NOTICE OF A MEETING
SUSTAINABILITY DASHBOARD WORKING GROUP
MID-OHIO REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
111 LIBERTY STREET, SUITE 100, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215
BUCKEYE CONFERENCE ROOM

January 9, 2020, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm

AGENDA

1. Welcome & Introductions
   Justin Milam, Co-Chair, Rick Stein, Co-Chair

2. Regional Sustainability Dashboard Updates
   Adam Porr, CURA

3. Review of Problematic Metrics and Data Collection
   Natalie Hurst, MORPC
   Progress Updates:
   2.6 Improve Water Quality in the Upper Scioto Watershed
   3.2 Increase the number of adopted institutional purchasing policies that support the purchase of local food

4. Beta Testing
   Natalie Hurst, MORPC
   Brandi Whetstone, MORPC
   Adam Porr, CURA
   a) Assignments and Timeframe
   b) How to Respond
   c) Timing of Beta Testing for SAC/RDAC

5. Next Steps
   Justin Milam, Co-Chair, Rick Stein, Co-Chair

6. Adjourn

Please notify Lynn Kaufman at 614-233-4189 or LKaufman@morpc.org to confirm your attendance for this meeting or if you require special assistance.

The next Sustainability Dashboard Working Group Meeting will be
February 11, 2020, 9:30 am – 11:00 am
111 Liberty Street, Suite 100, Columbus, Ohio 43215
PARKING AND TRANSIT: When parking in MORPC’s parking lot, please park in a “MORPC Visitor” space or in a space marked with a yellow “M”. Handicapped parking is available at the side of MORPC’s building. Indoor bike parking is available for MORPC guests. MORPC is accessible by CBUS. The nearest bus stop is S. Front Street & W. Blenkner St. Buses that accommodate this stop are the Number 61 - Grove City, the Number 5 - West 5th Ave. /Refugee, and the Number 8 - Karl/S. High/Parsons.
Meeting Called to Order at 2:34 pm.

Welcome & Introductions
Working Group Members and staff introduced themselves.

Regional Sustainability Dashboard Updates
Adam Porr reported that the team at the Center for Urban and Regional Analysis (CURA) has been working on the aesthetics of the Dashboard recently, including a new compact mode (with more items on the screen) and an online tutorial. CURA has three dedicated Graduate Research Associates working on the Dashboard – one for the front end, one for the database/API, and one for the ingestion pipeline.

State Preservation
When a user changes settings on the Dashboard, it will capture the changes and store them locally in cookies. Whenever that user opens the Dashboard, the updates are preserved. The settings are also preserved in the URL, so a view can be shared with others.

Social Media Sharing
The Dashboard will have Facebook and Twitter icons. In the beta version, the Dashboard will create a sample post with the link embedded; the user can customize the text.

Progress Indicators
Members agreed to table the creation of progress indicators until after the spring release of the Dashboard.

Reasons to table this matter:
- The data is extremely diverse.
- The Regional Sustainability Agenda (RSA) will be reevaluated in 2020, and the amount of time and effort that will be required may be wasted if the goals and objectives change.
- The progress indicators would be restating information already on the landing page.
Beta Testing Time Frame
Beta testing by Working Group Members should begin at the January 8 Working Group meeting. CURA staff will create a survey for Working Group Members to complete as they test the system. CURA staff will distill the responses to see what the priority updates are. The beta version of the Dashboard will have real data to work with.

Target Values
Staff and Working Group Members have discussed target values and baseline values for RSA objectives, and in some cases, the baseline value is explicitly stated. When that is the case the Dashboard will show target and baseline as well.

Discussion
Maintenance
The front end of the Dashboard should require almost no maintenance; it will be set up to retrieve a list of data to be extracted from a database. It will then download the data and display it to the user. It will be mostly automated.

The data ingestion section of the Dashboard will require maintenance. There will be one or more datasets to work with for each objective. The system will be able to retrieve those datasets and automatically transform them. However, there may some datasets where automatic download will not be possible because of the nature of the data. When the ingestion is automated, the system will either download according to a schedule, or it can be triggered by a web interface. Someone at MORPC will tell the system to refresh this data.

Data Integrity
MORPC and CURA will depend upon the data sources to provide quality data. If a download fails, CURA will modify the ingestion process to accommodate the new data. CURA may design a gatekeeper function in the ingestion pipeline where all the transformation happens; this will probably be a manual process.

Once the real data is being fed into the Dashboard, CURA and MORPC staff will review the output for errors.

Update Dates
Members asked that there be a notice on either the landing page or in the Dashboard to tell the user how current the data is. Adam noted that that is doable.

Adam will present an update at the next Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting and at the December 11 Regional Data Advisory Committee meeting.

Review of Problematic Metrics and Data Collection
2.1 Reduce Emissions to Meet Federal Air Quality Standards
City of Columbus is attempting to put air quality monitors in parking garages and street lamps, and staff hopes to integrate that data into the Dashboard in a later version.

2.3 Reduce the Amount of Solid Waste Per Capita Disposed in Landfill
MORPC did receive data from the Ohio EPA, including recycling totals, which can be shown in the Dashboard.
2.4: Minimize Greenfield Development and Promote Infill and Redevelopment
This metric was shown on the 2018 Report Card by using land use classifications. While this process worked, there were a few disadvantages: it was extremely time intensive, there were accuracy issues (the land use types change), and the process does not allow for frequent updates of land use classifications. Aaron Schill noted that staff could use the generalized MORPC land use codes that do not provide much nuance. MORPC staff would standardize 15 counties to one land use classification which would require a large amount of generalization. Otherwise, MORPC staff could analyze 15 different counties.

