

CHAPTER FOUR

POPULATION AND ECONOMIC BASE

An understanding of the general characteristics of Dover's population is a crucial component of the master plan process. Basic background data on growth rates and population characteristics compared to other towns in the immediate area, as well as Dutchess County as a whole, provide insights into Dover's more unique qualities and common area-wide needs. Population projections, in particular, supply essential information on the potential requirements for community services, but the analysis in this chapter will also influence policy recommendations on such issues as land use, transportation, economic development, and housing.

TRENDS IN POPULATION GROWTH

Dutchess County's population has grown significantly since 1920, as illustrated in Table 4.1. Steady growth rates between 13 and 15 percent prevailed from 1920-1950, then doubled to 26 to 29 percent in the 1950s and 1960s, before dropping back to approximately 10 percent in the 1970s and around 5 percent in the 1980s. Most of the county's population has been concentrated in the southwestern portion from Hyde Park south to Fishkill along the Hudson River and spreading inland to Pleasant Valley, LaGrange and East Fishkill.

Table 4.1
Total Population

Year	Dover		Dutchess County	
	Population	Percent Change	Population	Percent Change
1900	1,959		81,670	
1910	2,016	2.9%	87,661	7.3%
1920	1,710	-15.2%	91,747	4.7%
1930	3,775	120.8%	105,462	14.9%
1940	7,385	95.6%	120,542	14.3%
1950	7,460	1.0%	136,781	13.5%
1960	8,776	17.6%	176,008	28.7%
1970	8,475	-3.4%	222,295	26.3%
1980	7,261	-14.3%	245,055	10.2%
1990	7,778	7.1%	259,462	5.9%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

By comparison, the census figures for Dover show a much more erratic pattern. Population increased slightly between 1900 and 1910, but then declined by over 15 percent during the 1910s. During the 1920s and 1930s census data shows incredible growth rates hovering around 100 percent. However, the institutionalization of patients at the Harlem Valley Psychiatric Center beginning in 1924 explains the major portion of these increases. In all succeeding years total population figures are significantly influenced by the institutional population.

During the 1940s and 1950s more stable growth occurred with increases of 1 percent and approximately 18 percent respectively. Then in the 1960s and 1970s the deinstitutionalization of Psychiatric Center patients begins to show up in the data, as reflected by the 3 percent and 14 percent decreases respectively (see Table 4.4). Total population growth in the 1980s was approximately 7 percent. This figure measures fairly accurately the actual growth rate experienced in the non-institutional population; the institutional population rose by 11 percent during the 1980s.

Tables 4.2 through 4.6 compare Dover's total population and the rates of change with the surrounding towns from 1930 to 1990. Because both Amenia and Beekman have large institutional populations (in Amenia the Wassaic Developmental Center and in Beekman Greenhaven Prison) and Pawling, Union Vale and Washington do not, for comparative purposes the non-institutional population is more useful. Dover's non-institutional population growth exceeded most of the surrounding towns with the exception of Beekman and Union Vale. It must be remembered, however, that percentage growth rates tend to be exaggerated when the population base is relatively small.

Table 4.2
Total Population

Municipality	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990
Dover	3,775	7,385	7,460	8,776	8,475	7,261	7,778
Amenia	1,969	6,873	7,481	7,546	7,842	6,299	5,195
Beekman	764	790	1,703	3,326	5,701	7,139	10,447
Pawling	2,391	2,752	2,891	3,938	4,764	5,795	5,947
Union Vale	1,025	1,056	970	1,138	1,702	2,658	3,577
Washington	3,024	3,080	3,427	3,695	4,407	4,382	4,479

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 4.3
Percent Change Total Population

Municipality	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990
Dover	120.8%	95.6%	1.0%	17.6%	-3.4%	-14.3%	7.1%
Amenia	7.5%	249.1%	8.8%	0.9%	3.9%	-19.7%	-17.5%
Beekman	-9.5%	3.4%	115.6%	95.3%	71.4%	25.2%	46.3%
Pawling	22.3%	15.1%	5.1%	36.2%	21.0%	21.6%	2.6%
Union Vale	3.9%	3.0%	-8.1%	17.3%	49.6%	56.2%	34.6%
Washington	8.2%	1.9%	11.3%	7.8	19.3%	-0.6%	2.2%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 4.4
Total Institutional Population

