Cecil County
Comprehensive Plan

Scenarios Workshop
July 31, 2008
Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Overview of Process/Schedule/ Roles of Technical Advisory Committee and Oversight Committee
3. Trends, Constraints and Issues
4. Criteria
5. Driving Forces and Possible Futures
6. Goals, Objectives and Overlaps/Desired Futures
7. Potential Scenarios
8. Evaluating the Scenarios
Overview of the Process
Technical Advisory Committee

- Eric Sennstrom, Cecil County Planning and Zoning
- Anthony DiGiacomo, Cecil County Planning and Zoning
- Al Wein, Cecil County Administrator
- F. Scott Flanigan, Cecil County Public Works
- Vernon Thompson, Cecil County Economic Development
- Diane Lane, Comprehensive Plan Citizens Oversight Committee Chair
- Gerrit Knaap, National Center for Smart Growth Education & Research
- John Leocha, Maryland Department of Planning
- Melissa Appler, Maryland Department of Transportation
- Mike Nixon, Maryland Department of Transportation
- Janice Outen, Maryland Department of the Environment
- Dan Blevins, WILMAPCO
- Dave Gula, WILMAPCO
- David Nemazie, Facilitator, Maryland Extension Service
- Clive Graham, ERM
- Michael Bayer, ERM
- Ben Sussman, ERM
Project Organization

Cecil County
County Commissioners
Planning Commission

Planning and Zoning Department
Eric Sennstrom
Anthony Di Giacomo
David Black

ERM Team
Clive Graham, Project Manager
Michael Bayer, Senior Planner
Ben Sussman, Water Resources

Oversight Committee
7 subcommittees
Each committee is meeting to draft policy recommendations on the plan elements assigned to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick off</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Issues, Define Goals and Objectives, Develop Preliminary Policy Recommendations</td>
<td>February-June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepare Draft Comprehensive Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>July 2008-</strong> January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Oversight Committee Draft Plan</td>
<td>February-March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Subcommittees/Full Committee)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Forum</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Review</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Review</td>
<td>June-July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Public Hearing/Work Sessions</td>
<td>August-September 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Commissioners Public Hearing/Work Sessions</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Adoption</td>
<td><strong>November 2009</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cecil County Comprehensive Plan Schedule

**REVISED – February 22, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Planning and Zoning Staff</th>
<th>Oversight Committee</th>
<th>Sub-committees: Agriculture and Preservation</th>
<th>Housing and Recreation</th>
<th>Economic Development and Tourism</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Transportation</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Water Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan Topic: Water Resources (July 16, 6:30 p.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Old business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review water resources element and how water resources relate to future land use in Cecil County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review preliminary goals, objectives and issues for the plan (input from sub.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions and comments from subcommittees meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PLAN ELEMENTS: Background, Water Resources Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preliminary Comprehensive Plan vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings as scheduled by subcommittee chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Plan Topic:</strong> Land Use (Sept. 17, 6:30 p.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Old business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review preliminary policy recommendations and land use alternatives drafted by subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions and comments from subcommittees meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PLAN ELEMENTS: Land Use, Land Development Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehensive Plan vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review preliminary policy recommendations with subcommittee for presentation at next month’s OC meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transmit meeting minutes to P&amp;Z staff by Sept. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Plan Topic:</strong> Infrastructure and Transportation/Public Services and Facilities (October 15, 6:30 p.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Old business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review preliminary policy recommendations drafted by subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions and comments from subcommittees meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PLAN ELEMENTS: Transportation Plan, Community Facilities Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review preliminary policy recommendations with subcommittee for presentation at next month’s OC meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transmit meeting minutes to P&amp;Z staff by October 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Plan Topic:</strong> Agriculture and Preservation (Nov. 19, 6:30 p.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Old business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review preliminary policy recommendations drafted by subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions and comments from subcommittees meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PLAN ELEMENTS: Sensitive Areas, Historic, Priority Preservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review preliminary policy recommendations with subcommittee for presentation at next month’s OC meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transmit meeting minutes to P&amp;Z staff by December 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cecil County Comprehensive Plan process**
Scenario Building Process

