



Maryland DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

January 18, 2023

Planning Commission Chair Kara Voight
Town of Centreville
101 Lawyer's Row
Centreville, MD 21617

Dear Chair Voight,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft 2040 Town of Centreville Comprehensive Plan. (Draft Plan). The Maryland Department of Planning (Planning) believes that good planning is important for efficient and responsible development that adequately addresses resource protection, adequate public facilities, housing, community character, and economic development. Please keep in mind that Planning's attached review comments reflect the agency's thoughts on ways to strengthen the Draft Plan, as well as satisfy the requirements of Maryland's Land Use Article.

The Department forwarded a copy of the Draft Plan to several State agencies for review, including: the Maryland Historical Trust and the Departments of Transportation, Environment, Natural Resources, Commerce, Department of Disabilities, and Housing and Community Development. To date, we have received comments from the Maryland Historical Trust and the Departments of Environment, Transportation, and Housing and Community Development, and these comments have been included with this letter. Any plan review comments received after the date of this letter will be forwarded upon receipt.

Planning respectfully requests that this letter and accompanying review comments be made part of the town's public hearing record. Furthermore, Planning also asks that the town consider State agency comments as revisions are made to the Draft Plan, and to any future plans, ordinances, and policy documents that are developed.

Please feel free to contact me or David Dahlstrom, Eastern Shore Regional Planner at david.dahlstrom@maryland.gov.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Boyd, AICP
Director, Planning Coordination

Enclosures: Comments on the draft 2040 Town of Centreville Comprehensive Plan

cc: Joseph Griffiths, AICP, Manager - Planning, Local Assistance and Training
David Dahlstrom, AICP, Regional Planner, Planning



Maryland DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

Maryland Department of Planning Review Comments Draft 2040 Centreville Comprehensive Plan January 18, 2023

The Maryland Department of Planning (Planning) has reviewed the Draft 2040 Centreville Comprehensive Plan (Draft Plan) and offers the following comments for your consideration. These comments are offered as suggestions to improve the draft comprehensive plan and better address the statutory requirements of the Land Use Article. Other state agencies as noted have contributed comments. Still others may have comments submitted under separate cover. If comments from other agencies are subsequently received by Planning, they will be forwarded to the town in a timely manner.

Summary of the Draft Comprehensive Plan

This is a refinement and update to the 2009 Town of Centreville Community Plan.

The Draft Plan is a refinement, rather than a complete rewrite of the current 2009 Community Plan. The plan goals are generally the same, but an expansion to the Municipal Growth Area is proposed, and there is an immediate need to address the limited availability in water and sewerage capacity.

The purpose of the Draft Plan is to bring about careful development of a community and the conservation of which town residents find exceptional. The focus of the update revolves around five specific goals.

1. To provide direction on how to expand the water and sewer system, as the existing systems are at 97% of service capacity.
2. To develop local economy, commercial tax base, and resilient fiscal health.
3. To organize the character and function of the town's existing and future streets.
4. To show how to interconnect existing and future neighborhoods with outstanding open space and greenways to promote vitality; and
5. To guide the location, layout and character of future neighborhoods.

General Comments

Planning generally supports the town’s approach. It will be incumbent to address the water and sewer capacity issues to facilitate any meaningful growth and development within the next 10 years. Therefore, the town is encouraged to coordinate with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and Queen Anne’s County Public Works, to have the County’s Master Water and Sewerage Plan updated to reflect the effluent disposal needs and future growth and development goals of the town.

Without adequate sewer and water capacity, the proposed growth areas, including those newly proposed in the Draft Plan, are significantly larger than the available water and sewer capacity needed to facilitate development. The town’s growth projections will be limited without available sewer and water capacity. The town should consider that any future sewer and water capacity availability may not be available for use until the year 2028 and beyond, to allow for study, engineering, approvals and construction. The town should consider this timing factor as it implements the goals for the Draft Plan.

Additionally, there is a new requirement since the 2009 plan to complete a 5-Year Mid Cycle Review of all comprehensive plans, presumably as part of the Annual Report Review in the year 2028. The Draft Plan’s goals should consider measures needed to evaluate how the town is progressing in achieving its growth, development, open space, planning, and economic development goals. More detailed technical comments and questions on the Draft Plan Elements are provided in the sections below.

Minimum State Law Requirements for Charter Municipalities

Maryland’s Land Use Article sets forth the required components of a local comprehensive plan but does not mandate a specific format. As such, local governments have addressed these required elements in a manner that fits the needs of their community and the resources available to respond to the issues explored during the planning process. The following checklist summarizes an assessment as to whether each required local plan element is addressed in the Draft Plan.

TABLE 1

Checklist of Maryland Code (Land Use Article) requirements for local comprehensive plans in Maryland			
State Comprehensive Plan Requirements	MD Code Reference	Additional MD Code Reference	Draft 2040Centreville Comprehensive Plan page references
(1) A comprehensive plan for a non-charter county or municipality MUST include:	L.U. § 3-102(a)		
(a) a community facilities element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(i)	Land Use § 3-108 -- Community Facilities Element	Pages 79-86
(b) an area of critical State concern element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(ii)	Land Use § 3-109 --Area of Critical State Concern Element	Pages 29-38, 97, 98
(c) a goals and objectives element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(iii)	Land Use § 3-110 --Goals and Objectives Element	Various
(d) a housing element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(iv)	Land Use § 3-114 --Housing Element	Pages 55-60
(e) a land use element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(v)	Land Use § 3-111 -- Land Use Element	Pages 45-54

Checklist of Maryland Code (Land Use Article) requirements for local comprehensive plans in Maryland			
State Comprehensive Plan Requirements	MD Code Reference	Additional MD Code Reference	Draft 2040Centreville Comprehensive Plan Page references
(f) a development regulations element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(vi)	Land Use § 3-103 -- Development Regulations	Pages 90-97
(g) a sensitive areas element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(vii)	Land Use § 3-104 -- Sensitive Areas Element	Pages 29-38
(h) a transportation element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(viii)	Land Use § 3-105 -- Transportation Element	Pages 64-78
(i) a water resources element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(1)(ix)	Land Use § 3-106 -- Water Resources Element	Pages 39-44
(i) a mineral resources element, IF current geological information is available	L.U. § 3-102(a)(2)	Land Use § 3-107 -- Mineral Resources Element	Not applicable
(k) for municipalities only, a municipal growth element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(3)	Land Use § 3-112 -- Municipal Growth Element	Pages 15-28
(l) for counties only if located on tidal waters, a fisheries element	L.U. § 3-102(a)(4)	Land Use § 3-113 -- Fisheries Element	Not applicable
Optional: (2) A comprehensive plan for a non-charter county or municipality MAY include: (a) a community renewal element; (b) a conservation element; (c) a flood control element (d) a housing element; (e) a natural resources element; (f) a pollution control element; (g) information concerning the general location and extent of public utilities; and (h) a priority preservation area (PPA) element	L.U. § 3-102(b)	L.U. § 3-102(b)(2)(i)	Not applicable
(3) Visions -- A local jurisdiction SHALL through the comprehensive plan implement the 12 planning visions established in L.U. § 1-201	L.U. § 3-201(c)	L.U. § 1-201 -- The 12 Planning Visions	Pages 8-9, throughout
Optional: (4) Growth Tiers -- If the local jurisdictions has adopted growth tiers in accordance with L.U. § 1-502, the growth tiers must be incorporated into the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan	L.U. § 1-509		Not applicable

As shown in the above checklist, the Draft Plan includes the required elements as identified in §3-102 of the Land Use Article of the Maryland Annotated Code.

Detailed Element Review Comments

The following are detailed comments on each of the sections of the Draft Plan:

Section II – The Population of Centreville

- Page 11, footnote 4: “The number of housing units added through 2020 (278) is based on the Town’s tracking of its building and occupancy permits. It differs from the recently released 2020 U.S. Census estimate of 1,989 housing units which implies that 295 units were added during the decade.” There are two points in reference to the quoted text: First, do not use the term “Census estimate” please consider replacing with *2020 U.S. Census count* or *2020 U.S. Census number*. Second, as the town disputes the Census Bureau’s count of new housing units since 2010, is the town of Centreville submitting a challenge through the [Census Bureau’s Count Quest Resolution](#) program? If the town needs assistance with this process, please contact David Dahlstrom to coordinate any assistance our department may be able to provide.

- Page 12, the first paragraph generally describes the age cohort for the year 2000 - 2010. This paragraph suggests that the town is losing school aged children and younger adults. The town should consider how these demographic changes will impact future needs of the community and expected increase in age of the population. Perhaps the town should consider reworking the paragraph for clarity.
- Page 12, Figure 3: The town’s share of county population is depicted over a 70-year period from 1950 to 2020. The State Data Center in reviewing these percentages referred to the Census Bureau’s Decennial Census Publications, and to Census data accessible on our website. The State Data Center finds that the town’s share of county population in 1960 was 8.9 percent, in 2000 (9.0%) and in 2010 (9.5%). Please verify percentages shown in Figure 3 for the subject years-- 1960, 2000 and 2010. Question: Are the differences between the percentages shown in the Figure and Census Bureau data due to keeping the town’s boundary constant? If the town’s geographic boundary has been kept constant for purposes of municipal growth analysis, Planning suggests that the town provide more information about that methodology in a footnote or appendix.
- Page 12, footnote 5: While the first paragraph on the page refers to 2020 population data, footnote 5 refers to 2018 data. What is the reason for this discrepancy? It is recommend to update the footnote, based on the [April 2020 Population Estimates Base](#), to show the total municipal population as a percent of county population for those counties in the Upper Eastern Shore region. See below:

County	Municipal Population Share
Caroline	37.7%
Cecil	29.4%
Kent	42.3%
Queen Anne's	14.3%
Talbot	53.1%

Source: Maryland Department of Planning, MSDC 2020 PEP data

- Page 13, Figure 4: This chart depicts selected age breakdowns for years 2000, 2010, and 2018. Years 2000 and 2010 reflect decennial Census data while 2018 reflects a sample of the population based on the 2013-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimate. Since 2020 Census data on age characteristics will not be released until Summer 2023, consider updating the 2018 graph with information from the most recent ACS, the 2016-2020 ACS.

Age Group	Percent
Under 18	24.1
65+ Older	23.4
Everyone Else	52.5

- Page 14, Section on Households Structure and Families: This discussion is only focused on 2010 Census data. The 2020 Census information on this topic will not be released until Summer 2023. However, the Maryland State Data Center recommends including comparable information from the ACS 2016-2020. The State Data Center is including for your review and consideration the 2016-2020 ACS socioeconomic profile for Centreville as an attachment to these comments.

- Page 15, Paragraph 3: There appears to be some disconnect between the Town of Centreville’s count of 2020 occupied housing units and the Census Bureau’s count of occupied housing units: 1,846 vs 1,836. The town should verify the number of new units constructed and occupied in the town as of 2020. If the town’s analysis still finds that the total number of occupied housing units, as of 2020, is 1,846, then the town should consider challenging the Census Bureau’s findings via its Count Question Resolution (CQR) program. According to the 2020 Census, the breakdown of the town’s housing units is as follows.

Centreville Housing Units			
Year	Total:	Occupied	Vacant
2020	1,989	1,836	153
2010	1,694	1,568	126
Change	295	268	27

Source: Maryland State Data Center, Census Data

Planning appreciates the three alternative growth projections. 875 units of residential development capacity meets 714 units of housing demand under projection #3 by 2040 but doesn’t meet housing demand of 2,374

units under projection #2. Planning likes to see the municipal growth element offer a balance between land supply (capacity) and demand (future forecast) regardless of the Centreville commission’s selection. If more demand exists in projection #2, the need for the municipal growth area is justifiable. Some recommendations would be proposed to ensure efficient use of land and infrastructure, and desired land use patterns. Although there are planned land uses for the designated growth area in Map 2 (p. 23), it is omitting proposed zoning as well as residential capacity units based on those zonings.

Page 16, Table 2: The residential development capacity by zoning district shows Max. Density by code (units/acre) and Computed Density (units/gross acre). Planning believes that it would be better to explain how to calculate potential housing units from Max. Density by Code. Planning also suggests that the town consider reducing densities by a “density yield” factor to account for right-of-way and other “real-world” conditions that limit buildout. Planning’s default, or assumed, yield factor is 75% (in the “Models and Guidelines” document for [Writing the Municipal Growth Element](#)). This varies by jurisdiction and zoning district.

- Page 17: Figure 5, Major Residential Infill Parcels: This figure still shows old information. It needs to be updated according to the Table 2 (p. 16), Residential Development Capacity by Zoning District.
- Page 18, Table 3 - Alternative Growth Projections: Projection #1 should provide more detailed information for readers to appreciate and evaluate the projected values. Perhaps, include household data (years 2000 to 2020) and projections (years 2030 to 2040) for Queen Anne’s County, and explain how the 9.9 percent share was calculated.

Chapter III - Municipal Growth

Planning commends the town’s approach to exploring realistic alternative growth projections. Planning also commends the town’s zoning development capacity approach and prioritization of infill. Residential development capacity (within the current town boundary) is calculated to be 875 potential housing units (page 16); 94% of this capacity is located in areas designated as major infill areas in the 2009 Community Plan and the Draft Plan.

Three Alternative Growth Projections are used in the Comprehensive Plan. Projection #1 is based on the town having the same county share of population in 2040 as it does in 2020 (9.9%), resulting in an additional 444 households by 2040; Projection #2 is based on the same growth trend in the town as occurred between 2000 and 2020, resulting in an additional 2,374 households by 2040; Projection #3 is based on the same growth trend in the town as occurred between 2010 and 2020, resulting in an additional 714 households by 2040.

The town's remaining water and wastewater treatment capacities are not sufficient to meet any of the growth projections; additional capacity would be required to meet demand within the scenarios. Current public water use plus commitments totals 622,600 gallons per day (97% of permitted capacity). Current demand for wastewater treatment plant capacity is approximately 542,000 gpd (93% of available capacity). Projection #2 is the most aggressive growth scenario, resulting in additional water and wastewater treatment demand of 618,500 gpd each. Projection #s 1 and 3 also result in demand beyond the current capacity for both the water and wastewater treatment systems. Projection #3 was selected as the scenario to forecast growth through 2040, resulting in a projected population of 6,670 by 2040.

