INDEPENDENT CASE STUDY

Goochland County, Virginia

A Data Center Case Study

The Overlay, the Lawsuit, and the Template

Goochland

Prepared by Tommy N. Turner
Williamsburg and Christiansburg, Virginia
October 2026 · Version 1.1
DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20673467 · ORCID 0009-0005-7422-9881

CASE STUDY: GOOCHLAND COUNTY

The Overlay, the Lawsuit, and the Template

Series: Companion to What Virginia Is Spending, What Virginia Is Getting (v5.3)
Evidence snapshot: June 12, 2026
Updated through: October 24, 2026, for the items dated in the text
Version: 1.1 (supersedes v1.0, June 2026)
Author: Tommy N. Turner
Location: Williamsburg and Christiansburg, Virginia
Contact: 757-784-0979 · tommy@gofast.pro · linkedin.com/in/tommyturner
ORCID: 0009-0005-7422-9881
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20673467
Published: June 2026 (v1.0) · Revised October 2026 (v1.1)

Companion case studies in this series:

- Case Study: Henrico County — How Two Neighborhoods Forced Virginia's Second-Largest Data Center Jurisdiction to Change Course
- Case Study: Hanover County — Mountain Road, Tract, and the Search for Leverage
- Case Study: Louisa County — The First Overlay, the Amazon Retreat, and the $17 Billion Bet
- Case Study: Orange County and the Town of Orange — Convergence at Two Scales: One Industry, Two Governments, and the Entitlement Neither Can Reach
- Case Study: Prince William County — Governance Capture, the Revolving Door, and the Democratic Correction
- Case Study: Chesterfield County — The $0.24 Rate, the Thirty-Year Lock, and the Two-Corridor County
- Case Study: The Google-CFS Power Purchase Agreement

Version note: This version carries the case forward from the June 12, 2026 evidence snapshot to October 24, 2026 for the items dated in the text: the State Corporation Commission's September 10, 2026 final order approving Dominion's West Creek line and substation, the October 9 notice of appeal from it, and the data center load described in that case's record; the Tuckahoe Technology Park formal application of August 5, 2026; the October 20, 2026 demurrer hearing; New Kent County's July 13, 2026 decision on its draft overlay district; the county's two pending ordinance amendments; and Hanover's June 24, 2026 rate vote. Part Thirteen lists the open documentary items. Research framework references follow the series role-label convention. Endnotes are numbered by first appearance.

Disclosure: The author serves on the advisory board of an Alfred P. Sloan Foundation-funded study at Emory University on data centers and the Southern energy buildout. The study had no role in this case study.

© 2026 Tommy N. Turner

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT **5**
PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND METHOD **6**
PART ONE: THE COUNTY AND THE CORRIDOR **8**
PART TWO: THE INSTRUMENT — LOUISA'S PRECURSOR **10**
PART THREE: THE ORDINANCE — WHAT THE TOD PERMITS AND THE TZ PAYS **11**
The District 11
The Use Table 11
The Data Center Standards 12
How the Standards Table Regionally 13
The Technology Zone 14
PART FOUR: THE ADOPTION **15**
Four Months, Two Town Halls, a Midnight Hearing 15
The Night-Of Changes 16
The Vote and the Reasons 16
The Contract in the Background 18
PART FIVE: THE LAWSUIT **19**
The Complaint 19
The Legal Predicate 20
The Defense and the $250,000 21
The May 26 Ruling 21
The October 20 Hearing 22
PART SIX: WHAT THE OVERLAY WAS BUILT TO RECEIVE **23**
Tuckahoe Technology Park 23
The SMR Thread, Run to Ground 24
The Corridor's Other Transactions 25
PART SEVEN: THE FISCAL ARCHITECTURE **26**
The Rate Nobody Repriced 26
The Expenditure Side of the Ledger 27
PART EIGHT: WATER AND POWER **28**
Water 28
Power 28
PART NINE: THE OPPOSITION ACROSS THE LINE **31**
Who Organized 31
The Cross-Boundary Pattern, Named 31
PART TEN: THE REPLICATION — NEW KENT AND THE DIFFUSION OF INSTRUMENTS **33**
PART ELEVEN: REGIONAL CONTEXT — THE FIFTH POSITION **35**
PART TWELVE: READINGS BY RESEARCH SPECIALTY **37**
The Institutional Behavior Reading 37
The Distributional Justice Reading 37
The Utility Finance Reading 37
The Energy, Labor, and Infrastructure Reading 38
The Energy Geography Reading 38
PART THIRTEEN: GAPS IN THE RECORD **40**
Status of Pending Matters 40

Primary-Source Verification Priorities....41
Data Gaps....42
APPENDIX: TIMELINE OF TURNING POINTS, 2019–2026....43
ENDNOTES....45

ABSTRACT

Hanover, documented in a companion study, decided its data center campuses one rezoning at a time. Goochland County tried something different. On November 6, 2025, after a public hearing at Goochland High School that ran past midnight, the Board of Supervisors voted 4-1 to adopt a Technology Overlay District and a companion Technology Zone: an overlay of roughly 4,400 acres for data centers and related uses along Route 288 from Interstate 64 to Patterson Avenue, about 3,500 of them in West Creek Business Park, where, on the county's account, data centers had been allowed by right since a 1987 rezoning, with by-right approval in most of the district, financial incentives layered on top, and a use table that includes small modular nuclear reactors by conditional use permit. No one who spoke in the public comment period supported it, by Richmond BizSense's account. Twenty-eight days later, four residents sued, alleging the county adopted the ordinance on defective notice and changed it materially the night of the vote. The county has budgeted $250,000 to defend it. On May 26, 2026, the circuit court rejected the county's attempt to file all 8,500 pages of its adoption record and ordered a pared-down set; the demurrer was argued October 20, 2026, and no ruling had been reported as of October 24, 2026. While the case is pending, the corridor is moving. On June 10, 2026, Tract, the developer Hanover rejected two weeks earlier, filed the district's first pre-application, for a data center campus its June concept plans showed as twelve buildings on roughly 900 acres; its formal conditional use permit application followed on August 5, 2026. At the June snapshot New Kent County was drafting its own version, the third iteration of a template Louisa County invented in 2023; on July 13, 2026, New Kent's board directed that the draft not proceed in its current form (Part Ten).