Objective track:
- Trends, constraints and issues
- Driving forces shaping trends
- Possible futures
- Build scenarios
- Test and evaluate scenarios
- Develop preferred plan and policies

Subjective track:
- Scope and set up process
- Stakeholders and goals
- Goals, objectives and overlaps
- Desired futures
Trends, Constraints and Issues
Scenario Building Process

Objective track:
- Scope and set up process
- Trends, constraints and issues
  - Driving forces shaping trends
  - Possible futures
  - Evaluation criteria
  - Stakeholders' and goals
  - Goals, objectives and overlaps
  - Desired futures
  - Build scenarios
  - Test and evaluate scenarios
  - Develop preferred plan and policies

Subjective track:
- Scope and set up process
County is Projected to Grow Significantly

Cecil Population Growth 2000-2030

- 2002 Series
- 2004 Series
- 2007 Series

County is projected to grow significantly.
## Projected Growth Rate Highest in MD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Maryland</td>
<td>5,296,486</td>
<td>6,362,100</td>
<td>6,446,400</td>
<td>6,737,750</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County</td>
<td>85,951</td>
<td>108,800</td>
<td>118,100</td>
<td>159,950</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Delaware</td>
<td>786,448</td>
<td>1,032,974</td>
<td>1,029,203</td>
<td>1,029,203</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle County</td>
<td>500,265</td>
<td>603,525</td>
<td>606,338</td>
<td>599,805</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cecil population growing 65%: fastest percentage in MD
- **6**\(^{th}\) largest in total population growth behind Montgomery, Prince George, Fredrick, Charles, Baltimore
### Projected Population Change Also Significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2005 Population</th>
<th>2030 Population</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County</td>
<td>96,950</td>
<td>159,950</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td>237,900</td>
<td>282,100</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>782,550</td>
<td>848,500</td>
<td>65,950</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County (MD)</td>
<td>19,850</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle (DE)</td>
<td>522,103</td>
<td>599,805</td>
<td>77,702</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cecil’s growth exceeds Harford County
- Nearly as much growth as New Castle County (DE) and Baltimore County
- Cecil projections may be over-estimated
  - Needs 1,100 units annually to reach projection total by 2030 (currently averaging 750)
Current Status of 2008 Update

• County-wide control totals established

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cecil</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>31,233</td>
<td>61,175</td>
<td>29,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>96,950</td>
<td>159,950</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• WILMAPCO completing planning district estimates

• Update based on changes in the countywide totals since 2005 data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 2030 From 2005 Series</th>
<th>Year 2030 From 2007 Series</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>61,825</td>
<td>61,175</td>
<td>-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>159,950</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Allocation of Projected Growth

### Total Population by Planning District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cecilton</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>5,892</td>
<td>1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>5,351</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>1,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkton</td>
<td>17,693</td>
<td>22,523</td>
<td>26,255</td>
<td>41,880</td>
<td>15,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Hill</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>8,082</td>
<td>9,144</td>
<td>13,093</td>
<td>3,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>16,204</td>
<td>18,673</td>
<td>20,592</td>
<td>38,229</td>
<td>17,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>7,172</td>
<td>9,102</td>
<td>10,307</td>
<td>14,820</td>
<td>4,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Deposit</td>
<td>9,533</td>
<td>10,325</td>
<td>11,305</td>
<td>25,747</td>
<td>14,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>4,407</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>1,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>6,268</td>
<td>1,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71,347</td>
<td>85,951</td>
<td>97,300</td>
<td>159,950</td>
<td>62,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Latest and Greatest" – but Still a Draft
Allocation of Projected Growth

