

**INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL LAND INVENTORY**  
**FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND**

**Synopsis**

**February 23, 2006**

**Prepared by**  
The Division of Planning and  
The Office of Economic Development

# Methodology

## *Development of the Database*

The GIS (Geographic Information System) component of this analysis was two fold, comprising a data creation and a data extraction procedure. The following methodology will explore the creation of the information and layers that make up the Commercial Industrial Land Database (CILD).

Since, a localized commercial property base layer is beyond the reach of the Frederick County GIS, at this time, staff utilized two external source base layers. The first base data source is Maryland Property View. This is a GIS layer available through the Maryland Department of Planning. The layer consists of a large variety of data fields and information relating to property tax assessment. The data associated with the Maryland Property View is gathered and maintained by the Maryland State Department of Taxation, for the sole purpose of assessing land taxes. The data is not designed to create the level of land use inventory that was desired for this inventory.

Therefore, to aid in the deficiencies of localized land use information of the Frederick County GIS, staff utilized CoStar information. CoStar is a commercial real estate database maintained by realtors. The Frederick County Office of Economic Development has purchased the usage of this program. They were able to export a snapshot of commercial properties available in the database in four categories: land, flex, commercial, and industrial. The four excel spreadsheets they were able to export from CoStar were consolidated into one and imported into GIS using the Latitude and Longitude coordinates in the database. This resulted in 403 geo-coded points.

Once both data sources were imported into the GIS, staff refined the points to our analytical needs. Maryland Property View is represented as the centroid of a parcel. In Frederick County we have over 88,000 parcel points. Staff refined this data layer to include only the commercial aspects of taxable land. In the over 100 data fields in the Maryland Property View database staff decided to use the land use description field, "DESCLU" in order to query out the commercial parcels in Frederick County. Included in our query were any properties described as Commercial, Commercial Condominium, Commercial Residential, Exempt Commercial, Industrial, and Residential Commercial. This resulted in 5,165 parcel points.

The problem of defining commercial and industrial land became an issue while developing the Database. According to Tax Assessments, properties such as churches, cemeteries, schools, fire stations, private clubs, electrical poles, etc. are considered commercial/industrial. Given the obvious non-commercial nature of these types of uses, they were ultimately not considered commercial or industrial for the purposes of this project.

One important aspect of the analysis was to determine whether the land was developed or undeveloped. Using the point layer data we currently had there was no good way to determine this. Therefore, the 2000 orthophotography was overlaid on top of the point layer and digitized parcels. If the digitized parcel showed there was a building in 2000, the point was moved to the middle of the building, rather than the parcel centroid and considered it to be developed. If there was no building on the parcel it was considered

undeveloped. Hence, even though the base layers were as of 2004 the developed information is a bit out of date and is only as of 2000 as it was the best available data for the purpose of this analysis and our resources.

Once the Maryland Property View data layer was more manageable we could begin to look at the individual property points as defined by both Maryland Property View and CoStar. The information received from both sources is different and they serve different purposes. Maryland Property View is for tax assessment and CoStar is for real estate investment. Neither one of these sources was meant to give an overall commercial land inventory; both hold very different types of information.

For the purposes of this study we needed to create a polygon or parcel layer, to more accurately obtain acreage information. Since Maryland Property View is the parcel centroid and there were 5,165 points compared to 403 points we decided to incorporate the CoStar points into the Maryland Property View point layer. In order to do this a unique identifier or serial number was created. If the serial number is between 1-10,000 the point was based off of Maryland Property View if the serial number is above 30,000 the point was obtained from CoStar.

From the point information staff digitized each parcel off the raster tax maps to create both a point and a commercial polygon layer. Since CoStar had no tax assessment reference each point had to be evaluated individually to see if an association to a given tax parcel could be matched. Most of the 403 points matched with a tax assessment record however, there were about 50 points that did not. These points were disregarded from the rest of the analysis because the polygon layer could not be digitized.

Once the polygons were digitized, it became apparent that the way in which commercial land is defined through the tax assessments is not the same definition needed for this analysis. For example, for assessment purposes land such as churches, cemeteries, recreational, public safety, non-profit, electrical, railroads, apartments, and trailer parks are considered commercial. For the purpose of this analysis these uses were not included as commercial lands, and therefore they were queried out of the database leaving 2,913 commercial parcels.