This case study treats the overlay itself as the protagonist: an institutional instrument with a design history, an adoption story, a legal test, and a replication path. The legal test is the part that matters most for the series. The plaintiffs do not argue that data centers are bad. They argue the county broke the rules adopting the district, and the question their suit poses is whether pre-entitlement by ordinance moves faster than the democratic and judicial checks built to answer it. The evidence so far says yes: the first campus application is moving through county review while the ordinance it depends on awaits a ruling on a docket clock. The study adds a fifth position to the series' institutional spectrum. Henrico reformed after entitling. Hanover refused case by case. Chesterfield contracted its leverage away. Prince William's governance was captured, then corrected. Goochland pre-entitled by ordinance, wholesale, and is being tested in court on process rather than substance.

PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND METHOD

This case study documents the conception, adoption, legal challenge, and early operation of Goochland County's Technology Overlay District and Technology Zone, from the county's economic development planning in 2024 through the evidence snapshot of June 12, 2026, with later items dated in the text through October 24, 2026. It is the series' first new-territory case, built from the record up, and its most time-sensitive: the central litigation is active and the report's claims about it are dated precisely for that reason.

The primary intended readers are researchers working on data center growth and its consequences for governance, land, water, and power. This document organizes its readings in five frameworks of the author's own, by type of work: institutional behavior, distributional justice, utility finance, energy and labor infrastructure, and energy geography.[1] The Goochland record offers each framework something the project-by-project cases cannot: the institutional behavior framework gets a county that moved the approval decision from the future to the past, converting case-by-case discretion into a standing entitlement; the distributional justice framework gets an opposition that is partly extraterritorial, people who cannot vote for the board that decided; the utility finance framework gets a pricing regime set before any facility operates, against a regional repricing wave moving the other way; and the energy geography framework gets its diffusion story operating at the level of ordinances rather than projects. These connections are flagged inline and consolidated in Part Twelve.

The second audience is Virginia localities that, at this snapshot, were studying the Goochland template, beginning with New Kent. The third is citizens and journalists seeking to understand what a technology overlay district is, what it permits, and what challenging one requires.

A note on method. This study is built entirely from public sources: the adopted ordinances and county documents, circuit court coverage, state code and case law, census and budget data, and sustained local news coverage, principally Richmond BizSense, VPM News, WTVR, WRIC, NBC12, the Virginia Mercury, Virginia Business, Cardinal News, and the Goochland-focused civic blog Goochland on my mind. Direct quotations are reproduced as reported in the cited coverage. No interviews were conducted for this version. The complaint itself is posted by the county only as a non-searchable scan, so the pleading's contents are reported here through news accounts and flagged accordingly. Claims that rest on secondary sources rather than primary documents are marked with an asterisk and consolidated in Part Thirteen with the primary source identified for verification. A standing discipline governs the litigation sections: the case is pending, the plaintiffs'

allegations are allegations, the county's defenses are defenses, and the May 26 ruling is a ruling about the record, not the merits. Both sides' positions are stated in their own terms. The companion report, What Virginia Is Spending, What Virginia Is Getting (v5.3), covers the statewide fiscal picture.[2]

PART ONE: THE COUNTY AND THE CORRIDOR

Goochland County runs west from the Henrico County line along the north bank of the James River, about 290 square miles of rolling horse-and-hay country with a courthouse village at its center. The Weldon Cooper Center estimates its July 1, 2025 population at 28,432, up from 24,727 at the 2020 Census, growth concentrated almost entirely in the county's eastern end.[3] The real estate tax rate is $0.53 per $100; the FY2027 budget, proposed at roughly $171 million all funds, was adopted on May 5, 2026 with no tax rate increases.[4] It is a small government. The county attorney's office told the board in February 2026 that it lacked the staff to handle all elements of defending a major lawsuit, and the FY2026 budget's headline personnel investment was thirteen new positions countywide.[5][6]

The eastern end is different country. West Creek Business Park, roughly 3,500 acres south of I-64 along the Route 288 corridor, has carried industrial zoning since a 1987 rezoning, under which, on the county's account, data centers could locate by right with minimal buffers, decades before anyone wanted them.[7][8] Its tenants are the county's fiscal anchors: Capital One, CarMax, Performance Food Group. In September 2025, Eli Lilly announced a $5 billion pharmaceutical manufacturing facility on a 227-acre Markel-owned site on West Creek Parkway, 650 permanent jobs, the largest single investment in county history.[9] Around the park's western edge, the growth machine meets subdivisions: Readers Branch, a 300-plus home community bordering an industrially zoned West Creek parcel; Mosaic at West Creek, a 55-and-over community; the Richmond Country Club. East across Route 288 sits Henrico's Short Pump, close enough that Goochland's land-use choices land in another county's living rooms.

Water and sewer in this corridor run through the Tuckahoe Creek Service District, created in 2002 and funded by a $0.32 ad valorem surtax on real estate within the district. The county's water comes from Henrico under a contract currently providing 5.25 million gallons per day, with ultimate contractual capacity of 25 MGD; wastewater agreements run to Henrico and Richmond.[10] The geography of the arrangement matters: the infrastructure that would supply any data center buildout in the corridor is purchased from the county whose residents showed up to oppose that buildout.

