Policy Committee
Government Center Complex
Large Conference Room, Building A

January 31, 2011 - 6:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call
B. Minutes - December 13, 2010
C. Old Business
D. New Business - (Report 1) (Report 2) (Report Final)
Cumulative Impacts of Development zoning ordinance updates
E. Adjournment

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

December 13, 2010
6:00 p.m.
County Complex, Building A

1. **Roll Call**

Present	**Staff Present**
Mr. Jack Fraley, Chair	Mr. Allen Murphy
Mr. Tim O' Connor	Ms. Tammy Rosario
Mr. Reese Peck	Ms. Leanne Reidenbach
Mr. Al Woods (via phone)	Ms. Kate Sipes
	Mr. Brian Elmore
	Mr. John McDonald
	Ms. Fran Geissler
	Mr. John Horne

Mr. Jack Fraley called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. **Minutes - November 22, 2010**

Mr. Tim O'Connor moved for approval of the minutes.

The minutes were approved (4-0).

3. **Old Business**

Mr. Fraley asked Committee members to send staff any comments on the Planning Commission Annual Report.

4. **New Business – FY2012 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)**

Mr. Fraley asked how staff developed the Stormwater Division Capital Improvements Program (CIP) project list.

Ms. Leanne Reidenbach stated that twelve individual projects were being submitted as a single CIP proposal. She stated the project list was reviewed by the Stormwater Program Advisory Committee (SPAC), who requested funding through the Stormwater Division for the priority projects in FY12. The large number of projects gives the County flexibility to deal with project delays or high cost estimates by shifting to other projects.

Ms. Fran Geissler, Director of the Stormwater Division, stated the SPAC developed a system for ranking priority projects. She stated public health, safety, and welfare, and relation to the Comprehensive Plan are major factors in developing project scores. Water quality and drainage improvements are additional stormwater concerns. Every dollar spent on stormwater infrastructure should improve water quality, allowing the County to receive Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) credits. Tier 1 Stormwater Division projects are the highest priorities in each district. The SPAC believes limited dollars should be spread around the magisterial districts evenly. The $200,000

feasibility study will help the County determine what types of remediation will be necessary in the York River watershed. The SPAC has considered separating the single Stormwater CIP request into capital maintenance and capital improvement projects. Projects were not divided into project categories due to past issues with gaining access easements. When easements cause delay, Stormwater moves to another project.

Mr. Reese Peck stated Stormwater priorities were difficult to compare to one another. He stated projects should be separated and ranked based on project type. With limited funding, there should be set Stormwater core priorities, such as water quality, which is included in last year's budget description. Larger projects could be ranked individually.

Mr. John Horne, Manager of General Services, stated the Board of Supervisors established the Stormwater division's priorities as drainage repairs, water quality improvements, and flood improvements. He stated these priorities may not always overlap on a proposal.

Mr. Peck stated he would like to see public debate on setting a highest priority among Stormwater's several mission statements.

Mr. Horne stated citizen requests for drainage improvements to the County and Board have been the primary driver of the Stormwater program. He stated calls to the Board regarding property damage usually became top priority.

Mr. Fraley stated there were differences in priorities between the CIP request and the Stormwater bond project list. He stated that taken individually, some Stormwater projects would rank lower than the middle school classroom expansions. Ranking the Stormwater list as a whole would allow some less deserving projects to use the overall list's high priority. The Committee could not be certain which specific projects would be pursued due to the County's difficulty securing easements.

Mr. Horne stated that in similar situations in the past, the Committee has attached comments emphasizing priorities or including further recommendations to forward to the Board with its final CIP listing.

Ms. Geissler stated that neighborhoods with mandatory homeowner's associations (HOAs) that experience stormwater flooding can receive County guidance, but not funds. Neighborhoods on the project list are older or do not have HOAs to raise repair funds.

Mr. Horne stated some Stormwater projects are prioritized due to being inexpensive or relatively simple repairs.

Mr. Peck stated the County should articulate the differences between 'stormwater' and 'water quality.'

Mr. Horne stated the Committee could rank each project category, including drainage improvements, BMP refits, or stream restoration separately. He stated the SPAC's unified ranking system prioritizes projects with multiple benefits, including protection of people and property, relevance to the Comprehensive Plan, and use of outside funding.

Ms. Reidenbach stated the SPAC's ranking process is very similar to the Committee's CIP ranking methods.

Ms. Geissler stated that necessary easements from property owners must be attained before money could be spent on any Stormwater projects.

Mr. Al Woods asked how the Committee could make recommendations to the Board without knowing the various inputs staff was using for rankings, such as cost and complexity.

Mr. Horne stated staff should have attached specifications to the project list to help compare dissimilar proposals. He stated repairs protecting private property also served to improve water quality by improving run-off management.

Ms. Reidenbach stated Stormwater projects were grouped as a whole due to the SPAC's technical review and prioritization. She stated the Committee could add footnotes to the list and the Board could reprioritize them if it wanted.

Mr. Peck stated the public expects clear delineations between the types of work performed. He stated the grouped Stormwater list could create the impression that the Committee recommends the same high priority for each individual project. Stormwater proposals should be grouped by project types.

Mr. Horne stated funding the proposed watershed and feasibility studies were the foundation of staff's recommended project list found in their CIP request.

Mr. Fraley stated the Committee should attach a note saying that studies should be funded by means other than the CIP for the Board. He stated projects could be grouped first by project type and second by tier level. He asked whether the Committee should rank project types as a whole or create averages for project types based on individual rankings.

Mr. Woods asked why Committee members should rank projects over the expertise and recommendations of Stormwater staff and the SPAC.

Mr. Peck stated the Commission has the statutory authority to make recommendations. He stated the Commission is supposed to bring common sense to the process. The CIP process has evolved to defer to staff and advisory boards and to remove maintenance projects. The Committee has attempted to elevate rankings to allow policy discussions on various proposals.

Mr. O'Connor stated if the project list is broken up, projects should be ranked individually.

Mr. Fraley stated he preferred ranking the project list as a whole, with attached notes on certain projects and policies.

Mr. John McDonald, Manager of Financial and Management Services, stated there was very little money for projects.

Mr. Woods stated he favored ranking the Stormwater list as a whole, with notes identifying inconsistent projects or those that needed additional consideration.

