn	Malone	Ryan	Mild	James
Kossmann	Beth	Mamlin	Leigh	Mild	Renee
Kraut	Eric	Mandrell	Chad	Miller	Heather
Kreisler	Lisa	Mandrell	Jessica	Miller	Julie
Kriebel	Janet	Mann	Mason	Miller	Halie
Kuhl	Amy	Manning	Maureen	Mitchell	Beth
Kuhnell	Sarah	Marker	Sara	Mitchin-Verhoef	Mechtelina
Kulikowski	David L.	Marks	Katherine	Monroe	Heather
Kulikowski	Judy	Marks	Ben	Montague	Juliette
Kull	Charles M.	Marschall	Gwynette	Moody-Ganoom	Liz
Kushner	Jennifer	Marsh	Lee	Mooney	Michele
Kyser	Scott	Marsh	Mary	Mooney	Bill
LaFontaine	Gregory	Marti	Edward	Moore	Jess
LaFontaine	Lara	Marti	Jane	Mottice	Robert
LAMB	NICHOLAS	Martin	Daniel C.	Mulligan	Michael
Lampe	Phil	Martindale	Lori	Murden	Isla
Lancaster	Boyce	Masters	Carol	Murphy	Sarah
Lang	Norma	Matejic	Sarah	Musgrove	Deborah
Lauducci	Patricia	Matic	Anthony	Mutti	Donald
Lavender	Steve	Matlack	Sarah	Myers	Jack and Kay
Lavender	Rachel	Matlack	James	Mykel	Ian
Law	Shawn	Matson	Bev	Nagel	Rosanne
Law	Barbara	Matthews	Stephen	Nasdeo	Kelly
Lawrenz	Anita	May	Casey	Neale	Judy
Lear	Deanna	Mayhood	Ruth	Neelan	Natalie
Leier	Jolene	McAlister	James	Neely	Michelle
Leier	Carl	McCallister	AnnMarie	Nesline	Richard
Lesley-Tecklenburg	Jane	McCarthy	Leslie	Nesline	Nancy
Levingston	Heather	McCarthy	Bryn	Newby	Kristen
Likirdopulos	Christina	McCarthy	Constance	Newcome	Lane
Lilly	B	McCarthy	Michael	Nittle	Timothy
Lin	Albert	McCarthy	Natalie	Nolan	Rachel
Lipstreu	Tiffany	McCarthy	Tim	Nolan	Gary

Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name
Norman	Erik	Ratliff	Glenn	Sandberg	Makenzi
Obee	Karen	Ratliff	Gretchen	Sater-Wee	Diane
Oberliesen	Janet	Rayburn	Mary	Saunders	Randy
Odom	Sylvia	Raynes	Phil	Savage	Kelly
Odom	John	Ream	Julie	Savage	Dan
Oglevee	Zachary	Reed	Caroline	Savage	Jerry
Oldfield	Lee	Reeves	James	Savage	Barb
Orebaugh	Jamie	Reeves	Julie	Schaub	Kristin
Ott	Rebecca	Reid	Matt	Schaublin	Matt
Ouellette	Sylvie	Reid	Brooke	SCHERER	ELLEN
Overly	Timothy	Reiger	John	Scherer	John Douglas
Ozkan	Erdal	Reiger	Andrea	Scherer	Nora
Pack	Cathy	Reik	Katherine	Schmidt	Jessica
Palmer	Nathan	Reiss	Janet	Schmitt	Laura
Palmer	Jeanetta	Reiss	Gary	Scholl	Joy
Panhuis	Tami	Rethman	Katherine	Scholl	Mike
Panhuis Belcher	Tiffany	Rethman	Craig	Schrader	Lucas
Parak	Jill	Rice	Margaret	Schuler	JoAnna
Parrett	Michelle	Rice	Mark	Schulhaus	Eric
Pascoe	Edwin	Richards	Lauren	Schulze	Ronald
Patterson	Joseph	Richards	Mark J.	Schulze	Mary
Patterson	Canady	Ridenour	Chester	Schumer	David
Paulsen	Kristina	Ridenour	Shelley	Schwotzer	Sondra
Payne	Cynthia	Riegner	David	Seals	Jim
Penzone	Gina	Rings	Jamie	Seals	Suzanne
Perchuk	Alex	Roberts	Linda	Seech	Beth
Perge	Nicholas	Roberts	Marie	Seed	Laura
Perge	Jennifer	Robertson	Jodi	Seed	Allen
perry	mary	Robertson	Mike	Seed	Jessica
Pfendler	Thomas	Robinson	David	Serrano	Deidre
Phillips	Gregory	Robinson	Lorraine	Sestile	Lindsay
Piloseno	Richard	Rochte	Maryclaire	Settle	Tiffany
Pischel	Julie	Roderick	Karen R.	Sever	Jeff
Plinke	Joanna	Rogers	Rachel	Severance	Sandra Lee
Plinke	Scott	Rogge	Mary	Severance	Greg
Poll	Brett	Rogge	David	Severance	Janien
Poma	Whitney	Roggenkamp	Renee	Severance	Sandra
Poma	Jonathan	Rosendale	Laurie	Seymour	Sally
Potenzini	Pete	Roskuski	Leslie	Seymour	Scott
Poulson	Gretchen	Ross	Laura	Shanahan	Daniel
Prats	Lindsay	Royalty	Linda	Shannan	Kevin
Price	Sarah	Ruffner	Melissa	Sharvin	Michael
priess	mike	Rush	Jim	Sharvin	Jim
Purves	Brendan	Rusnak	Laura	Shaw	Beverly
Putka	Steven	Rust	Rebecca	Shearer	Amelia
Putka	Wendy	Ryan	Bev	Sheehan	Donna
Quigley	Ryan	Ryan	Kevin	Sheehan	Timothy
Raab	Dean L.	Ryan	Abby	Sheridan	Jenn
Raab	Jacob	Saboley	Saundra	Sherlock	Suzanne
Rainier	Ryan	Sadvari	Sharon	Sherman	Joe
Rainier	Alison	Sadvari	Joshua W.	Sherman	Linda
Rankey	David	Salamone	Lauren	Sherwood	Charles
Ratliff	Kristin	Sandberg	Daniel	Shinaberry	Scott

Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name
Shonk	Amber	Steinbrink	Jessica	Thompson	Mardella
Shumway	Martin	Stephan	John	Thompson	Pam
Siciliano	Deborah	stevens	thomas	Thompson	Amy
Siders Sanford	Jamie	stevens	robert	Thornton	Renee
Simmons	Scott	Stillwagon	Megan	Tinapple	Emilee
Simmons	Patti	Stimpert	Terri	Tonra	Christopher
Simon	Catherine	Stinson	Patricia	Tornes	Stephen
Sinclair	Amy	Stinson	Patricia	Toth	Anastasia
Sinclair	Daniel	Stiver	Tina	Toth	John
Sjostrom	Joe	Stoffregen	Craig	Toth	Alex
Slough	Bryan	Stoffregen	Amy	Trgovac	Tracey
Smith	Dale	Stolfi	David	Troester	Caren
Smith	Rachael	Stolfi	Jennifer	TRUXALL	DEBRA
Smith	Shellie	Stoller	Zachary	Truxall	Gabe
Smith	Andrew	Stone	Lisa	Tufano	Julie
Smith	Collin	Stone	Derek	Tyler	Corinne
Smith	Tiffany	Stoner	William	Urban	Elizabeth
Smith	Jeanette	Stoner	Cristine	Vance	Megan
Smith	Daniel	Storch	William	Vance	Erin
Smith	James	Strope	Patricia	Vance	Matthew
Smith	Sara	Suber	Nancy	Vanderveen	Natalie
Smith	Robert	Sullivan	glen	Vanderveen	John
Smith	Elizabeth	sullivan	matt	VanFleet	Linda
Smith	Victoria	Sullivan	Kathryn	Vasey	Libby
Smitih	Maxine	Sunderland	Dorothy	Vaughn	Ralph
Snavely	Dan	Suter	Joanna	Ventresca	Jordy
Snavely	Tiffany	Suttle	Amanda	Ventresca	Jim
Snediker	Gertrude	Suttner	Andy	Vogel	Heidi
Sokolnicki	Paul	Sykes	Matthew	Vujnovic	Karen
Solomon	Miriam H.	Taber	Jennifer	Vukovich	Lauren
Song	Jing	Taddeo	Jaelith	Wagner	Susan
Spadafore	James	Taft	Curtis	Walker	Susan
Spaulding	Melissa	Talbert	Sharyn	Walsh	Ted
Sproul	Margaret	Tapocsi	Greg	Waltz	Jordan
Spurgeon	Tulia	Tapocsi	Emily	Wander	Karen
Srkadi	Myra	Taylor	Joan	Ward	James
Stafford	Jacqueline	Taylor	Scott	Warren	Kay
Stanich	Jennifer	Taylor	Karen	Watson	Alison
Stansbury	Emily	taylor	Kristen	Watts	Robert
Stanton	Mindy	Taylor	Joshua	Watts	Julie
Starkey	Dustin	Taylor	Cate	Webb	Lillian
Stasiak	Susan	Taylor-Miesle	Heather	Weber	Ron
Stazenski	Dave	Teresi	Scott	Weber	Melissa
Steckler	Michael J	Terman	Stacy	Webster	Chris
Steele	Patrick	Terrien	Patrick	Webster	Stephen
Steele	Jennifer	Tessier	David	Whalen	Heather
Stefan	Natalie	Tessier	Jane	Whalen	Kelly
Stefan	Brett	Teufel	Stefan	Wheeler	Gregory
Stegemiller	Robert	Teufel	Linda	White	Gary
Stegemiller	Mary	Teufel	Rainer	White	Christopher
Steigerwald	David	Thomas	Lousa Gabriella	White	Mark
Steigerwald	Susan	Thompson	Shan	White	Tracy
Steinbrink	Tom	Thompson	Keith	Whitman	Emily

Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name	Last Name	First Name
Wickham	Sarah	Bragg	Robyn		
Widder	Nikki	Cooper-Whitman	Darci		
Wiesner	Evelyn	Eganhouse	Jeff		
Wilkerson	Rochelle L.	Litton	Stacey		
Wilkins	Jonathan	Ryan	Dan		
Wilkins	Mairi	Stoner	Cristine		
Wilkinson	Molly	Thompson	Michael		
Willard	Katie	Widder	Kyle		
Williams	Charles				
Williams	Dorothy				
Williamson	Martin				
Williamson	Janice				
Willis	Laura				
Wilson	Bryan				
Windle	Cory				
Winter	Mary & Chester				
Wise	Nadine L.				
Wise	Rachel				
Wise	Isaac				
Wise	Aaron				
Wise	Elias				
Withrow	David				
Woltz	Erin				
Woods	James				
Woods, III	James				
wooster	angela				
Wooster	Matt				
Worthington	Sara				
Wright	Heidrun				
Wright	Lisa				
Yates	Colette A.				
Yates	Michael				
Yeager	Katie				
Yitsis	Greg				
Yitsis	Marisa				
Yost	William				
Yost	Linda				
Young	Christine				
Young	Randal				
Young	Rhonds				
Young-Grabo	Julie				
Yount	Connie				
Zedeker	Rob				
Zedeker	Jennifer				
Zevallos	Ann				
Zevallos	Ulises				
Zhang	Baowen				
Zipfel	Travis				
Zurovchak	Sandra				
Schulhaus	Katherine				
Alexander	Ned F.				
Alexis	Meg				
Allen	Charles R.				

Appendix B: Excerpt from City's Cost-to-Serve Analysis, Scenario 4

This is pulled directly from the City's Cost-to-Serve analysis, conducted in 2018, studying 4 basic outcomes for the UMCH property development.

Scenario 4 is the closest to the PCPW Proposal.

Scenario 4

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	...	Year 7	Year 8	...	Year 10	Year 11	...	Year 18	...	Year 25
Expenditures													
Stormwater & Site Engineering Consulting Fees	35,000	35,000	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Wesley Blvd. Plan Review & Insp.	40,000	0	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Infrastructure Consulting Fees	62,500	62,500	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Planning & Bldg Consulting Fees	15,000	15,000	15,000		0	0		0	0		0		0
Public Area Fees	20,000	0	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Fire Prevention	0	0	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Parks Capital Investment	12,500	12,875	13,261		14,926	15,373		16,310	16,799		20,661		25,410
Parks Maintenance Technician/Contract Assistance	107,000	110,210	113,516		127,764	131,597		139,611	143,799		176,855		217,509
Parks Supplies	30,000	30,900	31,827		35,822	36,896		39,143	40,317		49,585		60,984
Service & Engineering Services	6,000	6,180	6,365		7,164	7,379		7,829	8,063		9,917		12,197
Total Expenditures	\$328,000	\$272,665	\$179,970		\$185,675	\$191,245		\$202,892	\$208,979		\$257,018		\$316,099

Note: These costs do not include the land acquisition and/or the development costs of the parkland.