Total Occupied Households by Planning District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cecilton</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ches. City</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkton</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>9,649</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td>16,260</td>
<td>6,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Hill</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>4,741</td>
<td>1,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>6,814</td>
<td>7,495</td>
<td>4,914</td>
<td>14,772</td>
<td>7,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>5,522</td>
<td>1,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Deposit</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>5,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24,725</td>
<td>31,223</td>
<td>35,250</td>
<td>16,198</td>
<td>61,175</td>
<td>25,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Latest and Greatest” – but Still a Draft
Cecil County
Household Projections
2005-2030

Household Changes
2005-2030
- 800 +
- 500 to 800
- 200 to 500
- 100 to 200
- Less than 100
Cecil Comp Plan
Land Use vs. Recent Housing Construction

- Houses Built Since 2004
- Town District
- Resource Protection District
- Municipality
- Mineral Extraction District
- Development District
- Suburban District
Cecil County Election Districts

- Municipality
- Town District
- Mineral Extraction District
- Resource Protection District
- Development District
- Suburban District
- Protected Land
- Planned Development
Housing Market Strong Til Recently

Housing Units Authorized for Construction 1990-2007-Cecil County*

Avg. Units:
1990-99: 791/yr.
2000-07: 754/yr.

* Includes Incorporated Areas. Source: MD Dept. of Planning
Where Are People Moving From?

Total Changes in Tax Returns 1999-2006

- New Castle (DE): 28%
- Harford County: 22%
- Other: 40%
- Delaware County (PA): 2%
- Baltimore: 2%
- Anne Arundel County: 1%
- Chester County (PA): 4%
- Baltimore County: 4%

Total Returns: 17,811
Where Are People Moving To?

Total Changes in Tax Returns 1999-2006

Total Returns: 14,241

New Castle (DE) 28%
Harford County 13%
Baltimore County 4%
Chester County (PA) 4%
Kent, DE 2%
Lancaster (PA) 2%
Baltimore 1%
Kent, MD 1%
Anne Arundel County 1%
Other 44%

Total Returns: 14,241
Capacity Analysis

- Based on current zoning, Cecil County has capacity for 67,512 additional households.
- Of this, 35,600 new households could be accommodated within the County’s Priority Funding Areas.
- This is more than the 26,000 households identified in the 2030 projections.
- Almost 90% of Cecil’s capacity can be found on large, undeveloped lots rather than smaller, infill-type lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Current New Household Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>14,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>3,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR</td>
<td>3,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>12,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>1,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>18,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>5,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,512</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity Analysis:
Cecil County at Buildout
Employment Trends

• Over the past five years, employment increased 27% while population rose 13%.
• Labor force participation among working-age males has been declining in Cecil County, generating a myriad of social ills.
• Cecil County has one of Maryland’s highest and most rapidly climbing divorce rates.
• Cecil County’s average weekly wage is higher than neighboring Harford County’s.
• Manufacturing represents 15.6% of all non-agricultural employment in Cecil County, but is less than 6% statewide.
• Manufacturing saw an increase between 2002 and 2004 of 12.2%, while manufacturing in the United States as a whole decreased.
• Retail Trade had the most business establishments in Cecil County each year from 2001 to 2004. The number of establishments increased 12.1% in this period.
• The Construction sector had the second most business establishments in Cecil County, and the number of business establishments in this sector increased 5.8% from 2001 to 2004.
• The number of business establishments in the Health Care-Social Assistance sector increased 30.1% from 2001 to 2004.
Employment Growth 2005-2030

Employment Growth
- 600 +
- 400 to 600
- 200 to 400
- 0 to 200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>EMP 2005</th>
<th>EMP 2030</th>
<th>2005 - 2030 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cecilton</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ches. City</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkton</td>
<td>18,784</td>
<td>27,344</td>
<td>8,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Hill</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>9,641</td>
<td>3,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Deposit</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>2,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County</td>
<td>37,800</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>18,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected Population Change 2005-2030 for the WILMAPCO Region by Traffic Analysis Zone.
Figure 1: 2000 County to County Commuter Workflows