The fiscal motive behind everything that follows is stated plainly in the county's own materials. The board named economic development among its priorities at a January 2024 special meeting, and board chair Tom Winfree has described the goal as a 70/30 split between residential and business revenue.[11][12] Winfree put the logic on the record the night of the adoption vote: "Increasing revenue from commercial sources allows us to meet the future needs of our community without the need to

balance the budget on the backs of the homeowners."[12] Goochland had already placed its bet on the data center sector specifically. In April 2019, with no controversy and little notice, the county created a separate business personal property classification for data center equipment at $0.40 per $100, against $3.75 for ordinary business equipment, "to promote further investment in this market sector."[13] The rate, now $0.44, was the quiet predicate. The overlay was the loud one.

PART TWO: THE INSTRUMENT — LOUISA'S PRECURSOR

The technology overlay district as a Virginia instrument was invented one county to the northwest. In April 2023, Louisa County adopted Ordinance 2023-6 by a 6-1 vote, creating a Technology Overlay District codified at County Code §§ 86-330 through 86-334.[14][15] The district's provisions, including its noise ceiling of 65 dB by day and 60 dB at night, sit at §§ 86-330 through 86-334.[14]

Louisa's design established the template's architecture: an overlay the board can lay over any underlying zoning by ordinance and map amendment, minimum contiguous acreage (125 acres in Louisa), required proximity to 115kV-or-greater transmission, design and buffer standards (200 feet from residential, 300 from agricultural in Louisa's current text), a noise ceiling, and a cap on total district size of one percent of county land.[14] The original 2023 ordinance made data centers a by-right use inside the overlay. The sequence that followed is the part Goochland should have studied hardest. On August 30, 2023, 149 days after adoption, Louisa announced an $11 billion, two-campus Amazon Web Services deal inside the district.[16][17] Resident concern arrived after the commitment, not before. In August 2024 the county retrofitted a conditional use permit requirement onto the district's principal uses (Ordinance 2024-11), and in 2024 it shrank the district's footprint.[14][18] By 2025-2026 the county was fighting over the instrument itself: AWS withdrew a third-campus CUP under neighbor resistance in July 2025, bought roughly 1,925 acres including the same tract for $72.45 million in January 2026, and a unanimous board vote of January 20, 2026 directing the planning commission to consider pulling some 2,600 acres back out of the district stalled when the commission pulled its hearing on February 12 and again on April 9, 2026, with no resolution as of this snapshot.[19][18][17]

Louisa's arc, by-right invitation, anchor commitment, retrofit of discretion, rollback fight, is the template's full life cycle observed once. Goochland adopted the template at the third stage of someone else's cycle while reproducing the first stage's design choice: data centers by right across most of its district. What Goochland added was a financial instrument Louisa never paired with its overlay (the Technology Zone incentives of Part Three), a use category no Virginia locality had zoned for (the small modular reactor provision), and an adoption fight that arrived before the anchor tenant rather than after. The energy geography framework should register the form of the diffusion: what spread from Louisa to Goochland was not a project, a developer, or a parcel of land. It was ordinance text.

PART THREE: THE ORDINANCE — WHAT THE TOD PERMITS AND THE TZ PAYS

The District

The adopted Technology Overlay District spans about five miles of the Route 288 corridor from I-64 south to Patterson Avenue: roughly 4,400 acres total, about 3,500 of them inside West Creek Business Park (controlled by Pruitt Associates), plus a roughly 900-acre western sub-area along Hockett Road, designated TOD West, owned in parts by members of the Haddock, Stern, and Arenstein families.*[20][12] The ordinance package consists of a comprehensive plan amendment (CP-2025-00002) and a zoning ordinance amendment (ZOA-2025-00001) adding Article 27.A, Sections 15-448 through 15-450, to the county code, with siting criteria requiring at least 100 contiguous acres and proximity to 115kV-or-greater transmission.[21] The parallel Technology Zone ordinance (No. 6453) amends Chapter 8, adding Sections 8-100 through 8-106 under the authority of Virginia Code § 58.1-3850.[22]

The Use Table

Inside the overlay, data centers are a by-right use, processed administratively through a conceptual master plan and plan of development, with no public hearing per project. The exception is TOD West, where data centers require a conditional use permit. Because West Creek's 1987 zoning already allowed data centers by right, on the county's account, the sources read for this case study do not size how much land the overlay newly opened to by-right data centers; the adopted ordinance and map are the record (Part Thirteen). Also by right: technology R&D, advanced manufacturing, technology schools and training centers, transmission substations, and energy storage meeting distance and chemistry conditions. Utility generating stations, defined to include natural gas peaking plants and small modular nuclear reactor facilities under 300 megawatts electric, require a conditional use permit anywhere in the district.[21] The SMR provision made Goochland the first Virginia locality to write nuclear generation into a data center zoning instrument, a distinction Cardinal News framed as a test of public acceptance for the technology.[23] Part Six runs that thread to ground; the short version is that the reactor exists in the use table and nowhere else.

Two county-initiated amendments would change this table; as of October 24, 2026, neither had been adopted. On August 24, 2026, the county filed two pre-applications of its own. The first would prohibit data centers outside the Technology Overlay District: "Data centers would be prohibited everywhere else in Goochland." The second would align the ordinance with Va. Code § 15.2-2209.5, effective July 1, 2026, which the county describes as requiring a noise impact study "before a facility

drawing 100 megawatts of power or more can be approved," and would have the board "re-adopt the TOD ordinance uses and standards." The board voted on Tuesday, September 1, 2026, to refer the proposed prohibition to the Planning Commission; WTVR, which reported no tally, noted that the vote was not final approval. On October 6, 2026, the board extended the commission's time, and the commission "now has until January 22, 2027, to consider and provide a recommendation on the proposals." The county's page states: "Nothing is decided yet."[24]