Revenue without Incentives

Permit Fees	58,500	0	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Public Area Fees	20,000	0	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Income Tax	812,000	828,240	844,805		914,444	932,733		970,415	989,823		1,136,996		1,306,051
Property Tax	67,400	69,085	70,812		78,163	80,117		84,173	86,278		102,557		121,908
Total Revenue without Incentives	\$957,900	\$897,325	\$915,617		\$992,607	\$1,012,850		\$1,054,589	\$1,076,101		\$1,239,553		\$1,427,959

Revenue with Incentives

Permit Fees	58,500	0	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Public Area Fees	20,000	0	0		0	0		0	0		0		0
Income Tax	649,600	662,592	675,844		731,555	932,733		970,415	989,823		1,136,996		1,306,051
Property Tax	19,400	19,885	20,382		22,498	23,061		24,228	86,278		102,557		121,908
Total Revenue with Incentives	\$747,500	\$682,477	\$696,226		\$754,053	\$955,793		\$994,643	\$1,076,101		\$1,239,553		\$1,427,959

Assumptions

- Expenditures will increase 3% annually
- Income tax revenues will increase 2% annually
- Property tax revenues will increase 2.5% annually
- Income tax incentive will end after seven years
- Property tax incentive will end after ten years

Green spaces and mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies

David Rojas-Rueda, Mark J Nieuwenhuijsen, Mireia Gascon, Daniela Perez-Leon, Pierpaolo Mudu

Summary

Background Green spaces have been proposed to be a health determinant, improving health and wellbeing through different mechanisms. We aimed to systematically review the epidemiological evidence from longitudinal studies that have investigated green spaces and their association with all-cause mortality. We aimed to evaluate this evidence with a meta-analysis, to determine exposure-response functions for future quantitative health impact assessments.

Methods We did a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies on green spaces and all-cause mortality. We searched for studies published and indexed in MEDLINE before Aug 20, 2019, which we complemented with an additional search of cited literature. We included studies if their design was longitudinal; the exposure of interest was measured green space; the endpoint of interest was all-cause mortality; they provided a risk estimate (ie, a hazard ratio [HR]) and the corresponding 95% CI for the association between green space exposure and all-cause mortality; and they used normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) as their green space exposure definition. Two investigators (DR-R and DP-L) independently screened the full-text articles for inclusion. We used a random-effects model to obtain pooled HRs. This study is registered with PROSPERO, CRD42018090315.

Findings We identified 9298 studies in MEDLINE and 13 studies that were reported in the literature but not indexed in MEDLINE, of which 9234 (99%) studies were excluded after screening the titles and abstracts and 68 (88%) of 77 remaining studies were excluded after assessment of the full texts. We included nine (12%) studies in our quantitative evaluation, which comprised 8 324 652 individuals from seven countries. Seven (78%) of the nine studies found a significant inverse relationship between an increase in surrounding greenness per 0·1 NDVI in a buffer zone of 500 m or less and the risk of all-cause mortality, but two studies found no association. The pooled HR for all-cause mortality per increment of 0·1 NDVI within a buffer of 500 m or less of a participant's residence was 0·96 (95% CI 0·94–0·97; I^2 , 95%).

Interpretation We found evidence of an inverse association between surrounding greenness and all-cause mortality. Interventions to increase and manage green spaces should therefore be considered as a strategic public health intervention.

Funding World Health Organization.

Copyright © 2019 World Health Organization; licensee Elsevier. This is an Open Access article published under the CC BY 3·0 IGO license which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. In any use of this article, there should be no suggestion that WHO endorses any specific organisation, products or services. The use of the WHO logo is not permitted. This notice should be preserved along with the article's original URL.

View the full article here: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196\(19\)30215-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196(19)30215-3/fulltext)