

# Potential Smart Growth Indicators

DRAFT September, 2009

Indicator	Availability of Data/Information	Frequency of Updates	Geography of the Indicator (County, Municipality, Region, State)	Empirical Data vs. Derived Analysis	What does the indicator tell us? What Goal is it Accomplishing?	Issues with Indicator	Who is responsible for Reporting?	Workgroup Recommendation
-----------	----------------------------------	----------------------	--	-------------------------------------	---	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

1. Housing Choices, including affordability:								
<b>1. Housing Vacancy Rate</b>	Census, ACS Data for some counties, and USPS	Decennial, quarterly and yearly where possible (ACS)	State and County. Zip code or Census Tract if possible.	Empirical	Identifies housing revitalization needs and opportunities in particular jurisdictions.	1. The 2005-2007 averages from ACS is not available for Kent County. 2. Year by year ACS data is only available for 16 Maryland counties. It should also be noted that year to year data is not supposed to be compared to each other because of the methodology used to collect the data. 3. No issues with using decennial census data or USPS data	DHCD	OK
<b>2. Housing production / growth -</b> New residential building permits inside and outside PFAs	Residential permit data in and out of the PFA required by House Bill 295.	Annual	State, County.	Empirical	Identifies extent and location of new residential construction activities.		Local Governments	OK
<b>3. RENTAL &amp; OWNER AFFORDABILITY:</b> Cost Burdened Households (all household types) a. Owner Costs as 25% of Household Income b. Renter Costs as 30% of Household Income	American Community Survey / CHAS	Annual	State, County	Empirical and Derived	Identifies extent of households that have a cost burden (paying too much for housing) for renters, owners, and elderly.		DHCD	OK
<b>4. Shortfall / Demand for Rental Housing</b>	Data is currently produced by DHCD	Annual	State, County	Derived Analysis	Identifies demand for affordable/workforce rental housing for families, seniors and disabled.		DHCD	OK
<b>5. Subsidized &amp; Affordable Housing Inventory.</b> Number of subsidized rental housing opportunities by county.	DHCD survey/research of HUD, Housing Authorities, & Local Governments.	Annual/Every 5 Years	State, County, zip code.	Empirical	Indicates available supply and location (where possible) of affordable rental housing.	DHCD commits to updating and expanding the list moving forward. DHCD already reports this inventory to HUD as part of the 5 year Consolidated Plan.	DHCD	OK