The Data Center Standards

The standards in Section 15-449 are the county's answer to the question every opponent asked: what protects the people already there. Data centers on industrial base zoning must sit at least 300 feet from residentially zoned property, with a 250-foot vegetated buffer where adjacent to non-industrial property; on agricultural base zoning the setback is 500 feet, reducible to 300 by CUP. Noise is capped at 55 dBA and 65 dBC measured at the property line adjacent to residential, with a third-party noise study required at plan of development, again within three months of operations, and on demand up to four times a year. Generator operation is prohibited except for testing (two hours a day, weekdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., on a published schedule) and defined emergencies; generators must be Tier 4 certified low-emission diesel, shielded by a principal building, enclosed, walled, and screened by berms installed before any structures rise. Height is capped at 120 feet, with an 80-foot ceiling adjacent to residential or agricultural property and step-back and sprinkler requirements above 60 feet. Public water and sewer are mandatory. Construction near residential is limited to weekdays, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.[21]

The county's framing of these standards is the strongest version of its case for the whole enterprise: "Prior to the adoption of the TOD, data centers could have located as close as 50-feet to residentially zoned property with very limited buffers and no sound protections. Under the adopted TOD, data centers are now required to be located a minimum of 300-feet with sound, visual, and height protections."[8] The claim is true as far as it goes. West Creek's 1987 zoning, on the county's own account, did allow by-right data centers with minimal buffers, as close as 50 feet to residentially zoned property such as Readers Branch.[8] The opponents' counter, developed across Part Four, is that the county packaged the protections with a vast enlargement of where the entitlement applies, and adopted the package in a way that is now in front of a judge.

How the Standards Table Regionally

Jurisdiction / instrument	Setback from residential	Noise at property line	Generator standard	Approval posture
Goochland TOD (Nov. 2025)	300 ft (500 ft on agric. base)	55 dBA / 65 dBC	Tier 4 diesel, enclosed, bermed, tested 2 hrs/day max	By right (CUP in TOD West)
Louisa TOD §§ 86-330-334 (as amended Aug. 2024)	200 ft buffer (300 ft agric.)	65 dB day / 60 dB night (no weighting stated)	Not specified in district standards	CUP (retrofitted Aug. 2024)
Hanover, Mountain Road proffers (final, May 21, 2026)	300 ft	57 dBA day / 50 dBA night; 73/68 dBC (proffered, not ordinance)	Tier IV, testing 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. weekdays	Case by case; rejected 4-3, May 27, 2026
Chesterfield ZOMod, Sec. 19.2-32 (eff. Jan. 2026)	200 ft from residential or agric. property	60 dBA	Testing 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays	CUP required
Prince William, Sustainability Commission draft recommendations (Mar. 2025)	1,320 ft	Not specified in the draft as tabled	DEQ Tier 4	Draft; the amendment adopted Sept. 22, 2026 keeps by right inside the closed overlay, SUP outside
Loudoun ZOAM-2024-0001 (Mar. 2025)	500 ft	Phase 2 pending at Mar. 2025	Not tabled	SPEX required

Sources: adopted Goochland TOD ordinance; Louisa County Code § 86-332; companion Chesterfield, Hanover and Prince William studies.[21][14][25][26]

Read down the table and Goochland's standards sit in the middle: tighter than Louisa's noise ceiling and than Chesterfield's ZOMod on both noise and setback, looser than the 500 feet in Loudoun's amendment and the 1,320 feet in Prince William's draft recommendations. Read across the last column and Goochland's posture is shared, among these rows, only by Prince William's overlay as amended on September 22, 2026, which keeps by-right development for eligible properties inside a district closed to expansion. Every other jurisdiction in the table attaches its standards to a discretionary act it can still refuse. Goochland attached its standards to an entitlement it has already granted. The standards are the price of

admission the county set; what the county gave up is the power to refuse the admission.

The Technology Zone

The Technology Zone is the overlay's checkbook. For up to ten years, a "qualified technology business" can receive reimbursement of up to 75 percent of building permit fees and up to 100 percent of utility connection fees, paid after investment and job thresholds are verified, with amounts scaled to estimated economic impact. The board may add discretionary incentives by performance agreement. Qualification requires five full-time jobs and $500,000 of capital investment for a new business, two net new jobs and $100,000 for an existing one, with wages at twice the federal minimum.[22] These are fee reimbursements rather than tax abatements; the data center equipment rate of Part Seven is a separate, countywide classification, and the ordinance expressly leaves the Tuckahoe Creek surtax intact. For the distributional justice framework, the structure of the package matters: the incentives flow to firms meeting investment thresholds, the buffers and noise ceilings flow to adjacent residents, and the two groups are not the same people. Who lives along the corridor and who collects the reimbursements is an empirical question Part Twelve leaves open.

The TZ ordinance also contains the adoption story's first procedural footnote: its own public hearing was advertised for October 7, 2025, then deferred by board motion to November 6 "so that this ordinance could be heard in tandem with the Technology Overlay District ordinance."[22] The tandem hearing is why both instruments share a midnight birthday.

PART FOUR: THE ADOPTION

Four Months, Two Town Halls, a Midnight Hearing

The public arc ran 122 days. The county introduced the proposals at a community meeting on July 7, 2025.[8] By early August the reaction had forced a schedule change: County Administrator Jeremy Raley announced that the planning commission hearing set for August 21 would move to September "after hearing public outcry," with opposition concentrated in Readers Branch, where the original draft would have allowed a data center under 80 feet within 50 feet of the subdivision's edge.*[27] A second community meeting on September 8 drew around 700 people.*[28] The county also held two town halls and a circuit of HOA meetings; the town hall dates do not appear in county postings and are a verification item.[8]

The planning commission heard the case over two nights. On September 18, residents again spoke out "in the dozens" during public comment, and the commission voted 4-1 to continue to a second session; on September 25 it voted 3-2 to recommend approval.[21][29] Commissioners Jess McLaughlin, Dwain Cosby, and Curt Pituck voted yes; Amanda Kowalski and Guy Kemmerly voted no, with Kemmerly making the motion that attached four recommended conditions (CUP-only energy generation, a 500-foot setback from residential property for by-right data centers with a CUP required to locate closer, an 80-foot by-right height cap adjacent to residentially zoned property, and decibel limits below the proposed 65 by day and 60 at night) and then voting against the result.*[29] WRIC's headline verb was "narrowly advances."[30] The testimony that night supplied the adoption fight's most quoted lines. A speaker for the Mosaic at West Creek HOA: "We cannot be half community and half an industrial park. We cannot be half a safe haven for families and half a sacrifice zone for economic development." Another resident, reaching for the worst available analogy for the nuclear provision: "We will probably not be known as Chernobyl on the James, but please remember the choice we have."*[28]

On October 20-21 the county posted revised ordinances incorporating the commission's conditions: no by-right energy generation anywhere in the district, no by-right data centers in TOD West, noise lowered to 55 dBA with a new 65 dBC limit, a 500-foot setback (described in the county's news release as applying to data centers on agricultural base zoning, where the commission's condition had named residential property), the 80-foot adjacency cap, mandatory public water, no access through residential streets.[31] Those late-October postings defined the version the public was noticed to hear on November 6. What changed after them is the subject of the lawsuit.

