



**Dover/Kent MPO
Data and Demographics Sub-committee**

Minutes of February 24, 2011

Those attending:

Theon Callender, Town of Cheswold
Janelle Cornwell, City of Dover
Michael DuRoss, DelDOT Planning
Mary Ellen Gray, Kent County Planning
David Edgell, Office of State Planning Coordination
James Galvin, MPO Staff
Ben Johnson, MPO Staff
Catherine Samardza, MPO Staff

The meeting was called to order in the Police Training Room on the 2nd Floor of Camden's Town Hall.

- 1) **Introduction of Members & Guests**
- 2) ***ACTION ITEM: Approval of Agenda***

Mr. Galvin asked that Item 5 be amended from an Action Item to a review item.

MOTION By Ms. Cornwell to approve the agenda as amended above. Seconded by Mr. Edgell. Motion carried.

- 3) ***ACTION ITEM: Approval of Minutes – December 15, 2010***

MOTION By Mr. Edgell to approve the minutes of December 15, 2010. Seconded by Ms. Cornwell. Motion carried.

- 4) ***UPDATE: New Data Results***

MPO Staff reviewed the materials sent to the committee. Mr. Johnson explained that he used the census block group numbers and the 2040 population numbers to determine the household size. This varies by TAZ, with a range of 2.4-3.1. Mr. Galvin noted that the 3rd column in the chart was household size. Mr. Johnson said that some blocks did not line up exactly with the TAZs, so he used the larger of the TAZs and block numbers in those situations.

Mr. Edgell asked if the committee would be meeting annually or bi-annually to look at the numbers, since this data is 10 years old, and next year there will be new data. Mr. Galvin thought that the committee would meet for the next 6 months or so, then once a year to look at



the Population Consortium projections published in October. Mr. Edgell asked if we would be mirroring WILMAPCO's schedule, and Mr. Galvin said that it was similar. Mr. Edgell felt that it would be good for the committee to look at WILMAPCO's schedule.

5) *AMENDED: DISCUSSION ITEM (ACTION ITEM): Review (Approval) of Population and Household 2040 projections*

Mr. Galvin asked if anyone had feedback on the graphic representation of the data. A rough draft was sent; Mr. Galvin distributed a newer version. He asked the committee to let him know what they thought of the distribution and to see if it made sense. He noted that there was a shift in one TAZ.

Mr. Edgell said he had some questions he felt should be discussed. He noted that there was a large increase in households in the TAZs in the lower part of the County. However, the County is not seeing any activity there, it is constrained by sewer issues. Harrington and Farmington will be included in the County sewer system in the next year or so.

Mr. DuRoss was asked his opinion; he said his direction was not to make comments, but he could make observations on a historical perspective. He said about 10 years ago that the Kent County Levy Court representative to the TAC had made strenuous objections to the numbers in this area the last time the numbers were updated, thinking the additional growth was too high.

Mr. Edgell repeated that he thought the numbers in this area was high. He noted that there was a lot of Ag preservation property in the area and farming operations. Mr. DuRoss said that generally, the distribution looks like what was seen with Mr. Ratledge's numbers in the 90s. Agency comments at that time moved the growth toward the middle of the County.

Ms. Callender asked what the growth was based on, census or development? Mr. Johnson explained that it is a combination of things. Mr. Galvin noted that development patterns within the TAZ generate new households. Ms. Callender asked if there was any consideration for children growing up and staying in the area. Mr. Johnson said that was not one of the things taken into consideration. Mr. Edgell felt that growing household numbers would capture that, but not directly. Mr. DuRoss said that the model looks at migration to or from Delaware.

Mr. Edgell said that he felt this approach was "business as usual." He said his office has been doing research on future demographic trends and there is some demographic evidence that the next 30 years is going to be considerably different than the previous 30 years. The reason being that the largest population groups have different preferences - "Babyboomers" downsizing to smaller homes near services, and "Generation X" - young couples with families also tend to prefer community settings to be near infrastructure with jobs, activities and services. It was noted that there is a glut of rural single family homes on large lots on the market now, and it does not make sense to predict more.



Mr. Galvin asked if the committee wanted to continue with this model. He said that while Mr. Blevins does a great job with the WILMAPCO model, the D/KC MPO has taken a different approach. It IS a status quo approach, because it is based on subdivisions. He wanted to know if the committee wanted to continue with this model or look to concentrating the population in more developed areas.

Mr. Edgell said that he understood how the model came up with this result, and it was similar to Mr. Ratledge's model, although the MPO model is better explained and easier to understand, but he felt it needed tweaking. He was not ready to abandon it, but it was time to apply art to the science. He also said that he liked the way that Mr. Johnson broke down the household side, breaking down the census per TAZ.

