CECIL COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
CITIZEN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
15 October 2008

Present: Walbeck, Carl; Lane, Diane; Doordan, B. Patrick; Stewart, Gary; Gilley, Paula; Pugh, Mike; Whiteman, Will; Derr, Dan; Strause, Vicki; Clewer, Jeff; Denver, John; Bunnell, John; Folk, Patricia; Priapi, Vic; Jackson, Ann; Shafer, Henry; Polite, Dan; Wiggins, Ken; Kilby, Phyllis; Bennett, John; Hodge, Robert; Bolender, Brian; Tapley, Donna; Thorne, Owen; Cairns, Ed; Hutton, Randy; Gell, Bob; Edwards, Sandra; Ellerton, Vaughan; Broomell, Diana; Buck, Walter; Bayer, Michael – ERM; Graham, Clive – ERM; Di Giacomo, Tony – P&Z; Sennstrom, Eric – P&Z

Absent: Poole, John, Snyder, Linda; Whitehurst, Dan; Smyser, Chuck; Rossetti, Rupert; Day, Shawn; Colenda, Sarah; Butler, Eileen; Deckard, Donna; Duckett, Vernon;

Call to Order: Chairperson Lane called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: Motion was made by Patricia Folk to approve the September 17th meeting minutes. Motion was seconded by B. Patrick Doordan with the proviso that his comments from the September meeting be included in the minutes. All members present voted in favor of motion to approve with B. Patrick Doordan's addition. Motion carried.

Update: Chairperson Lane provided a reminder to the COC that the November meeting will be held on Wednesday, 11/19/08 from 12:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in Room 208 of Cecil College's Technology Center.

New Business: Michael Bayer provided a review of the contents of the meeting packet and reviewed the agenda. The revised scenarios, how large should the County grow, what is density, and a review of the choosing by advantages (CBA) process and draft factors were on the agenda. The November meeting will focus on the CBA process to select a preferred alternative. A sub-group of COC members has met 3 times with Mr. Bayer to familiarize themselves with the CBA process and will act as facilitators at the November meeting. Michael Bayer reviewed the master schedule to remind the COC where we are in the process, reported that the scenarios were presented to the COG, indicated that the Towns will provide additional input, and models will be run on scenarios. He reiterated that we are still on schedule. Dr. Lane queried as to whether the COG comments will be available to the COC members. Mr. Bayer answered in the affirmative and that they will be included in the next packet. Mr. Bayer noted that ERM has synthesized the COC comments from last meeting and placed them in tonight's packet. The big questions seemed to be what are the numbers, what are the details, and is it a management or buildout plan. He stated that 2030 is an interim point in the long term growth focus. What density will accommodate that growth, what will it look like, and do ideas relate to specific areas are all components of scenario refinement once preferred scenario is selected. ERM will address these issues in the framework of that scenario. Will Whiteman expressed concern about there not being enough of a difference between

the two scenarios.   Michael Bayer explained that the two scenarios were created out of the previous three. Protected lands have been added with most of the changes occurring to the greenbelt scenario. Sensitive areas and productive agricultural soils have been included. Both scenarios will be tweaked with additional information from model runs. Carl Walbeck inquired as to whether the maps in the packets were the same as the map on the screen. It was determined that the maps were the same.

Michael Bayer stated that the data associated with each scenario is the key to the model run. Gary Stewart questioned the delta between resource and protected lands in the Greenbelt scenario.   Mr. Bayer explained resource would permit low density development while protected would not permit any development.   He added that protecting property rights will be discussed further. Donna Tapley asked if scenarios include feedback from previous meetings in that the growth corridor should reflect sensitive areas such as Bainbridge being 1/3 green. Michael Bayer said that they have included that feedback and the finalized scenarios will reflect those comments. Gary Stewart interjected that it is important to note that not all of the growth area will be developed. Mr. Bayer indicated that ERM is using MDP and MDE layers which include protected lands.   Gary Stewart noted that the mineral extraction district is not incorporated in the models. Michael Bayer said the calculations are based on ERM's meeting with Mr. Stewart. Carl Walbeck expressed a liking for the sidebar notes. Mr. Bayer stated that ERM will send them to the County for posting on the website. Clive Graham observed that there are green areas on these scenarios that weren't present previously. At this point, it is a balance between big picture and specific detail and that refining and detailing will follow. John Bennett inquired as to how the Agricultural Subcommittee should proceed with its work developing a Priority Preservation Areas element for the plan.   Michael Bayer responded that ERM will coordinate with the subcommittee. Clive Graham stated that ERM has met with MDP regarding the PPA and there has been a myriad of responses from different counties regarding this element. He does not see any harm in the subcommittee meeting with MDP.   Donna Tapley questioned the notes in the handout vis a vis the number of acres in each scenario. Michael Bayer said that they will be in the details.