The hearing itself began at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 6, 2025, in the Goochland High School auditorium, and the vote came just after midnight. Roughly

350 residents attended. More than 80 people spoke in opposition over a comment period that BizSense timed at more than four hours and WTVR at three; the discrepancy is noted and the recording is the primary source.[12][32][33] No speaker during the comment period supported the ordinance, by BizSense's account. A FOIA request by resident Stephen Levet had already established that the county received more than 1,000 emails on the proposal, the vast majority opposed.[34][35] Two Henrico supervisors crossed the county line to speak: Jody Rogish of Tuckahoe and Misty Roundtree of Three Chopt, whose districts abut the corridor. Roundtree's appeal to the board ran against type for an elected official addressing a neighboring jurisdiction: "This is a gift that every elected official would want to have... I implore you to not squander that gift."[35]

The Night-Of Changes

Two sets of changes entered the ordinance on the night of the vote. Staff presented amendments described in coverage as small wording changes plus a substantive clarification: where a data center is by-right under base zoning and the property adjoins residential, the TOD standards apply (adopted as Section 15-448.B(3)), along with a weekday limit on construction hours.[12][21] Supervisor Charlie Vaughters then moved floor amendments converting the generator sound-mitigation menu, which the October draft offered as options, into an all-of-the-above mandate for data centers adjacent to residential zoning: shielding by a principal building, enclosure, opaque sound-minimizing walls, berms installed before construction, and Tier 4 certified low-emission diesel units, plus a requirement that data centers on industrial base zoning comply with the enhanced TOD standards.[11][21][31]

Each change tightened the ordinance in residents' favor, which is the county's point. Each change also entered the text after the last published notice, which is the plaintiffs'. District 5 Supervisor Jonathan Lyle reacted in real time: "This is a lot, and please don't take this as criticism, but I would have liked to have seen this before tonight."[12]

The Vote and the Reasons

Lyle moved to defer the decision to the board's regular July 2026 meeting; the motion died without a second. (BizSense reports the deferral target as the board's regular July meeting; VPM quotes Lyle asking to "defer a vote til next year"; the Virginia Mercury characterized it as a one-year delay.) His subsequent amendment to remove TOD West from the district also died without a second. Vaughters moved approval, Neil Spoonhower seconded the TOD motion, Jonathan Christy is recorded as seconding the Technology Zone, and both ordinances passed 4-1.[12][11][22]

Supervisor	District	Vote	Stated position
Charlie Vaughters	4	Yes (moved both)	“With this (TOD), Goochland has a chance to set and follow a higher standard for development.”
Tom Winfree	3 (2025 chair)	Yes	The 70/30 revenue goal; commercial revenue avoids “balanc[ing] the budget on the backs of the homeowners”
Neil Spoonhower	2	Yes (seconded TOD)	Process defense: “If this is back-dooring, it is the worst job of back-dooring a project that I have ever seen”
Jonathan Christy	1 (2026 chair; seconded TZ)	Yes	Individual reasoning not quoted in available coverage; meeting recording is the source
Jonathan Lyle	5	No	“My belief is that we are all working towards the same end, but I’m of the opinion that we could have improved what we’re about to vote on.”

Sources: county news release and recorded vote block in Ordinance 6453; BizSense, VPM, WTVR, NBC12, Virginia Mercury coverage.[11][22][12][35][33][36][32]

Vaughters described the process as the hardest of his tenure and his own posture in it memorably: “I had to take the cotton out of my ears and put it in my mouth during this process — listen, learn and compromise.”[35] Lyle’s no was a process vote, not a substance vote; he has said the TOD “was seen as a tool, not the tool, but a tool, that would help us attract more industry,” and his stated objection was timing: “I think this could be better and I think time would have allowed us to do that.”[32][36] Two record notes: VPM’s photo captions mislabel Lyle as the District 2 supervisor (the article text has District 5 correctly), and the Virginia Mercury renders the chair’s name as “Tim Winfree”; the county’s roster has Thomas.[35][32][37] One more, with some bearing on a lawsuit about notice: the adopted TZ ordinance’s boilerplate recital locates the November 6 meeting “in the Goochland County Administration Building.” The county’s own hearing notice and every news account place it at Goochland High School.[22][31]

The Contract in the Background

The adoption fight ran alongside an unresolved question about what, specifically, the district was for. During the fall, an email from Lyle surfaced through a resident FOIA request asserting that a contract existed between the TOD West landowners and an unnamed developer for an eight-building data center campus of roughly two million square feet, contingent on the land's inclusion in the district, and that other supervisors had received information he had not.*[38] The county's response, on its own FAQ page, confirmed the outline: it "has been made aware of discussions between a private developer and several landowners regarding a contract for a potential data center project on approximately 900+ acres near Mosaic and Richmond Country Club along Hockett Road (TOD West)," adding that it learned of the discussions after they occurred.[39] At the November 6 hearing Lyle pressed the implication: if no data center deal hinged on passage that evening, he was not sure why a deferral was unacceptable.[12] Spoonhower's "worst job of back-dooring" line was the rebuttal.