Municipality	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990
Dover	1,643	4,761	4,983	5,399	4,015	863	958
Amenia				4,243	3,773	1,944	1,213
Beekman				1,865	2,083	1,818	2,081
Pawling				0	0	144	118
Union Vale				154	0	125	0
Washington				0	104	261	153

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and N.Y.S. Department of Mental Hygiene

Table 4.5
Total Non-Institutional Population (Total Pop - Institutional Pop)

Municipality	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990
Dover	2,132	2,624	2,477	3,377	4,460	6,398	6,820
Amenia				3,303	4,069	4,355	3,982
Beekman				1,461	3,618	5,321	8,366
Pawling				3,938	4,764	5,651	5,829
Union Vale				984	1,702	2,533	3,577
Washington				3,695	4,303	4,121	4,326

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and N.Y.S. Department of Mental Hygiene

Table 4.6
Percent Change Total Non-Institutional Population

Municipality	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990
Dover	23.1%	-5.6%	36.3%	32.1%	43.5%	6.6%
Amenia				23.2%	7.0%	-8.6%
Beekman				147.6%	47.1%	57.2%
Pawling				21.0%	18.6%	3.1%
Union Vale				73.0%	48.8%	41.2%
Washington				16.5%	-4.2%	5.0%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and N.Y.S. Department of Mental Hygiene

The institutional population makes up a significant percentage of Dover's population from the 1920s through the 1960s. Between 1930 and 1960 the institutional population makes up over half of all residents in the Town. When the institutional population is subtracted, the data shows a much more steady pace of growth. With the exception of the 1940s, non-institutional population grew by over 20 percent during every decade from the 1920s through the 1970s, with growth rates averaging 26 percent per decade.

Non-institutional population trends have also been influenced by the Psychiatric Center to a large extent. The great demand by the facility for care, supervisory and maintenance personnel has translated into increases in Dover's workforce and, therefore, its non-institutional population. The Wassaic Developmental Center in the Town of Amenia has had a similar, though lesser effect on Dover's population. Other factors contributing to Dover's population growth include the presence of the Metro-North Commuter Railroad, and other major employers in the area, including IBM facilities in Fishkill, Poughkeepsie and East Fishkill, local manufacturing facilities such as Westchester Modular, Pawling Corporation, and the various mining and quarrying operations.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION

Household Population

National population data have reflected for several decades the decrease in size in the typical American household. There are many factors contributing to the decrease in average household size, such as the divorce rate, older marriages, decisions by couples to limit the size of families, and the ability of older people to live independently. Census figures show that Dutchess County households overall and those in Dover have followed this trend. As shown in Table 4.7, the average household size in Dover has decreased from 3.3 residents in 1960 to 2.7 residents in 1990. Similarly, the average size of a household in Dutchess County has decreased from 3.7 to 2.9 during the same time period.

Table 4.7
Households

Year	Dover			Dutchess County		
	Number	Percent Change	Persons per Household	Number	Percent Change	Person per Household
1960	1,024		3.3	46,964		3.7
1970	1,382	35.0%	3.2	62,495	33.1%	3.6
1980	2,254	63.1%	2.8	80,642	29.0%	3.0
1990	2,493	10.6%	2.7	89,567	11.1%	2.9

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

The total number of households in Dover has grown from 1,024 to 2,493 between 1960 and 1990 with the sharpest growth occurring during the 1970s. The growth of households in Dutchess County overall was similar during the same time period, however, countywide growth was not as sharp during the 1970s. Substantially smaller household sizes translate into a greater demand for housing units than the rise in population would suggest.

Age Distribution

The distribution of age groups in Dover can be important in determining which services are needed most in the community. Table 4.8 provides an overview of Dover's age breakdown and the changes that have occurred between 1960 and 1990. Major changes show up as increases in the younger age categories and decreases in the age 45 or older population including middle age, retirement age and elderly groups (note: the institutional population is included in these figures. The census does not break out institutional population by age).

