1. Update on developing 2050 control totals
   a. Frank Lenk, MARC’s Director of Research Services, presented proposed employment and population predictions for the KC Metro. Mr. Lenk showed employment history and forecast from 1969 to 2050. The trend shows two past recessions and another predicted in the next decade within an otherwise steadily upward trend. He expects about 2 more years of growth, then a brief recession, followed by the Federal Reserve’s estimate of long-run growth of 1.8 percent. When compared to historic performance, the forecast employment growth trend is between 1990s-level high growth and the lower rates observed for the 2000-2010 decade. In a comparison of the population, employment, and labor force forecasts, the employment levels are higher than the labor force because of people holding multiple jobs. Population and employment change by decade shows population growing faster than jobs after the 2000s, where we added almost no jobs, but population still grew. In the 2010 decade, employment grew faster because the unemployed were going back to work.
   b. Mr. Lenk shared trends and forecasts of natural population change vs. migration by race. Among the white-Non Hispanic and Black Non-Hispanic population, migration will account for more of the population change than natural growth. Asians, other non-Hispanics, and the Hispanic population will continue to increase with a combination of natural growth and migrants. Future migration is spread evenly among whites and other racial/ethnic groups. He explained that forecasting by race/ethnicity is a new addition for the KC forecast. By 2035, Hispanics will be the largest minority group, and Hispanics and Asians, and other racial/ethnic groups will have an increasing share of the growth. Whites account for a smaller proportion of population growth in the future. Mr. Lenk asked attendees whether they anticipated problems with sharing population trends by race, and no objections were raised.
   c. In the trend of population change by age group, the share of population aged 65+ will increase the most.
d. Data will be sent out for review, and Mr. Lenk will present it to the Sustainable Places Policy Committee.

2. 2020 Census preparation

Mr. Lenk reviewed current and upcoming activities for local planners to prepare for the 2020 Census. Several TFC attendees reported involvement in recent preparation activities. The Census Bureau expects to get fewer forms returned, which then increases their costs to track down responders and increases the likelihood of data error. Census is hoping to use local address data to improve results. When cities respond to the boundary and annexation survey with boundary changes, Census will revise the area used for current and past population estimates, and they will edit block boundaries at city boundaries. Also, transportation planning zones will change to block groups. Criteria for boundaries may be revised. In the past, tracts must follow physical features such as roads, but using city boundaries as a tract boundary may be an option. Also, complete count committees will be established within communities to conduct outreach.

3. Place types

a. Mr. Lenk reminded attendees that ‘place types’ are being developed to calibrate Urban Sim. To create place types, noncontiguous groups of tracts are classified according to shared employment, population, and household change characteristics. He said that the place types have shown promise in correcting an initial forecast that spread change too evenly throughout the metro.

b. Andrea Repinsky, MARC Planner, reviewed the population change place types shared earlier with the TFC, plus preliminary work on employment change-based place types. Options for block-based place types were explored, as well as a process to determine the similarity of all tracts to the tracts that experienced the highest levels of change prior to the forecast period. Where successful, tract population, housing unit, or employment change will increase as the similarity to high-change tracts increases. This was achieved with population and housing unit change, but not with employment change, which has a much less clustered pattern. Additional refinements will be made and presented to the committee.

c. Suggestions/questions:
   i. Look at what drives businesses to make location decisions.
   ii. Consider using percent loss/gain of employment.
   iii. Consider how to handle the very different employment location variables—very different forces influenced the location of the Edgerton Intermodal facility vs. employment in Lee’s Summit or other employment centers. We may be able to model changes in employment by sector.
   iv. Consider the influence of existing public infrastructure on the availability of land for development.

4. Other data

Work continues on editing data used to set maximum potential housing units, population, and employment per block.