Note: workers are defined as persons in the workforce over the age of 16.
Transportation: Challenges and opportunities

• Creating travel choices
• Accommodating the needs of older citizens
• Maintaining economic prosperity
• Preserving aging infrastructure
• Addressing rising gas prices
• Ensuring transportation equity
• Addressing congestion
• Improving air quality
• Financing our transportation system
Where have we been?
Building on ten years of progress

Demographic and travel changes, 1996-2005

- Population: 9.7%
- Households: 10.1%
- Employment: 10.7%
- Lane Miles: 4.4%
- Daily Trips: 8.6%
- Trip Length: 12.6%
- VMT: 14.1%
Where are we going?
Challenges and opportunities

• Future land use shaped by:
  - Future households (67,380 more households)
  - Future employment (53,980 more jobs)
  - NCCo Comp Plan
  - BRAC
Constrained 2030 WILMAPCO RTP Projects
Cecil County, Maryland

- Projects in Service by 2020
- Projects in Service by 2030

- I-95 widening - Susquehanna River to DE Line -
  Add 1 lane in each direction plus bridge expansion

- MD 272 - US 40 to Lums Rd.

- MD 213 - Fanchtown Road to US 40
Aspiration List – Cecil County Projects

Transit Projects

• Bus Maintenance Facility
• Park-and-Ride Lots
• Bus Transfer Facility
• MD Commuter Rail: Perryville to Wilmington
• Increase Bus Service
• New Bus Service

*On project list, but no funding yet*

Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

• Lower Susquehanna Heritage Greenway
• Susquehanna River Ped/Bike Crossing
• East Coast Greenway – Cecil County
# Aspiration List – Cecil County Projects

## Roadway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-95 Interchange between Perryville and Northeast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 213 (Augustine Herman Highway), MD 285 to Frenchtown Rd: Divided highway reconstruction</td>
<td>On project list, but no funding yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 213 (Bridge St.), US 40 to MD 279: Multi-lane urban reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 279 (Elkton-Newark Rd.), MD 213 to MD 316: Multi-lane urban reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway), Kent County line to Delaware State line: Access control improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 7 (Philadelphia Rd.-Cecil Ave.), East limits of Charlestown to MD 272: 2 lane reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 213 (Singerly Rd.), North of Providence Rd. to MD 273: 2 lane reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 222 (Perryville/Bainbridge Rd.), US 40 to MD 275: Multi-lane reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 222 (Bainbridge Rd.), MD 275 to Bainbridge entrance: 2 lane reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 272 (North East Rd.), North end of couplet to US 40: Multi-lane urban reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 273 (Telegraph Rd.), East Limits of Rising Sun to Sylmar Rd: 2 lane reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 279 (Elkton Rd./Newark Ave.), North of US 40 to west of MD 213: Divided Highway Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 40 (Pulaski Highway) MD 279 to Delaware State line: Divided highway reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water Resources

• Except for Rising Sun, most water supplies have capacity for some growth, but will likely face longer-term (2035 or so) problems.
• Most WWTPs currently exceed their nutrient cap limits on Phosphorus.
• Some WWTPs currently exceed their cap limits for Nitrogen.
• Without upgrades, all WWTPs face long-term limitations.
• With upgrades, many public WWTPs will still need to find offsets (nutrient trades) or alternative disposal methods (land application, tertiary treatment wetlands, etc) to accommodate growth.
Current Nutrient Loads