Mr. Fraley stated that the New Horizons contribution should not be scored due to the County's contractual obligation to support the program.

Mr. Woods asked about information regarding the school projects, since little information was provided.

Mr. McDonald explained that the schools have not adjusted their CIP review timeline since the Policy Committee began reviewing applications earlier. He then stated that with the classroom expansions at Hornsby and Berkeley middle schools, the need for an additional middle school could be delayed until 2017. He stated bond proceeds existed to finance the expansions. Due to redistricting and changing development patterns, Hornsby has already exceeded design capacity. The Jamestown field lighting proposal came about after foul balls began hitting cars at Mid-County Park. Older youth and adult baseball/softball leagues need a replacement site. Security card CIP proposals represent a longer-term expenditure as the schools slowly acquire and install the systems as they refurbish each school. The Cooley Field lighting project is for a site used occasionally at James Blair school in the City of Williamsburg, but that has no public access. Fire Station #4 currently has no female firefighter facilities.

Mr. Woods asked if the school timeline would be moved ahead to fit in with the Policy Committee's review timeframe.

Mr. McDonald stated that next year the school and Policy Committee timeline would align.

The Committee discussed their CIP project rankings.

Mr. Fraley asked Policy Committee members to have their final rankings and comments to staff by the end of the day on December 14th. He stated scores would be discussed for a maximum of fifteen minutes at the next Committee meeting.

5. Adjournment

Mr. O'Connor moved to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Jack Fraley, Chair of the Policy Committee

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 31, 2011

TO: Policy Committee

FROM: Christy Parrish, Proffer Administrator
Kate Sipes, Senior Planner
Leanne Reidenbach, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Cumulative Impact Modeling

I. Cumulative Impact Modeling

A. General Background and Scope

The ordinance update methodology identifies cumulative impact modeling as one of the priority areas. The goal of this topic area is to determine the feasibility of creating a system that allows accurate tracking of development as it moves from proposal to reality. This includes existing development, approved development that is not built, and estimated future build-out of vacant parcels. The third component (estimated future build-out) would likely be added a later date, but for the purposes of this memo is listed as Stage VI below. The system could then be used to assess current and future impacts on public facilities and services using fields and multipliers built into the system (e.g. school district, number of school children generated, etc.).

B. Description of Element and History

Currently, staff evaluates the impacts of proposed developments to determine the availability of infrastructure and services in the County, including school capacity, water and sewer infrastructure, and roadways. Staff has been asked to explore comments that in evaluating impacts, certain factors have not been adequately addressed to date, such as (a) impact studies have not sufficiently taken into account the impacts of existing and approved-but-not-yet-built development and (b) there may be some categories of impact which are not currently being assessed sufficiently (road capacity, watershed impacts, impacts to fire station or library capacity, etc.). As an example of the first factor, the County's current adequate public facility test policy examines the projected number of school children to be generated by a proposed development against the capacity of the school based on current year enrollment levels, but does not include an assessment of school children that would be generated by approved-but-not-yet built projects in the same school district. It is important to note with respect to the second factor that the County has a joint school and library system with the City of Williamsburg, as well as mutual assistance agreements with the City of Williamsburg and York County for a number of other facilities and services such as fire and police protection.

C. Comprehensive Plan GSAs, public input, and PC and BOS direction

During the 2009 Comprehensive Plan Update, the Steering Committee, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors identified the following actions related to cumulative impact modeling:

- *LU 5.1 Through the following measures, coordinate allowable densities and intensities of proposed developments with the capacities and availability of water, public roads, schools, and other facilities and services:*
- *LU 5.1.1 Reporting on the feasibility of development of a model or models to assess and track the cumulative impact of development proposals and development on existing and planned public facilities and services.*

II. Discussion Items

Staff has researched approaches to cumulative impact modeling across the country and received information from consultants in the field through a Request for Information (RFI) process. The RFI that was submitted includes a more technical description of the cumulative impacts model and is available in attachment 1. As a result of the RFI, staff viewed a demonstration of a system with similar goals developed by a consultant for the Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT). The system is known as the Planning and Development Coordination Application (PDCA). Basically, this web-based system was designed to help DelDOT store, manage, integrate, and analyze development proposals and the impacts of development on surrounding road infrastructure. It enables DelDOT to input information about specific development projects, including number of new units/square footage proposed, location of new entrances to the development, impacted intersections, type of development (based on ITE land use code), trip generation information, any improvements the developer will have to install, and if money was contributed to other off-site traffic signals or road improvements. It also allows DelDOT to model the impacts of the proposed development in three different scenarios in a specified target year – undeveloped/existing, developed but without the traffic improvements completed, and developed with all traffic improvements installed. Development proposals can also be color-coded based on their status in the review process – final acceptance (when DelDOT approves the project), approved (when the locality approves the project), in progress (when it is under construction), and inactive. When the analyses are generated, the user can designate an area around the proposed project to encompass other projects that are either under review or approved in order to incorporate the impacts and transportation improvements associated with those projects into the impact analysis. All of this is done visually through a GIS mapping system that allows DelDOT to archive layers based on what was built/proposed in different years. More information about this system is available on http://www.jmttg.com/projects.html?id=0.

As a result of this research and consultant presentation, staff has identified several stages of data collection and tracking linked with cumulative impact modeling. The feasibility of each of these stages must be assessed in order to determine the overall feasibility of cumulative impact modeling and how much staff can accomplish versus the need for additional resources or outside help. After an explanation of each stage, staff has offered an assessment on feasibility of completing the task internally and what, if any, limitations would be placed on the model as a result. The next section will discuss the pros and cons of a staff versus consultant-developed product.

A. Stage I – Residential Development Tracking

Staff identified residential development tracking as the first stage to developing a cumulative impact model. This stage includes assessing the following:

- residential development currently on the ground and occupied;
- residential development approved through a master plan, site plan, or subdivision plat but not built yet; and
- a way to simply track each residential unit from plan approval to construction and occupancy.

