

**Georgetown Scott County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee  
January 20, 2022 Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 p.m. All Committee members were present, except Smith, Hostetler, Jones, Prather & Mifflin. Director Joe Kane and Planners Matt Summers and Elise Ketz were present.

**Introductions:**

Joe Kane appointed Mark Sulski as acting chair for the meeting. Kane presented an introduction to state statutes and background of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Public Involvement Plan:**

Matt Summers presented an introduction to the public involvement plan.

Jack Conner asked if different focused surveys could also be made (ie. for out-of-state developers, members of the public, entrepreneurs looking to franchise in the region). Additionally, he recommended creating a database of past responders to pull from for upcoming surveys and public engagement events.

Kim Rice referenced past experience with online survey collections for 2016 Parks & Rec Comp Plan. She mentioned that she has a 3,000 individual database where she collected approximately 600 responses in 2016. Rice also commented that there should be additional focuses on non-traditional methods of news media, such as social media. There were concerns mentioned on length of survey reducing completion rates.

Conner asked that all public meetings be held in a larger place that would be able to satisfy demand, such as the extension office.

Kandice Whitehouse recommended expanding online surveys to Facebook and having physical surveys at the library and other community gathering buildings. She asked if intentional surveys could be distributed in a direct to consumer manner. Whitehouse referenced past experience with conducting surveys in marginalized and underrepresented groups, and that they are more willing to collaborate with individuals who they trust and not search for surveys to complete as well as feel compensated for their time. She mentioned the K-Count is coming up, which is an annual count of individuals experiencing homelessness in Scott County. Her staff may be able to use the event to get more completion rates amongst underrepresented groups.

Rice recommended hosting public meetings and mini-kickoff events at the Ed Davis Learning Center and other areas where people gather.

Covington commented that the SC Fiscal Court and Georgetown were interested in collecting information on community views on infrastructure needs. He stated that SC Fiscal received \$11 million in ARPA funds and Georgetown received \$9.5 million in ARPA funds. Use of the money was initially restricted, but recently the uses were expanded. The money was intended for use to support the

community during the pandemic. A survey was released by Georgetown and drafted by SC Fiscal asked community members what the most positive use of the allotted funds would be. He asked if parts of surveys from SC Fiscal and the GSCPC Comp Plan be combined as to not repeat questions and increase usability of the information.

Covington also mentioned that in 2018/2019 a Capital Projects Committee was formed, a citizen board specifically intended to guide SC Fiscal in how the community wishes for money to be spent. While the pandemic prevented meeting of the Committee, the intent was to restart it shortly.

Rice reiterated that the P&R Comp Plan was due and that surveys would be collected from the population. She believed that if the surveys were combined, they would be best able to reach more people as there would be duplicate questions between the GSCPC Comp Plan and the P&R Comp Plan.

Covington recommended that additional questions regarding where future business parks (BP-1) should be located be included in the survey.

Conner stated that the 2022 Economic Development Plan was expected to be released in April 2022 and that hearings from the consultant's recommendations and conclusions would be held that would relate to the survey questions.

Covington clarified that Georgetown collected survey information asking the residents what they wanted prior to the restrictions being lifted and that the SC Fiscal had not sent one yet. He recommended contacting Georgetown to see if they would be interested in collaborating with the GSCPC Comp Plan & SC Fiscal surveys. Covington also commented on conducting the survey, and that the Planning Commission should consider purchasing ads on Facebook or through a company that targets ads to specific IP addresses within the county to increase visibility.

After closing of discussion, the preliminary public involvement plan was endorsed with emphasis that the survey would need further review and collaboration.

**Demographics Background:**

Summers presented on county and city demographics. Kane presented on changes to the community since the 2017 GSCPC Comp Plan.

Covington stated that the SC Fiscal included projected costs to purchase ROW, utility easement, and construction were included in the three upcoming annual budgets (2022, 2023, & 2024) to allow for transportation/KYTC improvements. He stated that a portion of those costs could be allocated to support construction of possible business parks, should they be formed.

**Exercise:**

Staff presented the Visioning exercise for the Committee. Group 1 (Whitehouse, Sulski, Conner, & Debbie Osborne) focused on a 1.0% annualized growth rate, Group 2 (Covington, Rice, Todd Stone, Mary Robey Singer, & Alonzo Allen) focused on an 1.76% annualized growth rate, and Group 3 (Chase Azevedo, Les Jarvis, Kim Menke, & Greg Hampton) focused on a 3.0% annualized growth rate, all at the county level. The groups considered what their vision for the future county population is and what possible opportunities and threats were affiliated with each growth rate.

Group 1 had a discussion concerning quality of life, affordable housing, public-private partnerships (P3s), diversifying the economy, valuing existing farmland and the regional agricultural economy. They listed opportunities as that the slower rate than seen from 2017-2020 would allow for creative solutions and would allow for greater control and management could be executed in terms of growth of infrastructure and amenities. They listed one threat that any population growth would result in further turnover of agricultural lands to other uses, as well as that the cost of agricultural lands would push small agricultural landowners away decreasing the ability of the agricultural economy in SC to exist in perpetuity. Additionally, they listed a threat that the growth would result in limited opportunities for those in the population from marginalized groups (newcomers, young people, lower income, etc.).

Group 2 had a discussion concerning infill practices, schools, workforce readiness, balancing new developments having affordable housing and agricultural lands, incentivizing the diversification of the local economy, quality of live (parks & entertainment), and regional connectivity. They discussed that the surrounding counties are more anti-development while SC is focused on pro-development (or at least pro-growth) policy would strengthen the bargaining power to bring new economies and people to the region. They listed opportunities as that the increased population would increase the tax base of each municipality and the county overall, that the population would demand expansion of the entertainment & retail sectors of the economy (and respective tax base) as well as that the population would demand further areas for community gathering and outdoor programming. They listed threats as that the infrastructure would struggle to keep pace with the growing population (ie. public servants, physical facilities, parks) and that the policies towards annexation could prove to be a challenge to the existing government structure and relationships between the municipalities and the county.

Group 3 had a discussion on where the growth would go, municipality and county government autonomy, and protection of key geographical and environmental features (ie. Greenbelt management). They listed opportunities as that the fast rate of growth would encourage the region to embrace innovation (ie. policy, residential development, industries) and that the reduction of buildable land due to the population requiring amenities would result in more sustainable practices. They listed threats as that the inherent consumption of existing green areas would be not environmentally sustainable, ideas related to the basic right to public services would need to change as providers respond to increased demand, difficulty developing and maintaining the “growth paying for growth” approach, and that there is a careful balance between responsible growth and exacerbation of new or existing hazards.

**Closing Comments:**

Kane closed the discussion. He made concluding comments and presented the Committee Bylaws.

**Motion by Rice and seconded by Singer**, the Committee Bylaws were adopted unanimously. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair was postponed to following meeting.

After discussion, the Committee voted to hold all future meetings on the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of each month from 4pm to 6pm in the GSCPC offices. Kane closed the meeting at 7:30.

**There being no further business, the Meeting was adjourned.**