Table 4.8
Age Breakdowns

Age Group	1960		1970		1980		1990	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0-4	412	4.7%	429	5.1%	481	6.6%	595	7.6%
5-19	958	10.9%	1,388	16.4%	1,671	23.0%	1,538	19.8%
20-44	2,332	26.6%	2,139	25.2	2,670	36.8%	3,229	41.5%
45-64	3,152	35.9%	2,428	28.6%	1,548	21.3%	1,525	19.6%
65-74	1,217	13.9%	1,215	14.3%	558	7.7%	521	6.7%
75+	705	8.0%	876	10.3%	333	4.6%	370	4.8%
Total	8,776		8,475		7,261		7,778	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

The figures reflect the maturity of the post-World War II baby boom generation. The growth of this age group is significant because it includes parents with children at home and represents families likely to live in or desire single family dwelling units. This generation will probably contribute to a second generation stabilization or increase in the school and pre-school populations. The increase in the numbers of pre-school-aged children already apparent in the data will have implications for planning in terms of availability of housing and future school and recreational needs.

The decrease in the middle age population particularly may have already had some negative impacts on the Town. This age group generally has the highest earning potential and as they increase in age, their demand for services (public schools especially) decreases. Overall the balance of town tax revenues relative to expenditures may suffer from this population trend as those demanding relatively fewer services decrease and those demanding relatively more services increase.

Race and Ethnicity

Dover, along with most of the more rural municipalities in Dutchess County, has a relatively small minority population. The 1990 census classifies 90 percent of the population as white including approximately 2 percent persons of Spanish origin. Approximately 8 percent of Dover's population is black, which mirrors the countywide average. While Dover's black population is small overall, it is larger than those in most of the surrounding communities: Pawling (1.3%), Union Vale (2.0%), Washington (3.7%), Amenia (5.9%). Beekman is the only exception with a 12.9% black population (note, however, that these figures include institutional populations). Census figures for Asian-Pacific Islanders and Native Americans are around 2 percent total.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

The former Dover Master Plan (1966) projected total population in 1970 would be 5,000, in 1985, 9,000 and by 2000, 15,000. As shown above, actual population growth has not achieved the levels predicted earlier. This points out the hazards in projecting population. Even with this caveat, however, updating population projections is a useful exercise so that officials and private interests can continually plan for community service needs. Projections should only be used as guidelines. Unforeseen factors such as increased migration rates, economic recession or technological changes may alter anticipated growth patterns.

Projections 1990-2010

Table 4.9 shows two sets of longer term population projection for the Town of Dover.

NYSDEC Projections

These figures are official estimates by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. These projections are reported to the U.S. Census Bureau and revised periodically. During the periods 1990 to 2000 and 2000 to 2010 they show an increase of 8.0 percent and 5.7 percent respectively. The population in 2010 is estimated at 9,300. This is a 19.6 percent increase of the 1990 population.

Table 4.9
Population Projections

Year	NYSDEC	Regression Analysis
2000	8,800	7,357
2010	9,300	8,159

Source: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
and Dutchess County Department of Planning

Continuation of the 1930-1990 Growth Rate

This set of projections is based on a continuation of the historical growth rate experienced by Dover from 1930 through 1990. The projections are based on a least squares regression of the non-institutional population only. Institutional population was omitted from the regression analysis due to its historic variability. Anecdotal information and statistical analysis suggest that predicting institutional population in the future will continue to be difficult. The resulting projections for non-institutional population is 8,159 by the year 2010. This projection also results in a 19.6 percent increase in non-institutional population only.

ECONOMIC BASE

History

Dover's economic development has reflected that of Dutchess County, which is on the edge of the New York metropolitan economic region. During the eighteenth century, farmers extended their activities inland from the early Hudson River holdings, and the area experienced a period of settlement and growth based on primarily wheat production. But with the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825, competition from upstate and beyond for the larger regional markets forced many Dutchess farmers to switch to dairy farming. The dairy industry flourished as new rail service made New York City markets more accessible to Dutchess County production of perishable goods. Agriculture, especially dairy, and the local mills and mining operations combined to make this a prosperous area for over half a century. But, in the decades following the Civil War, there was a general decline in local manufacturing as production became more concentrated in industrial centers. Dairy farming remained profitable, but did not constitute the economic force of the earlier period.

The next significant movement affecting the growth of the area was the urban to rural migration which began in the 1920s. Many of the new residents of the following decades were commuters working in Poughkeepsie and other developing communities in southwestern Dutchess, Westchester County and the New York City area. Also during the 1920s

two large state facilities opened in and near Dover, the Harlem Valley Psychiatric Center and the Wassaic Developmental Center. These institutions have had a strong impact on Dover's economic health, both attracting new residents to the Town and providing consistent employment for existing residents.