Residential development was identified as the first stage because residential units typically have greater direct impacts on County facilities without the same high generation of tax revenue as commercial developments. Additionally, information necessary to track individual single-family units is more readily available in real estate data and certificate of occupancy tracking. Tracking apartments, mobile home parks, and nursing homes requires slightly more research as each is generally only assigned one tax map number but includes multiple units. Staff has developed an Excel table to assemble this data and is working through assembling and tracking residential development for the Jamestown District as a trial (see attachment 2). This first stage would not involve assessing or evaluating the impacts that various development projects have had on public infrastructure/facilities, but would be geared toward assembling an accurate inventory of residential development and a way to track a development proposal through its lifecycle.

Staff has determined that this stage of the project could be done internally. Regardless of whether or not subsequent phases are completed in-house or by using a consultant, data collection and verification would need to be done by Planning staff before moving forward. So far, this has involved learning about each of the different computer systems operated by various County divisions (i.e. Code Compliance uses HMS, Planning uses CaseTrak, Real Estate uses EGTS and ProVal, etc.) and understanding what data is already being collected in those systems and how it can be pulled into a single source. This has also involved identifying gaps in information that we need to collect to help streamline the tracking process. The limitation associated with this stage is that the update process will not be totally automated and will require time to make sure new data is incorporated and accurate. As a result, updated data would be available on a semi-annual basis rather than on-demand. Additionally, the data would primarily be in spreadsheet form rather than a visual representation of the development through GIS mapping.

This stage of the analysis is similar to the type of data generated by the James City County Citizen's Coalition (J4C) from 2007-2010. Through creating a tracking database, staff can verify the J4C data, including reconciling Planning data with Real Estate Assessment data, and establish consistent and standard operating procedures for keeping this data updated. Additionally, staff's figures will include residential units approved on already subdivided parcels (known as "acreage lots") and not included in a formally named subdivision and can also exclude common areas or dedicated open spaces within residential neighborhoods, which was not consistently done through the J4C numbers.

B. Stage II – Residential Assessment of Key Impacts

The second stage of developing a cumulative impact model is adding in an assessment of how existing and proposed/in-the-pipeline (also known as "approved-but-not-yet-built") residential developments impact certain selected infrastructure and public facilities. Staff has identified water, sewer, and school impacts as the most straightforward items to address initially because the County and JCSA already have established methodologies and historical data that identify water and sewer usage and the number of school children generated by various types of residential units.

Staff has determined that this stage of the project could also be done internally, but would be subject to the same limitations associated with Stage I listed above. As an alternative, staff could turn over the information collected in Stage I to an outside consultant to develop an impact tracking system. This would likely be strongly linked to GIS mapping so it could be visually displayed and manipulated. The data may also be able to be updated more frequently.

C. Stage III – Commercial Development Tracking

The third stage in cumulative impact modeling involves tracking commercial development. This stage includes the following:

- categorizing buildings by type of non-residential use (industrial, retail, office, etc.);
- assessing what commercial development is currently on the ground and occupied and what commercial development has been approved through a master plan or site plan but may not have been built yet; and
- developing a way to simply track commercial square footage from plan approval to construction and occupancy.

Staff has not begun to work on this stage of the process yet, but anticipates that it will resemble the process and limitations of Stage I above. Staff also anticipates that some work on collecting and verifying information will have to be done internally regardless of whether a consultant is used to actually develop the impact model.

Commercial development presents some unique challenges not present with residential development tracking. First, real estate data does not differentiate commercial buildings by type. Each commercial property is coded as "commercial and industrial." Staff will need to examine this data to verify what actually exists in terms of commercial uses. This will involve re-coding each structure in the Real Estate Assessments database. Second, non-residential buildings can frequently change uses, often changing between categories for example, from office to retail. Site plans are not always required for use changes and building permits do not always clearly state the use change. Staff would need to develop a way to track these changes to update the model.

D. Stage IV – Water and sewer impacts of existing and proposed/pipeline commercial projects

The fourth stage involves adding in an assessment of how existing and proposed/in-the-pipeline commercial developments impact certain selected infrastructure. Staff has identified water and sewer infrastructure as the priority to determine impacts. Once each commercial building use is re-coded in Stage III, staff will be able to evaluate how different uses place different demands on infrastructure. Staff will then need to work closely with JCSA to identify standard water and sewer usage figures for each of the commercial use categories, similar to what is already available for residential units. This can again be accomplished in-house, but has been identified as Stage IV due to the tracking and inventorying challenges indicated above.

E. Stage V – Additional tracking and impacts

As Stage V, additional tracking and impacts for various other facilities could be added. Based on initial feedback during the Comprehensive Plan update and current planning case reviews, staff has identified the following facilities and infrastructure to add to the impact tracking in phases once Stages I-IV are completed and reliable:

- Environmental
- Traffic and transportation
- Fire/EMS
- Police
- Library
- Parks and Recreation

Staff has only briefly researched the efforts that would be involved in assessing the impacts of development for each of these categories to determine that there is not data readily available to easily track those impacts. Many of the above, particularly the public facilities, have per capita standards outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. By tracking the cumulative impact of development in these areas, figures could be compared to the guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan to evaluate available capacities. To help prioritize which of these areas should be targeted for further research, staff is seeking guidance on what questions the Committee anticipates will be asked of the cumulative impact model (beyond school and water and sewer impacts) in the near future.

F. Stage VI – By-right development potential

The final stage of the cumulative impact model would involve looking at the by-right development potential of land in the County to determine what could be constructed absent any additional approvals from the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors. The County has looked at by-right development potential on two occasions in the last 10 years, each with different constraints and objectives. The first time that a development potential analysis was conducted was prior to the 2003 Comprehensive Plan update. In this model, a consultant (Kimley-Horn) looked specifically at each undeveloped parcel within the Primary Service Area (PSA) designated for residential development by the Comprehensive Plan and the estimated a unit yield. Land Use designations and regulations about development and environmental protections have changed since this point, which would likely change the lot yield estimated by the analysis. This analysis also excluded areas outside the PSA and commercial development potential.

The second analysis was conducted by a consultant (URS) during the 2009 Comprehensive Plan update. URS evaluated areas both inside and outside the PSA and looked at commercial and residential development by Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ). Another primary difference between the 2003 Kimley-Horn and 2009 URS analyses is that instead of analyzing each parcel individually, URS aggregated undeveloped parcels, applied a generalized density or intensity of uses, and then applied a generalized discount factor to account for environmental constraints and roadways. This could be a good start to the development potential analysis for the cumulative impact modeling of transportation impacts because the TAZ is a good way of organizing this data. It may, however, be more difficult to disaggregate and reorganize the data to use by school district or voting district since each has different boundaries.