Imagery
Members and staff discussed the pros and cons of analyzing imagery:

Pro:
• A.I. could be taught to interpret vacant land, parking lots, etc. on satellite imagery. It could also interpret the changes in the images over time.

Con:
• There is not a set frequency of updates and consistency of imagery from the Ohio Statewide Imagery Program (OSIP). OSIP would provide the most consistent updates, as they fly the entire state every few years. However, their pixel size has changed several times over the past few years – the pixels were three meters 10 years ago, then two meters, and most recently six inches.
• ESRI has a program that would cost a few cents for ten transactions, but there could be a large cost associated with analyzing 15 counties at a fairly granular level.

Aaron noted that MORPC staff will investigate this process and report back to the Working Group.

2.5 Reduce Per Capita Water Consumption
Natalie Hurst will meet with EPA staff on December 4 to discuss per capita water consumption. Their production data may be used as a proxy for consumption.

2.6 Improve Water Quality in the Upper Scioto Watershed
Natalie reported that there are three options for this metric:
1. EPA designated attainment which has four water quality uses: 1) Aquatic life, 2) Recreation, 3) Human Health, and 4) Drinking Water. The most recent data exists for aquatic life use from 2009. The next survey to cover the entire watershed is scheduled for 2024.
2. USGS Real Time Water Quality which measures many features and is updated almost daily. However, the data is not as cut and dried as the EPA Attainments.
3. Use public drinking water information as a proxy.

3.2 Increase the Number of Adopted Institutional Purchasing Policies that Support the Purchase of Local Food.
This metric was not featured in the 2018 Sustainability Report Card, there is no data reference for the past or the present, and there is no target. Members previously decided to include this metric but there was no consensus about the data source. This metric was developed when MORPC was directly involved in local foods as one of its core areas of work in Sustainability. MORPC is no longer in that space.
Natalie presented the following data sources, with pros and cons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Food Directories</td>
<td>Comprehensive information about availability of local food</td>
<td>• Proxy for objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Likely to be time-intensive since resources would need to be combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not provide insights about progress over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Policies</td>
<td>Pros: Aligns with objective</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited number of policies in geographic area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional research required; May not be comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Policy Networks</td>
<td>Pros: Since map has year founded, able to see progress over time</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proxy for objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Aaron noted that this metric is a good way to understand how much awareness there is, but it is not a measure of impact. The goal for the Dashboard is to measure impact toward the bigger objectives.

Members suggested that staff contact the Department of Agriculture. This metric may already be an initiative and they might already have data.

**Next Steps**

Adjourned at 4:02 Pm.
AGENDA

- Dashboard Updates
- Problematic Metrics
- Beta Testing
- Other business
- Next Steps
3.2: INCREASE LOCAL FOOD PURCHASING POLICIES

Increase the number of adopted institutional purchasing policies that support the purchase of local food.

XX% increase in adopted institutional food purchasing policies (data and methodology under development)

Not in 2018 Report Card
3.2: INCREASE LOCAL FOOD PURCHASING POLICIES

• Recommendation
  • Use USDA Farm to School Census
    • Downloadable data from 2013 and 2015 at school-district level
    • Note: “Of 1,258 school districts in Ohio, 57% completed the USDA Farm to School Census.”
  • Includes data like…
    • Definition of local
    • Frequency of serving local items
    • Total spent on local foods (and non-local)
    • Number of students in district
    • Issues serving local foods
  • Data sample: Ohio Farm to School Census Report
3.2: INCREASE LOCAL FOOD PURCHASING POLICIES

• Sample data

Farm to School Participation by County, 2015
3.2: INCREASE LOCAL FOOD PURCHASING POLICIES

- Recommendation
  - Use USDA Farm to School Census
  - Potentially supplement with university information or schools that have local food programs that are not captured in USDA data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Authoritative data source with consistent measuring  
• Currently only data available to institutional purchasing  
• Seems like USDA will repeat every two years | • Only 57% response rate – not all schools represented |
3.2: INCREASE LOCAL FOOD PURCHASING POLICIES

• What data do we want to show?
  • Number/Percent of school districts that participate in local food activity
  • Amount/Percent of food spending spent on local food activities
  • Other

• What is our baseline?
• What is our target?
• Do we even include these?
2.6: IMPROVE WATER QUALITY IN UPPER SCIOTO WATERSHED

**Objective:** Improve water quality in the Upper Scioto Watershed.

**2020 Target:** 85% of Upper Scioto Watershed sampling sites are in attainment.

No data in previous report card
2.6: IMPROVE WATER QUALITY IN UPPER SCIOTO WATERSHED

• Recommendation
  • Use information from various data sources to get snapshot of water quality in region
    • Ohio Department of Natural Resources
    • OSU Ohio Water Resources Center
    • Franklin Soil and Water Conservation District
    • Midwest Biodiversity Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Authoritative data sources</td>
<td>• Doesn’t align with objective to increase attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can provide more recent data</td>
<td>• May not have historical data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seems to be the best perspective of</td>
<td>• No streamlined data collection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water quality available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BETA TESTING

• Link to beta testing survey:
  • Will be shared after meeting
• Three exercises: Choose 2
• Please be as honest as possible