Another hindering factor was the commercial properties located in the 12 incorporated municipalities of Frederick County. Downtown commercial properties were hard to define or extract from the assessment information and the task was difficult to achieve absent a geographic parcel layer. Staff also did not have complete GIS layers such as Land Use and Zoning from the municipalities to analyze the data similar to the County land being evaluated. For the purposes of our analysis we decided that only the parcels within the County, not in incorporated municipalities would be used, resulting in 956 parcels defined as commercial throughout the County.

## ***Industry Mix***

### SECOND QUARTER 2005

<b>INDUSTRY</b>	Number of Reporting Units	Monthly Employment			Quarterly Average Employment	Total Wages	Average Weekly Wage Per Worker
		First	Second	Third			
<b>TOTAL EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>5,793</b>	<b>91,205</b>	<b>92,139</b>	<b>93,027</b>	<b>92,124</b>	<b>\$855,902,896</b>	<b>\$715</b>
<b>GOVERNMENT SECTOR - TOTAL</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>14,066</b>	<b>14,093</b>	<b>14,029</b>	<b>14,063</b>	<b>\$154,258,121</b>	<b>844</b>
Federal Government	55	3,187	3,204	3,266	3,219	\$49,436,663	1,181
State Government	7	652	659	647	653	\$6,439,799	759
Local Government	70	10,227	10,230	10,116	10,191	\$98,381,659	743
<b>PRIVATE SECTOR – TOTAL ALL INDUSTRIES</b>	<b>5,661</b>	<b>77,139</b>	<b>78,046</b>	<b>78,998</b>	<b>78,061</b>	<b>\$701,644,775</b>	<b>691</b>
<b>GOODS-PRODUCING</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>17,757</b>	<b>18,029</b>	<b>18,305</b>	<b>18,030</b>	<b>\$188,005,632</b>	<b>802</b>
Natural Resources and Mining	51	566	563	579	569	\$4,222,908	571
Construction	1,076	10,767	10,981	11,152	10,967	\$110,607,148	776
Manufacturing	194	6,424	6,485	6,574	6,494	\$73,175,576	867
<b>SERVICE PROVIDING</b>	<b>4,320</b>	<b>59,370</b>	<b>60,005</b>	<b>60,681</b>	<b>60,019</b>	<b>\$513,524,338</b>	<b>658</b>
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	1,106	16,126	16,185	16,258	16,190	\$125,781,378	598
Information	97	1,563	1,583	1,578	1,575	\$17,338,350	847
Financial Activities	516	7,798	7,790	7,847	7,812	\$87,071,255	857
Professional and Business Services	1,137	12,196	12,357	12,485	12,346	\$145,677,857	908
Education and Health Services	551	10,332	10,355	10,449	10,379	\$89,450,560	663
Leisure and Hospitality	431	8,228	8,585	8,866	8,560	\$28,112,691	253
Other Services	482	3,127	3,150	3,198	3,158	\$20,092,247	489
<b>UNCLASSIFIED</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>\$114,805</b>	<b>736</b>

Source: Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, 2nd quarter of 2005

## ***Land Supply Characteristics***

### ***Overall Acreage***

There are 428,294 acres in Frederick County. Excluding the acres within the municipalities (25,402), the number of acres under the jurisdiction of the County totals **402,892 acres**.

#### **Total Commercial and Industrial Acreage by Inventory Area**

	Comp Plan	Zoning	Difference	% Difference
Total Acres	15,170.4	1,3583.9	1,586.5	11.68%
% of County Total	3.77%	3.37%		

### ***Distribution of Land by Planning Region***

#### **Planned and Zoned Commercial/Industrial Acreage by Planning Region**

	Comp Plan	Zoning	Difference	% Difference
Adamstown	4,098.3	3,911.9	186.4	4.8%
Brunswick	301.5	294.5	7	2.4%
Frederick	3,791.9	2,831	960.9	33.94%
Middletown	249	128.1	120.9	94.4%
New Market	1,005	706.3	298.7	42.3%
Thurmont	658.6	653.9	4.7	0.7%
Urbana	1,925.4	1,765.4	160	9%
Walkersville	3,140.7	3,292.8	-152.1	-4.6%
Total Acres	15170.4	13583.9	1586.5	11.68%