The development potential is strongly influenced by current zoning ordinance regulations and Comprehensive Plan Land Use designations. As such, the estimate of units can vary at different points in time under different scenarios. One of the reasons why this task was left for the last stage is so that staff can account for any changes in permitted densities that result from the ordinance update process. This task could be accomplished internally, but could involve a significant work effort. Staff will need to further evaluate this after completion of the previous stages to determine whether the analysis completed by URS can be used as a starting point for updating the development potential figures.

III. Summary of Pros/Cons

The information discussed above helps frame a discussion of the overall feasibility of a cumulative impact model. In short, it is feasible for staff to develop a basic system for tracking the cumulative impacts of commercial and residential development on schools, water, and sewer infrastructure.

Additional impact modeling, as outlined in Stage V above, would require some additional research. The feasibility of Stage VI, the by-right development potential, is not expressly included in this summary.

The kinds of questions that the model needs to be able to answer, how frequently the data needs to be updated to answer those questions, and what format data needs to be compiled in all lead into the decision of how to proceed with evaluating the cumulative impacts model. Below is an outline of the pros and cons of producing the model internally versus using a consultant. While reading, keep in mind that data collection and verification still has to be completed by Planning staff in either scenario. These pros and cons are geared toward facilitating a discussion about the Committee's expectations for the model, which will help staff, County Administration, and the Board of Supervisors determine whether the model will be developed internally or using a consultant.

Staff-based cumulative impacts model:

Pros	**Cons**
- Lower cost to develop and implement	- Requires more staff time up-front and to maintain
- Uses existing data (for the impact categories in Stage II, other categories require more research)	- Data will be updated semi-annually so there will be a lag between when a unit is occupied and when it appears as occupied in the model
	- Limited reporting capabilities

Consultant-based cumulative impacts model:

Pros	**Cons**
- Designed to fit County's needs	- Cost – based on a request for information completed in the fall, it would cost $100-$150K for consultant fees and an estimated $15K for software/technology upgrades
- More comprehensive analysis tools, including running projections for future years	- Additional software/system for Information Technology to maintain (though consultants indicated this should be minimal)
- Real time updates and reporting capability	- Greater amount of initial staff time from other departments/divisions
- Once the system is operational, less staff time will be required for system maintenance	
- Once operational, system can be maintained by County staff (i.e., no additional cost to consultant to maintain)	
- Allows geographical-based reporting (maps)	
- Uses existing data (for the impact categories in Stage II, other categories require more research)	
- Consultants would be more experienced and knowledgeable so impact models could	

be more sophisticated	
- System could be compatible with CaseTrak	

The broad trade-off between a consultant-developed model and a staff-developed model is between timing and cost. In a consultant-designed process, Stages I-IV as described above could be carried out in a more condensed timeline. For example, staff could be assembling and validating information about existing commercial development while the consultant is developing the residential impact model. Additionally, they would be better equipped to more quickly delve into the broader impacts denoted in Stage V. While the model could be operational in a shorter timeframe, there is a larger cost associated with securing a consultant. In a staff-led process, cost is kept to a minimum and would only require purchase of hard/software over the top of staff's salary and time, but the model would be serially assembled in the stages outlined above. Another trade-off is in the scale and features of the model. As discussed earlier, staff can develop a basic model to track cumulative impacts. However, a consultant would be able to provide a model with additional graphical and tracking features, conveniences, more up-to-date data, and a more intuitive interface.

IV. Staff recommendation

This memorandum serves as an update on the feasibility of developing a cumulative impact model. Since this task does not have an associated ordinance section or language, the Policy Committee does not need to vote on specifics at this time. Instead, staff is requesting the Committee's feedback on expectations for the cumulative impacts system and guidance on the following questions:

- What questions should the model be able to answer (related to various impact categories)?
- How frequently do updated reports need to be generated?
- What format do reports and data need to be in for easy use – spreadsheet or graphic?

Through answering these questions, staff can determine if internal development of a system meeting these expectations can be developed. Otherwise, staff can anticipate requesting additional funds in the budget to secure a consultant to help develop the model.

V. Conclusion

Based on the feedback and available funding, staff will determine the most appropriate direction for the project. For the time being, staff is proceeding to develop the database and collect and verify data internally and will continue to keep the Committee updated on progress. Feedback will also be used to help in the present budget planning process if there are critical system features identified that can best be obtained through use of a consultant.

Attachments:

1. Request for Information
2. Staff progress on residential development tracking – Jamestown District

Jamestown District

Subdivision	Vacant	Improved	Grand Total	Zoning	Total Legal Acreage	PSA	Water	Sewer	Election District	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Watershed	Rezoning Case	Unit Cap
Acreage Lots	109	248	357						Jamestown						
Albemarle Condos		11	11	R-2	1.067	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Berkeley's Green	11	266	277	R-1	120.08	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Matoaka	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
Birchwood Park & Marlboro	4	132	136	R-1, R-1 AA, R-2, R-2 AA	71.27	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Boughsprings		27	27	R-1, R-1AA	21.12	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Bozarth & Mahone	8	38	46	R-1	44.43	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Brook Haven	8	35	43	R-2	20.85	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Brookhaven	1	1	2	R-2	1.07	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Brookwood Center	2	2	4	R-8	2.82	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette			
Canterbury Hills	3	43	46	R-1	22.27	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Matthew Whaley	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Chanco Estate	2	19	21	R-1	26.61	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Chestnut Hills		9	9	R-1	4.46	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	Powhatan Creek		
Druid Hills	1	87	88	R-1	39.21	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Drummond's Field	3	65	68	R-8	93.11	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
Drummond's Quarter on the James	2	8	10	A-1, R-1, R-8	15.54	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
Durfey's Mill	3	3	6	R-1	3.55	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Fernbrook	3	105	108	R-1	46.78	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
First Colony	18	281	299	R-1	251.61	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
First Settler's Landing	1	8	9	R-8	26.36	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
Five Lots on Jamestown Road	4	1	5	R-1	4.26	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Jamestown	Mill Creek		
Frances S. Rees	2	3	5	R-8	108.71	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Frank Armistead (Jamestown Road)	5	20	25	R-1/LB	20.93	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Jamestown	Mill Creek		
Frank Armistead Estate	2	3	5	R-2	8.17	Yes	Private	Private	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Gatehouse Farms	3	46	49	R-1	25.23	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Gilley Properties LLC	8	2	10	R-2	9.45	Yes	Private	Private	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Gilliam's Woods		4	4	R-1	3.88	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Gordon Berryman Duplexes		10	10	R-2	4.44	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Governor's Square	1	72	73	R-5	5.74	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Greensprings Commons	1	3	4	LB	3.25	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Matoaka	Hornsby	Jamestown			
Heritage Landing	4	89	93	R-1	63.87	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
Hill		4	4	R-2	0.84	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette			