Page 20: Indicates that current public water use plus commitments totals 622,600 gpd; however, the Water Resources chapter indicates on page 40 that current actual water use is approximately 360,912 gpd. With limited capacity, is there a mechanism to retire commitments? In addition, the text on page 20 indicates that current wastewater treatment plant demand is 542,000 gpd, but Table 5 on page 20 lists the current demand as 503,000 gpd. Also, the projections for water and sewer demand in Table 5 for Projection #s 1, 2, and 3 seem to be for additional demand beyond the current demand rather than total demand; this should be clarified in the table title, column headers, etc. Planning recommends that these different figures be corrected or explained to add clarity.

Planning recommends that the town consider coordinating with Queen Anne's County Public Works to amend the Master Water and Sewer Plan (WSP). The timing of future water and sewer service areas for the proposed growth areas should be coordinated with the anticipated provision of future water and sewer capacity. In general, most the growth areas will be limited with available capacity for at least 10-years based on typical infrastructure design and construction schedules. A detailed plan to achieve capacity, and expansion to future growth areas, should be established. The Draft Plan could be used to provide the framework for establishing these priorities in the WSP.

Since the water treatment plant will need to be expanded to meet projected demand, the town should consider whether more land area for plant expansion, or moving the plant to a different parcel, will be required. Planning recommends that the town include a recommendation for a study to identify where the additional needed water capacity can be sourced from and how the treatment plant will be expanded, including whether it will need to be relocated. The town should also identify any constraints related to expanding its wastewater capacity to accommodate its growth plan. If the town determines that constraints exist, then the WRE should put forward recommendations for dealing with those constraints. Before adopting this Draft Plan, the town should consider obtaining assurance from MDE that its plans for obtaining additional source water and obtaining additional wastewater capacity are feasible.

- Page 24 - Resource Conservation / Open Space:
This Land Use designation in the Draft plan is designed to protect resource land. The Resource Conservation designation encompasses those natural resource lands that exist today including wetlands, streams and their buffers, steep slopes, shorelines, and forested areas (See Chapter IV, Natural Environment). The generalized land use plan also envisions an expansion of resource lands as development takes place, through the widening of stream buffers and planned forest regeneration, and the designation of lands for future conservation area especially when connections can be made between natural areas. As future neighborhoods are developed, land

along existing streams and forest areas would be set aside for conservation and parks and open space amenities could be provided such as trails to link neighborhoods together. The town should be commended for considering measures towards increased stream buffers and forested area preservation.

- Pages 24 and 25, Complete Neighborhoods: Though geared for growth areas, the Complete Neighborhood concept includes features that support conservation and recreation:
 - The yellow areas on Map 2 show the location of the town’s future neighborhoods. These areas would allow for a diverse set of housing types, open spaces and parks, institutional uses, and, where applicable, a limited amount of neighborhood level retail, office, and commercial service uses. As noted in Chapter IV, Natural Environment, this Draft Plan recommends substantial forest regeneration, clustering home sites to minimize the coverage of the land in impervious surfaces, [and] connecting areas with bike and walking trails.
 - This Draft Plan prepares for a future when neighborhoods may look substantially different than the conventional single-family subdivisions now in town. In the future, homes may be clustered in higher density arrangements and in attached buildings which will leave more open space to be preserved.
 - It is important to clarify that this Draft Plan does not envision a future of residential subdivisions covering the entire growth area. Instead, it envisions pockets of well-planned and denser development interconnected with major preserved open spaces.
- Page 25: The objectives for Planned Urban Developments (PUDs) include the following:
 - To encourage cohesive, functional, and aesthetic use of open spaces including the enlarging resource areas, connecting existing and planned open spaces on adjoining tracts of land, and preserving of broad open vistas.
 - To encourage flexibility in the design of neighborhoods and construction of buildings so they are responsive to the unique environmental, cultural, and scenic resources that characterize a property and its surroundings.
- Page 28: Figure 7 - Greenbelt: The map of the greenbelt, is not clear, for three reasons:
 - The legend on the map contains two shades of green, one for Resource Conservation/Open Space and one for Greenbelt, but it appears that there is only one shade of green appearing on the figure.
 - The text says “The Greenbelt encompasses areas **beyond** the Growth Area” [emphasis added], however, some of the green appears inside the growth area.
 - The word “Greenbelt” appears six times on the map. Are the white areas underneath part of the greenbelt, or are the words intended to point to areas of greenbelt? If the former, please provide green shading; if the latter, please supply arrows pointing to the greenbelt.

If the greenbelt lies outside the town’s growth area, presumably areas under county control, then the Draft Plan should mention how Queen Anne’s County intends to keep the area rural. Parcels in the greenbelt that are already under easement or publicly owned should be shaded in a separate color or identified in some other fashion. Additionally, as the greenbelt was a feature in the 2009 Community Plan, it does not appear that any gain has been made since that plan’s adoption to secure a greenbelt. The town should consider identifying which actions have been taken to address the provision of a greenbelt, or the challenges associated with achieving this goal.

- Page 35, A Plan for Natural Resources: The objectives on page 36 and recommendations on pages 37-38 are promising; they include recommendations for a town forestry program and the transformation of the growth area “into High Value Ecologically Sustainable Neighborhoods.”

Chapter VI - Land Use

Existing land uses in Centreville include Central Business District, Commercial, Institutional, Natural Resource, Office/Light Industrial, Open Space, Residential, Residential High Density, and Vacant. Future land uses include the same categories, except for Vacant since these areas are planned for infill. Future land use also includes the Municipal Growth Area boundary with Commercial, Complete Neighborhood, Employment, and Resource Conservation/Open Space land uses.

- Page 46, Land Use: The parcel lines, five-foot contours, and dotted lines of various kinds that appear in the map legend are difficult to recognize on the map. Perhaps a couple of the contours could be deleted, and the others made more legible on the map.
- Page 46, Local Jurisdictional Annual Report Tools. General comments. Page 47: “The Town’s designated growth area is comprised of very large tracts of land. Each has significant development potential, and with thoughtful planning and coordination, an inter-connected arrangement of open spaces and naturalized areas can be preserved for recreational use and environmental protection.”
- Pages 48-49: The objectives are good, including “To create a network of open spaces and resource conservation lands which will secure important environmental functions, form the basis of a town wide recreational asset, and promote community health, vitality, and scenic beauty.”
- Page 49 -The Municipal Growth Area: As shown on the Future Land Use figure on page 49 appears larger than the current town area, and it seems that annexation into these areas would more than double the size of the town. However, the growth area also includes a significant proportion of Resource Conservation/Open Space area. In particular, the county has identified two areas with Deed Restricted Open Space designations, one north of Rt. 304, between the middle school and Rt. 301. The other is north of Rt. 301 between Rt. 213 and Rolling Bridge Rd. The Draft Plan should consider identifying the preservation of these open spaces or discuss how these areas will be incorporated into future Complete Neighborhoods and the future street network.
- Page 50: The text says that “Areas planned for Open Space / Resource Conservation include improved public and private recreational areas....” However, on the map these areas appear linear in nature and are not located within the large areas of Complete Neighborhoods. The description of Complete Neighborhoods on page 53 indicates that they will contain parks and open spaces, but it’s not at all clear that this land will address the recreational needs of the added population. (Future parks to be located in Complete Neighborhoods are shown on figure 17, which doesn’t appear until page 88. Perhaps parks should be shown on Map 6 on page 49).

While Planning appreciates the discussion of Centreville’s future growth, it is important to consider the size of the growth area relative to (1) in-fill development capacity and (2) future growth projections.

- According to Table 3 on page 18, the town assumes growth projection scenario #3, which anticipates adding 714 housing units between 2020 and 2040. However, on page 17, figure 5, the plan identifies five sites with a potential in-fill development capacity of 810

dwelling units. It appears that the town may be able to absorb most, if not all, of the anticipated residential growth, and would only require land for non-residential uses. Please confirm if this assumption is accurate.

- It would be helpful to provide readers with the existing town limit acreage so that a comparison can be made to the proposed 2,250-acre growth area. Also, it may be helpful to provide anticipated in-fill and growth area non-residential capacity, so that it is possible to determine how much commercial, institutional, office and industrial land uses may be accommodated within the existing town limits.

In the last paragraph under A Plan for Land Use, it appears that Map 7 should be referenced as Map 6.

Chapter V - Water Resources

- Page 39. The Water Resources chapter of the Draft Plan references the Natural Environment and Land Use chapters as also being integral to the town's "comprehensive policy aimed at improving and sustaining the water related natural resources that protect the health and well-being of the town."
- Page 39, Existing Conditions, Aquia Aquifer: The sole source of potable water in the town is the Aquia Aquifer. The aquifer is also the most significant water source in Queen Anne's County. Heavy pumping of groundwater on Kent Island, where many Aquia Aquifer wells are located, and in some Talbot County towns has resulted in brackish water intrusion on the northwestern half of Kent Island. MDE no longer allows any additional appropriations on Kent Island. MDE will consider new appropriations east of the Kent Narrows, which includes Centreville, on a case-by-case basis. An area within the aquifer, including Centreville, exceeds the federal drinking water standard for arsenic; therefore, the town water treatment system requires arsenic removal. Due to these factors, the town should consider options for additional water sources to ensure future capacity.
- Page 40, Public Water: The town operates its own water supply system (which supplies the entire municipality with water), comprising three wells (well capacity and permitted withdrawal rate is 645,000 gallons per day [gpd]), three water storage tanks with a total storage capacity of 600,000 gallons (the town also plans to build a fourth, 600,000-gallon storage tank), and two water treatment facilities (North Brook and Business Park) with treatment capacities of 720,000 gpd and 700,000 gpd and including arsenic removal. Current actual water use is approximately 360,912 gpd. Due to the large amount of committed capacity, the town should consider options to retire those commitments that are not moving forward.
- Page 40, Corsica River Watershed and Non-Point Source Water Pollution: Centreville is located within the Corsica River Watershed. The Corsica River is a tributary of the Chester River, which flows to the Chesapeake Bay. Farm fields are the primary pollutant loading contributors to the Corsica River Watershed; but within the Centreville town limits, impervious surfaces are the primary source of pollutant loading. As of 2016, Queen Anne's County estimated impervious coverage in the Corsica River Watershed at 4.5%, whereas coverage above 10% is the threshold indicative of where the most sensitive stream qualities are lost; however, the town notes that the lower impervious coverage does not protect against the non-point runoff from farm fields in the watershed. The town should consider options with the county to address non-point runoff.

- Page 41, Wastewater Treatment: Centreville operates a public sewerage system, comprising a wastewater treatment plant (permitted to discharge 542,000 gallons per day, average, between December 1 and March 31) that discharges to Gravel Run (a “Use 1 Waterway” protected for human contact and nontidal warmwater aquatic life), and utilizes a spray irrigation system year-round for effluent disposal along with the approved seasonable discharge to Gravel Run.
- Page 42, Plan for Water Resources: Centreville plans to contribute to the county’s targeted reductions to meet the state’s 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement commitments by minimizing the pollutant loadings generated within the town, reducing/minimizing pollutant runoff by using Environmental Site Design under modern stormwater management rules for new development; and through seeking water quality improvements by implementation of this comprehensive plan’s recommendations, e.g. those regarding open space preservation, forest retention, stream buffers, and modernization of the wastewater treatment plant. Planning is encouraged by the town’s commitment demonstrated by these strategies.
- Page 42, Objectives: The Water Resources chapter identifies four objectives regarding ensuring safe and quality drinking water, protecting water quality as development continues, reducing water pollution “by retrofitting antiquated stormwater management, adding new green solutions to address untreated impervious areas, planting trees, restoring stream buffers and other approaches,” and encouraging low impact land development (LID) techniques as much as possible.
- Page 43, Recommendations: The recommendations regarding water resources include wellhead protection by preparing a Source Water Protection Plan and adopting a Wellhead Protection Ordinance; ensuring that abandoned well heads are properly closed and sealed; protecting remaining forests and streams, including forests in the Growth Area; managing stormwater with modern regulations and sediment and erosion control regulations, including guiding developers during early development site planning to use LID and environmental site design; minimizing impervious surfaces to remain under 10% in the face of development/expansion (to achieve this under-10%-impervious-coverage goal, the watershed can only accommodate up to 2.0 square miles more of impervious surface area). The town notes that they have already taken action to minimize impervious surfaces by allowing narrower streets and house clustering on small lots within planned unit developments; other implementation strategies the town notes they could consider include the reduction of standard parking requirements, requirements for pervious materials for parking areas and the prioritization of pervious materials in parks and larger developments, requirements for clustering in new subdivisions, and the incentivization of installing green roofs and voluntarily removing unnecessary lot coverage.
- Since the water treatment plant will need to be expanded to meet projected demand, the town should consider whether more land area and moving the plant to a different parcel will be required. Planning recommends that the town include a recommendation for a study to identify where the additional needed water capacity can be sourced from and how the treatment plant will be expanded, including whether it will need to be relocated. The town should also identify any constraints related to expanding its wastewater capacity in order to accommodate its growth plan. If the town determines that constraints exist, then the WRE should put forward recommendations for dealing with those constraints. Before adopting this comprehensive plan update, the town should consider obtaining assurance from MDE that its plans for obtaining additional source water and obtaining additional wastewater capacity are feasible.

The following recommendations are based on the [2022 Water Resources Element \(WRE\) Guidance Update](#).

1. A checklist of best practices to identify and plan for suitable receiving waters is within the 2022 WRE Guidance at <https://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurWork/envr-planning/water-resources-mg/2022/02/framework-checklist.aspx>. The state requests that local governments meet the best practices in this WRE Guidance Update as best as they can within the limitations of cost and time. The town has addressed some of these elements in its WRE, such as identifying farm fields as the primary pollutant loading contributors to the Corsica River Watershed. Some examples of best practices from the checklist that the city should consider implementing include a Pollution Risk Assessment; load reduction tracking; strategies for ensuring a higher-than-minimum-requirements-level of water quality restoration and protection; and identification of recurrent flooding areas and evaluation of whether climate change and planned development will worsen those conditions, along with changes to the land use plan where warranted.
2. All local jurisdictions in Maryland are and will continue to experience climate change impacts on water resources and water infrastructure (water, sewer, and stormwater), as well as water impacts on communities. The WRE should be adjusted to include strategies focused on improving local understanding of current or expected water-related climate change impacts at the local level, and if sufficient information exists, the WRE should add strategies to address these impacts. Best practices for integrating water-related climate change adaptation into the comprehensive plan are listed at <https://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurWork/envr-planning/water-resources-mg/2022/03/climatechange-checklist.aspx>.
3. If the land use changes in the town's comprehensive plan are planned in a watershed(s) prone to riverine or urban flooding, then the WRE should be adjusted to incorporate the flooding-related components of the 2022 WRE guidance. See <https://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurWork/envr-planning/water-resources-mg/2022/02/framework-cwa-wqfloodmgmt.aspx>. At a minimum, the WRE should indicate the extent of current local knowledge concerning flood-prone areas and should discuss whether implementation of the land use plan will increase, decrease, or have no effect on those flood-prone areas. If the local government does not know what type of impact implementation of the land use plan will have on flood-prone areas, then at a minimum, the WRE should call for a study to determine this.

