

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, January 25, 2016 8 15 AM  
**To:** Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** FW: Forest Lands error

FYI and for the record Thanks

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pool, Bob  
**Sent:** Friday, January 22, 2016 5 34 PM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver, McCauley, Mark, Cook, Christine  
**Cc:** Pearrow, Ken  
**Subject:** RE: Forest Lands error

Oliver,  
Correct the DSEIS excluded Forest Lands. This is referred to as the Forest Lands exclusion turned on

Sorry, I need to clarify things one more time I am afraid I did not fully understand the process

Barbara's process was to take input from Councilor Madore in the form of a GIS Landuse layer and an Overrides table These would be used as inputs into the GIS Rural/VBLM Councilor Madore would also run his own version of the Rural/VBLM and they would compare numbers. Barbara would help him to identify where his model might be different that her model. He would make changes and rerun his version of the Rural VBLM model

They finally agreed on the same results between the two different models.  
The GIS Rural/VBLM model had the Forest Lands turned off during all of these runs.

The Forest Lands were turned off in the Rural Model sometime in August and were left off for all subsequent runs This error was discovered on November 24th date when it realized that the Forest lands were still turned off. The Forest Lands were left off by mistake after the test run in August

Forest lands turned off is not a switch on a form, it is code that is commented out. So it is not an obvious thing you see when running the model It is the type of thing you do and could quite easily forget

The Forest Lands turned off was discovered when Councilor Madore tried to reconcile his results against the DSEIS, and found that his numbers did not match the DSEIS.

Forest Lands are currently still turned off

Bob

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Friday, January 22, 2016 3 24 PM  
**To:** Pool, Bob; McCauley, Mark, Cook, Christine  
**Cc:** Pearrow, Ken  
**Subject:** RE: Forest Lands error

Hello Bob and Ken

Thank you your email and clarification. From your email, I take it to mean that no error was made in estimating the potential new lots as calculated in the DSEIS. In other words, designated forest lands and timber were excluded in the number of lots across all alternatives in the DSEIS. Please, confirmed that it is Councilor Madore's later work used the version of the model that turned the forest layer off in his development of the revised alternative 4. All that happened would have occurred between after November 24, 2015. Thanks

Best,

Oliver

-----Original Message-----

From: Pool, Bob

Sent: Friday, January 22, 2016 3:01 PM

To: Orjiako, Oliver, McCauley, Mark

Cc: Pearrow, Ken

Subject: Forest Lands error

Oliver and Mark,

Sorry about the time this has taken to respond. It has taken some time to fully review the events that led up to this back in September of 2015.

The area outside the UGA has always had a simple rural vacant buildable lands model. This Rural/VBLM program has been around since the 1994 plan was adopted. It is only run every few years for either the Plan Monitoring report or the Comprehensive Plan update. As we dusted it off and reviewed it for this round of planning it was found to have issues with the data sources and the GIS software version used to run it.

GIS quickly rewrote the program to improve the data sources and upgrade the software in June of 2015. One of the assumptions in the Rural VBLM is that timber lands will not develop. This is referred to as the Forest Lands exclusion. The data source for this assumption was a list of property owners provided to the County by the Forest Land Practices Board (FLPB) in 1994. This list of owners was used to create a GIS layer in 1994. This layer has never been updated.

GIS recommended that the data source for this be changed to those properties in the Current Use Timber program or the Current Use Designated Forest Lands program and the VBLM land use classification of forest land. This was the new criteria used to meet the Forest Land assumption that was included in the DSEIS.

After the DSEIS was delivered the Rural Land model suddenly got elevated to a very high profile issue and the assumptions saw lots of scrutiny and review. One issue raised was why are the Forest Lands even being excluded? GIS was asked to run the model with the Forest Land Exclusion turned off so that we could see how many additional houses that would add.

Simultaneously, Councilor Madore started working with GIS to understand how the model worked. This evolved into him creating his own model based on the data he had working on with GIS staff. The initial efforts by Councilor Madore began with a copy of the VBLM model, mistakenly the model he started playing with was the one with the Forest Land Exclusion turned off. At the time, I don't think anyone thought that data he was using would be the basis for the final preferred alternative. It certainly was not given that level of scrutiny or review.

In the past many people have played with the GIS data from the VBLM. They have voiced concerns and identified issues. These issues are reviewed and responded to by GIS and Community Planning. Recommendations are made to the Board.

and the model is updated and rerun based on the direction from the Board. The results are again displayed and reviewed.

This error is a simple honest mistake. We sincerely apologize for this error. This is the type of error that should have been caught during the review of the output of the model. While Councilor Madore did ask us to review his results, his approach to doing the work did not lend itself to a meaningful review of the process. The most we could do is compare his results to ours and note the differences.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Bob

-----Original Message-----

From: Orjiako, Oliver

Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 4:08 PM

To: McCauley, Mark

Cc: Pearrow, Ken, Pool, Bob

Subject: RE

Hello Sir

I have asked GIS staff to help us figure the issue out. I must say that staff did not count forest lots in the DSEIS analysis. I will copy Ken Pearrow on this email so we can address the issue. If anything, Councilor Madore is the one that included forest lots in his methodology or on his revised Alternative 4. So let GIS staff confirm or disprove that. Thanks

Best,

Oliver

-----Original Message-----

From: McCauley, Mark

Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 3:29 PM

To: Orjiako, Oliver

Subject:

Hi Oliver. I came by this morning to discuss the 1,000% forestry parcel error Madore is harping about--what are we doing to correct the problem--and what effect did the error have?

I am leaving the office now and will be at the board retreat in the morning for much of the day. I might be in towards midafternoon.