Jamestown District

Holly Ridge	1	21	22	R-1	8.59	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Hollybrook	2	47	49	R-1	45.53	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Indigo Park	12	140	152	R-1	79.87	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Matthew Whaley	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Indigo Terrace		22	22	R-2	9.37	Yes	Private	Private	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
James Square	2	69	71	R-5AA	9.61	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Jamestown Farms		41	41	R-1	25.73	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Matthew Whaley	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Kennington Woods	24	17	41	R-1	9.66	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Kingswood	4	96	100	R-1	77.19	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
La Fontaine	5	164	169	MU / B-1	20.3	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Lake Powell Forest	4	163	167	R-1	65.25	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Lake Powell Pointe	11	41	52	R-1	29.24	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Lakewood	3	40	43	R-1	28.65	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Jamestown	Mill Creek		
Landfall at Jamestown	21	67	88	R-2	113.96	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Jamestown	Powhatan Creek		
Landfall Village	15	2	17	R-2	11.35	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Jamestown	Powhatan Creek		
Larson's Lane		6	6	R-2AA	2.91	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Marywood	41	24	65	R-1	72.89	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette			
McFarlin Park	3	2	5	R-2	53.6	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette			
Mill Creek Landing	13	83	96	R-1	59.21	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Matthew Whaley	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Neck-O-Land Hundred	3	17	20	R-8	16.37	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Norco	3		3	R-8	5.57	Yes	Private	Private	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Oak Hill Condos	1	12	13	R-2	1.25	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Jamestown	Powhatan Creek		
Paddock Green	1	3	4	R-1	5.4	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Paddock Lane		2	2	R-1	3.71	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Page Landing	22	56	78	R-1	74.73	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Parrish	1	5	6	R-8	6.59	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Peleg's Point	24	91	115	R-1	66.35	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Powhatan Shores	8	99	107	R-1	66.09	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Raleigh Square	4	68	72	R-2	11.75	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Powhatan Creek		
Rolling Woods	5	195	200	R-2. R-2AA	108.72	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Settler's Mill	12	190	202	R-1	100.9	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Jamestown	Mill Creek		
Shellbank	6	13	19	R-1	20.44	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		
Shellbank Woods	6	130	136	R-1	91.11	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Hornsby	Jamestown	James River		

Jamestown District

Shibui Woods	3	1	4	LB	5.48	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette			
Smith Grove		5	5	R-1	8.06	Yes	Private	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Springdale	2	13	15	R-1AA	7.6	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Steers	1	12	13	R-1	10.31	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
The Colony	6	31	37	R-2	27.4	Yes	Private/Public	Private/Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
The Midlands	2	155	157	PUD-R / LB	21.64	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Vass Meadows	1	16	17	R-2	9.27	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
White Oaks	5	30	35	R-1	22.63	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Whiting, William L.		6	6	R-2	2.74	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Clara Byrd Baker	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Williamsburg Landing		3	3	R-5 / R-5AA	137.43	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	College Creek		
Williamsburg Office Park	1	60	61	B-1	6.99	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette			
Winston Terrace		67	67	R-2 / B-1	24.89	Yes	Public	Public	Jamestown	Rawls Byrd	Berkeley	Lafayette	Mill Creek		
Grand Total	487	3970	4457												

Jamestown District

Subdivision	Vacant	Improved	Grand Total	Zoning	Total Legal Acreage	PSA	Water	Sewer	Election District	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Watershed	Rezoning Case	Unit Cap
Acreage Lots	**109**	**248**	**357**						**Jamestown**						
CA	4		4												
Church		4	4												
Commercial	21	49	70												
Duplex		6	6												
Multi-Family		10	10												
Other	7		7												
PL	10	18	28												
Recreation		1	1												
Single Family	66	160	226												
Unknown	1		1												
Albemarle Condos		**11**	**11**	**R-2**	**1.067**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
Condo		11	11												
Berkeley's Green	**11**	**266**	**277**	**R-1**	**120.08**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Matoaka**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
CA	10		10												
PL	1		1												
Single Family		266	266												
Birchwood Park & Marlboro	**4**	**132**	**136**	**R-1, R-1 AA, R-2, R-2 AA**	**71.27**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Other	1		1												
PL	1	1	2												
Single Family	1	131	132												
Unknown	1		1												
Boughsprings		**27**	**27**	**R-1, R-1AA**	**21.12**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
PL		1	1												
Single Family		26	26												
Bozarth & Mahone	**8**	**38**	**46**	**R-1**	**44.43**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	2		2												
Single Family	5	38	43												
Unknown	1		1												
Brook Haven	**8**	**35**	**43**	**R-2**	**20.85**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family	7	35	42												
Brookhaven	**1**	**1**	**2**	**R-2**	**1.07**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	1	1	2												
Brookwood Center	**2**	**2**	**4**	**R-8**	**2.82**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**			
CA	1		1												
Condo	1	2	3												
Canterbury Hills	**3**	**43**	**46**	**R-1**	**22.27**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Matthew Whaley**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
PL	1		1												
Single Family	1	43	44												
Unknown	1		1												
Chanco Estate	**2**	**19**	**21**	**R-1**	**26.61**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	2	19	21												
Chestnut Hills		**9**	**9**	**R-1**	**4.46**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**Powhatan Creek**		
Single Family		9	9												
Druid Hills	**1**	**87**	**88**	**R-1**	**39.21**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	1	87	88												
Drummond's Field	**3**	**65**	**68**	**R-8**	**93.11**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		