- The Cherry Hill, Cecilton, and Harbour View WWTPs currently exceed their point source caps for both nitrogen (TN) and phosphorus (TP).
- All plants except for North East River and Elkton are over the limit for phosphorus.
- Strategies are in place to upgrade these plants and to trade credits for additional discharge ability.
- However, based on existing conditions, the County will need to consider restricted growth or service area limitations to achieve nutrient caps.
- Alternatively, creative options include land application, Point to Point nutrient trading, Septic hook-ups, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public System</th>
<th>Existing Water Production</th>
<th>Demand, 2007</th>
<th>Net Available Capacity, 2007</th>
<th>Percent Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gpd</td>
<td>gpd</td>
<td>gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilton</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>47,800</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>92,400</td>
<td>114,600</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City (N)</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City (S)</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkton</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour View</td>
<td>51,700</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>31,900</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowview / Highlands</td>
<td>1,685,000</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>1,295,000</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>530,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>376,000</td>
<td>424,000</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Hills</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Deposit</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>216,100</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,186,700</td>
<td>3,837,100</td>
<td>3,349,600</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Wastewater Treatment Demand & Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gpd</td>
<td>gpd</td>
<td>gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilton</td>
<td>50,000 gpd</td>
<td>60,305 gpd</td>
<td>(10,305) gpd</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill</td>
<td>250,000 gpd</td>
<td>150,000 gpd</td>
<td>100,000 gpd</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City (N)</td>
<td>75,000 gpd</td>
<td>73,000 gpd</td>
<td>2,000 gpd</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake City (S)</td>
<td>88,000 gpd</td>
<td>57,000 gpd</td>
<td>31,000 gpd</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkton</td>
<td>2,700,000 gpd</td>
<td>1,625,000 gpd</td>
<td>1,075,000 gpd</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour View</td>
<td>65,000 gpd</td>
<td>31,000 gpd</td>
<td>34,000 gpd</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>50,000 gpd</td>
<td>44,000 gpd</td>
<td>6,000 gpd</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowview</td>
<td>700,000 gpd</td>
<td>400,000 gpd</td>
<td>300,000 gpd</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>2,000,000 gpd</td>
<td>1,400,000 gpd</td>
<td>600,000 gpd</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>1,650,000 gpd</td>
<td>696,000 gpd</td>
<td>954,000 gpd</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Deposit</td>
<td>150,000 gpd</td>
<td>124,000 gpd</td>
<td>26,000 gpd</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>275,000 gpd</td>
<td>228,000 gpd</td>
<td>47,000 gpd</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,053,000 gpd</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,888,305 gpd</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,164,695 gpd</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Nutrient Loads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>Wastewater System</th>
<th>Existing WWTP Demand</th>
<th>Existing Nutrient loading (lbs/year)</th>
<th>Load Cap (lbs/year)</th>
<th>2008 OVERAGE (lbs/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Creek</td>
<td>Chesapeake City (N)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>4,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chesapeake City (S)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>4,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Elk Creek</td>
<td>Cherry Hill</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>8,213</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>7,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemia River</td>
<td>Cecilton</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>2,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina River</td>
<td>Meadowview</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>9,734</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>42,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlands¹</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>3,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Elk River</td>
<td>Harbour View</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Susquehanna R.</td>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>16,937</td>
<td>4,234</td>
<td>20,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Deposit</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>8,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast River</td>
<td>Seneca Point</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>17,035</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>24,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octoraro Creek</td>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>12,484</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>15,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Elk River</td>
<td>Elkton</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>19,772</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>37,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>105,492</td>
<td>23,433</td>
<td>169,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRAC

- Commuting patterns indicate that roughly half of the Cecil County housing demand would focus on Perryville and North East (within a half-hour commute). The remaining half of demand would extend to Elkton and other areas more distant from APG.
- The County is projected to have a shortage of WWTP capacity, schools and housing supply.
- The county’s schools are essentially at full capacity. By 2017 BRAC would result in demand for school capacity that is approximately 14% to 19% greater than current capacity.
- BRAC could increase the total demand for new retail space over the next decade to 718,000 to 758,000 SF, an increase of between 16 to 22% over baseline demand.
- Increased growth most likely in western region of County, whereas health services, hospital, health department, police, and other services are concentrated in eastern region.
## BRAC

### Summary of mid-case scenario BRAC impacts by jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Public school population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td>19,237</td>
<td>7,059</td>
<td>19,059</td>
<td>4,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>13,954</td>
<td>3,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York County</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster County</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle County</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,682</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,042</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,927</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agricultural Preservation

• Cecil County comprises 222,824 acres, of which about 34.6% (77,089 acres) is farmland.