Seven months later, Tract filed its pre-application for a twelve-building campus on approximately 900 acres of Haddock, Stern, and Arenstein land in TOD West (Part Six). The county never confirmed that the rumored 2025 counterparty was Tract, and this study does not assert it. The acreage, the ownership, and the location match.

The county has since published its own account of its dealings with Tract, on the project page it maintains for the application. It states that in November 2023 the Economic Development Authority and Tract entered into a nondisclosure agreement "concerning Tract's interest in developing a data center campus on property in West Creek," that "This agreement did not involve the Tuckahoe Technology Park site in the TOD West," and that discussions with the county's economic development staff "ceased in April 2024"; that in August 2025 the owners of TOD West "asked to have their property included in the TOD area"; that on November 17, 2025, "After the TOD was adopted, Tract contacted the County with inquiries regarding developing a portion of the TOD West property," after which the county, the EDA, and Tract "entered into a separate NDA concerning that property"; and that "As of June 17, 2026, Tract has released the County and the EDA from both agreements." The county has posted the agreements. The timeline is the county's statement, published while the lawsuit is pending, and it does not identify the developer described in the fall 2025 email.[40]

PART FIVE: THE LAWSUIT

The Complaint

On December 4, 2025, twenty-eight days after adoption and inside the 30-day window Virginia Code § 15.2-2204(E) allows for advertisement-based challenges, four Goochland property owners sued the county, the Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission in Goochland County Circuit Court: Cynthia Haas, Peggy Knisley, Virginia H. Reed, and Gail A. Minnick.[5][41] Haas lives in a community immediately adjacent to land where the district now permits data centers.*[42] Their counsel is Phillip Strother of Strother Law Offices; an informal adviser, Goochland resident and former Maryland lawyer John Gessner, assists.*[43][20] The court file is posted by the county only as a scanned image, and no published source read through October 24, 2026 reports the case number; the pleading-level detail below rests on news accounts and is flagged accordingly.[44]

The complaint as filed pleaded nine counts seeking, principally, a declaration that the TOD and the related comprehensive plan and zoning amendments are null and void, plus legal fees.*[45][5] The reported allegations group into three theories. First, defective advertisement: the required notice was “wholly inadequate” and “confusingly defective,” and residents in and near the district were not properly notified, including a failure to properly identify affected properties.*[20][5] Second, substantive zoning defects: per the complaint as quoted by Virginia Business, “The TOD ordinance contains provisions authorizing certain uses without adequately objective standards, includes internal inconsistencies that fail to provide clear notice to landowners and administrators, and delegates broad discretion to county officials in the review and approval process.”[5] Third, the night-of changes: the adopted version “differed materially” from the version described in the county’s late-October published notices.*[20] Plaintiff Haas, describing the November 6 floor amendments: “Residents were given no advanced notice. Residents spoke at the November 6 meeting and said, ‘You guys can’t pass this tonight.’” She added: “You just added four additional things,” and “It didn’t matter to the county.”[20]

In spring 2026 the plaintiffs voluntarily withdrew Count VIII, which had alleged the adoption was arbitrary and capricious. Strother described the withdrawal as strengthening the case; County Administrator Jeremy Raley said the withdrawal “speaks to the work that the board and staff did.”[43] The strategic reading is worth recording: dropping the arbitrariness count abandons the deferential-review battlefield, where Virginia courts presume legislative validity, and concentrates the case on procedure, where no deference applies. A zoning ordinance adopted without the advertising the statute requires is not owed the benefit of the doubt; under

Glazebrook and the Court of Appeals' 2026 Digital Gateway opinion it is void ab initio.[46][47]

The Legal Predicate

Virginia Code § 15.2-2204 lets a plan or ordinance be advertised by reference, but every such advertisement "shall identify the place or places within the locality where copies of the proposed plans, ordinances or amendments may be examined," and the notice must be published twice, "with the first notice appearing no more than 28 days before and the second notice appearing no less than five days before the date of the meeting referenced in the notice." For a map change involving more than 100 parcels, the advertisement may instead describe the boundaries and link a map. Written notice goes to the owner of each parcel involved and, where 25 or fewer parcels are involved, also to the owners of abutting property and property across the street.[41] The statute once required a "descriptive summary" of the proposed action; the 2023 amendments (2023 Va. Acts chs. 506, 507) removed that requirement and kept the requirement to say where the text may be examined, as the Court of Appeals of Virginia recorded in its March 31, 2026 Digital Gateway opinion.[47] Glazebrook v. Board of Supervisors of Spotsylvania County (2003) voided an ordinance whose advertisement lacked the descriptive summary then required, and the Court of Appeals reads it as having enforced subsection A's advertising requirements "without regard to whether the plaintiffs had actual notice of the hearing."[46][47] The statute contains defenses the county can be expected to invoke: a savings clause for inadvertent failure to give written notice, and a provision under which a party's actual notice of, or active participation in, the proceedings waives that party's challenge for failure to receive the written notice. In the same opinion the Court of Appeals held that this waiver "does not excuse advertising deficiencies under subsection A."[47] How the circuit court applies that holding to the plaintiffs' published-notice and material-change theories is for the demurrer ruling, and this study does not predict it.

The plaintiffs' own template is recent and nearby. Their advertising theory tracks the Prince William Digital Gateway litigation, in which a circuit judge voided that rezoning in August 2025 over advertising non-compliance; the case was on appeal at this snapshot; on July 2, 2026 the QTS acquisition entities withdrew their petition to the Supreme Court of Virginia, and the judgment took full effect. The companion Prince William study treats the case at length.*[5][48] The institutional behavior framework should note what this borrowing means: the process challenge is itself now a replicable instrument, diffusing county to county along the same paths as the overlay.