#### **Percent of Countywide Distribution of Planned and Zoned Commercial/Industrial Acres**

	Comp Plan	Zoning
Adamstown	27.0%	28.8%
Brunswick	2%	2.2%
Frederick	25.0%	20.8%
Middletown	1.6%	.9%
New Market	6.6%	5.2%
Thurmont	4.3%	4.8%
Urbana	12.7%	13.0%
Walkersville	20.7%	24.2%

## ***Development Status of Land by Planning Region***

### **Development Status of Commercial/Industrial Land in the Comprehensive Plan**

Planning Region		Designated Com/Ind Land	Developed Acreage	Undeveloped Acreage	% Developed	% of Total Developed Acreage
	Adamstown	4098.3	2576.6	1521.7	62.9%	44.4%
	Brunswick	301.5	47	254.5	15.6%	0.8%
	Frederick	3791.9	1527.1	2264.8	40.3%	26.3%
	Middletown	249	53.8	195.2	21.6%	0.9%
	New Market	1005	101.6	903.4	10.1%	1.8%
	Thurmont	658.6	219.2	439.4	33.3%	3.8%
	Urbana	1925.4	323.4	1602	16.8%	5.6%
	Walkersville	3140.7	956.8	2183.9	30.5%	16.5%
	<i>Total</i>	<b>15160.4</b>	<b>5805.5</b>	<b>9354.9</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### **Development Status of Commercial/Industrial Land in Zoning**

Planning Region		Zoned Com/Ind Land	Developed Acreage	Undeveloped Acreage	% Developed	% of Total Developed Acreage
	Adamstown	3911.9	2589.6	1322.3	66.2%	45.03%
	Brunswick	294.5	50.1	244.4	17.1%	0.87%
	Frederick	2831	1336.9	1491.1	47.2%	23.25%
	Middletown	129.7	59.5	70.2	46.5%	1.03%
	New Market	706.3	102.7	603.6	14.5%	1.79%
	Thurmont	653.9	226.1	427.8	34.6%	3.93%
	Urbana	1547.1	338.5	1208.6	19.2%	5.89%
	Walkersville	3292.8	1047.5	2245.3	31.8%	18.21%
	<i>Total</i>	<b>13583.9</b>	<b>5750.9</b>	<b>7833</b>	<b>42.3%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## ***Distribution of Land by Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Category***

### **Commercial/Industrial Land by Land Use and Zoning Category**

	<b>Comp Plan</b>			<b>Zoning</b>			
	<b>Total Acreage</b>	<b>% of Total</b>		<b>Total Acreage</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Difference in Acres</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b>CR</b>	219.5	1.4%	--	---	---	219.5	---
<b>GC</b>	1306	8.6%	<b>GC</b>	1318.7	9.7%	-12.6	-1%
<b>GI</b>	2654.3	17.6%	<b>GI</b>	2965.8	21.8%	-301.6	-10.2%
<b>HS</b>	111.6	0.7%	<b>HS</b>	170.2	1.3%	-58.6	-34.4%
<b>LI</b>	3029.7	20%	<b>LI</b>	2509.4	18.5%	520.3	20.7%
<b>MM</b>	3997.9	26.4%	<b>MM</b>	3797.5	28%	200.4	5.3%
<b>--</b>	---	---	<b>MXD</b>	357.3	4.9%	-357.3	---
<b>ORI</b>	3160.8	20.8%	<b>ORI</b>	1471.6	10.8%	1689.2	114.8%
<b>VC</b>	680.6	4.5%	<b>VC</b>	690	5.1%	-9.4	-1.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15170.4</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>13583.9</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1586.5</b>	<b>11.7%</b>

