Direction 2030: Planning Task Force
Meeting 3
Wednesday, January 18, 2012

1. **Attendance**
   - **Present**
     Diane Brown, Chuck Eilerman, Marc Hult, Shad Sletto, and Ken Wynn.
   - **Not Present**
     Bill Goetz, Chris Moriconi, Dan Bell, Sherry Carran, Don Catchen, Paul Darpel, Jon Draud, Tom France, John Link, Paul Meier, Tom Rouse, and Gene Weaver.

2. **Introductions (Logsdon)**
   Mr. Logsdon described that Phase I of public input is complete and that staff is now examining how to obtain more input from groups that were not adequately represented within the first round. He continued by describing that Phase II would begin to examine the goals and objectives of the plan, which were created in the 1970s.

2. **Key Pad Highlights, Round 1 Public Meetings (Logsdon)**
   *Generation Representation*
   Mr. Logsdon began discussion of the keypad results with information pertaining to the generational breakdown that attended the meetings. He described the following results: Silent - 21.85%, Baby Boom - 38.24%, Generation X - 20.17%, Millennial - 7.14% and No Answer - 12.61%. Ms. Brown asked if the no answer category pertained to participants that arrived late. Mr. Logsdon replied yes, and that it also applied to people that may have chosen not to answer.

   *Demographic Profile of Participants*
   Mr. Logsdon provided the following details on demographic profile of the participants at the meetings. He said 56% of the attendees were makes and 35% were female with 59% of the attendees over age 45. A majority of the attendees (90%) were white. 79% of
the attendees had a college degree and 56% earned an income $65,000 or over. 68% of the attendees were married with 85% living in single family homes. Mr. Logsdon pointed out the 90% Caucasian ethnicity statistic and that staff is currently working on learning more from other populations such as the African American and Spanish Speaking populations in the county.

Alternate Modes of Transportation
Mr. Logsdon described that the basic breakdown of the statement “We as a community should prepare for a non-automobile dependent environment” consisted of a combined average of 40% who agreed and 36% who disagreed. The remaining 24% were either neutral or did not answer.

Mr. Logsdon described results from the question “Would you use alternate modes of transport such as bus or bike if...” and indicated the combined average was 51% for yes with improvements and 15% for never. Mr. Sletto stated that only 21% of people in Latonia stated we should prepare for alternate modes and then 68% stated they would use alternate modes. He questioned whether one could make a strong argument on the desire to use alternate modes if a lower percentage of people even wanted non-automotive modes in the first place. Ms. Brown offered that while she heard firsthand that some homeowners did not want to pay for alternate modes to be added, many of these same people reported they would use the modes if they were more plentiful.

Workforce Housing
Mr. Logsdon presented keypad results pertaining to workforce housing and affordability expressed by the question “Do you think every community has a responsibility to provide workforce housing that is affordable”. He mentioned that this question was very close in results (48% for and 44% against). Mr. Hult pointed out that at two of the meetings he attended people suggested the meetings should not be looking at generational differences, but rather at income differences. He pointed out that he was very encouraged that staff was examining income differences in the intermediary sessions. Mr. Eilerman questioned how results from this question specifically would be used to create policy for the plan. Ms. Reddy answered staff is nowhere near creating policy from results such as these, the answers simply provide insight as to what the public is thinking at this time.

Recreation Opportunities
Mr. Logsdon next discussed recreation opportunities based on the question “How satisfied are you with the choices for recreational opportunities for you and/or your
family in this community?” Results showed that 58% of people were satisfied with the options available in Kenton County and 30% were dissatisfied. He further elaborated by incorporating results from the question “What type of recreational opportunity would you like to see more of in Kenton County?” This question showed that when asked, 61% of respondents wanted some type of improvement and 27% said no improvements were needed.

**Environmental Issues**

Mr. Logsdon next presented results from the question “How important are environmental issues such as land conservation, water quality and flooding to you?” 60% of respondents said these issues were important and 15% said not important.

**Southern Kenton County Future**

Mr. Logsdon presented information specific to southern Kenton County from the question “In the next 20 years in southern Kenton County I would like to see more...” Results to this question are as follows: Agriculture 23.91%, Natural Areas 13.04%, Residential 8.70%, Other Development 15.22%, Stay the Same 32.61% and No Response 6.52%.

Mr. Sletto questioned whether it was a good idea to try to allow this area to remain agricultural. He specifically questioned where industrial land in Kenton County would go and where new jobs would be created. Ms. Reddy answered that there are currently about 1,200 acres of vacant land reserved for industrial use north of Walton Nicholson Road. Mr. Logsdon added there is more land south of the area previously described close to the railroad and interstate. Mr. Eilerman offered that approximately 85% of respondents did not want added industrial in the area. Mr. Sletto countered that it was 85% of people at one meeting in Piner and that he was not ready to commit the future of the southern end of the county to one group of 50 people. Mr. Logsdon suggested that perhaps the focus should not be on whether industrial is desired but rather that people still desire agriculture as a valid use in the area.