Today, Dover is on the periphery of an expanding urban economy. Route 22 and the Harlem Valley rail line serve as links to economic opportunities in Westchester County, New York City and Connecticut to the south. Routes 21, 55 and 343 also connect Dover to Poughkeepsie and southwestern Dutchess County. The Town has begun to feel the development pressure that has influenced Dover's neighbors farther to the south, particularly Pawling and Beekman, but the current economic downturn and abundance of commercial space in Putnam and Westchester Counties has helped attenuate those pressures. Economic prospects will depend on Dover promoting its greatest assets, the beautiful natural setting and the historic hamlet centers including the Psychiatric Center campus.

Employment

Over the past twenty years Dutchess County has consistently had one of the lowest unemployment rates in New York State. The 1990 census reports that the countywide unemployment rate for people 16 and older stood at 4.2 percent. Dover's rate was slightly lower at 3.8 percent. According to the census, Dover's total workforce consisted of 3,513 people, of whom 1,547 were women and 1,966 were men.

Dover had a higher percentage of its adult population in the labor force compared to the countywide average as shown in Table 4.10. However, Dover's labor force participation was significantly lower than several of its neighbors including Washington, Union Vale and Pawling. This is most likely caused by the inclusion of Psychiatric Center residents in the total population. Without these residents, the participation rate increases to 69.2 percent.

Table 4.10
Labor Force Participation

Municipality	Population	Adult Population (16+)	Adult Population in Labor Force	
			#	%
Dover	7,778	6,038	3,513	58.2%
Amenia	5,195	4,328	2,066	47.7
Beekman	10,447	8,151	4,451	54.6
Pawling	5,947	4,613	3,080	66.8
Union Vale	3,577	2,612	1,795	68.7
Washington	4,479	3,577	2,516	70.3
Dutchess County	259,462	204,006	133,694	51.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Occupation

Table 4.11 illustrates the distribution of employment by occupation in 1990. It should be noted that this section discusses jobs held by town residents regardless of place of employment.

Distribution between census employment categories was relatively even especially when compared with countywide averages. No occupational category dominates over another. Dover differs from the county as a whole with far fewer people employed in management and professional and sales and administrative support positions. This probably reflects the strong IBM management and technical influence on countywide employment. Dover has a significantly higher percentage of service workers as compared to Dutchess County as a whole. However, the percentage of service employees has dropped significantly since 1980 when they made up 32 percent of the workforce. The unemployment rate then was 4.6 percent. It can be concluded, based on the 1990 unemployment rate of 3.8 percent and the lower total number of service workers in 1990, 723 compared to 958 in 1980, that Dover's service workers have been able to adapt and find new jobs.

Dover's neighbors with the exception of Amenia, reflect more closely countywide occupational trends. Pawling, Beekman and Washington have a significantly higher percentage of management and professional workers and sales and administrative support workers than Dover while Dover's percentage of service workers is significantly higher. Dover's percentage of workers employed in farming is comparable with surrounding towns, although Washington has significantly more and Beekman significantly less. Dover and Amenia's differences with nearby communities and with Dutchess County as a whole to a large extent reflect the employment requirements of the large state facilities which have a higher need for service workers and less of a need for sales and management personnel.

Table 4.11
Employment By Occupation, Percent, 1990

Occupation	Dover	Amenia	Beekman	Pawling	Unionvale	Washington	Dutchess County
Management Professional	20.8%	26.8%	34.2%	33.5%	30.1%	35.8%	33.0%
Clerical, Sales, Technical Staff	24.0	22.4	31.9	28.6	27.4	26.4	31.7
Service (Incl. Fire and Police)	21.5	25.8	11.2	10.7	12.6	13.4	13.2
Labor, Equipment Operation	16.6	12.3	10.0	11.4	9.2	7.4	10.0
Crafts, Repair, Precision Production	14.0	8.7	11.3	12.7	17.3	10.1	10.6
Farming, Forestry	3.1	4.0	1.4	3.1	3.4	6.9	1.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Industry

A breakdown of employment by industry, shown in Table 4.12, indicates that 38.9 percent of the labor force is involved in business and professional services, which tracks fairly closely the countywide average of 35.4 percent. Of Dover's service industry employees, 774 or 59 percent of the category, work in the health services field. In other industries Dover matches countywide averages fairly closely, having slightly fewer residents employed in manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade and finance and real estate, but slightly more involved in transportation, communication and utilities, public administration and agriculture. People employed in the mining industry make up only 0.4 percent of Dover's workforce.