Chapter VII - Housing

The passage of HB-1045 in 2019 requires a housing element in all comprehensive plans adopted after June 1, 2020. The new law requires a comprehensive plan to address the need for low-income and workforce housing, using the definitions contained in §3-114 of the Land Use Article and §4-1801 of the Housing and Community Development Article. The bill defines low-income households based on 60% of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Area Median Income (HUD AMI) and workforce households as 60% - 120% HUD AMI (homeownership) and 50% - 120% HUD AMI (renter). Centreville is in the Baltimore-Columbia-Towson Income Limit Area, for which 60% of the 2022 HUD AMI is \$69,660, and 50% to 120% of AMI is \$58,050 - \$139,320. Planning recognizes that page 55 of the Draft Plan includes the 2021 HUD AMI for the region and suggests that it be updated to include the more current 2022 figures.

Planning has developed Housing Element Models & Guidelines to address the recent legislation (HB 1045), which is contained within the [Maryland Department of Planning website](#) as a tool for local jurisdictions. (Here is the link: [11](https://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurWork/housing-element-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

mg/housing-element-home.aspx) Planning suggests that the Draft Plan use the most recent ACS 5-year estimate data for 2016-2020 on the website as opposed to the 2015-2019 data.

As part of the State of Maryland's efforts to define the housing issues today, the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development joined with the National Center for Smart Growth at the University of Maryland and Enterprise Community Partners, Inc. to develop [the Maryland Housing Needs Assessment & 10-Year Strategic Plan \(December 2020\)](#) (Needs Assessment). This document is intended to provide guidance to transform Maryland into a more affordable place to live by 2030 (page 1 of the Needs Assessment).

Section 2, Proposed Statewide Priorities on page 5 of the Needs Assessment suggests two types of priority needs: (1) homes for low-income households, especially extremely and very low-income households, and (2) constructing affordable and market-rate housing, thereby increasing supply in the market. Priority populations were identified as two specific income groups with unmet needs, those households at 30 percent AMI and households at 60 percent AMI. In addition to these income groups, the Maryland Housing Needs Assessment Advisory Group also noted that a focus should be placed on housing for seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons experiencing homelessness (page 7 of the report).

The Needs Assessment provides a focus for communities throughout the state to consider the priorities identified. In the case of Centreville, it would be consistent to align the analysis of the needs of the low-income, extremely low-income, and very low-income households.

The regional overview for Eastern Maryland, in which Centreville is included, begins on page 48 of the Needs Assessment. Maps 5 and 6, pages 50 and 52 of the report respectively, classify Centreville as an area of "Lowest Need" for homeowners and "Lowest Need" for renters. Planning recommends that the town consider the priority actions for homeowners and renters that are expressed in the Needs Assessment. For the former, these include homebuyer assistance programs and expansion of the use of the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development's [Maryland Mortgage Program](#) financing. For the latter, this includes expanding rental licensing programs and increasing available resources for property rehabilitation.

The Draft Plan, page 56, mentions that 39.77% of renters and 26% of homeowners are housing burdened. Planning suggests that the Draft Plan be expanded to include a housing plan with more guidelines and specific strategies and measurable objectives about how the town will address affordable housing for workforce, low-income, and senior residents.

Planning applauds the Draft Plan's objectives and recommendations aimed at promoting diverse housing types serving all households, including those making less than 60% of the median household income and seniors, as well as the strategy to develop an inter-generational housing taskforce, as these will both address the requirements of HB 1045 and support the provision of senior housing, expressed as a need on page 59.

Planning also encourages the town to consider expanding its affordable housing planning scope to include some of the following strategies, with the understanding that some will likely require expanded water and sewer capacity.

- Low-income and workforce housing for households with children;
- Protecting and preserving the existing supply of affordable housing;

- Consider inclusionary zoning to mandate a portion of residential units as either workforce or affordable housing in the development of new construction and in redevelopment opportunities;
- Consider if zoning adjustments to permit duplexes and accessory apartments in the R-1 and R-2 zones are a potential option to increase housing diversity in the town, as well as incentives to encourage a greater variety of housing types, such as increased density and missing middle housing products in the existing single-family neighborhoods, vacant areas, and in the proposed designated growth area; and
- Consider strategies to continue to promote a high level of home ownership. This strategy could also be addressed in updates to the town’s Sustainable Communities Action Plan.

The town should also be aware of the recent passage of [HB 90](#) (2021) relating to State and Local Housing programs – Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. The intent of the bill is as stated in the preamble of the bill. Section 3-114 of the Land Use Article is amended in the bill (effective January 1, 2023) to include the following:

- (d) (1) Local jurisdictions have a duty to affirmatively further fair housing through their housing and urban development programs.
- (2) The housing element of a comprehensive plan that is enacted or amended on or after January 1, 2023, shall include an assessment of fair housing, to ensure that the local jurisdiction is affirmatively furthering fair housing.
- (3) On request of a local jurisdiction, the Department of Planning shall provide technical assistance for the purpose of developing the housing element of the comprehensive plan.
- (4) This subsection does not require a local jurisdiction to take, or prohibit a local jurisdiction from taking, a specific action to affirmatively further fair housing.

Planning is collaborating with state agency partners to develop guidance and resources for jurisdictions to address HB 90 new housing element requirements. The department recently post some information, guidance, and resources on the topic of affirmatively furthering fair housing on the [Housing Element Models & Guidelines](#) webpage. At a minimum, Planning recommends that the Draft Plan should include descriptions of Maryland requirements for fair housing and a policy statement that the town supports and will continue to ensure that it will affirmatively further fair housing through its housing and community development programs.

Chapter VII - Transportation

Planning notes that both the housing and transportation chapters are labeled as VII. Planning suggests that the Draft Plan be updated to fix that duplication.

Planning recognizes that the town’s transportation planning vision is to develop an interconnected system of complete streets that promote walkability and reduce traffic along the downtown MD-213/South Liberty and South Commerce Street corridor. Planning is pleased to see the Draft Plan includes transportation recommendations that would help achieve the planning vision and maintain and improve the walkability in the town. These recommendations include the construction of the planned collector street system as the town grows (page 70), the application of new complete streets development principles (page 73) and the development of a bicycle and pedestrian master plan (page 77).

Recommendations

Planning offers the following specific suggestions which may help Centreville prepare for future growth impacts to its transportation network.

- The Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) is currently developing plans to construct a new Chesapeake Bay Bridge crossing, which will make it easier to travel to and from Maryland's eastern shore and will impact growth and development in Centreville and throughout the Eastern Shore region. Planning recommends that the Draft Plan (1) acknowledge the Tier II NEPA study, (2) discuss the Town's existing and anticipated future efforts to coordinate with local and state transportation and planning agencies, and (3) discuss Centreville's efforts to plan for potential transportation-induced growth-related impacts.
- Planning is glad to see the Draft Plan identify strategies to finance public facilities such as roads, sewers, and water infrastructure using developer impact fees. The cost to construct future public facilities for an anticipated 2,000 + acre growth area may require additional creative financing and phasing strategies. Do you anticipate developing these in a future comprehensive plan update?
- Planning appreciates the town's recommendation to require developers to finance and build multi-use trail linkages within or near development projects (page 77). This is an innovative strategy to maintain bicycle and pedestrian connectivity between the town's neighborhoods.
- According to page 60, the share of town residents 65 years and older increased from 18 to 22 percent from 2010 to 2019. This age cohort represents transit-dependent riders that will demand transit services to healthcare, shopping, and other destinations. Centreville should consider assessing the adequacy of existing transit service and make recommendations to support or enhance the service, if needed.
- Increasingly, plug-in electric vehicles (EV) are gaining popularity in Maryland. The town may want to consider supporting EV charging facilities. For more information on local EV resources including technical and financial assistance programs, please refer to the Maryland's EV website at https://marylandev.org/local_ev_resources/.
- Refer to Figure 16 (page 77), the town plans to convert the segment of the inactive Maryland and Delaware Railroad (MDDE) in Centreville to a trail. The town should coordinate with the MDDE and the Maryland Department of Transportation regarding the proposal.
- On page 66, the first paragraph mentions Table 10, but Table 9 should be referenced. On page 67, the last paragraph mentions Table 11, but Table 10 should be referenced. Please double-check references on Table 9, 10, and 11 on pages 66 and 67 and make corrections.
- Page 74: This section contains two promising New Street Development Principles (and the accompanying photographs are helpful):
 - To the extent possible, all Primary Local streets should include ample planting strips and street trees well suited to and selected to complement the design of the street.
 - The development of all new streets, primary streets, and local streets and lanes, should follow required design standards and specifications, including those standards in the town's Tree Ordinance, that the town maintains and would revise in accordance with this Draft Plan.

This section also includes a greenway and trail map that shows extensive connections between existing, programmed, and planned trails within greenways.

- Pages 82-85, Parks. The Draft Plan defines Mini Parks, Neighborhood Parks, and Community Parks and says, “A fourth type, Natural Resource Areas, can also fit into a larger system of recreational assets and this is certainly the case in Centreville.” The Draft plan gives examples of these types in the town or nearby. Page 85 acknowledges the shortage of parks in town:

“[T]he Town is deficient in neighborhood parks and miniparks. There are no neighborhood level parks in Town apart from the private HOA-owned parks in North Brook and Symphony Village. It is important to note that the Town is home to four public schools whose grounds may hold potential for park programming, which may be especially beneficial to the residents that live within walking distance of them.”

A 318-acre (county) community park that serves the town is located just north of town. Also, the town planning commission recently approved a YMCA, which will provide additional recreational activities.

- Page 85: The town mentions its ability to acquire land and develop parks through the county’s Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation (LPPRP) and Program open Space (POS) processes. This is commendable. Page 95 goes further to recommend “that the Town participate with Queen Anne’s County in its regular five-year update of the County Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan.” Because Queen Anne’s County’s Draft LPPRP was not completed until November 2022, the Centreville plan could not refer to it. Perhaps the final adopted Centreville comprehensive plan can acknowledge some of the findings of the county’s LPPRP. For example, page II-30 of the LPPRP mentions the proximity and equity map for the central county, which shows that “[o]ne of the two areas of the county that indicate a Medium High need based on the layers in the State’s Equity Maps is located on the southeastern side of Centreville. This area has access to fields and open play space at Queen Anne’s Middle and High Schools but does not have access to a neighborhood or community park within a half mile. The closest town park is Mill Stream Park on the other side of Centreville.”

In addition, the capital improvement plan in Appendix C of the LPPRP lists seven projects in Centreville that the Centreville comprehensive plan might want to address.

- Pages 87-88, the Draft Plan makes an excellent recommendation to address park, open space, and green infrastructure shortcomings:

“This Plan recommends that the Town Council appoint a citizen committee to study the Town’s recreational needs, develop standards that will shape how parks are provided and improved overtime including the availability of public schools [sic] grounds for recreation, to assemble a park master plan, and to coordinate with Queen Anne’s County on a regular basis in the update of the County Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreational Plan.”

“With or without a more detailed study or plan..., as discussed throughout this Plan, the Town aspires to develop a greenway and trail network along with public neighborhood parks in all future neighborhoods. Figure 17 shows existing parks and the recommended general location of future greenways and parks. Where greenways are shown on land to be developed, such land should be dedicated by the developer to the Town as public resources to be preserved in

perpetuity and improved for public recreational and educational purposes and managed for environmental protection.”

- Clustering is a way to allow maximum lot yield while providing parks, open space, and trails. In addition, the recommendations on pages 88 and 89 include these good ideas:

“Future neighborhood development in Centreville will favor creative arrangements of open spaces and neighborhood design that prioritize high accessibility to parks over the run-of-the-mill platting of lots that maximize the yield of lots. Until such time as the Town adopts specific regulations, the following standard should stand as the minimum amount of parkland in new developments: 1,000 square feet of parkland should be provided for each proposed household in a residential development.”

“This Plan also recommends that the Town coordinate with Queen Anne’s County Public Schools to program school grounds for recreational purposes especially in areas that lack neighborhood parks. Centreville Elementary School and Kennard Elementary School are especially accessible for residents within their respective neighborhoods.”

- Page 91: Calls for the creation of a Resource Conservation/Open Space District. The text says that it should contain “purposes and standards in accord with this Plan,” but perhaps a sentence or two of greater detail can be provided or indicate how these districts will be incorporated into the town’s zoning and land development regulations.
- Page 92: Contains this good recommendation for a longer-term regulatory change: “Amend the subdivision regulations to require the expansion and reservation of broad riparian buffers and the reservation, improvement, and dedication of planned streets, open spaces, parks, and school sites as a condition of subdivision approval.”

Chapter IX - Implementation

- Planning commends the town for creating specific amendments, immediate and long term, that can help the town achieve its goals and objectives.
- Planning commends the town for its interjurisdictional coordination with Queen Anne’s County.

END MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING COMMENTS

**Maryland Department of Planning Review Comments
Draft 2040 Centreville Comprehensive Plan**

STATE AGENCY COMMENTS

The following pages contain comments from other State agencies in support of the Maryland Department of Planning (Planning) review of the Draft 2040 Centreville Comprehensive Plan (Draft Plan) as part of the standard 60-day review period for municipalities. Comments not included here may be submitted under separate cover, or via the State Clearinghouse. If comments from other agencies are received by Planning, they will be forwarded to the County in a timely manner.