• According to data published by the Maryland Department of Agriculture's Statistics Service for the year 2000, Cecil County produced a grand total of $19,843,145 million in wholesale value.

• As of April 2008, Cecil County had 21,722 acres of permanently protected land through easements, with another 5,937 acres pending through the Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Program (MALPF).
Agricultural Preservation

• Preservation Programs in Cecil County include:
  – Cecil County Purchase of Development Rights – 299,435 acres preserved
  – Rural Legacy: Eastern Shore Land Conservancy & M.E.T. – 1,978 acres
  – Rural Legacy: Cecil Land Trust & M.E.T. – 1,330 acres
  – Forest Legacy: MD DNR – 854 acres
  – Eastern Shore Land Conservancy & M.E.T. – 1,083 acres
  – Maryland Environmental Trust – 2,830
  – Other Private Easements – 460 acres
Green Infrastructure

1. Leverage key state and federal conservation incentive programs.
2. Incorporate green infrastructure analysis into landscape and site level land use decisions.
3. Develop a green infrastructure tracking and reporting system.
4. Initiate a new County department focused on protection of green infrastructure, water quality, and natural resources.
5. Explore a potential nutrient trading system.
6. Explore new mechanisms for obtaining conservation capital, including a new local transfer tax.
7. Foster partnerships and educate the public about green infrastructure.
8. Implement identified water quality strategies.
Property Owner Goals for Stewart Property

- Mining will remain the primary use of the property between I-95 and US 40 (at least 15-20 years for the area east of Belvidere Road, 50 years to the west), and north of I-95 (with structures supporting mining operations)
- Owners support the concept of a master planned “new town” when this area develops, potentially as a master planned, mixed-use community “like Columbia” centered around the intersection of US 40 and Belvidere Road
- Residential areas would have a range of housing types
- Near-term development will continue to focus on employment uses (including commercial) at Principio Business Park
Belvidere Road

Long-term mining

Medium-term mining

Belvidere Road
Property Owner Goals for Stewart Property

• The first residential areas to be developed are south of US 40, starting in 10-15 years; as these develop, the commercial area west of Principio would come online

• Residential areas would be developed at densities that support transit

• Longer-term transportation and infrastructure issues: Desire for MARC station, incorporated as part of development, adjacent to employment and residential uses, as well as new interchange at I-95 and Belvidere Road
Property Owner Goals for Stewart Property

• Owners are willing to work within an environmental framework that allows them to develop the property

• Steep slopes, wetlands, streams and creeks would be protected as part of a master plan for the site
Scenario Building Process

Objective track

Scope and set up process
- Trends, constraints and issues
- Driving forces shaping trends
- Possible futures

Evaluation criteria

Build scenarios
- Test and evaluate scenarios
- Develop preferred plan and policies

Subjective track
- Stakeholders and goals
- Goals, objectives and overlaps
- Desired futures
Criteria

• Scenarios will be evaluated using the Choosing by Advantages process

• Criteria will include output from:
  – Traffic model (MDOT)
  – Growth Simulation model (MDP)
  – Water Resources model (ERM)

• In addition, quantitative/qualitative measures related to:
  – Agricultural lands affected
  – Impervious surface
  – Quality of life measures
  – Relative cost
  – Capacity of local governments to implement
  – Others?
Driving Forces
Scenario Building Process

Objective track:
1. Trends, constraints and issues
2. Driving forces shaping trends
3. Possible futures

Subjective track:
1. Stakeholders and goals
2. Goals, objectives and overlaps
3. Desired futures

Build scenarios
Test and evaluate scenarios
Develop preferred plan and policies
What is Causing Change in Cecil County?