Michael Bayer summarized the capacity analysis and looked at the capacity of the current zoning (67,512 additional units, 35,600 in PFA's, 26,000 above 2030 projection). Phyllis Kilby asked about the number of persons per household. Michael Bayer responded approximately 2.59 presently. Clive Graham opined that 5% is the typical vacancy rate and Cecil's rate in 2000 was 9%. He also said that ERM is using housing units, not households. B. Patrick Doordan asked if the RM zone is indicating 12,742 units, does that mean there are 12,000 acres of undeveloped RM land. Paula Gilley interjected that housing units include all housing types, not just single family. Dan Derr observed that 49,000 units would be placed in the growth area which would be an improvement. Robert Hodge noted that that assumes water and sewer infrastructure to accommodate growth.

Clive Graham presented a summary of housing units by model run, capacity analysis, mineral extraction, growth increment, total units, and corridor units. Gary Stewart and

Clive Graham engaged in a discussion of units on mineral extraction lands at complete buildout and the Stewart land holdings. 4,000 – 5,000 units was seen as a more realistic projection. Discussion ensued regarding TDR's and focusing growth in the growth area. Gary Stewart inquired as to how many units are in the growth area and whether the growth area can handle those units. Discussion ensued regarding housing units by zoning district and the size of the growth area. Clive Graham reminded the COC that they need to be asking if we are on the right road and do we need to change where we are heading. Discussion ensued on how Cecil stands in regard to other counties. As far as protection of land, Clive Graham feels we are above average. B. Patrick Doordan stated that talk about maximum buildout and 2030 with mining still occurring will create confusion as to when 67,000 units will occur. Gary Stewart noted that 11,346 housing units in the mineral extraction is too high. Michael Bayer indicated that 61,164 housing units will be there in 2030, 117,209 units at a point beyond that in the future. Paula Gilley questioned the reliability of the projections based on recent trends. She noted that only 15,000 units would be added by 2030 using recent development levels. Ed Cairns commented that the numbers entering the scenarios are most important. Brian Bolender queried on the amount of future units in the growth area as outside the growth area.

Michael Bayer explained what density is and provided examples of what existing subdivisions at differing densities in the County look like. He presented a density table comparing Cecil's growth area to growth areas in surrounding jurisdictions within the region. Mr. Bayer explained that at 0.62 units per acre by 2030, our growth area would look somewhat like the area of Harford County today between Havre De Grace and the Baltimore County line. At full buildout of 1.28 units per acre it would resemble I-95/U.S. 40 in Delaware at the present. Discussion ensued regarding TDR's, densities in rural areas vs. growth areas, and how units were derived. Mr. Bayer indicated that the density table would be finalized accounting for amount of buildout for each scenario with the mineral extraction adjustment. ERM will work with MDP on outputs. Michael Bayer summarized the next steps which include plugging numbers into scenarios, where the units go, how dense will it be, running the models based on future buildout as well as 2030 interim point.

Michael Bayer provided a reminder to the COC as to what the CBA process is and what it is not. The CBA process will make sense to the COC once they go through it. ERM and the subgroup will determine factors to evaluate the scenarios and identify the advantages of each attribute. A matrix will also be generated for the November meeting. The preferred scenario will be the output of November's meeting. Data will include model outputs, growth factors, travel factors, water resource factors, and other factors. Ed Cairns asked what will determine significant differences. Michael Bayer stated the term is used in the sense that the numbers will be different with inherent advantages in each. Some will drop out for various reasons. The decision process will be objective to the greatest degree. Will Whiteman asked what happens if there is no significant difference between scenarios. Michael Bayer said CBA has two parts, first is assigning advantages, the second is analyzing values assigned. Taking a piece from one to add to another may be the best or one may be better. Discussion ensued on factors and plan implementation. Vicki Strause queried as to whether other factors could be emailed.

Randy Hutton was vexed by the double siding of the maps in the copying process. He also reminded the COC of the importance of property rights and while it is important to have a TDR program, farmers can't be forced to sell their development rights. Mike Pugh declared that the premise of the scenarios needs to be known. Clive Graham stated that the scenarios are a vision and the COC needs to vote for the scenario that best meets their vision. ERM will comeback with a plan based on that scenario. Gary Stewart opined that in 2030 most of his holdings won't be developed and that TDR's haven't worked to date due to a lack of a viable receiving area. Discussion ensued regarding the lack of TDR implementation. Dr. Lane Stated that ERM will eliminate the abstract to the greatest extent possible.

Adjournment: Dr. Lane declared the meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Next Meeting: 12:00 p.m., Wednesday, 19 November 2008, Room 208, Technology Center, Cecil College

Respectfully submitted:

_____

Eric S. Sennstrom, AICP
Director of Planning & Zoning

ACRONYMS

CBA – Choosing by Advantages
COC – Citizen Oversight Committee
COG – Council of Governments
ERM – Environmental Resources Management
MDE – Maryland Department of the Environment
MDP – Maryland Department of Planning
P&Z – Planning & Zoning
PPA – Priority Preservation Area
TDR – Transfer of Development Rights