## ***Development Status of Land by Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Category***

### **Commercial/Industrial Acreage by Land Use and Zoning Category**

	<b>Comprehensive Plan</b>				<b>Zoning</b>		
	<b>Total Acreage</b>	<b>Developed Acreage</b>	<b>Percentage Developed</b>		<b>Total Acreage</b>	<b>Developed Acreage</b>	<b>Percentage Developed</b>
<b>CR</b>	219.5	118.5	54.0%	--	---	---	---
<b>GC</b>	1306	538.9	41.3%	<b>GC</b>	1318.7	645.1	48.9%
<b>GI</b>	2654.3	1849	69.4%	<b>GI</b>	2965.8	2186	73.7%
<b>HS</b>	111.6	7.4	6.6%	<b>HS</b>	170.2	34.2	20.1%
<b>LI</b>	3029.7	1215.6	40.1%	<b>LI</b>	2509.4	1371.4	54.7%
<b>MM</b>	3997.9	1650.5	41.3%	<b>MM</b>	3797.5	1278.5	33.7%
<b>--</b>	---	---	---	<b>MXD</b>	660.7	142.3	21.5%
<b>ORI</b>	3160.8	342.4	10.8%	<b>ORI</b>	1471.6	143.3	9.7%
<b>VC</b>	680.6	83.3	12.2%	<b>VC</b>	690	92.4	13.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15170.4</b>	<b>5805.6</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>13583.9</b>	<b>5750.9</b>	<b>42.3%</b>

# Distribution by Acreage and Development of Land Use and Zoning Categories

	Comprehensive Plan			Zoning	
	% of Total Acreage	% of Developed Acreage		% of Total Acreage	% of Developed Acreage
<b>CR</b>	1.4%	2.0%	---	---	---
<b>GC</b>	8.6%	9.3%	<b>GC</b>	9.7%	11.2%
<b>GI</b>	17.6%	31.8%	<b>GI</b>	21.8%	38.0%
<b>HS</b>	0.7%	0.1%	<b>HS</b>	1.3%	0.6%
<b>LI</b>	20%	20.9%	<b>LI</b>	18.5%	23.8%
<b>MM</b>	26.4%	28.4%	<b>MM</b>	28%	22.2%
---	---	---	<b>MXD</b>	4.9%	0.0%
<b>ORI</b>	20.8%	5.9%	<b>ORI</b>	10.8%	2.5%
<b>VC</b>	4.5%	1.4%	<b>VC</b>	5.1%	1.6%



## ***Improved Value***

Information regarding the square feet of structures on commercial/industrial land and the improved value of property is incomplete. Information about square footage was gathered from 617 out of 776 (80%) developed parcels. Improvement values were obtained from 695 out of 776 (90%) records.

### **Total Area and Improved Value of Structures by Land Use and Zoning Categories**

	<b>Comprehensive Plan</b>			<b>Zoning</b>	
	<b>Total Building Footprint SF</b>	<b>Improved Value</b>		<b>Total Building Footprint SF</b>	<b>Improved Value</b>
<b>A</b>	183,254	\$9,520,300	<b>A</b>	312,443	\$20,090,100
<b>CR</b>	344,473	\$13,194,900	<b>GC</b>	3,611,004	\$206,544,600
<b>GC</b>	3,244,189	\$199,734,800	<b>GI</b>	3,094,046	\$59,592,000
<b>GI</b>	3,491,780	\$68,244,400	<b>HS</b>	41,465	\$2,450,900
<b>HDR</b>	85,218	\$8,099,800	<b>LI</b>	6,643,089	\$287,218,500
<b>I</b>	62,812	\$4,908,000	<b>MM</b>	218,218	\$7,702,000
<b>LDR</b>	277,081	\$18,367,560	<b>MXD</b>	1,254,007	\$105,161,000
<b>LI</b>	6,000,202	\$267,092,600	<b>ORI</b>	906,570	\$70,960,710
<b>MDR</b>	11,329	\$1,109,500	<b>PUD</b>	297,290	\$16,957,100
<b>MM</b>	296,386	\$9,052,400	<b>R1</b>	133,097	\$5,313,470
<b>ORI</b>	16,031,263	\$758,147,460	<b>R3</b>	42,307	\$5,329,900
<b>PO</b>	9,646	\$226,400	<b>R5</b>	5,838	\$732,060
<b>RC</b>	346,697	\$23,531,710	<b>R8</b>	8,024	\$597,700
<b>RurC</b>	261,037	\$8,013,882	<b>RC</b>	82,494	\$5,518,000
<b>RurH</b>	10,438	\$364,400	<b>VC</b>	304,718	\$12,904,060
<b>RurN</b>	83,076	\$5,694,200	<b>Total</b>	<b>16,954,610</b>	<b>\$807,072,100</b>
<b>RurS</b>	810	\$31,200			
<b>VC</b>	179,681	\$9,057,260			
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,919,372</b>	<b>\$1,404,390,772</b>			