Dover has a more balanced distribution of employment by industry than does its neighbor, Amenia. Dover had more manufacturing employment and less management and professional employment. Otherwise Dover's neighbors show a fairly balanced distribution amongst industries, although Dover does have a lower percentage of people involved in the real estate and finance industries than most of its neighbors with the exception of Amenia.

TABLE 4.12
Employment By Industry, Percent, 1990

Industry	Dover	Amenia	Beekman	Pawling	Unionvale	Washington	Dutchess Cnty.
Business & Professional Service	38.9%	48.2%	28.5%	34.9%	32.6%	40.9%	35.4%
Manufacturing	17.4	9.0	22.8	14.6	27.7	14.6	23.0
Wholesale and Retail Trade	15.1	20.1	17.2	16.0	12.4	11.1	16.8
Trans., Communication Utilities	8.0	2.5	11.5	7.4	4.7	5.5	6.6
Public Administration	6.4	5.1	3.8	5.7	4.3	3.8	4.5
Construction	6.9	7.4	7.3	9.0	10.2	7.4	6.5
Finance & Real Estate	3.3	1.2	6.8	9.5	4.6	7.8	5.3
Agriculture	3.6	5.7	1.7	2.9	3.2	8.9	1.7
Mining	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Commuting Patterns

A majority of Dover's workers have jobs within the county. Sixty-six percent worked within Dutchess County, while another 22 percent worked out of county, but in New York state. Only 12 percent of Dover's workforce is employed outside of New York State. Even with the large percentage of in-county workers, the average travel time to work was 25 minutes, indicating a fairly substantial number of long distance commuters.

Table 4.13 shows that in 1990, the private automobile was the dominant means of travel for Dover's workers. Most of the commuters drove alone (78.3%), but a significant number carpooled (14.4%). Public transportation, including the LOOP bus system and trains to White Plains and New York City, accounted for 1.2 percent of the total. Two percent worked at home compared to 2.4 percent for Dutchess County, and 3.4 percent reported walking to work compared to 4.5 percent countywide. Dover residents use carpools at a higher rate than county averages and a surprising number of residents walk to work considering the rural nature of the Town. However, carpooling and walking are both down significantly from 1980 when they accounted for 27.8 percent and 6.7 respectively. The increase in people that drive alone has taken up the decrease in carpooling and walking.

Table 4.13
 Transportation To Work, Percent, 1990

Means	Dover	Dutchess County
Drive Alone	78.3%	77.9%
Share Ride	14.4	11.3
Public Transportation	1.2	3.2
Walking	3.4	4.5
Other	0.7	0.7
Work at Home	2.0	2.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Income

Two statistics are available to compare the income of Dover residents to those of other municipalities. Those are mean family income (the average of all family incomes), and median family income (the middle value with 50 percent of all cases being higher and 50 percent being lower).

Relative to adjacent towns, Dover's mean family income is lower than all adjacent towns with the exception of Amenia. The same holds true for median incomes. As Table 4.14 indicates, while mean and median incomes are lower than those for surrounding towns, they are only slightly below those of the average Dutchess County family. This combined with a relatively low unemployment rate means that Dover still maintains a relatively strong economic base.

TABLE 4.14
 Income Indicators, 1990

Municipality	Family Mean	Family Median
Dover	\$47,368	\$41,567
Amenia	38,014	33,821
Beekman	61,070	56,026
Pawling	59,010	52,712
Union Vale	60,773	54,314
Washington	87,478	50,458
Dutchess County	55,580	49,305

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

In Table 4.15, when family incomes are sorted into levels and compared to county averages, a consistent pattern emerges. In all income categories below \$50,000, Dover ranked above countywide figures, while in all income groupings above \$50,000 Dover had lower percentages of residents. This shows an income distribution skewed slightly to moderate and lower income families with relatively fewer upper income residents.