• The County’s location along I-95 corridor, on the edge of one major metropolitan area and within commuting distance of another, generates demand for land

• The County’s considerable supply of undeveloped land and location within the region makes development relatively inexpensive

• Access to the I-95 and US 40 corridors has generated significant demand for warehouse and distribution uses

• The County has a relatively small employment base, so many residents must commute to jobs outside of the County

• The County’s labor force participation rate has been declining, particularly among men
What is Causing Change in Cecil County?

• Population growth has been rapid and is projected to continue through 2030
• Household size continues to decrease as the number of single-person households increases
• The population is aging and will continue to do so, but the County is also projected to get significant growth in the number of people under 19
• Scattered development may threaten the future viability of agriculture
• BRAC will increase demand for housing and result in spin-off demand for employment sites
Givens

• The price of resources is rising
• Increased protection of the Chesapeake Bay will constrain growth unless technology is changed and/or the provision of sewer and water infrastructure is better coordinated
Uncertainties

• Rising energy costs, at least in the short term, may affect locational decisions for housing and jobs
• Cecil County’s mix of employment and role in the regional economy is changing
• The era of inexpensive water may be over
• How sewer and water infrastructure will be provided in the future is uncertain
• The County’s fiscal capacity to implement large-scale infrastructure solutions is uncertain
Possible Futures
Scenario Building Process

Objective track

Scope and set up process

Trends, constraints and issues → Driving forces shaping trends → Possible futures

Evaluation criteria

Stakeholders and goals

Goals, objectives and overlaps

Desired futures

Build scenarios

Test and evaluate scenarios

Develop preferred plan and policies

Subjective track
Goals, Objectives and Overlaps
Scenario Building Process

Objective track

Scope and set up process

Trends, constraints and issues → Driving forces shaping trends → Possible futures

Evaluation criteria

Build scenarios

Test and evaluate scenarios

Develop preferred plan and policies

Subjective track

Stakeholders and goals

Goals, objectives and overlaps → Desired futures

ERM
New Development

- Limit growth
- Require new development to pay for the cost of providing the water it needs
- Encourage sustainability / green buildings
- Direct growth to existing transportation corridor (I-95/US-40/Amtrak/Conrail)
- Add flexibility to development controls to allow for creative and alternative solutions
- Restrict public utility extensions into rural areas

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Growth Corridor

- Designate growth areas & facilitate high density, mixed use development that will support transit
- Discourage growth outside of growth areas
- Direct growth to existing public facilities
- Focus transportation and infrastructure investments in growth areas

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Agriculture

• Protect, preserve and sustain prime agricultural land
• Encourage the economic viability of farming and farming related business

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Mining

- Identify and set aside areas most suitable for surface drinking water reservoirs, large scale tertiary treatment wetlands, spray irrigation and other future public service needs
- Provide for reclamation of mineral extraction district land in the County

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Preservation/Natural Resources

- Protect, preserve and restore the natural resources, open spaces, and historic sites throughout the County
- Develop and use innovative techniques, such as clustering and conservation easements, to help preserve open space
- Develop a comprehensive inventory of natural resource lands, and track and monitor these areas
- Locate recreation land and facilities close to population centers
- Use storm water management programs to reduce non-point source loading of nutrients and sediment into the bay, and to increase infiltration and aquifer recharge
- Sustain and protect existing water supplies

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Employment

• Attract and encourage manufacturing, high tech, and R&D industries, and have land available for economic development

• Encourage private and public economic activities, such as eco-tourism, natural resource-based outdoor recreation, commercial fishing