## ***Business Parks***

	<b>Total Acreage</b>
<b>Adamstown</b>	2247.70
<b>Brunswick</b>	9.90
<b>Frederick</b>	880.10
<b>Middletown</b>	46.60
<b>New Market</b>	53.70
<b>Thurmont</b>	0
<b>Urbana</b>	428.40
<b>Walkersville</b>	28.40
<b>Total</b>	<b>3694.80</b>

## ***Site Advantages***

### ***Proximity to Infrastructure***

#### **Proximity of Comprehensive Plan Commercial/Industrial Land to Infrastructure**

	<b><i>Within 1/2 Mile</i></b>	<b><i>Between 1/2-1 Mile</i></b>	<b><i>Greater Than 1 Mile</i></b>
<b>Interchange Ramp</b>	3758.3	3308.5	8103.8
<b>Freeway</b>	5655.2	2137.6	7377.8
<b>Principal Arterial</b>	4218.9	2936.4	8015.3
<b>Minor Arterial</b>	8573.5	4581.2	2015.9
<b>Proposed Minor Arterial</b>	42.9	188.0	14939.7
<b>MARC Station</b>	367.2	992.1	13811.3
<b>Airport</b>	8.6	90.0	15072.0
<b>Cell Tower</b>	845.6	2381.6	11943.4

#### **Proximity of Zoned Commercial/Industrial Land to Infrastructure**

	<b><i>Within 1/2 Mile</i></b>	<b><i>Between 1/2-1 Mile</i></b>	<b><i>Greater Than 1 Mile</i></b>
<b>Interchange Ramp</b>	2841.1	2686.3	8056.2
<b>Freeway</b>	4136.9	1888.2	7558.5
<b>Principal Arterial</b>	4114.0	2527.4	6942.2
<b>Minor Arterial</b>	7464.7	4124.4	1994.5
<b>Proposed Minor Arterial</b>	42.9	136.0	13404.7
<b>MARC Station</b>	408.1	956.5	12219.0
<b>Airport</b>	0.0	20.5	13563.1
<b>Cell Tower</b>	680.0	1861.5	11042.1

## ***Planned Water Service***

### **Planned Water Service by Com/Ind Zoning Designations**

		<b>GC</b>	<b>GI</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>LI</b>	<b>MM</b>	<b>MXD</b>	<b>ORI</b>	<b>VC</b>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Water Classification</i>	<b>NPS</b>	386.8	912.5	141.5	177.6	3655.2	3.7	12.8	379.0	<b>5669.1</b>
	<b>US</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
	<b>W5</b>	228.9	1442.7	28.6	1103.0	126.8	0.4	803.3	194.3	<b>3928.0</b>
	<b>W4</b>	69.7	0.7	0.0	126.4	0.4	0.6	367.9	10.3	<b>576.0</b>
	<b>W3</b>	109.5	196.0	0.1	295.6	0.0	399.2	130.7	41.2	<b>1172.3</b>
	<b>W2/I</b>	523.8	432.3	0.0	797.5	14.9	256.8	156.9	67.1	<b>2249.3</b>
	<i>Total</i>	<b>1318.7</b>	<b>2984.2</b>	<b>170.2</b>	<b>2500.1</b>	<b>3797.3</b>	<b>660.7</b>	<b>1471.6</b>	<b>691.9</b>	<b>13594.7</b>
<i>Sewer Classification</i>	<b>NPS</b>	355.5	925.1	142.7	154.1	3655.1	3.7	330.6	203.2	<b>5770.0</b>
	<b>US</b>	0.0	1.5	0.0	9.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	<b>11.2</b>
	<b>S5</b>	203.9	1315.6	27.4	1191.1	129.6	0.4	803.2	77.8	<b>3749.0</b>
	<b>S4</b>	79.6	0.0	0.1	102.4	0.4	0.6	230.9	0.0	<b>414.0</b>
	<b>S3</b>	114.3	195.0	0.0	161.0	0.0	335.3	130.4	57.3	<b>993.3</b>
	<b>S2/I</b>	565.4	528.6	0.0	891.5	12.2	320.7	158.8	170.8	<b>2648.0</b>
	<i>Total</i>	<b>1318.7</b>	<b>2965.8</b>	<b>170.2</b>	<b>2509.4</b>	<b>3797.5</b>	<b>660.7</b>	<b>1653.9</b>	<b>509.3</b>	<b>13585.5</b>