The Defense and the $250,000

The county's posture is confident. Its 66-page responsive pleading calls the adoption "a model of good government in action" and argues the plaintiffs "generally lack standing as they have failed to allege particularized harm"; a demurrer seeks dismissal outright.[20][5][44] At the February 3, 2026 board meeting, the county allocated $250,000 for outside counsel, Gentry Locke of Roanoke (attorney Michael Finney), atop up to $100,000 in VACo liability coverage. County Attorney Tara McGee's explanation to the board doubles as a datum on small-county capacity: "We don't have the staffing in our office… to handle all elements of defensive litigation."[5] Winfree used the occasion to renew his vote: "I've never been convinced any more than I am today that we made the right decision in this case."[5] The appropriation equals about a quarter of one percent of the general fund. Plaintiff fundraising runs the other way: legal fees paid, per coverage, by donations from roughly 300 residents. Haas: "We've got a David and Goliath situation going on... Little David here is doing everything based on donations."[42][20]

The May 26 Ruling

On Tuesday, May 26, 2026, Judge Timothy K. Sanner heard pretrial motions on what the record in the case would be. (Coverage published May 27 describes the hearing as "Tuesday"; this study dates the ruling to the hearing, May 26, not to the publication date.) The county had moved to admit its full legislative record, roughly 8,500 pages, on the theory that a challenge to a legislative act puts the whole record in play and that the county could not know which documents mattered before seeing the plaintiffs' demurrer opposition. Strother argued the county had failed to identify which documents were essential and should "not be given the opportunity to dump" the volume on the court, citing as an example a Virginia Mercury article dated weeks after the adoption vote that the county had included. Sanner agreed the wholesale filing was excessive, denied admission, and directed a pared-down set germane to the case, with the county free to return after reviewing the plaintiffs' theory.[43][45]

The discipline this study applies elsewhere applies here doubly: the ruling is about the record, not the merits. It establishes no defect in the adoption and voids nothing. What it does establish is tempo. Per the county's own litigation update of May 2026, the modified record was due at the end of June, the plaintiffs' response to the county's challenges was due July 21, additional county records were to follow in late August, and the demurrer was set for argument on October 20, 2026.[8][43] The ordinance operated unreviewed for more than eleven months, from adoption on November 6, 2025 to the first merits-adjacent hearing on October 20, 2026. Haas said she was "pleased" with the result, and the residents said they did not plan to back down.[43]

The October 20 Hearing

On the county's account, that schedule held. The county filed its modified legislative record on June 30, 2026, and both parties filed briefs on the county's demurrer over the summer. Judge Sanner heard the demurrer on Tuesday, October 20, 2026, in a hearing the county describes as lasting almost three hours; the county reports that the plaintiffs dropped further claims at its opening. Per the county, the judge "did not issue a ruling at the hearing" and said he would issue a written opinion, with no timeframe given. No ruling had been reported as of October 24, 2026, in the sources read for this version. Like the May ruling, the hearing establishes no defect in the adoption and voids nothing.[49]

PART SIX: WHAT THE OVERLAY WAS BUILT TO RECEIVE

Tuckahoe Technology Park

The district's first application arrived June 10, 2026, two days before this snapshot, as what the county calls a pre-application. Tract, the Denver land developer whose Mountain Road campus Hanover rejected on May 27 and whose 744-acre Chesterfield proposal died at the commission stage in 2025, filed a pre-application for a conditional use permit for "Tuckahoe Technology Park": nearly 900 acres across thirteen parcels owned by members of the Haddock, Stern, and Arenstein families, under contract to Tract, in TOD West, bordered by Hockett Road, Patterson Avenue, Route 288, and the Mosaic at West Creek neighborhood.[50] Concept plans show seven development areas and twelve data center buildings, most at 60 feet with one area at 80, with 500-foot setbacks where the ordinance requires them. Tract projects $3 billion in construction over 20 years, $400 million in real property tax and more than $600 million in personal property tax over the same horizon, and 350 permanent jobs. Water and sewer would extend from the Tuckahoe Creek Service District along Hockett Road. No megawatt figure appeared in the coverage of the pre-application as of this snapshot.[50]

The filing closes the loop Part Four left open: the rumored 2025 contract described eight buildings and two million square feet on the same land whose inclusion in the district Lyle tried and failed to strip on adoption night. Because the site is TOD West, the application takes the conditional path: a community meeting, a planning commission hearing, a board hearing, the discretionary process the rest of the district no longer requires. The first project under the overlay will therefore be decided the old way, which is an irony the institutional behavior framework should not let pass: the cleanest test of the by-right machinery is postponed precisely because the most controversial land was carved into the conditional sub-area. No hearing dates were public as of this snapshot.

The formal application followed. On August 5, 2026, the county received a formal application for a conditional use permit from VALCO2 Goochland, LLC (Tract), case CU-2026-00014. The county's Completeness Letter #1 of August 20 listed outstanding items, and the county also encouraged the applicant, "While not required for a complete application," to provide further documentation, including a health impact assessment, an environmental impact analysis, air quality impact, a decommissioning plan, a monitoring plan for the end user, clarification of its financial modeling, and a plan for managing construction traffic. The county's project page, in an update dated September 1, 2026, describes "a campus-style development with seven (7) development areas on 871 acres in the Technology Overlay District." The county's page, as read on October 24, 2026, states no

megawatt figure; Richmond BizSense, reporting the formal filing, wrote that "According to filings, the 900-megawatt campus would be developed over several years," on a site of 11 parcels, against the thirteen reported in June. As of October 24, 2026, the county's project page listed no Planning Commission or Board hearing date, and the application did not appear on the Planning Commission's posted agenda for October 26, 2026, although BizSense had reported in August that the commission could consider it "at its October meeting at the earliest." The county states that "The CUP process generally takes 90 to 120 days."[51]

Tract was rejected in Hanover on May 27 and filed its pre-application in Goochland on June 10, fourteen days later. The companion Hanover study closes by asking where a post-rejection developer goes; this is the answer, observed in under three weeks, and it is the energy geography framework's diffusion hypothesis compressed to a single firm's quarter: pressure does not dissipate when refused, it relocates to the nearest jurisdiction whose framework is already open.