Attachments

- Page 18: Maryland Historical Trust
- Page 20: Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development
- Page 23: Maryland Department of Planning, Resource Conservation
- Page 27: Maryland Department of the Natural Resources
- Page 31: Maryland Department of Transportation
- Page 35: Maryland Department of the Environment
- Page 37: Maryland Department of Planning – State Data Center



Maryland
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST

December 21, 2022

Mr. David Dahlstrom
Upper Shore Regional Planner
Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street, 11th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Mr. Dahlstrom:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft Town of Centreville Comprehensive Plan and submit comments on behalf of the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT).

In general, we recommend that the plan include a more robust description of Centreville's rich historic resources, as well as some discussion about how the existence of those resources and their preservation will support economic development, community revitalization, and quality of life. Centreville's Main Street designation, which brings benefits for historic preservation, and its inclusion in the Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area are only mentioned in Figure 18 (p. 97); we recommend more discussion of how participation in these programs can help the Town meet its goals. We also note that the plan refers to the [Maryland Historic Revitalization Tax Credit Program](#) (p. 53 and footnote 19) but does not mention other historic preservation financial incentives, which can be found on the [MHT website](#).

We very much support the proposal to increase local designations for greater access to incentive programs (p. 53) but recommend that the plan reference the properties already listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register. Specifically, in addition to a handful of individually listed properties, we note that the [Centreville Historic District](#) is listed in the National Register and the [Needwood-Content Rural Historic District](#) was determined eligible for listing in 2001. While we cannot evaluate, as part of this review, which properties are still extant or still retain the integrity necessary to achieve or maintain National Register listing, we encourage the Town to include this information in its plan. We also recommend noting that MHT holds easements on [Tucker House](#) and the [Centreville Armory](#), guaranteeing the highest level of protection and ensuring that MHT will review any proposed changes to the structures. Information about designated and documented (undesigned) historic properties can be accessed via [Medusa](#), MHT's online database.

Finally, as Centreville is located within the Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area, any comprehensive plan update must incorporate the management plan by reference. Please include the following language in the plan:

The Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area Management Plan was adopted and made a part of the comprehensive plans of Caroline, Kent, Queen Anne's, and Talbot counties in 2005. This update of the comprehensive plan, when adopted by the Town, incorporates by reference all portions of the Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area Management Plan, except those portions solely relating to other jurisdictions within the Heritage Area.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the plan. If you have any questions, please contact me at (410) 697-9592 or by email at nell.ziehl@maryland.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nell Ziehl". The signature is written in dark ink on a white background.

Nell Ziehl
Chief, Office of Planning, Education and Outreach

Cc Joseph Griffiths, MDP
 Rita Pritchett, MDP

December 13, 2022

Joseph Griffiths
Manager of Local Assistance and Training
Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street, 11th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Mr. Griffiths,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Town of Centreville's Comprehensive Plan: 2040 (the "Plan"). When reviewing plans, the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development ("DHCD") comments on items for which political subdivisions can strategically leverage DHCD's resources to accomplish their housing and community development goals. DHCD also reviews comprehensive plans for consistency with relevant statutes and, if appropriate, Sustainable Communities Action Plans.

Overall, DHCD staff were impressed with the quality of the Plan. Staff in the DHCD Division of Neighborhood Revitalization reviewed the plan and provided the following comments, which are meant to help realize the Plan's goals. We present the following comments in no particular order:

1. The housing and economic development components of the Plan are consistent with and build upon the Sustainable Communities Action Plan.
2. DHCD can assist with home repairs that improve comfort, livability, and accessibility for homeowners through its Special Loan Programs. Planning staff and residents can learn more about these programs at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Residents/Pages/SpecialLoans.aspx> or contact the program directly at 301-429-7409 or DHCD.SpecialLoans@maryland.gov.
3. The Plan notes Centreville's capacity for additional housing and that very little low-income (less than 60% of median income) housing exists (including only two developments), it does not provide a tally of all low-income housing. The formation of a localized intergenerational task force is a good step, and additional actions such as the rehabilitation of available vacant units—an issue which is noted as being a weakness in the Action Plan—to be utilized for low-income housing could be explored. Both DHCD's Strategic Demolition Fund (SDF) as well as the Community Legacy Fund (CL) could be utilized to acquire and rehabilitate vacant structures.

In addition, the plan notes that the number of senior citizens is expected to continue to rise. While the plan notes that 70% of senior citizens plan to age-in-place, other than the table shown in Figure 18, no mention of the CL program benefits in relation to this desire to age-in-place is provided. Town planning staff can learn more about SDF and CL online

at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/programs/SDF.aspx> and <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/programs/CL.aspx> or contact the Eastern Shore Regional Project Manager, Bill Hersch, at 410-209-5810 or william.hersch@maryland.gov. If planning staff want to support further LIHTC development, they may find more info online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/HousingDevelopment/Pages/lihtc/default.aspx> or contact Edward Barnett, Director of Rental Lending, at 301-429-7740 or edward.barnett@maryland.gov.

4. The Plan does not show that Centreville has conducted a point-in-time count to identify the total number of people experiencing homelessness in Centreville, and the Plan does not identify goals or actions regarding services for people experiencing homelessness. For information on DHCD's programs addressing homelessness, please see more online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/HomelessServices/Pages/GrantFunding.aspx> or contact the Homelessness Solutions Program Manager, Suzanne Korff, at 410-209-5850 or Suzanne.Korff@maryland.gov. If you are a person experiencing homelessness and need assistance, contact Mid Shore Behavioral Health at 1-888-407-8018.
5. The Plan identifies the community's needs with respect to income and poverty. Centreville or non-profits active in Centreville may be eligible to apply for discretionary Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funds administered by DHCD in order to provide services for low-income individuals and families at or below 125% of poverty. Planning staff can learn more about CSBG programs online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/programs/CSBG.aspx> or contact the Poverty Solutions Team at 301-429-7525 or csbg.dhcd@maryland.gov.
6. The Plan identifies a need for homeowner affordability. Planning staff and residents may learn more about Maryland's homeownership incentive programs at <https://mmp.maryland.gov/pages/default.aspx>.
7. Centreville's downtown has been designated as a Maryland Main Street. More information on the revitalization benefits associated with this designation can be found online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/communities/pages/programs/mainstreet.aspx> or by contacting Amy Seitz, the Main Street Coordinator, at 410-209-5813 or amy.seitz@maryland.gov.
8. The Plan identifies a need to support the vitality of the downtown core. Info on DHCD's support for businesses can be found online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Business/Pages/SmallBusinesses.aspx> or by contacting Mike Haloskey, Director of Business Lending Programs, at 301-429-7523 or Michael.Haloskey@maryland.gov.
9. The Plan identifies a need for infrastructural improvements that increase the town's overall safety. These projects could be supported through DHCD's Community Safety Works program. More information on the program can be found online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/csw/default.aspx> or by contacting Christine McPherson, Program Officer, at 410-209-5802 or christine.mcpherson@maryland.gov.
10. The Plan identifies a need to fill vacant commercial properties. DHCD's Project Restore can be leveraged to attract and retain businesses that occupy vacant properties. More information on the program can be found online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Pages/ProjectRestore/default.aspx> or by contacting the Program Managers at keith.mainhart@maryland.gov or jon.leishman@maryland.gov.



11. The Plan's Housing Element does not include an assessment of fair housing. Maryland House Bill 90 (2021) requires, effective January 1, 2023, that comprehensive plans include an assessment of fair housing. For technical assistance in development of the Plan's Housing Element, please contact staff at the Maryland Department of Planning.

We in the Division of Neighborhood Revitalization look forward to continuing our productive partnership with Centreville in its future initiatives. Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Plan. If you have any questions regarding the comments above, please contact me at carter.reitman@maryland.gov or 410-209-5849.

Sincerely,

Carter Reitman
Program Manager, State Revitalization Programs

Cc: David Dahlstrom, Maryland Department of Planning
Rita Pritchett, Maryland Department of Planning
William Hersch, DHCD Division of Neighborhood Revitalization
John Papagni, DHCD Division of Neighborhood Revitalization



DHC comments – Climate Change – as addressed in the Town of Centerville

Comprehensive Plan: 2040 – Public Hearing Draft – November 17, 202[2]

While not specifically identifying climate change, the draft Town of Centerville Comprehensive Plan: 2040 has noted flooding and sea level rise as issues of concern. The plan indicates that more severe and frequent flooding from sea level rise can be expected.

The plan also includes elements that are in support of state plans and policies that either directly or indirectly address climate change (Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Act, marsh migration, sea level rise).

III. Municipal Growth

Pg. 25 – The plan envisions “well-planned and denser development interconnected with major preserved open space”. Noting that “clusters of residential development may even be able to exist without a hard connection [to] the Town’s WWTP and open spaces may accommodate community scale wind and solar projects to supply some portion of the demand for residential energy”.

Comment: This vision for residential development will incorporate actions that will minimize environmental impacts.

Pg. 28 – Greenbelt – The Greenbelt is a major element that has been included in previous plans and is a significant element of the 2040 plan. The Greenbelt is located outside of the municipal Growth Areas and is an area that the Town and County need to coordinate on.

Comment: The plan references Interjurisdictional Coordination later in the report but should also be referenced/emphasized in this section.

IV. Natural Environment

Pg. 35 – Impacts of Sea Level Rise – The Town of Centerville has limited amounts of developed shoreline, so the plan notes it is not as vulnerable to sea level rise as coastal communities. The plan states “sea level rise will impact the Town’s tidal shorelines, wetlands, the floodplains of the Corsica River and the tidal parts of other streams. Impacts may include shoreline erosion, deterioration of tidal wetlands, rising groundwater, and nuisance flooding in lower lying riverine areas.”

Pg. 36 – The plan references the Maryland Commission on Climate Change projection that by 2050 sea levels will rise 2.1 feet over the levels measured in 2000. “...the Town could expect through the lifetime of this Plan that floodplains will expand, flooding will be more severe and frequent, and tidal wetlands will extend further upland as hydrologic conditions change. Lands at or below the elevation of 2.1 feet are projected to be inundated. As a general guide, protecting these areas over the next decades will become increasingly important.”

One of the objectives is “to facilitate the natural migration of wetlands and natural vegetation as Bay water levels rise along the tidal portions of streams, so that buffers can continue to function to improve water quality and minimize flooding.”

Comment: This is consistent with state efforts to facilitate marsh migration.

Pg. 37 – Recommendations – One of the identified recommendations is to “institute a continuous town forestry program to promote forest health and vitality and greater tree canopy coverage.... Tree planting within the Town can.... cool impervious surfaces.... reduce energy consumption.... improve air quality.” These benefits are also related to impacts of climate change and are consistent with state plans such as the Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Act Plan.

Another recommendation was to “Protect Stream Buffers” – “Where redevelopment and the intensification of land is proposed or where new development is proposed on properties containing streams, this Plan recommends that expansive stream buffers be established both within and outside of the Critical Area....amend the Zoning Ordinance to require non-disturbance buffers of at least 100-foot wide on each side of perennial streams and 50-foot on each side of intermittent streams, expanded as needed to account for steep slopes and floodplains. Naturalized buffers play a significant role in protecting water quality and accommodating the migration of wetlands and flood zones as sea levels rise.”

Comment: The plan is commended for recognizing the importance of wetland migration.

Pg. 38 – Recommendation – “Transform the Growth Area into High Value Ecologically Sustainable Neighborhoods” – “The Plan recommends that the Town guide community development into high value ecologically sustainable ways: substantial forest regeneration, clustering home sites to minimize the coverage of the land in impervious surfaces, connecting areas with bike and walking trails to minimize vehicle trips, using the most advantageous stormwater practices designed to treat stormwater associated with the most significant rainfall events not just typical rain events....developing 100% renewable energy neighborhoods – that is, Centreville future neighborhoods would be powered by renewable energy sources.”

Comment: These all support concerns or impacts associated with climate change.

Recommendation – “Coordinate with the Queen Anne’s County, the State, Federal Agencies, and Non-Profits” – The plan notes that the Town of Centreville provided leadership to the “Corsica River – Watershed Restoration Action Strategy – Final Report, September 2004”, (WRAS). It is further noted that “there may be other opportunities over the next two decades for the Town to coordinate with others on studies and strategies aimed at environmental improvements within the Corsica River Watershed.”

Comment: Since the Greenbelt is a significant element of the Plan, this recommendation section provides an opportunity to highlight its importance and to coordinate efforts with the county.

VI. Land Use

Pg. 50 – Open Space/Resource Conservation – “Areas planned for Open Space/Resource Conservation...are, to the extent possible, meant to be protected so they can perform their resource functions, like retaining flood waters, recharging ground water supplies, and protection downstream water quality.”

Comment: This emphasizes the importance of the wetlands identified in Chapter IV. Natural Environment.

VII. Transportation

Pg. 77 – Build A Town-wide Trail Network – “...recommends that trail alignments be reserved, and the trails be constructed as land development takes place or sooner where practical.....ultimately [the trails] would provide a greenway network connecting residents to the Town’s park system.....the Town should also consider preparing and implementing a Walking and Bicycle Trail Plan which would recommend and program specific improvements for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity throughout the greater Centreville area.”

Comment: While not specifically identifying climate change, the recommended trail network would provide walking/hiking/biking connections throughout the town. This would provide an alternative to vehicular access which supports greenhouse gas reduction goals.

VII. Community Facilities

Pg. 86 – Objective – “To upgrade and expand the Town’s public water and sewer systems.”

Comment: Marsh migration and with it the inland movement of saltwater into traditionally brackish and/or freshwater systems was mentioned in earlier sections. Gravel Run is the discharge point for the WWTP. Was any consideration given to the infrastructure of the sewer outfall as it might be impacted by the salinization of Gravel Run?

Are there any potential infrastructure issues associated with the sea level rise projections or the salinization of groundwater that might impact the underground infrastructure of either the public water or sewer systems. If this is a consideration, suggest noting that in this objective.

IX. Implementation

Pg. 91 – Immediate Term Amendments – “Establish standards for buffers on both sides of streams of at least 100-foot wide for perennial streams and 50-foot wide for intermittent streams and consider minimum buffers along existing forests.”

Pg. 92 – Longer Term Amendments – “Amend the subdivision regulations to require the expansion and reservation of broad riparian buffers....” And “Update regulations including the Critical Area regulations and the Floodplain Management Ordinance for areas vulnerable to sea level rise.”