## ***Planned Sewer Service***

### **Planned Water Service by Com/Ind Comp Plan Designations**

		<b>CR</b>	<b>GC</b>	<b>GI</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>LI</b>	<b>MM</b>	<b>ORI</b>	<b>VC</b>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Water Classification</i>	<b>NPS</b>	212.5	239.1	416.3	111.3	363.6	3573.1	26.0	0.7	<b>4942.6</b>
	<b>US</b>	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	11.8	2.5	0.0	0.0	<b>15.4</b>
	<b>W5</b>	4.2	339.9	1642.8	2.5	1480.9	140.2	1799.9	309.7	<b>5720.1</b>
	<b>W4</b>	0.7	84.3	0.7	0.4	220.8	0.4	339.4	147.0	<b>793.7</b>
	<b>W3</b>	0.2	118.5	173.6	1.3	286.4	0.0	541.7	157.9	<b>1279.6</b>
	<b>W2/I</b>	1.9	550.3	396.5	9.1	784.5	7.0	453.8	65.3	<b>2268.4</b>
	<i>Total</i>	<b>219.5</b>	<b>1332.1</b>	<b>2631.0</b>	<b>124.6</b>	<b>3148.0</b>	<b>3723.2</b>	<b>3160.8</b>	<b>680.6</b>	<b>15019.8</b>
<i>Sewer Classification</i>	<b>NPS</b>	214.4	196.1	440.0	111.3	346.6	3573.7	48.6	0.9	<b>4931.6</b>
	<b>US</b>	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	11.8	2.5	0.0	0.0	<b>15.4</b>
	<b>S5</b>	4.2	323.6	1573.8	9.0	1576.9	139.4	1844.5	151.9	<b>5623.3</b>
	<b>S4</b>	0.7	90.4	0.0	2.9	195.5	0.4	339.2	136.7	<b>765.8</b>
	<b>S3</b>	0.2	120.3	174.1	0.0	169.2	0.0	503.1	174.5	<b>1141.4</b>
	<b>S2/I</b>	0.0	575.6	475.3	1.4	850.2	7.2	448.2	216.8	<b>2574.7</b>
	<i>Total</i>	<b>219.5</b>	<b>1306.0</b>	<b>2664.3</b>	<b>124.6</b>	<b>3150.2</b>	<b>3723.2</b>	<b>3183.6</b>	<b>680.8</b>	<b>15052.2</b>

## ***Development Constraints***

### ***Environmental Constraints***

The environmental factors considered included wetlands, floodplains, and steep slopes.

#### **Commercial/Industrial Acreage in Comp Plan and Zoning With Environmental Constraints by Planning Region**

	<b>Zoning</b>			<b>Comprehensive Plan</b>		
	<b>Zoned Land</b>	<b>Env. Constraints</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Planned Land</b>	<b>Env. Constraints</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Adamstown</b>	3911.9	690.0	0.0%	4098.3	503.8	12.3%
<b>Brunswick</b>	294.5	25.9	8.8%	301.5	24.4	8.1%
<b>Frederick</b>	2831	420.5	14.9%	3791.9	472.6	12.5%
<b>Middletown</b>	128.1	13.6	10.6%	249	21.1	8.5%
<b>New Market</b>	706.3	85.4	12.1%	1005	165.5	16.5%
<b>Thurmont</b>	653.9	98.3	15.0%	658.6	88.4	13.4%
<b>Urbana</b>	1765.4	110.0	6.2%	1925.4	130.4	0.0%
<b>Walkersville</b>	3292.8	493.7	15.0%	3140.7	266.2	8.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13583.9</b>	<b>1937.4</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>15170.4</b>	<b>1672.4</b>	<b>11.0%</b>