Table 4.15
Family Income Distribution, Percent, 1990

Family Income		Dover	Dutchess County
Under	\$10,000	6.0%	3.6%
\$10,000	- \$19,999	12.5	8.1
\$20,000	- \$29,999	12.3	11.4
\$30,000	- \$39,999	14.7	13.6
\$40,000	- \$49,999	23.7	14.3
\$50,000	- \$74,999	21.0	29.2
\$75,000	- \$99,999	6.8	12.4
\$100,000	- \$124,999	2.3	4.2
\$125,000	- or more	0.7	3.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Harlem Valley Regional Economic Development Study

Dover's participation in the Harlem Valley Regional Economic Development Study (REDS) marked a commitment by the Town to regional solutions to economic concerns. Dover, with the other Harlem Valley communities of Amenia, North East, Millerton and Pine Plains, joined with a not-for-profit organization, the Harlem Valley Planning Partnership, to produce a series of studies detailing the Valley's economic assets and opportunities for job creation and revenue production. The REDS project produced reports in three areas: agriculture, commerce and industry, and health care. The work on agriculture and commerce and industry are particularly useful for this master plan.

1. Agriculture

The agriculture study produced by Yellow Wood Associates recognized the difficulty traditional farms encounter in their daily operations. A common assumption is that agriculture is not viable in the Harlem Valley. Typical problems found by agricultural operations are: increasing population pressure, rising land values,

high taxes and unfavorable agricultural policies outside the control of local communities. Traditional dairy farming, a staple of local agricultural operations, has been particularly damaged by these problems.

The study suggests, however, that these problems, rather than being the end of agriculture altogether in the Harlem Valley, only signal farmers' need to innovate and shift production away from traditional dairy and dairy products into other more profitable markets. The REDS study examined 6 specific products for possible diversification and posited several additional suggestions helpful for agricultural business survival. Beef, turkey, mushrooms, and so called u-pick operations were all viewed as possibly successful avenues for diversification. In addition, community supported agriculture (CSA), where customers buy shares of a farm's output before the growing season begins were also viewed favorably. Traditional dairy operations would be helped by implementing a more aggressive and targeted marketing campaign, including the use of direct marketing techniques.

In keeping with a different focus on agricultural product marketing, the study also suggested that hay and custom beef marketing were areas where the Harlem Valley could capitalize on existing output. Finally, an agricultural recreation and educational center aimed at tourists and others from both outside and inside the region could take advantage of the combination of traditional agricultural uses and the Valley's rural and scenic qualities.

Far from seeing the end of agriculture in the Harlem Valley the study found that with a shift in product focus, and a renewed effort on marketing using several innovative techniques, a resurgence could be expected.

2. Commerce and Industry

The business consulting and planning firm of Abeles Phillips Preiss & Shapiro found that the Harlem Valley region possesses unique assets and liabilities influencing the types and amount of development that could reasonably be expected. The firm reasoned that the relative isolation of the valley due to lack of a well developed road network, combined with a small population base, meant that success in economic development depended on the creation of specialized business opportunities fitted to the unique characteristics of the valley.

The REDS study recommended five major areas for concentration for economic development: tourism, specialized retail, light industry, the nurturing of existing specialized businesses, and the state campuses. Tourism was seen as having the greatest potential. The valley's beautiful scenic resources, open spaces, and historic sites could combine, if packaged and marketed properly, to make the region an important tourist destination. The consultants stressed that the relative isolation, which might seem a problem when talking about traditional economic development, could actually become an asset.

The rural qualities could be used to attract people and bring their money into the community. The consultants suggested several tourist related ventures, including bed and breakfasts, inns, a visitors guide and map, farm vacations, even a commercial sports facility.

The REDS study also found that specialized retail, or the creation of a retail identity could be a draw. As an example, the study cited an antiques center. To some extent Webatuck Craft Village already performs the function of a specialized center for crafts. Other suggestions included a large sporting goods store and a visitors center and concession store for local products.

Light industry was viewed as "a long shot" by the study. However, the study cited Hipotronics in North East as a successful rural manufacturing operation. Dover should expect a few light industrial uses to locate in the Town, but their arrival would be unpredictable and difficult to encourage. The study found that a principle determining factor in the decision to locate a company in a rural place is where the company president or chief operating officer lives. These individuals like to be within a ten minute commuting distance of their firm. While the Town should actively seek light industrial uses, their location in the community will be more than likely a random occurrence.

The study suggests that the Town nurture and support what it calls "existing entrepreneurial activities." Such businesses include people that work out of their homes or have limited office space. A craft incubator with joint studio, display and retail space was one suggestion. An office service center where copying, faxing, mailing and secretarial service could all be shared was another. A directory of existing business would help market those companies.