Comment: These amendments will support the objections of the plan and are consistent with state efforts to provide for marsh migration.

Pg. 94 and 95 – Interjurisdictional Coordination – Growth Area and General Planning – The plan recommends the Town and County coordinate on “strategies for land preservation in the designated Greenbelt around the Growth Area”.

The plan also “recommends that the separate Town and County Planning Commissions meet periodically to review implementation of their respective comprehensive plans and work to sustain existing and develop new cooperative arrangements.

Comment: These recommendations also support the earlier comment on how to coordinate activities in the Greenbelt.

Pg. 95 – Interjurisdictional Coordination – Queen Anne’s County Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan – “This Plan recommends that the Town participate with Queen Anne’s County in its regular five-year update of the County Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan.”

Comment: This is consistent with MDP’s recommendations in the LPPRP guidance document.

Town of Centreville Comprehensive Plan Review, Fishing and Boating Services Comments

The Town of Centreville recognizes the importance of protecting its natural resources by establishing and strengthening regulations and preparing for the future as development and climate change becomes an increasing threat. This recognition fits with Fishing and Boating Services need for conservation of rural lands because of their association with productive fisheries.

Maryland DNR Fishing and Boating Services has adopted guidelines for impervious cover (an indicator of intensity of development) to communicate changes in habitat and fisheries that influence our ability to manage important recreational and commercial fisheries. Impervious surface is used as an indicator of development because of compelling scientific evidence of its effect in freshwater systems and because it is a critical input variable in many water quality and quantity models. Impervious surface itself increases runoff volume and intensity in streams, leading to increased physical instability, erosion, sedimentation, thermal pollution, contaminant loads, and nutrients. Urbanization may introduce additional industrial wastes, contaminants, stormwater runoff and road salt that act as ecological stressors and are indexed by impervious surface.

Generally, watersheds with 5% or less impervious surface (IS; rural watersheds) support good non-tidal and tidal fish habitat for anadromous fish and this serves as an upper boundary for maintaining fish habitat in fairly natural condition (MD DNR 2022). Once a watershed exceeds 10% impervious surface (an early suburban watershed), the ability to manage fisheries becomes compromised because of habitat deterioration due to development. We consider 10% impervious surface a threshold beyond which we expect increasing problems. We estimate that impervious surface for Corsica River's watershed was 4.58% in 2020. Our IS estimates of the non-tidal watersheds are 4.54% for Old Mill Stream, 5.25% Three Bridge Branch, and 7.02% Gravel Run. Impervious surface delineations were configured using NHDPlus catchments upstream from the monitoring stations. With county impervious surface nearing the 5% target, we support any recommendations and incentives to conserve remaining rural land in watersheds that drain through Centreville. The non-tidal watersheds for Three Bridge Branch and Gravel Run have surpassed the 5% IS target and we encourage increased effort to conserve the remaining habitat available. A map generated using an 8-digit watershed scale and NHDPlus catchments that delineates the non-tidal watersheds previously mentioned within the Corsica River watershed is available upon request.

Maryland's Department of Natural Resources Fish Habitat and Ecosystem Program sampled the tidal estuarine and non-tidal stream of the Corsica River most recently in 2018 and 2019, as well as other water bodies, to support Queen Anne's County update to its 2010 Comprehensive Plan. Past non-tidal stream surveys were done in 1977 by DNR and in 2006-2007 by citizen scientists. The tidal estuary was previously sampled from 2003 to 2012 by DNR. Yellow perch larvae were detected in citizen scientist surveys in the tidal portion of the Corsica River streams and in the estuary during 2006-2007. White and Yellow Perch were spawning in non-tidal portions of Old Mill Stream and Three Bridges Branch during 1977 (O'Dell et al. 1980); both species were also present in stream samples during 2006-2007 (Margaret et al. 2007) and 2019 (Uphoff et al. 2020). There was no evidence of successful spawning in Gravel Run during surveys in 1977 and 2006-2007. Herring spawning was also detected in 2019 (Uphoff et al. 2020). "Herring" is a collective term for Blueback Herring, Alewife, and Hickory Shad. Spawning habitat for Herring species is sensitive to the level of land development. Old Mill Stream and Three Bridges Branch

were determined by DNR to still have viable anadromous fish spawning habitat. Streams draining watersheds in Town of Centreville boundaries empty into an area of Chesapeake Bay that is important habitat for juvenile anadromous fish. Maps depicting tidal spawning habitat for anadromous fish can be found in the Maryland Coastal Atlas <https://gisapps.dnr.state.md.us/coastalatlus/WAB2/>.

During July-September in 2003 to 2012, 2018, and 2019, DNR sampled fish communities in the Corsica River estuary. Basic water quality was conducted at multiple sites during sampling on the Corsica River at the surface, mid-depth, and bottom, including water temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), pH (a measure of acidity), salinity, and clarity. High precipitation in 2018 did not indicate an overwhelming impact on water quality measurements. The increase in rainfall in 2018 did cause a decline in salinities, possibly altering the composition of finfish and shifting the migratory range finfish are known to inhabit. Salinities in most of the Queen Anne's County subestuaries sampled were at the lower bounds of what had been observed during previously but remained within their salinity class. Corsica River had a noticeable improvement in bottom DO during 2018-2019 compared to the earlier years sampled (Uphoff et al. 2020); the increase may reflect the State's designation of the Corsica River as a targeted watershed for restoration in 2005, which provided additional funding for several restoration programs to occur, as well as an upgrade to the wastewater treatment plant that occurred in 2010. Species composition changed slightly, reflecting the disappearance of Bay Anchovy in 2018-2019. Three species defined the top 90% of finfish caught in the Corsica River for all sampling years, White Perch (adults and juveniles), Bay Anchovy, and Spot, did not indicate a drastic shift in species composition during 2019 (Uphoff et al. 2020). Reports containing these studies and for all sampling years can be found on MD DNR FHEP website.

Town of Centreville development impacts many important fisheries resources that support recreational and commercial anglers. Centreville Wharf, constructed in the early 18th century, was a trade center for tobacco, cattle, and coal. Continued sedimentation has required numerous dredging projects over the years (most current dredging project was in 2020) in the upper portions of the Corsica River and wharf to open the channel for boating access. The wharf provides access to both recreational and commercial fishermen. Fishing and crabbing are part of Queen Anne's County heritage. According to individual license sales, roughly 17% of county residents purchased a recreational fishing license in 2021. Residents and visitors to Queen Anne's County can take various fishing and crabbing opportunities as previously described. Commercial fishing also provides economic opportunities for Queen Anne's County residents. In 2021, just over a thousand commercial licenses were purchased, permitting them to harvest fish and crabs for market, as well as provide charter or guide trips. In order to maintain this livelihood, the county must promote sound land planning and conservation to assure fish habitat remains productive.

Other specific recommendations in the Plan related to maintaining the rural character of the watershed:

Section IV. Page 36. Protect Sensitive Environmental Areas. Protect other sensitive natural resources from loss or impacts to forests, wetlands, and wildlife habitats resulting from development. Land Use changes upstream can exacerbate flooding and runoff, impacting downstream fish habitat.

Section V. Page 40-41. Corsica River Watershed and Non-Point Source Water Pollution. "The long-term goal of this plan is to remain under 10% as the Town develops and expands into its growth area. Since Centreville is the only urban center in the watershed, it will impact the health

of the Corsica River.” Ten percent impervious surface is a threshold to be avoided if maintaining fish habitat and local fisheries is a desired outcome of the Plan. The Corsica River watershed has not surpassed the 5% impervious surface target while the non-tidal streams within the Corsica River watershed are nearing or have surpassed the 5% impervious surface target for fisheries and fish habitat. With development projected to increase, we support any recommendations and incentives to conserve remaining rural land in the tidal and non-tidal watersheds of the Corsica River.

References:

Corsica Implementers Team. 2012. Corsica River Targeted Initiative, Progress Report 2005-2011.

[https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/water/319NonPointSource/Documents/Watershed%20Plans/A-I EPA Accepted Plans/Corsica River Targeted Initiative Progress Report 2005-2011.pdf](https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/water/319NonPointSource/Documents/Watershed%20Plans/A-I_EPA_Accepted_Plans/Corsica_River_Targeted_Initiative_Progress_Report_2005-2011.pdf)

Corsica River Conservancy. 2020. The Course of the Corsica: A Report on Restoration.

<https://www.corsicariverconservancy.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Corsica-Report-DEC-2020-v2.pdf>

McGinty, M., J. Uphoff, B. Pyle, R. Lukacovic, and J. Mowrer. 2007. Anadromous fish spawning and habitat assessment: Corsica River. Final report, 2007, submitted to Maryland DNR Ecosystem Restoration Center. Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Fisheries Service, Annapolis, Maryland.

https://dnr.maryland.gov/fisheries/Documents/2007_Anadromous_spawning_assessment_CorsicaRiver.pdf

O'Dell, J., J. Mowrer, and J. Gabor. 1980. Survey and inventory of anadromous fish spawning areas: Chester River and west Chesapeake Bay drainage, January 1975 - December 1979. Completion report, Project AFC-9. Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Fisheries Division, Annapolis, Maryland.

Uphoff, J. H., Jr., M. McGinty, A. Park, C. Hoover, and S. Dawson. 2020. Marine and estuarine finfish ecological and habitat investigations. Performance Report for Federal Aid Grant F-63-R, Segment 10, 2019. Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Fishing and Boating Services, Annapolis, Maryland. <https://dnr.maryland.gov/fisheries/Documents/F-63-R-10%202019%20rept.pdf>

Uphoff, J. H., Jr., M. McGinty, A. Park, C. Hoover, and M. Patton. 2019. Marine and estuarine finfish ecological and habitat investigations. Performance Report for Federal Aid Grant F-63-R, Segment 9, 2018. Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Fishing and Boating Services, Annapolis, Maryland.

<https://dnr.maryland.gov/fisheries/Documents/F63R9%202019%20annual%20rept.pdf>

December 16, 2022

Mr. David Dahlstrom
Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street, Suite 1101
Baltimore MD 21201

Dear Mr. Dahlstrom:

Thank you for coordinating the State of Maryland's comments on the Town of Centreville Planning Commission's Draft Comprehensive Plan Update. The Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) offers the following comments for the plan for consistency with State of Maryland and MDOT's goals and objectives:

General Comments:

- The State's fiscally unconstrained Highway Needs Inventory (HNI) identifies highway needs critical to Maryland's transportation system but does not indicate a financial commitment. The one project in Centreville included in the HNI is a multi-lane reconstruct project on MD 213 from US 301 to Centerville.
- MD 213 in Centreville is a part of the MDOT State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) Bike Spine network. The MDOT SHA Bike Spine network includes roadways and trails throughout the State of Maryland that are officially designated as routes that meet specific safety criteria to accommodate bicycles.
- MD 213 (Church Hills Road, N Commerce St, N Liberty St, and Centreville Road) and MD 18 (4-H Park Rd and Main St) in Centreville are part of the Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway. The Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway is a Maryland byway that exhibits one or more of six core intrinsic qualities - scenic, natural, historical, recreational, archaeological, or cultural - contributing to a unique Chesapeake River eastern shore travel experience.
- When referring to SHA can you please update to use Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA).
- Future planning and design efforts should consider the review and implementation of the MDOT SHA Context Driven Guide. The MDOT SHA Context Driven guide is a planning and design resource offering practitioners' guidelines centered on establishing safe and effective multimodal transportation systems. The MD 213 and MD 304 corridor is within the Suburban Activity Center and Traditional Town Center Context Zones. These Context Zones are located outside of the major urban centers and are characterized by medium-density multi-purpose land use. These areas serve both the short trips around commercial corridors as well as longer pass-through trips. The need for internal circulation only exceeds the need for mobility through this Context Zone.

Specific Comments:

Existing Conditions

Page 34 - Natural Environment

- The Natural Environment section emphasizes development impacts from sea level rise like Corsica River, tributary streams, and rainfall events. Impacts may include shoreline erosion, deterioration of tidal wetlands, rising groundwater, and nuisance flooding in lower lying riverine areas. The MDOT SHA recommends a review of MDOT SHA's online Climate Change Vulnerability Viewer (<https://maryland.maps.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=86b5933d2d3e45ee8b9d8a5f03a7030c#overview>) to evaluate the vulnerability of planned improvements to storm surge, nuisance flooding, and sea level rise. This public tool may be used to identify and assess potential hazards of storm events and other types of extreme weather. If you have any questions, please contact Jessica Shearer at 410-545-5656 or ippd@mdot.maryland.gov.

Page 66 - Chapter VII. Transportation

- Highway Traffic Volumes and Conditions section documents the various counts on MDOT SHA roadways in Centreville. The MDOT SHA recommends the review of the public-facing MDOT SHA Traffic Monitoring System Dashboard (<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/b3dacc0b17b54902b2d6c05ced66c7cf?org=maryland>) application. This public tool may be used to identify and review volume trends, annual average daily traffic (AADT), intelligent traffic management system (ITMS), and mileage and travel data and information. If you have questions, please contact Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division Team Leader Rana Shams at 410-545-5648 or email rshams@mdot.maryland.gov.

Page 67 - Highway Traffic Volumes and Conditions

- First and second paragraphs reference Table 10, which should be changed to Table 9. This page documents the need to have signalization at MD 213 and Laser Drive in sync with the current signalization at MD 213 and Coursevall Drive. The improvement is currently not a Queen Anne's County priority. For consideration of a review or study, don't hesitate to contact MDOT SHA Assistant District Engineer Traffic, Mr. Rich Baker, at 410-810-3240 or email rbaker@mdot.maryland.gov.