#### **Commercial/Industrial Acreage in Comp Plan and Zoning With Environmental Constraints by Land Use Category**

	<b>Zoning</b>			<b>Comprehensive Plan</b>		
	<b>Zoned Land</b>	<b>Env. Constraints</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Planned Land</b>	<b>Env. Constraints</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>CR</b>	0	0.0	0.0%	219.5	25.1	11.4%
<b>GC</b>	1318.7	168.5	12.8%	1306.1	150.8	11.5%
<b>GI</b>	2965.8	515.7	17.4%	2664.2	348.3	13.1%
<b>HS</b>	170.2	15.3	9.0%	111.6	7.4	6.6%
<b>LI</b>	2509.4	348.5	13.9%	3029.7	364.9	12.0%
<b>MM</b>	3797.5	515.7	13.6%	3997.9	334.1	8.4%
<b>MXD</b>	660.7	131.3	19.9%	0	0.0	0.0%
<b>ORI</b>	1471.6	157.5	10.7%	3160.8	328.8	10.4%
<b>VC</b>	690	84.9	12.3%	680.6	113.0	16.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13583.9</b>	<b>1937.4</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>15170.4</b>	<b>1672.4</b>	<b>11.0%</b>

## ***Forested Area***

### **Forested Commercial/Industrial Acreage in Comp Plan and Zoning by Planning Region**

	<b>Zoning</b>			<b>Comprehensive Plan</b>		
	<b>Zoned Land</b>	<b>Forested Area</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Planned Land</b>	<b>Forested Area</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Adamstown</b>	3911.9	370.1	0.0%	4098.3	312.9	7.6%
<b>Brunswick</b>	294.5	75.0	25.5%	301.5	73.0	24.2%
<b>Frederick</b>	2831	152.3	5.4%	3791.9	178.4	4.7%
<b>Middletown</b>	128.1	14.1	11.0%	249	15.4	6.2%
<b>New Market</b>	706.3	187.6	26.6%	1005	235.5	23.4%
<b>Thurmont</b>	653.9	199.3	30.5%	658.6	190.6	28.9%
<b>Urbana</b>	1765.4	468.1	26.5%	1925.4	467.1	0.0%
<b>Walkersville</b>	3292.8	727.4	22.1%	3140.7	669.8	21.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13583.9</b>	<b>2193.9</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>15170.4</b>	<b>2142.7</b>	<b>14.1%</b>

### **Forested Commercial/Industrial Acreage in Comp Plan and Zoning by Land Use Category**

	<b>Zoning</b>			<b>Comprehensive Plan</b>		
	<b>Zoned Land</b>	<b>Forested Area</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Planned Land</b>	<b>Forested Area</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>CR</b>	0	0.0	0.0%	219.5	17.1	7.8%
<b>GC</b>	1318.7	145.3	11.0%	1306.1	131.8	10.1%
<b>GI</b>	2965.8	389.8	13.1%	2664.2	327.7	12.3%
<b>HS</b>	170.2	53.6	31.5%	111.6	64.0	57.3%
<b>LI</b>	2509.4	439.7	17.5%	3029.7	463.0	15.3%
<b>MM</b>	3797.5	767.9	20.2%	3997.9	635.7	15.9%
<b>MXD</b>	660.7	57.2	8.7%	0	0.0	0.0%
<b>ORI</b>	1471.6	314.9	21.4%	3160.8	399.1	12.6%
<b>VC</b>	690	25.5	3.7%	680.6	104.3	15.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13583.9</b>	<b>2193.9</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>15170.4</b>	<b>2142.7</b>	<b>14.1%</b>