The state facilities were viewed as a major asset to the community, having full services including sewer and power generation. The most viable economic development opportunities cited were an academic campus, a spa or a conference center. While these projects were viewed as big potential winners, they were described as "all or nothing" possibilities.

3. Health

The REDS project identified a need for some health care facilities. However, the report concluded that the Valley's low population density would have a difficult time supporting a large medical facility. Health care options for which sufficient demand exists include: a residential health care facility or nursing home with 80 to 120 beds and about 100 full time employees, a small research lab related to the health care facility and a medical hotel also related to the health care facility, which would provide short term housing to staff and families. The study also found a need for the development of between 40 and 80 independent and "supported" housing units for senior citizens.

In addition to care facilities principally for senior citizens, the REDS report found a need for a community center containing a series of multi-use spaces and offering recreational facilities not currently provided in the area. An extended care facility attached to a larger remote facility like the St. Francis Hospital was also recommended.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING

Dover's non-institutional population, while growing rapidly in the decades of the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's, appears to have slowed down during the 1980's. If past trends continue, Dover's non-institutional population could rise to over 8,000 by the year 2010. As long as there are no severe economic downturns in the region, steady growth in both the Town and the county is likely to continue. If this population expansion occurs and average household sizes continue to decrease, pressure on the housing stock, particularly for lower priced units, will be felt.

At the same time, the construction of poorly planned housing development could severely diminish important natural, historic, and agricultural features of the Town. As the most convenient building sites are developed, construction will increasingly encroach on farmland and sensitive natural resources such as wetlands, steep slopes, and floodprone areas. Greater population also generally brings the demand for local commercial services, more community facilities, and causes higher taxes. Careful planning and zoning are needed to help the Town accommodate growth while preserving the valued characteristics of the community.

Recent studies by Scenic Hudson and Dutchess County Cooperative Extension have addressed the tax impacts of development. They found that while new development increases total tax revenues, residential development costs more in terms of services required than it generates in taxes. On the other hand, agricultural and open space uses, and commercial uses generate more in revenues than they cost in services. Other research and experience from more urbanized parts of the country suggest that, in general, areas with more urban and suburban type development have a higher tax burden than more rural areas. This suggests a need to carefully plan for growth to insure a proper balance between new urban and suburban uses and more traditional rural uses.

The age distribution in Dover is growing fastest in the reproductive 20 to 44 year grouping. This will continue to stimulate the housing market and will be likely to at least maintain current levels of pre-school population over the next decade. The percentage of elderly persons will also probably continue to increase over the long term, posing particular housing needs that will be difficult to address in the predominant single family housing pattern. A decrease in the number of middle aged residents who earn the most and generally require fewer services than their older and younger counterparts, will contribute to budgetary pressures. Town policy should insure that reasonable housing alternatives are available and that careful community facilities planning takes place on a continuing basis.

Dover's workforce is well balanced among the various industries and occupations tracked by the census bureau. This diversification will help the Town sustain itself during difficult times and offers a strong base from which to grow. However, a large portion of the workforce is employed in the state facilities in Dover and Amenia. Many of these workers are well trained and would have the ability to move into other skilled positions in other industries. Dover should seek long term, well planned and comprehensive solutions in the event that the Psychiatric Center ceases to employ the large numbers it has in the past. A closure at the Center may mean a drop in overall family incomes, which would diminish income levels already slightly below county levels. Surrounding communities have significantly higher incomes, indicating the possibility for encouraging higher wage earners to live in rural communities like Dover.

The Regional Economic Development Study, done in conjunction with the Harlem Valley Partnership, indicated many opportunities for the rural communities in the Valley including Dover. Long term economic health depends on Dover finding creative ideas to generate jobs and revenues and in utilizing the Town's greatest asset, its rural character. The agricultural component of the study suggested that farm operations have a great opportunity to diversify their product base and reach different markets. The study also found that while large scale industry will not be easily attracted to Dover because of the Town's relative isolation compared with communities farther to the south, small scale businesses may be interested in Dover because of its distance from more congested areas. The Town should focus on a series of solutions to encourage economic development, including a new use or uses of the Psychiatric Center, developing a specialized retail identity for the existing hamlet centers, and focus on tourism with an emphasis on the rural assets of the Town like agriculture and recreation. These solutions are not conventional, but they present a viable and realistic way to insure that Dover residents are able to continue to enjoy their community.