• Train and develop a labor force to fulfill the needs of these industries

• Support municipal economic growth initiatives

• Create employment opportunities near residential areas

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Transportation

• Pursue multiple modes of transportation, such as rail, buses, bicycles, trails, water transport, to decrease automobile use

• Encourage development of mixed use, pedestrian friendly communities

• Provide easier access to airports

• Promote and support ride sharing

• Reduce truck traffic on local roads

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Housing

- Provide a range of housing types to meet the needs of people at all income levels
- Identify and provide for the needs of the homeless
- Promote mixed-use developments
- Integrate housing options with shopping and employment opportunities

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Infrastructure

• Identify funding mechanisms such as impact fees and special taxing districts to finance County improvements

• Limit the provision of facilities and service in rural areas of the County

• Promote recycling, both commercial residential

• Sustain and optimize existing wastewater treatment capacity

• Develop new water supplies and wastewater treatment capacity to meet projected demand

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
Parks and Recreation

• Create a variety of quality recreational environments and opportunities
• Improve programming, coordination, and the integration of existing and future parks
• Make parks a priority in or near residential areas
• Identify funding mechanisms to create more parks and open space

Citizens Oversight Committee Draft Goals
## Potential Conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide for reclamation of mineral extraction district land in the County</td>
<td>Protect, preserve and restore the natural resources, open spaces, and historic sites throughout the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract and encourage manufacturing, high tech, and R&amp;D industries, and have land available for new development</td>
<td>Limit growth; Reduce truck traffic on local roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require new development to pay for the cost of providing the water it needs</td>
<td>Add flexibility to development controls to allow for creative and alternative solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use storm water management programs to reduce non-point source loading of nutrients and sediment into the bay</td>
<td>Encourage the economic viability of farming and farming related business; Protect, preserve and sustain all remaining prime agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct growth to existing transportation corridor (I-95/US-40/Amtrak/Conrail)</td>
<td>Direct growth to existing adequate public facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify funding mechanisms to create more parks and open space to be utilized by County residents</td>
<td>Focus transportation and infrastructure investments in defined growth areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Town Goals

• Elkton, North East, Perryville and Port Deposit want to grow, but in a manner that protects and enhances community character

• Directing development to growth areas with adequate sewer and water infrastructure and public facilities will require careful planning and coordination among the Towns and the County

• The Towns need infrastructure to grow but do not have the organizational capacity to build and manage it alone

• The Towns and the County should strive to make plans consistent

• Key areas of coordination include annexation, economic development, neighborhood and commercial revitalization and the protection of natural resources
Desired Futures
Desired Futures

• Direct growth to defined areas where there are adequate public facilities & infrastructure to support development

• Maintain the rural character of the County and preserve agriculture’s place in the economy (discourage development in rural areas)

• Protect, preserve and restore natural resources throughout the County, particularly Green Infrastructure and sites critical to water quality

• Attract and encourage manufacturing, high tech, and research and development industries. Train and develop a labor force to fulfill the needs of these industries.
Desired Futures

• Pursue multiple modes of transportation to reduce car traffic and facilitate movement within the growth area, as well as to create a pedestrian friendly community

• Make a variety of quality recreational environments and opportunities readily available to all citizens

• Pursue alternative funding sources for infrastructure and other improvements

• Provide a variety of housing options to support a diverse community, choosing mixed-use developments where appropriate
Potential Scenarios
Scenario Building Process

Objective track

Scope and set up process

Trends, constraints and issues → Driving forces shaping trends → Possible futures

Evaluation criteria

Stakeholders and goals → Goals, objectives and overlaps → Desired futures

Build scenarios

Test and evaluate scenarios → Develop preferred plan and policies

Subjective track
Potential Scenarios

• Buildout/Trends
• Town-Based Growth
• New Town on Stewart Property
• Constrained Approach
• Environmental-Based Growth
• Others?
Testing and Evaluating Scenarios
Cecil County Comprehensive Plan

Scenarios Workshop
July 31, 2008