Indicator	Availability of Data/Information	Frequency of Updates	Geography of the Indicator (County, Municipality, Region, State)	Empirical Data vs. Derived Analysis	What does the indicator tell us? What Goal is it Accomplishing?	Issues with Indicator	Who is responsible for Reporting?	Workgroup Recommendation
<b>6. Home Sales and Affordability:</b> Percent of housing for sale by county for households earning 60%, 80%, and 100% of AMI with sample professions representing income tiers.	MRIS and MDP	Monthly and Yearly	State, County.	Empirical data	Identifies the market supply of affordable/workforce for sale housing. A central indicator to identify local affordability.	Data is collected and available by price point rather than AMI. It could include picking additional price points.	DHCD	OK
<b>2. The Impact of Growth on the Environment, including Land, Air, &amp; Water:</b>								
<b>7. Amount of impervious surface</b>	Would have to be generated. MDP's land use layer could be the base for this. Explore using building permit data to capture this information.	Every 5 years	Municipality, County, watershed	MDP derived the impervious cover from land use classifications. If building permit data, would be empirical.	The percent impervious surface in a watershed correlates with the health of aquatic resources. The watersheds with the highest values for this indicator offer the greatest potential for implementation of best management practices whose objective is to filter runoff and moderate runoff peak velocities. GOAL: Environmental Protection.	If using MDP data, this would be a generalized estimate of impervious surface. Building permits do not uniformly capture this information.	MDP/Local Governments	OK, further study to explore site level data through building permits.
<b>8. Development on septic systems</b>	Available from MDE/MDP	Annual	County	Number of septic systems is empirical; pounds of nitrogen released could be derived	The increase in the number of septic systems is an indication of the number of buildings constructed in areas not served by public systems. GOAL: Environmental Protection	Data is collected at the local and state level. Further study on this would determine the best way to collect the information.	MDE/Local Governments/MDP	OK, further study to explore possibility of capturing data through building permits
<b>9. Percentage of new development served by public sewer</b> (as opposed to onsite sewage disposal system, such as septic systems)	MDP has a method to collect this information using the County Master Water and Sewer Plans  Many local governments have this information	Annual	County	Empirical	Public sewer generally correlates with denser development and development closer to existing communities. GOAL: Environmental Protection.	This indicator depends on accurate Water and Sewer plan data. MDP collects this but many Water and Sewer plans are outdated and the maps may not accurately reflect where sewer service actually exists.	Local Governments/MDP	OK
<b>10. Acres of open space in permanent protection (including parks, forests, wetlands, agricultural land) and the means of protection (easement type, fee simple ownership, donated etc.)</b>	Available from DNR/MDA/Counties/MDP	Annual	State, County	Empirical	Indicator of where tracts of resource lands are being permanently preserved across the State. GOAL: Resource land conservation	May be difficult to capture all the data. For example, MDE sometimes imposes permanent protection of wetlands and buffers in permits. (Remember HB 754 from 2009?)	DNR	OK
<b>11. The amount of forest acres</b>	This indicator should be tied to Forest Conservation Act implementation: acres of forest conserved on-site, planted on and off site, and fee-in-lieu activities.	Annual	County	Derived	It is not environmentally beneficial to clear forest; conservation of forest is generally good;	The indicator tells us little about the quality of the forest, e.g., the size of the contiguous tracts or the	DNR is required to report annually. See Nat. Res.	OK, further study to consider alternative indicators for this related to development

Indicator	Availability of Data/Information	Frequency of Updates	Geography of the Indicator (County, Municipality, Region, State)	Empirical Data vs. Derived Analysis	What does the indicator tell us? What Goal is it Accomplishing?	Issues with Indicator	Who is responsible for Reporting?	Workgroup Recommendation
cleared, conserved, and planted	DNR is working on using NAIP aerial photography to track this indicator				establishing new forests has many environmental benefits. GOAL: Resource Conservation	habitat value.	Code Section 5-1613.	(example: forest lost per residential unit or developed acre)
12. Number of developed parcels using best management practices for stormwater management	Available from MDE for jurisdictions covered by MS4 permits	Annual	County	Empirical	A great deal of development occurred before the stormwater programs began. Retrofitting is (or is going to be) required in Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permits (MS4 Permits). GOAL: Environmental Protection	This indicator is not directly related to growth, but it does represent investment in land management to restore the environment. It may not be available in all jurisdictions.	MDE	OK
13. Wastewater treatment plant capacity and reported flow	MDE	Annual	By wastewater treatment plant, could be aggregated to region.	Empirical	Increases in capacity result from investment in infrastructure to serve relatively compact growth. The difference between capacity and flow usually indicates whether there is a potential for growth.	Capacity rarely changes for a specific WWTP. If tracked by construction permits, data will not reflect when the plant comes on line or when it will use all the capacity.	MDE	OK
14. Land Use Change - loss of agricultural resource lands	MDP land use/land cover layer and parcel information	Updated every 5 years (parcels updated annually)	County	Empirical	Estimate of acres of land lost to development over time	Frequency of updates, data compatibility over time	MDP/local government	OK, further study to consider using Ag Census for this measure.
<b>3. The Fiscal Cost of Growth:</b>								
<b>4. The Job and Housing Balance:</b>								
15. Jobs-Labor Force Ratio	BLS and DLLR for labor force data	Annual	Region, County	Empirical	Can inform as to the basic relationship between demand and supply of labor at the County level, but should NOT be used to set a particular "ideal" ratio. A ratio is also more relevant at the region level, where the component counties are all in the same job market/labor force shed.	Will have different measures of jobs (BEA/BLS) which would yield different results. Use of households or housing unit data, while the more common measure, will neglect to take into account different demographics of populations and ultimately different labor force characteristics.	MDP	OK
<b>5. The Impact of Transportation on Growth:</b>								
16. Mode shares of transit, walk and bike for work or non-work, telecommuting	American Community Survey (Census Bureau)	1 year and three and/or five-year averages depending on population size	State, region	Survey	Indicates the percentage of people who use transit, bike, walk, or other non-SOV travel. Goals: to increase transportation choices; investment in transit and other alternative transportation; maximize transportation system connectivity, walkability.		MDOT	OK
17. Transit ridership rates	MTA, local transit systems	annual	State, region, County		Indicates the increase/decrease of transit usages. Goal: encourage transit usages		MTA/Local transit system	OK