He brought the discussion to household numbers assigned to the TAZ near Kenton, and those near Eden Hill Farm. He felt it was more likely that Eden Hill would fill up than the TAZ near Kenton. He felt the committee needed to spend time on this discussion.

Mr. Galvin reminded the Committee that what is developed here becomes part of the County Code, and may cost developers more money. That could cause challenges if numbers are moved to the center. Mr. Edgell asked for an explanation. Ms. Gray explained that the APFO includes traffic. Any TAZ increasing by a certain percentage requires a TIS. Mr. Galvin asked if that percentage was more than the 30 year projection. Ms. Gray did not remember if it was 20 or 30 years. Mr. Galvin referred everyone to Appendix F in the handouts.

There was more discussion concerning how the numbers might be challenged. Ms. Gray noted that outside the growth zone, community waste water plants are prohibited, and density is on a sliding scale. Developers were not going to be able to get a high density for development outside the growth zone. She felt that as long as the committee documents what is done and how it was decided – the art to the science – it would be okay.

Mr. Edgell said that documentation was important. He said that his office has been working with "heat" maps, a GIS application. It can identify areas where units are closer together.

Mr. DuRoss said that the model is useful to understand trends. He suggested using Mr. Ratledge's model for the first cut, then using Agency comments to move the numbers around. He noted that policies can change trends, so that what you want is what happens. He said that Mr. Blevins does a draft color-coded map for WILMAPCO, and then works with it for 4 months. Mr. DuRoss added that the committee should not discount the model, but track the comments as we move away from it.

Ms. Gray said that she liked the scenario of starting with this, generated by the model and doing some tweaking based on policies as well as what we know, such as subdivisions approved based on community septic will not be moving forward.



There was further discussion concerning the model and how to tweak it based on policies and observation of changing trends.

Ms. Gray said that for the next meeting she would like to be able to project the map with all the numbers on it. Members would bring all their information and the committee would go through each TAZ. Isn't that what we used to do? But if we moved something from one area it had to be moved to another without going over the control totals. Committee members agreed that this would be a good process. Further discussion suggested that the map would have GIS layers that could be pulled up on screen while the members worked with a map on the table to discuss each TAZ.

MOTION By Mr. Edgell to table approval until the committee can review maps and aerials and GIS data. Seconded by Ms. Cornwell. Motion carried.

Mr. Edgell said that he would forward his map to the Committee members. Ms. Gray said that this might take more than one meeting. Everyone agreed that multiple meetings would be acceptable.

6) DISCUSSION ITEM: Employment Projections for the Model

Mr. Galvin said that it may be premature to discuss the employment projections. It seems that the employment distribution is more art than science. Staff could look at the opportunity for the development of businesses. He hoped to have some ACS numbers by the time he got to this section. He felt it would be best to finish the household projections first.

There was further discussion concerning how to figure out future employment locations. Mr. DuRoss noted that there are ten types of jobs figured in the model. He agreed that it was definitely more art than science. He also noted that there was a shift happening from manufacturing industrial side to retail service side. He suggested allocating total jobs first, then type and location. He also agreed that household population needed to be established first.

Mr. Galvin said that he had Mr. Johnson work on a model than concentrated population to the growth zone in an extreme way. He felt it might be realistic, but not palatable to use for projections.

Mr. Edgell felt that Delaware was in a middle stage, and he wasn't sure it would change drastically. He felt the economy was still reeling from the recession and that there was a real downturn in development. Rather than building single family homes, developers were coming back to change the mix to add townhouses. Mr. Galvin said he was concerned with that – Eden Hill was evolving into a townhouse project rather than the mixed use retail and different types of housing originally planned. Ms. Callender said that from a municipal point of view, the people already in a subdivision of single family homes were not happy when the subdivision was changed to smaller and less expensive homes that what was already in place.



Mr. DuRoss felt there was value to a more focused scenario as a reference point for VMT – is that really where we want to go? Mr. Galvin said the scenario that Mr. Johnson did for the MPO was really a peak oil scenario, postulating use of public transit and rail, and concentrated population around rail lines.

7) QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Ms. Callender asked what planners meant when they said “mixed use.” The contractors all seemed to have different ideas. Ms. Gray said that there was a range of levels and gave some examples mixing residential, commercial and business. Mr. Galvin explained that mixed use was whatever you define it to be, and that it can be incorporated into the town’s code.

8) NEXT STEPS/NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on March 24, 2011 at 10 AM in the Council Chambers of Camden’s Town Hall.

9) ADJOURN

MOTION By Mr. Edgell to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Ms. Callender.
Motion carried.