Page 68 – Local Streets

- The draft plan mentions pedestrian linkages along Local Streets. If not already complete, the Town should consider conducting an American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan to ensure that current and proposed improvements are compliant with federal requirements.
- MDOT completed a bicycle level of traffic stress (LTS) analysis for the state which indicates the existing conditions people riding bikes experience on public access roadways by comparing the presence and quality of bicycle facility in relation to motor vehicle traffic speeds and volumes. Consider including a description of the Town's bicycling conditions as reflected on MDOT's LTS map available online at: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/8f01552b8ff745d8902476a7c569f64c/>

Page 69 – Trails

- Consider including a description of the different types of trails within the Town to better illustrate the how each trail supports the Town’s transportation goals. The term ‘hiker/biker trail’ is more commonly referred to as a ‘shared-use path’ (also referred to as a multi-use path later in the Plan) for both pedestrian and bicycle use and occasionally equestrian use. Shared-use paths can be used for both transportation and recreation purposes, constructed of varying surface types and open to two-way, non-motorized traffic.
- According to the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, shared-use paths should have a minimum width of 10-feet. A desktop survey of the three mentioned trails indicate that the Millstream Trail and North Brook subdivision trail are 6-feet-wide and the Symphony Village Trail is 8-feet-wide. The substandard width of the existing trails may be able to accommodate existing traffic volumes without significant user conflicts. Please consider establishing a policy that future trails should be a minimum of 10-feet-wide to encourage more residents to use the trails for transportation without potential user conflicts or safety concerns.

Page 73 to 76 - Apply New Street Development Principles

- The draft Plan includes a comprehensive description of street typology and users. Consider including a description of how the Town can utilize MDOT SHA’s Context Driven design guidelines, especially for state roadways within the Town.

Page 76 – Deploy Smart Street Technologies

- Consider including a description of how the Town will address implementing electric vehicle infrastructure.

Page 77 – Build A Town-wide Trail Network

- The Greenway and Trail Plan includes many possible trails to better connect the community. Consider reconciling the Greenway and Trail Plan with the Streets and Highways Plan (Map 8) on Page 71 as the proposed road and trail alignments are often parallel but serve the same destinations and connections. In many cases, a shared-use path can be created parallel to proposed roadways and serve both transportation and recreational purposes.
- Please clarify the symbology and status of the planned and programmed trail along of MD 213 north of Laser Drive.
- The MDOT supports the Town’s recommendation of a Walking and Bicycle Trail Plan. Consider coordinating the trail plan with Queen Anne’s County as both the County and Queenstown have proposed trails and other pedestrian and bicycle improvements adjacent to Centreville.

Page 97 – Figure 18

- Please consider adding additional MDOT programs and plans to assist Centreville in achieving plan goals:

Recommendation/ Policy Area	Spatially Designated Program	Policy Program	Plan
Building bikeways and sidewalks		MDOT Kim Lamphier Bikeways Network Program, Transportation Alternatives Program, Recreational Trails Program, MDOT SHA Sidewalk and Bicycle Retrofit Programs	MD Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Context Driven Design Guidelines
Smart Streets Technologies			Maryland Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Plan

If you have any other questions or need additional information, please contact Mr. Derrick Sexton, MDOT SHA Regional Planner for the Eastern Shore, at 410-545-5560 or via email at dsexton@mdot.marland.gov.

Sincerely,



Heather Murphy
Director, Office of Planning and Capital Programming (OPCP), MDOT

cc: Mr. Rich Baker, Assistant District Engineer, MDOT SHA
Mr. Nate Evans, Active Transportation Planner, OPCP, MDOT
Mr. Derrick Sexton, Regional Planner, MDOT SHA
Ms. Rana Shams, Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division Team Leader, MDOT SHA
Ms. Jessica Shearer, Senior Transportation Planner, MDOT SHA



Maryland

Department of the Environment

Larry Hogan, Governor
Boyd K. Rutherford, Lt. Governor

Ben Grumbles, Secretary
Horacio Tablada, Deputy Secretary

December 15, 2022

Mr. David Dahlstrom
Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street
Suite 1101
Baltimore, MD 21201

RE: Local Plan Review: Town of Centreville Planning Commission's Draft
Comprehensive Plan
MD20221121-0906

Dear Mr. Dahlstrom,

Below are the comments from the Maryland Department of the Environment regarding the above referenced project. Our response code is R1.

1. Any above ground or underground petroleum storage tanks, which may be utilized, must be installed and maintained in accordance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. Underground storage tanks must be registered and the installation must be conducted and performed by a contractor certified to install underground storage tanks by the Land and Materials Administration in accordance with COMAR 26.10. Contact the Oil Control Program at (410) 537-3442 for additional information.
2. If the proposed project involves demolition – Any above ground or underground petroleum storage tanks that may be on site must have contents and tanks along with any contamination removed. Please contact the Oil Control Program at (410) 537-3442 for additional information.
3. Any solid waste including construction, demolition and land clearing debris, generated from the subject project, must be properly disposed of at a permitted solid waste acceptance facility, or recycled if possible. Contact the Solid Waste Program at (410) 537-3315 for additional information regarding solid waste activities and contact the Resource Management Program at (410) 537-3314 for additional information regarding recycling activities.
4. The Solid Waste Program should be contacted directly at (410) 537-3315 by those facilities which generate or propose to generate or handle hazardous wastes to ensure these activities are being conducted in compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. The Program should also be contacted prior to construction activities to ensure that the treatment, storage or disposal of hazardous wastes and low-level radioactive wastes at the facility will be conducted in compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations.

5. Any contract specifying “lead paint abatement” must comply with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.16.01 - Accreditation and Training for Lead Paint Abatement Services. If a property was built before 1978 and will be used as rental housing, then compliance with COMAR 26.16.02 - Reduction of Lead Risk in Housing; and Environment Article Title 6, Subtitle 8, is required. Additional guidance regarding projects where lead paint may be encountered can be obtained by contacting the Environmental Lead Division at (410) 537-3825.
6. The proposed project may involve rehabilitation, redevelopment, revitalization, or property acquisition of commercial, industrial property. Accordingly, MDE's Brownfields Site Assessment and Voluntary Cleanup Programs (VCP) may provide valuable assistance to you in this project. These programs involve environmental site assessment in accordance with accepted industry and financial institution standards for property transfer. For specific information about these programs and eligibility, please Land Restoration Program at (410) 537-3437.
7. Borrow areas used to provide clean earth back fill material may require a surface mine permit. Disposal of excess cut material at a surface mine may requires site approval. Contact the Mining Program at (410) 537-3557 for further details.
8. The project may cause contaminated runoff from an animal feeding operation (AFO). Please contact the AFO Division at (410) 537-4423 to determine if this AFO will require registration under the General Discharge Permit for Animal Feeding Operations.
9. The project will result in increased numbers of confined animals at this animal feeding operation (AFO) and therefore necessitate registration under the General Discharge Permit for Animal Feeding Operations. Please contact the AFO Division at (410) 537-4423 to determine if this AFO will require registration under this permit.
10. Emissions from mobile sources are one of the primary contributors to both climate change and local air pollution, vehicles powered by electricity are one way to reduce the impacts of these emissions. A variety of funding initiatives are becoming available to allow for the faster adoption of electric vehicles, any funding opportunity that can help with this should be examined, especially for electric vehicle charging or refueling infrastructure.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Amanda R. Redmiles

Amanda R. Redmiles
Interdepartmental Information Liaison
Maryland Department of the Environment

SELECTED SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE				
Total households	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
Married-couple household	1,051	+/- 132	62.1%	+/- 7.8
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	(X)%	+/- (X)
Cohabiting couple household	57	+/- 57	3.4%	+/- 3.3
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	(X)%	+/- (X)
Male householder, no spouse/partner present	163	+/- 88	9.6%	+/- 4.9
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	(X)%	+/- (X)
Householder living alone	56	+/- 39	3.3%	+/- 2.2
65 years and over	39	+/- 33	2.3%	+/- 1.9
Female householder, no spouse/partner present	422	+/- 145	24.9%	+/- 8
With children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	(X)%	+/- (X)
Householder living alone	330	+/- 126	19.5%	+/- 6.6
65 years and over	180	+/- 99	10.6%	+/- 5.5
Households with one or more people under 18 years	578	+/- 97	34.1%	+/- 7.4
Households with one or more people 65 years and over	649	+/- 155	38.3%	+/- 7.5
Average household size	2.72	+/- 0.24	(X)%	+/- (X)
Average family size	3.20	+/- 0.25	(X)%	+/- (X)
RELATIONSHIP				
Population in households	4,601	+/- 137	100.0%	+/- (X)
Householder	1,693	+/- 154	36.8%	+/- 3.2
Spouse	1,084	+/- 142	23.6%	+/- 3
Unmarried partner	49	+/- 53	1.1%	+/- 1.2
Child	1,292	+/- 206	28.1%	+/- 4.4
Other relatives	323	+/- 198	7%	+/- 4.3
Other nonrelatives	160	+/- 97	3.5%	+/- 2.1
MARITAL STATUS				
Males 15 years and over	1,807	+/- 173	100.0%	+/- (X)
Never married	359	+/- 116	19.9%	+/- 5.7
Now married, except separated	1,133	+/- 128	62.7%	+/- 7.8
Separated	7	+/- 12	0.4%	+/- 0.6
Widowed	99	+/- 69	5.5%	+/- 3.6
Divorced	209	+/- 124	11.6%	+/- 6.5
Females 15 years and over	1,957	+/- 155	100.0%	+/- (X)
Never married	402	+/- 126	20.5%	+/- 5.8
Now married, except separated	1,152	+/- 116	58.9%	+/- 7.1
Separated	8	+/- 13	0.4%	+/- 0.7
Widowed	188	+/- 88	9.6%	+/- 4.2
Divorced	207	+/- 115	10.6%	+/- 5.6
FERTILITY				
Number of women 15 to 50 years old who had a birth in the past 12 months	50	+/- 43	100.0%	+/- (X)
Unmarried women (widowed, divorced, and never married)	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 45.1
Per 1,000 unmarried women	0	+/- 100	(X)%	+/- (X)
Per 1,000 women 15 to 50 years old	53	+/- 48	(X)%	+/- (X)
Per 1,000 women 15 to 19 years old	0	+/- 231	(X)%	+/- (X)
Per 1,000 women 20 to 34 years old	192	+/- 207	(X)%	+/- (X)
Per 1,000 women 35 to 50 years old	27	+/- 42	(X)%	+/- (X)

SELECTED SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
GRANDPARENTS				
Number of grandparents living with own grandchildren under 18 years	108	+/- 101	100.0%	+/- (X)
Grandparents responsible for grandchildren	59	+/- 88	54.6%	+/- 51.8
Years responsible for grandchildren				
Less than 1 year	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 28.6
1 or 2 years	59	+/- 88	54.6%	+/- 51.8
3 or 4 years	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 28.6
5 or more years	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 28.6
Number of grandparents responsible for own grandchildren under 18 years	59	+/- 88	(X)	+/- (X)
Who are female	31	+/- 46	52.5%	+/- 5.8
Who are married	59	+/- 88	100%	+/- 41.5
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT				
Population 3 years and over enrolled in school	1,188	+/- 240	100.0%	+/- (X)
Nursery school, preschool	64	+/- 59	5.4%	+/- 5
Kindergarten	155	+/- 91	13%	+/- 6.9
Elementary school (grades 1-8)	514	+/- 175	43.3%	+/- 12.7
High school (grades 9-12)	239	+/- 138	20.1%	+/- 10.8
College or graduate school	216	+/- 115	18.2%	+/- 8.3
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
Population 25 years and over	3,265	+/- 218	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than 9th grade	33	+/- 49	1%	+/- 1.5
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	223	+/- 107	6.8%	+/- 3.2
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	758	+/- 190	23.2%	+/- 5.1
Some college, no degree	662	+/- 165	20.3%	+/- 5
Associate's degree	356	+/- 141	10.9%	+/- 4.3
Bachelor's degree	709	+/- 173	21.7%	+/- 5
Graduate or professional degree	524	+/- 153	16%	+/- 5
High school graduate or higher	3,009	+/- 217	92.2%	+/- 3.8
Bachelor's degree or higher	1,233	+/- 223	37.8%	+/- 7
VETERAN STATUS				
Civilian population 18 years and over	3,657	+/- 210	100.0%	+/- (X)
Civilian veterans	335	+/- 118	9.2%	+/- 3.1
DISABILITY STATUS OF THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONALIZED POPULATION				
Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population	4,601	+/- 136	100.0%	+/- (X)
With a disability	304	+/- 124	6.6%	+/- 2.7
Under 18 years	1,164	+/- 213	100.0%	+/- (X)
With a disability	25	+/- 39	2.1%	+/- 3.3
18 to 64 years	2,396	+/- 223	100.0%	+/- (X)
With a disability	106	+/- 74	4.4%	+/- 3.1
65 years and over	1,041	+/- 251	100.0%	+/- (X)
With a disability	173	+/- 86	16.6%	+/- 8.4
RESIDENCE 1 YEAR AGO				
Population 1 year and over	4,775	+/- 55	100.0%	+/- (X)
Same house	4,142	+/- 264	86.7%	+/- 5.4
Different house (in the U.S. or abroad)	633	+/- 258	13.3%	+/- 5.4
Different house in the U.S.	633	+/- 258	13.3%	+/- 5.4
Same county	148	+/- 100	3.1%	+/- 2.1
Different county	485	+/- 237	10.2%	+/- 5

SELECTED SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
Same state	300	+/- 201	6.3%	+/- 4.2
Different state	185	+/- 222	3.9%	+/- 4.6
Abroad	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
PLACE OF BIRTH				
Total population	4,829	+/- 19	100.0%	+/- (X)
Native	4,745	+/- 56	98.3%	+/- 1.1
Born in United States	4,717	+/- 66	97.7%	+/- 1.3
State of residence	3,282	+/- 328	68%	+/- 6.8
Different state	1,435	+/- 327	29.7%	+/- 6.8
Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s)	28	+/- 31	0.6%	+/- 0.6
Foreign born	84	+/- 51	1.7%	+/- 1.1
U.S. CITIZENSHIP STATUS				
Foreign-born population	84	+/- 51	100.0%	+/- (X)
Naturalized U.S. citizen	43	+/- 35	51.2%	+/- 30.6
Not a U.S. citizen	41	+/- 36	48.8%	+/- 30.6
YEAR OF ENTRY				
Population born outside the United States	112	+/- 62	100.0%	+/- (X)
Native	28	+/- 31	100.0%	+/- (X)
Entered 2010 or later	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 60.2
Entered before 2010	28	+/- 31	100%	+/- 60.2
Foreign born	84	+/- 51	100.0%	+/- (X)
Entered 2010 or later	24	+/- 27	28.6%	+/- 25.9
Entered before 2010	60	+/- 40	71.4%	+/- 25.9
WORLD REGION OF BIRTH OF FOREIGN BORN				
Foreign-born population, excluding population born at sea	84	+/- 51	100.0%	+/- (X)
Europe	50	+/- 34	59.5%	+/- 27.3
Asia	24	+/- 27	28.6%	+/- 25.9
Africa	1	+/- 3	1.2%	+/- 3.9
Oceania	9	+/- 16	10.7%	+/- 18.6
Latin America	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 34.2
Northern America	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 34.2
LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME				
Population 5 years and over	4,550	+/- 119	100.0%	+/- (X)
English only	4,391	+/- 138	96.5%	+/- 2.1
Language other than English	159	+/- 96	3.5%	+/- 2.1
Speak English less than "very well"	15	+/- 25	0.3%	+/- 0.6
Spanish	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Speak English less than "very well"	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Other Indo-European languages	134	+/- 91	2.9%	+/- 2
Speak English less than "very well"	15	+/- 25	0.3%	+/- 0.6
Asian and Pacific Islander languages	24	+/- 27	0.5%	+/- 0.6
Speak English less than "very well"	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Other languages	1	+/- 3	0%	+/- 0.1
Speak English less than "very well"	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8