Jamestown District

Single Family	3	65	68												
Drummond's Quarter on the James	**2**	**8**	**10**	**A-1, R-1, R-8**	**15.54**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
Single Family	2	8	10												
Durfey's Mill	**3**	**3**	**6**	**R-1**	**3.55**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	3	3	6												
Fernbrook	**3**	**105**	**108**	**R-1**	**46.78**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
PL	1		1												
Single Family	2	105	107												
First Colony	**18**	**281**	**299**	**R-1**	**251.61**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
CA	4	1	5												
PL		2	2												
Single Family	12	278	290												
Unknown	2		2												
First Settler's Landing	**1**	**8**	**9**	**R-8**	**26.36**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
Single Family	1	8	9												
Five Lots on Jamestown Road	**4**	**1**	**5**	**R-1**	**4.26**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Jamestown**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	4	1	5												
Frances S. Rees	**2**	**3**	**5**	**R-8**	**108.71**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
Single Family	2	3	5												
Frank Armistead (Jamestown Road)	**5**	**20**	**25**	**R-1/LB**	**20.93**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Jamestown**	**Mill Creek**		
Commercial	1	6	7												
Single Family	4	14	18												
Frank Armistead Estate	**2**	**3**	**5**	**R-2**	**8.17**	**Yes**	**Private**	**Private**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	2	3	5												
Gatehouse Farms	**3**	**46**	**49**	**R-1**	**25.23**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family	1	46	47												
Unknown	1		1												
Gilley Properties LLC	**8**	**2**	**10**	**R-2**	**9.45**	**Yes**	**Private**	**Private**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
Duplex	8	2	10												
Gilliam's Woods		**4**	**4**	**R-1**	**3.88**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family		4	4												
Gordon Berryman Duplexes		**10**	**10**	**R-2**	**4.44**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
Duplex		10	10												
Governor's Square	**1**	**72**	**73**	**R-5**	**5.74**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Condo		72	72												
Greensprings Commons	**1**	**3**	**4**	**LB**	**3.25**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Matoaka**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**			
CA	1		1												
Commercial		3	3												
Heritage Landing	**4**	**89**	**93**	**R-1**	**63.87**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family	3	89	92												
Hill		**4**	**4**	**R-2**	**0.84**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**			
Single Family		4	4												
Holly Ridge	**1**	**21**	**22**	**R-1**	**8.59**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		

Jamestown District

CA	1		1												
Single Family		21	21												
Hollybrook	**2**	**47**	**49**	**R-1**	**45.53**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	2	47	49												
Indigo Park	**12**	**140**	**152**	**R-1**	**79.87**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Matthew Whaley**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	7	140	147												
Unknown	5		5												
Indigo Terrace		**22**	**22**	**R-2**	**9.37**	**Yes**	**Private**	**Private**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family		22	22												
James Square	**2**	**69**	**71**	**R-5AA**	**9.61**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	2		2												
TH		69	69												
Jamestown Farms		**41**	**41**	**R-1**	**25.73**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Matthew Whaley**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family		41	41												
Kennington Woods	**24**	**17**	**41**	**R-1**	**9.66**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family	23	17	40												
Kingswood	**4**	**96**	**100**	**R-1**	**77.19**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family	3	96	99												
La Fontaine	**5**	**164**	**169**	**MU / B-1**	**20.3**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Commercial	3	3	6												
Condo	1	160	161												
PL		1	1												
Lake Powell Forest	**4**	**163**	**167**	**R-1**	**65.25**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	3		3												
PL		1	1												
Single Family	1	162	163												
Lake Powell Pointe	**11**	**41**	**52**	**R-1**	**29.24**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	11	41	52												
Lakewood	**3**	**40**	**43**	**R-1**	**28.65**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Jamestown**	**Mill Creek**		
PL		2	2												
Single Family	3	38	41												
Landfall at Jamestown	**21**	**67**	**88**	**R-2**	**113.96**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Jamestown**	**Powhatan Creek**		
CA	5		5												
PL		1	1												
Single Family	16	66	82												
Landfall Village	**15**	**2**	**17**	**R-2**	**11.35**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Jamestown**	**Powhatan Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family	14	2	16												
Larson's Lane		**6**	**6**	**R-2AA**	**2.91**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family		6	6												
Marywood	**41**	**24**	**65**	**R-1**	**72.89**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**			
CA	1		1												
Single Family	40	24	64												
McFarlin Park	**3**	**2**	**5**	**R-2**	**53.6**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**			
Single Family	3	2	5												

Jamestown District

Mill Creek Landing	**13**	**83**	**96**	**R-1**	**59.21**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Matthew Whaley**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	4		4												
Single Family	8	83	91												
Unknown	1		1												
Neck-O-Land Hundred	**3**	**17**	**20**	**R-8**	**16.37**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Multi-Family		4	4												
PL	1		1												
Single Family	2	13	15												
Norco	**3**		**3**	**R-8**	**5.57**	**Yes**	**Private**	**Private**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
Single Family	3		3												
Oak Hill Condos	**1**	**12**	**13**	**R-2**	**1.25**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Jamestown**	**Powhatan Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Condo		12	12												
Paddock Green	**1**	**3**	**4**	**R-1**	**5.4**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	1	3	4												
Paddock Lane		**2**	**2**	**R-1**	**3.71**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family		2	2												
Page Landing	**22**	**56**	**78**	**R-1**	**74.73**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Other	1		1												
Single Family	20	56	76												
Parrish	**1**	**5**	**6**	**R-8**	**6.59**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family		5	5												
Peleg's Point	**24**	**91**	**115**	**R-1**	**66.35**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
PL	1		1												
Single Family	23	91	114												
Powhatan Shores	**8**	**99**	**107**	**R-1**	**66.09**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
Single Family	8	99	107												
Raleigh Square	**4**	**68**	**72**	**R-2**	**11.75**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Powhatan Creek**		
CA	3		3												
Condo		16	16												
Single Family	1	9	10												
TH		43	43												
Rolling Woods	**5**	**195**	**200**	**R-2. R-2AA**	**108.72**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	2		2												
PL		1	1												
Single Family	1	194	195												
Unknown	2		2												
Settler's Mill	**12**	**190**	**202**	**R-1**	**100.9**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Jamestown**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	5		5												
Single Family	7	190	197												
Shellbank	**6**	**13**	**19**	**R-1**	**20.44**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
Single Family	6	13	19												
Shellbank Woods	**6**	**130**	**136**	**R-1**	**91.11**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Hornsby**	**Jamestown**	**James River**		
CA	1		1												
PL	1		1												
Single Family	4	130	134												

