

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 9:45 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Methodology

FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 9:45 AM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Pool, Bob; Pearrow, Ken
Subject: RE: Methodology

Good morning Councilor

This is a follow-up to my email below and your request. Staff and I have reviewed the data and provide the following input.

The Exclusions data needs to have an additional column that shows why it's being excluded i.e. remainder lot, commercial timber, land bank, etc. so that we are not guessing as to the rationale.

The other data seems to have a problem with the "alots" field. It doesn't seem to accurately calculate the number of lots that can be created. In addition that field seems to be counting lots that already have homes and cannot be further divided as lots that can be built in the future. Given the problems with the data it would be premature to draw any conclusions from it. If you will like to update the information, we can index the methodology and pass it on to R W Thorpe and ESA. Thank you.

Best,

Oliver

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 10:09 AM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Pool, Bob; Pearrow, Ken
Subject: RE: Methodology

Hello Councilor

This is to acknowledge receipt of your email on the methodology you used for Alternative 4. Staff will review and will let you know if additional clarification is needed. Thank you.

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 9:49 AM

To: Orjako, Oliver; Madore, David
Subject: Methodology

Oliver,

I posted a methodology folder on the J Drive under my name that provides the basis for rural VBLM assumption 3

I welcome your feedback to ensure that everything is in order according to your standards. If you are good with the information exactly as posted, please pass it on to R W Thorpe so they are equipped to complete their task

I asked GIS for more information that would better equip me to provide a more thorough basis for assumption 4. As soon as they provide that info, I should be able to complete that task.

I asked GIS for the basis to support assumptions A and was told that there is none. However, they will do a more thorough search to see if they can find anything helpful. If you have anything, please forward it to me.

Thank you,

David

Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 3:56 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Map Corrections docx

FYI. Thanks

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

From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 3:51 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: Map Corrections docx

Oliver,

The results look perfect. I shared that message with Ken.

Thank you,

David

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

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 3:06 PM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine, Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: Map Corrections docx

Hello Councilor

This is a follow-up to our meeting relating to the need to correct mapping discrepancies. Barbara Hatman (GIS Staff) is done with the map. It is my understanding that she provided the data to you.

Attached, please find the write up of what was done. At our meeting, Ms. Chris Cook indicated the proposed changes will need to be approved by the Councilors in a public hearing. Please, advise so staff can prepare for the legal and notice provision as required by code.

Thank you

Best,

Oliver

Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 4:00 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Map Corrections docx
Attachments: Map Corrections docx

FYI

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

From: Alvarez, Jose
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 2:36 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Map Corrections.docx

Revised

Map Corrections

In reviewing the zoning map approved by Board of County Councilors as their preferred alternative. Several discrepancies were identified by staff and map corrections were proposed. The discrepancies fall into one of the following categories:

Split zoned parcels - Parcels that are currently split zoned between resource and non-resource designation were maintained with existing zoning or the closest match, to avoid resource designation requirements.

Rural Zone – There are 15 areas currently zoned R-10 or R-20 that were not designated a zone in Alternative 4 because they were either publicly owned or tax exempt properties. Instead of having two additional zones for such a small area, these areas were given one of the three proposed rural zones (R-1, R-2.5 and R-5). They were mostly designated R-5.

Spot zones – Certain spot zones areas were corrected by amending the zoning to most closely match the surrounding zoning.