SELECTED SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
ANCESTRY				
Total population	4,829	+/- 19	100.0%	+/- (X)
American	193	+/- 120	4%	+/- 2.5
Arab	70	+/- 107	1.4%	+/- 2.2
Czech	46	+/- 59	1%	+/- 1.2
Danish	18	+/- 30	0.4%	+/- 0.6
Dutch	16	+/- 20	0.3%	+/- 0.4
English	533	+/- 187	11%	+/- 3.9
French (except Basque)	119	+/- 99	2.5%	+/- 2.1
French Canadian	25	+/- 30	0.5%	+/- 0.6
German	730	+/- 231	15.1%	+/- 4.8
Greek	51	+/- 74	1.1%	+/- 1.5
Hungarian	7	+/- 12	0.1%	+/- 0.2
Irish	560	+/- 191	11.6%	+/- 3.9
Italian	406	+/- 208	8.4%	+/- 4.3
Lithuanian	71	+/- 101	1.5%	+/- 2.1
Norwegian	13	+/- 15	0.3%	+/- 0.3
Polish	140	+/- 121	2.9%	+/- 2.5
Portuguese	10	+/- 15	0.2%	+/- 0.3
Russian	7	+/- 11	0.1%	+/- 0.2
Scotch-Irish	38	+/- 64	0.8%	+/- 1.3
Scottish	44	+/- 39	0.9%	+/- 0.8
Slovak	15	+/- 24	0.3%	+/- 0.5
Subsaharan African	35	+/- 50	0.7%	+/- 1
Swedish	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Swiss	29	+/- 32	0.6%	+/- 0.7
Ukrainian	51	+/- 62	1.1%	+/- 1.3
Welsh	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
West Indian (excluding Hispanic origin groups)	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
COMPUTERS AND INTERNET USE				
Total Households	1,693	154.00	100.0%	+/- (X)
With a computer	1,638	151.00	96.8%	+/- 2.5
With a broadband Internet subscription	1,557	143.00	92.0%	+/- 4.9

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
5. An '****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

SELECTED ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Population 16 years and over	3,675	+/- 212	100.0%	+/- (X)
In labor force	2,229	+/- 223	60.7%	+/- 6.3
Civilian labor force	2,221	+/- 223	60.4%	+/- 6.4
Employed	2,202	+/- 222	59.9%	+/- 6.3
Unemployed	19	+/- 21	0.5%	+/- 0.6
Armed Forces	8	+/- 13	0.2%	+/- 0.4
Not in labor force	1,446	+/- 276	39.3%	+/- 6.3
Civilian labor force	2,221	+/- 223	(X)	+/- (X)
Unemployment Rate	(X)	+/- (X)	0.9%	+/- 1
Females 16 years and over				
Population 16 years and over	1,885	+/- 153	(X)	+/- (X)
In labor force	1,099	+/- 183	58.3%	+/- 8.4
Civilian labor force	1,099	+/- 183	58.3%	+/- 8.4
Employed	1,099	+/- 183	58.3%	+/- 8.4
Own children of the householder under 6 years	289	+/- 117	(X)	+/- (X)
All parents in family in labor force	212	+/- 108	73.4%	+/- 24.1
Own children of the householder 6 to 17 years	818	+/- 191	(X)	+/- (X)
All parents in family in labor force	637	+/- 225	77.9%	+/- 16.9
COMMUTING TO WORK				
Workers 16 years and over	2,208	+/- 222	100.0%	+/- (X)
Car, truck, or van -- drove alone	1,628	+/- 216	73.7%	+/- 7.8
Car, truck, or van -- carpooled	270	+/- 165	12.2%	+/- 7.2
Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	7	+/- 12	0.3%	+/- 0.6
Walked	60	+/- 53	2.7%	+/- 2.4
Other means	13	+/- 21	0.6%	+/- 1
Worked from home	230	+/- 150	10.4%	+/- 6.7
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	33.7	+/- 4.3	(X)%	+/- (X)
OCCUPATION				
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	2,202	+/- 222	100.0%	+/- (X)
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	1,002	+/- 198	45.5%	+/- 8.5
Service occupations	371	+/- 129	16.8%	+/- 5.7
Sales and office occupations	520	+/- 171	23.6%	+/- 7.3
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	125	+/- 75	5.7%	+/- 3.3
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	184	+/- 101	8.4%	+/- 4.4
INDUSTRY				
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	2,202	+/- 222	100.0%	+/- (X)
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	15	+/- 23	0.7%	+/- 1.1
Construction	198	+/- 107	9%	+/- 4.8
Manufacturing	124	+/- 90	5.6%	+/- 4
Wholesale trade	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 1.7
Retail trade	323	+/- 149	14.7%	+/- 6.2
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	67	+/- 70	3%	+/- 3.2
Information	32	+/- 40	1.5%	+/- 1.9
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	101	+/- 83	4.6%	+/- 3.9

SELECTED ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services	124	+/- 74	5.6%	+/- 3.3
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	762	+/- 213	34.6%	+/- 8.7
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	121	+/- 76	5.5%	+/- 3.5
Other services, except public administration	73	+/- 52	3.3%	+/- 2.3
Public administration	262	+/- 112	11.9%	+/- 5.2
CLASS OF WORKER				
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	2,202	+/- 222	100.0%	+/- (X)
Private wage and salary workers	1,596	+/- 223	72.5%	+/- 7.2
Government workers	550	+/- 166	25%	+/- 7.1
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers	56	+/- 42	2.5%	+/- 1.9
Unpaid family workers	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 1.7
INCOME AND BENEFITS (IN 2020 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)				
Total households	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than \$10,000	12	+/- 19	0.7%	+/- 1.1
\$10,000 to \$14,999	43	+/- 41	2.5%	+/- 2.4
\$15,000 to \$24,999	35	+/- 34	2.1%	+/- 2
\$25,000 to \$34,999	114	+/- 77	6.7%	+/- 4.4
\$35,000 to \$49,999	180	+/- 109	10.6%	+/- 6.4
\$50,000 to \$74,999	298	+/- 124	17.6%	+/- 6.9
\$75,000 to \$99,999	170	+/- 79	10%	+/- 4.6
\$100,000 to \$149,999	406	+/- 131	24%	+/- 7.6
\$150,000 to \$199,999	338	+/- 130	20%	+/- 7.4
\$200,000 or more	97	+/- 60	5.7%	+/- 3.7
Median household income (dollars)	\$98,942	+/- 30746	(X)%	+/- (X)
Mean household income (dollars)	\$105,808	+/- 9766	(X)%	+/- (X)
With earnings	1,297	+/- 131	76.6%	+/- 6.1
Mean earnings (dollars)	\$101,054	+/- 11278	(X)%	+/- (X)
With Social Security	676	+/- 156	39.9%	+/- 7.5
Mean Social Security income (dollars)	\$28,054	+/- 3701	(X)%	+/- (X)
With retirement income	665	+/- 136	39.3%	+/- 7.2
Mean retirement income (dollars)	\$34,679	+/- 7331	(X)%	+/- (X)
With Supplemental Security Income	45	+/- 37	2.7%	+/- 2.2
Mean Supplemental Security Income (dollars)	\$16,751	+/- 6936	(X)%	+/- (X)
With cash public assistance income	60	+/- 73	3.5%	+/- 4.2
Mean cash public assistance income (dollars)	\$4,998	+/- 2885	(X)%	+/- (X)
With Food Stamp/SNAP benefits in the past 12 months	207	+/- 110	12.2%	+/- 6.2
Families	1,228	+/- 116	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than \$10,000	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 3
\$10,000 to \$14,999	8	+/- 12	0.7%	+/- 0.9
\$15,000 to \$24,999	18	+/- 27	1.5%	+/- 2.2
\$25,000 to \$34,999	60	+/- 50	4.9%	+/- 4
\$35,000 to \$49,999	96	+/- 72	7.8%	+/- 5.7
\$50,000 to \$74,999	113	+/- 62	9.2%	+/- 5.1
\$75,000 to \$99,999	150	+/- 73	12.2%	+/- 5.9

SELECTED ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
\$100,000 to \$149,999	371	+/- 131	30.2%	+/- 10.1
\$150,000 to \$199,999	324	+/- 129	26.4%	+/- 10
\$200,000 or more	88	+/- 59	7.2%	+/- 5
Median family income (dollars)	\$120,793	+/- 16372	(X)%	+/- (X)
Mean family income (dollars)	\$123,341	+/- 11650	(X)%	+/- (X)
Per capita income (dollars)	\$37,589	+/- 4152	(X)%	+/- (X)
Nonfamily households	465	+/- 150	(X)	+/- (X)
Median nonfamily income (dollars)	\$47,417	+/- 17783	(X)%	+/- (X)
Mean nonfamily income (dollars)	\$56,620	+/- 13125	(X)%	+/- (X)
Median earnings for workers (dollars)	\$41,910	+/- 5160	(X)%	+/- (X)
Median earnings for male full-time, year-round workers (dollars)	\$85,262	+/- 8819	(X)%	+/- (X)
Median earnings for female full-time, year-round workers (dollars)	\$52,793	+/- 11296	(X)%	+/- (X)
HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE				
Civilian noninstitutionalized population	4,601	+/- 136	4,601	+/- (X)
With health insurance coverage	4,523	+/- 150	100.0%	+/- 1.4
With private health insurance	3,806	+/- 283	82.7%	+/- 5.5
With public coverage	1,793	+/- 314	39%	+/- 6.9
No health insurance coverage	78	+/- 65	1.7%	+/- 1.4
Civilian noninstitutionalized population under 19 years	1,261	+/- 214	1,261	+/- (X)
No health insurance coverage	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2.9
Civilian noninstitutionalized population 19 to 64 years	2,299	+/- 213	2,299	+/- (X)
In labor force:	1,935	+/- 203	100.0%	+/- (X)
Employed:	1,926	+/- 203	1,926	+/- (X)
With health insurance coverage	1,896	+/- 198	98.4%	+/- 1.8
With private health insurance	1,701	+/- 215	88.3%	+/- 5.7
With public coverage	343	+/- 156	17.8%	+/- 8.2
No health insurance coverage	30	+/- 35	1.6%	+/- 1.8
Unemployed:	9	+/- 15	9	+/- (X)
With health insurance coverage	9	+/- 15	100.0%	+/- 100
With private health insurance	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 100
With public coverage	9	+/- 15	100%	+/- 100
No health insurance coverage	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 100
Not in labor force:	364	+/- 137	364	+/- (X)
With health insurance coverage	316	+/- 111	86.8%	+/- 14.4
With private health insurance	267	+/- 100	73.4%	+/- 23.2
With public coverage	94	+/- 69	25.8%	+/- 12.6
No health insurance coverage	48	+/- 59	13.2%	+/- 14.4
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES AND PEOPLE WHOSE INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS IS BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL				
All families	(X)	+/- (X)	2.1%	+/- 2.4
With related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	3.1%	+/- 4.7
With related children of the householder under 5 years only	(X)	+/- (X)	0%	+/- 65
Married couple families	(X)	+/- (X)	0.8%	+/- 1.1
With related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	0%	+/- 7.8
With related children of the householder under 5 years only	(X)	+/- (X)	0%	+/- 65
Families with female householder, no spouse present	(X)	+/- (X)	19.6%	+/- 27.8

SELECTED ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
With related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	25%	+/- 37.1
With related children of the householder under 5 years only	(X)	+/- (X)	-%	+/- **
All people	(X)	+/- (X)	4.2%	+/- 2.8
Under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	3.9%	+/- 7.1
Related children of the householder under 18 years	(X)	+/- (X)	3.9%	+/- 7.1
Related children of the householder under 5 years	(X)	+/- (X)	9%	+/- 15.6
Related children of the householder 5 to 17 years	(X)	+/- (X)	2.6%	+/- 6.1
18 years and over	(X)	+/- (X)	4.3%	+/- 2.2
18 to 64 years	(X)	+/- (X)	2.7%	+/- 2.3
65 years and over	(X)	+/- (X)	8%	+/- 5.6
People in families	(X)	+/- (X)	2.2%	+/- 2.9
Unrelated individuals 15 years and over	(X)	+/- (X)	16.8%	+/- 8.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '**' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
5. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