Jamestown District

Shibui Woods	**3**	**1**	**4**	**LB**	**5.48**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**			
Commercial	3	1	4												
Smith Grove		**5**	**5**	**R-1**	**8.06**	**Yes**	**Private**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family		5	5												
Springdale	**2**	**13**	**15**	**R-1AA**	**7.6**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	2	13	15												
Steers	**1**	**12**	**13**	**R-1**	**10.31**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	1	12	13												
The Colony	**6**	**31**	**37**	**R-2**	**27.4**	**Yes**	**Private/Public**	**Private/Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
PL	2	1	3												
Single Family	4	30	34												
The Midlands	**2**	**155**	**157**	**PUD-R / LB**	**21.64**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Commercial	1	4	5												
TH		151	151												
Vass Meadows	**1**	**16**	**17**	**R-2**	**9.27**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
CA	1		1												
Single Family		16	16												
White Oaks	**5**	**30**	**35**	**R-1**	**22.63**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family	4	30	34												
Unknown	1		1												
Whiting, William L.		**6**	**6**	**R-2**	**2.74**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Clara Byrd Baker**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Single Family		6	6												
Williamsburg Landing		**3**	**3**	**R-5 / R-5AA**	**137.43**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**College Creek**		
CCRC		3	3												
Williamsburg Office Park	**1**	**60**	**61**	**B-1**	**6.99**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**			
CA	1		1												
Commercial		60	60												
Winston Terrace		**67**	**67**	**R-2 / B-1**	**24.89**	**Yes**	**Public**	**Public**	**Jamestown**	**Rawls Byrd**	**Berkeley**	**Lafayette**	**Mill Creek**		
Commercial		1	1												
Single Family		66	66												
Grand Total	**487**	**3970**	**4457**												

JAMES CITY COUNTY
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Cumulative Development Tracking and Impact Analysis

I. PURPOSE

James City County, Virginia ("the County") is requesting information from interested parties to conduct research and implementation of a Cumulative Development Tracking and Impact System ("CI") program.

The purpose of issuing this Request for Information ("RFI") is to:

a) obtain information on potential approaches to a CI analysis;
b) identify critical information or other studies or systems that are necessary for a comprehensive analysis;
c) obtain recommendations that would enhance the success of a future procurement opportunity for this project;
d) obtain resumes of professionals that could perform the CI analysis and establish an effective system of tracking development impacts;
e) obtain examples and references of recent CI projects conducted by the professional;
a) obtain high-level cost estimates for planning and budget purposes; and,
b) provide industry professionals with an opportunity to comment on the potential procurement opportunity.

Any qualified firm interested in providing services should prepare information in compliance with the specifications described in this RFI.

II. BACKGROUND

Comprehensive Plan

James City County is a full-service local government located near historic Williamsburg, Virginia. It is a growing, urbanizing community of 141 square miles with an estimated population of 63,700.

The James City County Planning Division completed the 2009 Comprehensive Plan: *Historic Past, Sustainable Future*, on November 24, 2009. The plan is available in its entirety on http://www.jccegov.com/government/administration/comprehensive-plan.html. A strong theme during the public participation process leading up to drafting the Comprehensive Plan was the need to assess impacts of existing and approved-but-not-yet-built development before approving new development.

There are several existing growth management tools currently used by the County to evaluate the timing and impacts of growth:

- **Legislative cases** include rezonings and special use permits and require consideration by the Planning Commission and approval by the Board of Supervisors. These bodies have the discretion to decide whether the proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan land use designation and whether it offers sufficient public benefit to the County.
- **Impact studies** are submitted for legislative cases and assess the impacts a proposed development is anticipated to have on traffic, schools, the environment, cultural resources, and the County's tax base and employment.

- **Proffers** are often offered by developers for legislative cases and may include cash contributions for water, Fire/EMS, libraries, parks and recreation, roads, schools and off-site improvements to offset the impacts of the development.
- **Adequate public facilities test policy** helps determine whether there is enough capacity in public facilities to handle the additional demands generated by a new development. The County currently has such a policy to determine impacts to public schools.

Further discussion of the items above is included in the Land Use section (starting on page 137) of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan found at the above link, and in the Land Use section technical report (starting on page 25) and its Appendix 3J, which can be found at the following links:
http://www.jccplans.org/pdf/steeringcommittee/weekof040609/Technical_Report_April_7.pdf
http://www.jccplans.org/pdf/steeringcommittee/weekof040609/Appendix3J_Impact_Assessment_April_7.pdf

Staff has been asked to explore concerns/ideas/criticisms that in evaluating impacts, certain aspects have not been adequately addressed to date: (a) impact studies have not sufficiently taken into account the impacts of existing and approved-but-not-yet-built development and (b) there may be some categories of impact which are not currently being sufficiently assessed (road capacity, watershed impacts, impacts to fire station or library capacity, etc.). As an example of the first aspect, the County's current adequate public facility test policy examines the projected number of school children to be generated by a proposed development against the capacity of the school based on current year enrollment levels, but does not include an assessment of school children that would be generated by approved-but-not-yet built projects in the same school district. It is important to note that the County has a joint school and library system with the City of Williamsburg, as well as mutual assistance agreements with the City of Williamsburg and York County for a number of other facilities and services such as fire and police protection.

As a result of input and feedback during the Comprehensive Plan update, staff developed a series of goals, strategies, and actions to pursue to help the County develop in a way that the community, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors desire. The following action was developed to address the interest in tracking cumulative development impacts:

1.5 Promote the use of land consistent with the capacity of existing and planned public facilities and services and the County's ability to provide such facilities and services.