**County Improvements**

Mr. Logsdon wrapped up the discussion of keypad results with question “What needs to be improved in the county?” Mr. Logsdon pointed out that employment was the predominant answer for respondent’s first choice, and a majority of the second choice. Mr. Hult commented that it would be interesting to see the responses with the “Employment” category removed because he felt that you couldn’t really plan for employment with a plan of this type.
Mr. Logsdon stated that while the plan doesn’t create jobs it could do things like assist with reserving land for new jobs and businesses to be built. Mr. Sletto commented that physical attributes such as reserving land and improving infrastructure could help with job creation. He continued by stating Lexington has only reserved 100 acres or so for new industry, which today could encompass one employer. Mr. Eilerman discussed how Tier One decided to stay in Covington even after receiving several incentive offers from suburban communities around the tri-state area. He continued by stating he thought the new economy jobs would be more aligned with office environment rather than industrial.

Mr. Hult brought up the question about how the plan could assist in increasing employment. Mr. Hult’s assessment was that the plan should help to solve the issues that hinder new jobs from beginning and questioned whether real estate was the true limiting factor in job creation. Mr. Eilerman agreed and raised points from the Millennial discussion, where they wanted more of an urban environment that you could walk in with smaller homes and more density. Ms. Brown stated it might be a good idea to do a lunch focus group with younger employees from Tier One to get their impressions of the area and what they would like to see as time progresses.

Mr. Logsdon wrapped up his discussion of the first meeting results by stating there were and would continue to be several points raised that did not necessarily fit in with the plan. He raised the example of points brought up from the first meeting where people argued for less planning, lower taxes, and less government. He mentioned that statutorily areas are required to have a plan if they have zoning and subdivision regulations, both of which are present in Kenton County. He asked the group to think about those issues and keep them in mind as the process moves forward.

3. **Small Group Discussion Highlights, Round 1 Public Meetings (Fausz)**

*Meeting 1.1 – Dixie Heights High School*

Mr. Fausz described the first meeting as having a mixed message. Some attendees commented on less government, lower taxes, and no planning, while others wanted to see changes in the area. Those that wanted planning commented that the airport needs to be revitalized, new development should be focused in the built up areas to the north rather than in greenfields, and that job opportunities should be improved so the youth of the area don’t leave for other cities with better opportunities. He also mentioned that comments were presented about the lack of youth in attendance at the meeting and whether their voices really mattered.
Meeting 1.2 – Kenton County Extension Office
He described that some of the comments revolved around filling the needs of all age groups, creating new job opportunities to allow for attracting and retaining youth, and increasing connectivity between the built and rural area. One of the new points raised at the second meeting was the need to provide for the necessities of an aging population.

Meeting 1.3 – Latonia Baptist Church
Mr. Fausz said this meeting had the highest representation of younger people who described that their voices are not being heard even when they participate in the process. They also spoke about the need to attract and retain younger generations, specifically by stating the urban areas are not ready because of the fragmented transportation, housing and entertainment options.

Meeting 1.4 – Piner Elementary
Mr. Fausz said most of the respondents in attendance wanted to maintain the rural character of the area and if new businesses were to be built they should be smaller “mom and pop” type stores. He said there was also a desire for better infrastructure in the form of roads, water/sewer, and telecommunications. Mr. Eilerman stated he learned that many of the farm families don’t make their full income from the farm and have to travel to jobs. He said one of the reasons they wanted better roads was so they could get to jobs more easily, not necessarily so more people could move south.

4. Market Place Assessment (Michael Dinn, Dinn Focused Marketing)
Ms. Reddy introduced Michael Dinn and discussed how his efforts will help staff better understand the market and what it can support. Mr. Dinn described the housing cycle and how it used to be predictable before the recession. He stated the last housing cycle started in 1991 and asked the group to think about how their lives had changed over the last 20 years. He continued that his role in the plan is to provide and connect information, profile the county, categorize the county into populations that are easily understood, look at housing values and how the market grew in the last 20 years, and work towards predicting how the area will develop over the next 20 years.

He went on to describe the Market Advisory Panel (MAP), which was created to discuss ideas and gain feedback about the research. The panel consists of ten people including builders, a land developer, banks and lenders, real estate attorneys, a sales and marketing professional, civil engineer, architect, and community planner.

5. Next Meeting:
Next meet will be held on Wednesday, February 15, 2012 at 6:15 pm.