Indicator	Availability of Data/Information	Frequency of Updates	Geography of the Indicator (County, Municipality, Region, State)	Empirical Data vs. Derived Analysis	What does the indicator tell us? What Goal is it Accomplishing?	Issues with Indicator	Who is responsible for Reporting?	Workgroup Recommendation
<b>18. State or Local major transportation investment inside or outside PFAs</b>	State: CTP; Local: CIP	annual	State, County, Municipality	Derived Analysis	Indicates where major state and local transportation improvements are implemented and how they may affect growth. Goal: invest major transportation facility improvements to support growth inside PFAs	Transportation projects are linear in nature and often located partially within PFAs, which creates ambiguousness for defining whether a project is outside or inside PFAs. The 1997 Priority Funding Areas law restricts the use of State funds to only fund major transportation projects that are located within PFAs. The law does not provide clear guidance for a project that is partially within and partially outside of a PFA. To address this issue, in 2002, COMAR 11.04.13 Smart Growth established criteria to determine whether a State transportation will be considered as locating inside PFAs. Generally speaking, a transportation project deems to be located inside PFAs if each segment of the project is less than 5% of the total lane miles of the project, or necessary for access management purposes, and if the total length of these small segments of the project is less than 20% of the total lane miles of the project.	MDOT/MDP for state projects; County/municipality for local projects	OK

**6. The Impact of Growth on Business, including Job Creation, Fiscal Impact, Agribusiness, Toursim, & Forestry:**

**7. The Impact of Growth on Cultural and Historic Resources:**

<b>19. Number of projects reviewed for compliance with federal and State laws (i.e. "Section 106" Reviews)</b>	Data currently maintained by MD Historic Trust (MHT) staff	Annually	Counties and Municipalities	Empirical	Projects are broken down into "effect" categories (i.e. no effect, no adverse effect or adverse affect), so it could tell us where growth is adversely affecting historic properties.	Section 106 reviews are only completed for projects requiring State or federal funding, permits or licenses. Privately funded or county/municipal-funded projects not requiring licenses or permits would not be counted.	MHT	OK
<b>20. Number of demolition permits issues for properties 50 years old and older.</b>	Most jurisdictions track demolition permits. Adjustments may need to be made to track the date of the building.	Annually	Counties and Municipalities	Empirical	It tells us the number of potentially historic properties demolished.	It may be hard to tell if the demolition was completed to allow new development on the property or if it was demolished just to be demolished. It would be ideal if we could capture this information in the permit process, (i.e. demolition for redevelopment, threats to un-insure by insurance company, or condemnation by local authorities.	Local Governments	OK
<b>21. Number of building permits issues for properties 50 years old and older.</b>	Most jurisdictions track building permits. Adjustments may need to be made to track the date of the building.	Annually	Counties and Municipalities	Empirical	It tells us the number of potentially historic properties rehabilitated.		Local Governments	OK