1.5.1 Through the following measures, coordinate allowable densities and intensities of proposed developments with the capacities and availability of water, public roads, schools, and other facilities and services:

1.5.1.1 Reporting on the feasibility of development of a model or models to assess and track the cumulative impact of development proposals and development on existing and planned public facilities and services.

1.5.1.2 Supporting state enabling legislation for adequate public facilities ordinances to extend the policies to already zoned lands, if in a form acceptable to the Board of Supervisors.

1.5.1.3 Permitting higher densities and more intensive development in accordance with the Land Use Map where such facilities and services are adequately provided.

Current Data Collection Activities and Tracking

The James City County Planning Division currently tracks the following information through multiple software and systems:

- Type of developments (i.e. single-family, multi-family, commercial)
- Number of units, lots and /or square footage for submitted development proposals
- Number certificate of occupancies for certain developments

Computer resources used:

- CaseTrak – web-based County tracking data input site that is linked to Pivot Tables in Excel and used by the Planning Division and other development plan reviewing agencies (http://first.jccegov.com/CaseTrak/login.aspx);
- HMS Inc. – Access database used by building and certificate of occupancy permit office;
- Proval - system that is a Windows based property appraisal software;
- Enhanced Government Tax Software – tax billing software;
- ESRI GIS 9.x

The above systems are used throughout the County but data is not always linked or shared between systems and data may be incomplete. In addition, different terminology for data fields is not consistent across systems (i.e. housing unit types).

Desired Data Collection and Tracking Capabilities

The two main goals of this project are to:

1. Create a system that allows accurate tracking of development as it moves from concept to reality. This includes existing development, approved development that is not built, and estimated future build-out of vacant parcels. The estimated future build-out would likely be added to the system at a later date.

2. Use the system to assess current and future impacts on public facilities and services using the fields, multipliers and assumptions built in the system (i.e. school district, number of school children, closest arterial road, etc.). This system should be designed to be manipulated and sorted by use fields.

While not committed to the format or content, attached is a concept spreadsheet of ideas.

The following is a list of some public facilities and services that we are interested in tracking the impacts of:

- Schools
- Traffic- arterial roads
- Fire Department
- Library
- Environmental impacts and impervious cover
- General government needs
- Water and sewer impacts
- Parks and Recreation

The following items are points to consider or features we would like to be included in the system:

- Coordination of multiple existing systems verses the creation of one new comprehensive system;
- Incorporation of both residential and commercial development within system;
- The ability to easily update the system electronically including automated updates (i.e. how to move units from approved to built);

- The ability to use information to develop cash proffer policies, adequate public facilities policies, and/or the implementation of a possible future impact fee system;
- Coordination with other adjacent localities on shared facilities and cross-jurisdictional impacts;
- Based on the impacts we want to track, evaluation of the data fields that are most appropriate and feasible to track. For example, suggest the best method of collecting data to track traffic impacts.

General Timeline, Expectations and Funding

Simultaneously with investigating cumulative development impact tracking, the County is also undertaking a comprehensive zoning and subdivision ordinance review and revision. Regulations governing rezoning and special use permit submittal document requirements (such as impact studies) and processing procedures will be evaluated as part of this process and would consider any recommendations developed as a part of this cumulative development impact tracking investigation. Currently, the general timeline for the ordinance update is beginning in July 2010 and concluding in late 2011/early 2012. The approximate timeline for consultant work on this project is six months, although the County is willing to consider alternative timelines if proposed.

The Planning Division is seeking input from qualified consulting firms and planning professionals about their experience in designing, setting up, or coordinating existing development tracking systems; processes for examining the feasibility of a cumulative development impacts tracking system; concurrency reporting; potential deliverables as part of setting up such a system; other areas of policies and ordinance requirements that should be considered; trends in development tracking, impact studies, and level-of-service standards; and examples of development impact tracking systems and related ordinance submittal requirement language.

III. RESPONSES

Interested parties are invited to respond to this RFI by submitting a response to the County. Responses should include ideas, information and recommendations that could result in a clarification of the requirements, cost-saving opportunities, and the identification of potential problem areas with this initiative.

Respondents are requested to provide a concise and focused response to this RFI. Responses are requested in the following format:

a) Brief company profile;
b) Information on any potential sub-consultants the company would need to complete analysis;
c) Name of a key contact person, including telephone number, fax number and email address;
d) Brief description of company's interest and past experience with cumulative development tracking and impact system, with references and examples if possible;
e) The names and qualifications of the specific staff members from each company (if more than one) who will be assigned to the project, their role in the project, and a resume listing their individual work experience in this role on similar projects;
f) Brief description of process ideas for conducting an analysis for the County;
g) Potential deliverables as part of the analysis;
h) Best estimated price range to provide services;
i) Time frame to conduct an analysis; and
j) Other information specific to the nature of this RFI and deemed important by the respondent.

In the event that sufficient information is received, the County may, but is not required to, issue a competitive solicitation. This RFI is not a competitive solicitation and no contract award shall result.

This RFI will not be used to evaluate, rank or select vendors, nor will it be used to pre-qualify or screen vendors for a subsequent competitive solicitation process, if any. If a subsequent competitive solicitation is issued, the County is under no obligation to advise any firm responding to this RFI. Vendors are advised to monitor the County's website (www.jccegov.com) for any such opportunities, which will be open to all vendors regardless of whether or not a response to this RFI has been submitted.

The County will not pay for the preparation of any information submitted or for use of that information. The County reserves the right to utilize any information submitted in its best interest without any obligation, liability, or consideration on the part of the County.

Ownership of all data, materials and documentation originated and prepared for the County pursuant to this RFI shall belong exclusively to the County and be subject to public inspection in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. Trade secrets or proprietary information submitted by a firm shall not be publicly disclosed under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; however, the firm shall invoke the protection of this section prior to or upon submission of the data or other materials and must identify the data or other materials to be protected and state the reasons why protection is necessary. Disposition of the proprietary materials after the RFIs are reviewed should be stated by the firm. Firms should indicate on the **Cover Sheet** the portions of their response that are proprietary and return the signed Cover Sheet with their submission. Please list the page number(s) and reason(s).

Attachment: Example spreadsheet showing initial brainstorming of data fields that may need to be tracked