SELECTED HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIP Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
HOUSING OCCUPANCY				
Total housing units	1,876	+/- 171	100.0%	+/- (X)
Occupied housing units	1,693	+/- 154	90.2%	+/- 4.8
Vacant housing units	183	+/- 96	9.8%	+/- 4.8
Homeowner vacancy rate	2.1	+/- 2.5	(X)%	+/- (X)
Rental vacancy rate	14.8	+/- 14.2	(X)%	+/- (X)
UNITS IN STRUCTURE				
Total housing units	1,876	+/- 171	100.0%	+/- (X)
1-unit, detached	1,581	+/- 170	84.3%	+/- 5.8
1-unit, attached	71	+/- 64	3.8%	+/- 3.3
2 units	51	+/- 70	2.7%	+/- 3.7
3 or 4 units	54	+/- 51	2.9%	+/- 2.7
5 to 9 units	57	+/- 56	3%	+/- 3
10 to 19 units	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2
20 or more units	62	+/- 48	3.3%	+/- 2.5
Mobile home	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2
Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2
YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT				
Total housing units	1,876	+/- 171	100.0%	+/- (X)
Built 2014 or later	192	+/- 99	10.2%	+/- 5.1
Built 2010 to 2013	129	+/- 84	6.9%	+/- 4.4
Built 2000 to 2009	665	+/- 135	35.4%	+/- 7.1
Built 1990 to 1999	33	+/- 38	1.8%	+/- 2
Built 1980 to 1989	194	+/- 104	10.3%	+/- 5.3
Built 1970 to 1979	211	+/- 91	11.2%	+/- 5
Built 1960 to 1969	127	+/- 100	6.8%	+/- 5.1
Built 1950 to 1959	62	+/- 56	3%	+/- 3
Built 1940 to 1949	66	+/- 68	3.5%	+/- 3.6
Built 1939 or earlier	197	+/- 91	10.5%	+/- 4.9
ROOMS				
Total housing units	1,876	+/- 171	100.0%	+/- (X)
1 room	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2
2 rooms	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2
3 rooms	101	+/- 70	5.4%	+/- 3.7
4 rooms	76	+/- 55	4.1%	+/- 2.9
5 rooms	141	+/- 79	7.5%	+/- 4.1
6 rooms	332	+/- 111	17.7%	+/- 5.5
7 rooms	298	+/- 115	15.9%	+/- 5.6
8 rooms	310	+/- 122	16.5%	+/- 7.1
9 rooms or more	618	+/- 168	32.9%	+/- 8.3
Median rooms	7.5	+/- 0.4	(X)%	+/- (X)
BEDROOMS				
Total housing units	1,876	+/- 171	100.0%	+/- (X)
No bedroom	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2
1 bedroom	113	+/- 69	6%	+/- 3.6
2 bedrooms	260	+/- 104	13.9%	+/- 5.2
3 bedrooms	668	+/- 184	35.6%	+/- 8.4

SELECTED HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIP Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
4 bedrooms	604	+/- 145	32.2%	+/- 8.2
5 or more bedrooms	231	+/- 89	12.3%	+/- 4.9
HOUSING TENURE				
Occupied housing units	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
Owner-occupied	1,353	+/- 144	79.9%	+/- 7.1
Renter-occupied	340	+/- 134	20.1%	+/- 7.1
Average household size of owner-occupied unit	2.90	+/- 0.28	(X)%	+/- (X)
Average household size of renter-occupied unit	2.01	+/- 0.44	(X)%	+/- (X)
YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT				
Occupied housing units	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
Moved in 2019 or later	51	+/- 74	3%	+/- 4.3
Moved in 2015 to 2018	322	+/- 105	19%	+/- 6.8
Moved in 2010 to 2014	346	+/- 121	20.4%	+/- 7
Moved in 2000 to 2009	657	+/- 163	38.8%	+/- 8.1
Moved in 1990 to 1999	73	+/- 59	4.3%	+/- 3.5
Moved in 1989 and earlier	244	+/- 97	14.4%	+/- 5.4
VEHICLES AVAILABLE				
Occupied housing units	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
No vehicles available	92	+/- 60	5.4%	+/- 3.5
1 vehicle available	431	+/- 138	25.5%	+/- 6.9
2 vehicles available	799	+/- 170	47.2%	+/- 9
3 or more vehicles available	371	+/- 99	21.9%	+/- 6.5
HOUSE HEATING FUEL				
Occupied housing units	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
Utility gas	68	+/- 63	4%	+/- 3.7
Bottled, tank, or LP gas	448	+/- 126	26.5%	+/- 7.6
Electricity	838	+/- 180	49.5%	+/- 9.4
Fuel oil, kerosene, etc.	278	+/- 127	16.4%	+/- 7.1
Coal or coke	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2.2
Wood	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2.2
Solar energy	24	+/- 31	140.0%	+/- 1.9
Other fuel	16	+/- 25	0.9%	+/- 1.5
No fuel used	21	+/- 33	1.2%	+/- 2
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS				
Occupied housing units	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2.2
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2.2
No telephone service available	37	+/- 40	2.2%	+/- 2.3
OCCUPANTS PER ROOM				
Occupied housing units	1,693	+/- 154	100.0%	+/- (X)
1.00 or less	1,683	+/- 154	99.4%	+/- 0.9
1.01 to 1.50	10	+/- 15	0.6%	+/- 0.9
1.51 or more	0	+/- 13	0.0%	+/- 2.2

SELECTED HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIP Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
VALUE				
Owner-occupied units	1,353	+/- 144	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than \$50,000	11	+/- 18	0.8%	+/- 1.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 2.7
\$100,000 to \$149,999	15	+/- 26	1.1%	+/- 1.9
\$150,000 to \$199,999	108	+/- 93	8%	+/- 6.6
\$200,000 to \$299,999	284	+/- 86	21%	+/- 6.3
\$300,000 to \$499,999	919	+/- 133	67.9%	+/- 7.8
\$500,000 to \$999,999	14	+/- 15	1%	+/- 1.1
\$1,000,000 or more	2	+/- 4	0.1%	+/- 0.3
Median (dollars)	\$338,100	+/- 12362	(X)%	+/- (X)
MORTGAGE STATUS				
Owner-occupied units	1,353	+/- 144	100.0%	+/- (X)
Housing units with a mortgage	973	+/- 128	71.9%	+/- 7.5
Housing units without a mortgage	380	+/- 117	28.1%	+/- 7.5
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS (SMOC)				
Housing units with a mortgage	973	+/- 128	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than \$500	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 3.8
\$500 to \$999	15	+/- 26	1.5%	+/- 2.7
\$1,000 to \$1,499	139	+/- 103	14.3%	+/- 10.1
\$1,500 to \$1,999	191	+/- 99	19.6%	+/- 9.8
\$2,000 to \$2,499	221	+/- 95	22.7%	+/- 9.1
\$2,500 to \$2,999	279	+/- 113	28.7%	+/- 11.6
\$3,000 or more	128	+/- 81	13.2%	+/- 8.3
Median (dollars)	\$2,320	+/- 241	(X)%	+/- (X)
Housing units without a mortgage	380	+/- 117	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than \$250	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 9.4
\$250 to \$399	30	+/- 32	7.9%	+/- 8.2
\$400 to \$599	43	+/- 33	11.3%	+/- 8.7
\$600 to \$799	183	+/- 89	48.2%	+/- 17.4
\$800 to \$999	56	+/- 44	14.7%	+/- 10.9
\$1,000 or more	68	+/- 56	17.9%	+/- 13.6
Median (dollars)	\$747	+/- 47	(X)%	+/- (X)
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (SMOCAPI)				
Housing units with a mortgage (excluding units where SMOCAPI cannot be computed)	973	+/- 128	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than 20.0 percent	363	+/- 124	37.3%	+/- 11.5
20.0 to 24.9 percent	166	+/- 98	17.1%	+/- 9.3
25.0 to 29.9 percent	196	+/- 98	20.1%	+/- 9.8
30.0 to 34.9 percent	45	+/- 51	4.6%	+/- 5.3
35.0 percent or more	203	+/- 81	20.9%	+/- 8.4
Not computed	0	+/- 13	(X)%	+/- (X)
Housing unit without a mortgage (excluding units where SMOCAPI cannot be computed)	380	+/- 117	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than 10.0 percent	156	+/- 81	41.1%	+/- 14.6
10.0 to 14.9 percent	36	+/- 24	9.5%	+/- 6.6
15.0 to 19.9 percent	37	+/- 32	9.7%	+/- 7.7

SELECTED HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIP Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
20.0 to 24.9 percent	39	+/- 49	10.3%	+/- 12.4
25.0 to 29.9 percent	28	+/- 34	7.4%	+/- 8.8
30.0 to 34.9 percent	55	+/- 48	14.5%	+/- 12
35.0 percent or more	29	+/- 27	7.6%	+/- 7
Not computed	0	+/- 13	(X)%	+/- (X)
GROSS RENT				
Occupied units paying rent	340	+/- 134	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than \$500	64	+/- 51	18.8%	+/- 15.3
\$500 to \$999	140	+/- 88	41.2%	+/- 21.4
\$1,000 to \$1,499	14	+/- 23	4.1%	+/- 7.1
\$1,500 to \$1,999	33	+/- 37	9.7%	+/- 11.3
\$2,000 to \$2,499	84	+/- 84	24.7%	+/- 20.7
\$2,500 to \$2,999	5	+/- 13	1.5%	+/- 3.7
\$3,000 or more	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 10.4
Median (dollars)	\$860	+/- 541	(X)%	+/- (X)
No rent paid	0	+/- 13	(X)%	+/- (X)
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (GRAPI)				
Occupied units paying rent (excluding units where GRAPI cannot be computed)	340	+/- 134	100.0%	+/- (X)
Less than 15.0 percent	50	+/- 51	14.7%	+/- 14.8
15.0 to 19.9 percent	55	+/- 49	16.2%	+/- 14.4
20.0 to 24.9 percent	13	+/- 22	3.8%	+/- 7
25.0 to 29.9 percent	22	+/- 32	6.5%	+/- 8.8
30.0 to 34.9 percent	69	+/- 77	20.3%	+/- 22.2
35.0 percent or more	131	+/- 97	38.5%	+/- 21.5
Not computed	0	+/- 13	(X)%	+/- (X)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
5. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
SEX AND AGE				
Total population	4,829	+/- 19	100.0%	+/- (X)
Male	2,349	+/- 173	48.6%	+/- 3.5
Female	2,480	+/- 170	51.4%	+/- 3.5
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	94.7	+/- 13.5	(X)%	+/- (X)
Under 5 years	279	+/- 119	5.8%	+/- 2.5
5 to 9 years	420	+/- 162	8.7%	+/- 3.4
10 to 14 years	366	+/- 137	7.6%	+/- 2.8
15 to 19 years	313	+/- 138	6.5%	+/- 2.9
20 to 24 years	186	+/- 91	3.9%	+/- 1.9
25 to 34 years	226	+/- 128	4.7%	+/- 2.7
35 to 44 years	755	+/- 205	15.6%	+/- 4.2
45 to 54 years	738	+/- 183	15.3%	+/- 3.8
55 to 59 years	204	+/- 103	4.2%	+/- 2.1
60 to 64 years	211	+/- 84	4.4%	+/- 1.7
65 to 74 years	538	+/- 162	11.1%	+/- 3.4
75 to 84 years	461	+/- 157	9.5%	+/- 3.2
85 years and over	132	+/- 83	2.7%	+/- 1.7
Median age (years)	43.6	+/- 3.5	(X)	+/- (X)
Under 18 years	1,164	+/- 213	24.1%	+/- 4.4
16 years and over	3,675	+/- 212	76.1%	+/- 4.4
18 years and over	3,665	+/- 211	75.9%	+/- 4.4
21 years and over	3,400	+/- 219	70.4%	+/- 4.6
62 years and over	1,253	+/- 274	25.9%	+/- 5.7
65 years and over	1,131	+/- 266	23.4%	+/- 5.5
18 years and over	3,665	+/- 211	100.0%	+/- (X)
Male	1,786	+/- 173	48.7%	+/- 3.4
Female	1,879	+/- 152	51.3%	+/- 3.4
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	95.1	+/- 13	(X)	+/- (X)
65 years and over	1,131	+/- 266	100.0%	+/- (X)
Male	476	+/- 152	42.1%	+/- 6.5
Female	655	+/- 149	57.9%	+/- 6.5
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	72.7	+/- 19.5	(X)	+/- (X)
RACE				
Total population	4,829	+/- 19	100.0%	+/- (X)
One race	4,788	+/- 74	99.2%	+/- 1.6
Two or more races	41	+/- 75	0.8%	+/- 1.6
One race	4,788	+/- 74	99.2%	+/- 1.6
White	4,171	+/- 242	86.4%	+/- 5
Black or African American	556	+/- 228	11.5%	+/- 4.7

DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
American Indian and Alaska Native	3	+/- 7	0.1%	+/- 0.1
Cherokee tribal grouping	0	+/- 13	(X)	+/- 0.8
Chippewa tribal grouping	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Navajo tribal grouping	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Sioux tribal grouping	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Asian	58	+/- 74	1.2%	+/- 1.5
Asian Indian	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Chinese	10	+/- 19	0.2%	+/- 0.4
Filipino	48	+/- 74	1%	+/- 1.5
Japanese	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Korean	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Vietnamese	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Other Asian	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Native Hawaiian	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Chamorro	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Samoan	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Other Pacific Islander	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Some other race	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Two or more races	41	+/- 75	0.8%	+/- 1.6
White and Black or African American	41	+/- 75	0.8%	+/- 1.6
White and American Indian and Alaska Native	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
White and Asian	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Black or African American and American Indian and Alaska Native	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Race alone or in combination with one or more other races				
Total population	4,829	+/- 19	100.0%	+/- (X)
White	4,212	+/- 235	87.2%	+/- 4.9
Black or African American	597	+/- 238	12.4%	+/- 4.9
American Indian and Alaska Native	3	+/- 7	0.1%	+/- 0.1
Asian	58	+/- 74	1.2%	+/- 1.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Some other race	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE				
Total population	4,829	+/- 19	100.0%	+/- (X)
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	141	+/- 167	2.9%	+/- 3.5
Mexican	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Puerto Rican	141	+/- 167	2.9%	+/- 3.5
Cuban	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Other Hispanic or Latino	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8

DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSING ESTIMATES
2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Area Name : Centreville town, Maryland

Subject	FIPS Code : 2414950			
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
Not Hispanic or Latino	4,688	+/- 168	97.1%	+/- 3.5
White alone	4,030	+/- 270	83.5%	+/- 5.6
Black or African American alone	556	+/- 228	11.5%	+/- 4.7
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	3	+/- 7	0.1%	+/- 0.1
Asian alone	58	+/- 74	1.2%	+/- 1.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Some other race alone	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Two or more races	41	+/- 75	0.8%	+/- 1.6
Two races including Some other race	0	+/- 13	0%	+/- 0.8
Two races excluding Some other race, and Three or more races	41	+/- 75	0.8%	+/- 1.6
Total housing units	1,876	+/- 171	(X)%	+/- (X)
CITIZEN, VOTING AGE POPULATION				
Citizen, 18 and over population	3,624	+/- 210	100.0%	+/- (X)
Male	1,786	+/- 173	49.3%	+/- 3.4
Female	1,838	+/- 148	50.7%	+/- 3.4

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
5. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.