The SMR Thread, Run to Ground

The September 2025 broadcast coverage of residents alarmed by "a proposed data center and nuclear reactor development" requires careful unwinding, because the alarm was real and the proposal was not.[52] What happened: the draft ordinance was amended during the summer to add three use definitions, small modular nuclear reactor facility, natural gas peaking plant, and utility generating station, to serve projected data center power demand. There is no SMR proposal, proponent, applicant, or site attached to any Goochland campus. The county's FAQ states the district "does not authorize or approve the construction or installation of a small modular reactor," and any actual reactor would face NRC and DEQ review on top of the CUP the ordinance requires.[39] The county administrator's only siting comment was hypothetical, pointing north of I-64 toward the landfill and quarry.*[53] Dominion's actual SMR activity sits at North Anna in Louisa County, with an Amazon partnership targeting nuclear capacity there; no Dominion filing or statement connects any reactor to Goochland.[54] The companion Hanover study reports the Dominion IRP's roughly 1.3 GW of SMR capacity through the late 2030s; that figure is a system-wide planning number, not a Goochland commitment.[55]

What Goochland actually did was zone for a reactor before anyone asked for one, which is the overlay's logic carried to its limit: pre-entitlement extended from the demand side of the data center economy to the supply side. The series has tabled co-located generation as a coming issue since the Google-CFS report; Goochland is the first jurisdiction in the portfolio to write it into land-use law, and the first whose residents organized against a power plant that exists only as a definition. "Chernobyl

on the James” was rhetoric. The use category that provoked it is real, adopted, and waiting.

The Corridor’s Other Transactions

The land record around the district shows steady institutional movement without a speculative wave. The dominant land-control event is Tract’s purchase contract itself, unrecorded and unpriced in public sources. Recorded transactions bracket it: HCA sold its long-closed West Creek emergency center on about 57 acres for $11 million in late September 2025 to an entity tied to Richmond developer Rob Chesson; Summit Real Estate Group and Loci Capital bought 23 acres in West Creek from Brandywine Realty Trust for $4.6 million in October 2025 and broke ground in January 2026 on a 221,000-square-foot speculative industrial building; Eli Lilly’s $5 billion facility, announced September 16, 2025, anchors the corridor’s non-data-center future.[56][57][9] A December 2024 rezoning involving the TOD West families’ land, approved over neighbors’ objections that it landlocked them, now reads as pre-assembly.*[58] BizSense’s DeedBook transfer lists sit behind a paywall, and a fuller transaction sweep is a Part Thirteen item.

PART SEVEN: THE FISCAL ARCHITECTURE

The Rate Nobody Repriced

Goochland taxes data center equipment at $0.44 per $100 of assessed value, against $3.75 for general business personal property: an 88 percent discount, re-adopted in the county's CY2026 rate resolution on April 14, 2026.[59][60] The county's economic development arm markets an effective rate of $0.24 after depreciation schedules.[61] The classification dates to April 2019, when the rate was set at $0.40; the move to $0.44 is undated in available sources.[13]

The regional table makes the posture legible. Rates per $100 of assessed value on data center equipment, as of this snapshot, with Hanover's June 24, 2026 vote added:

Locality	Rate	Direction
Fairfax	$4.57 (general BTPP)	Stable
Prince William	$4.50	Raised (from $4.15, FY2027)
Loudoun	$4.15 (general PP)	Stable
New Kent	$3.75 (general TPP; no DC class)	No class
Caroline	$3.50 (BPP/M&T; technology zone rebates apply)	No separate class
Henrico	$2.60	Raised (from $0.40, 2025)
Orange	$1.25	Stable
Spotsylvania	$1.25	SUP reform pending
Louisa	$1.25 (data center equipment class since Sept. 2023; general business PP $1.90)	Unchanged in FY2027 levies
Hanover	$0.45 (set by calendar-year resolution; not carried in the April 8 FY2027 budget); existing rate kept for one calendar year on June 24, 2026, after a proposed rate of up to $3.00; question referred to committee for FY2028	Increase weighed; rate kept
Goochland	$0.44 ($0.24 marketed effective)	Stable
Chesterfield	$0.24 (classification rate since 2019; 30-year locks in 2025 agreements)	Contracted

Sources: county rate schedules and budget coverage; see endnote for the full citation set. Henrico's official revenue page still displays the superseded $0.40 rate and conflicts with current reporting; the Hanover vote came twelve days after this snapshot.[62][63]

Hanover's existing $0.45 rate dates to 2023. On June 24, 2026, its board adopted $0.45 for calendar year 2026, 7-0, and referred the rate to its Finance Committee for the FY2028 budget process, as the companion Hanover study records from the adopted minutes.[55][63]

The table's shape is the finding. Of the jurisdictions in the table that recruited with a low rate, two repriced upward after seeing the industry up close: Henrico multiplied its rate six and a half times, and Prince William raised twice in two years. Hanover, which sets the rate by calendar-year resolution, left it out of its April 8 budget, advertised a hearing at up to $3.00, and then on June 24, 2026, after this snapshot, kept its existing $0.45 rate for one calendar year and sent the question to committee.[55] Goochland, holding the region's second-cheapest rate, re-adopted it unchanged five months after adopting an overlay of 4,400 acres, and its FY2027 budget as proposed in February 2026 booked essentially no revenue from the district: the personal property and business equipment line is flat at $21.4 million.[64] The utility finance framework gets a clean statement of the pricing-before-buildout problem the Hanover study poses, answered the opposite way. At this snapshot Hanover was using the pre-construction window to weigh raising its price, with a rate of up to $3.00 set for its June 24 hearing.[63] Goochland created its class in 2019 at $0.40, moved it to $0.44 at a date the sources read do not give, built the entitlement around it in 2025, and re-adopted $0.44 in April 2026. If Tract's $600 million twenty-year personal property projection assumes the current rate, it assumes $0.44; each penny of rate the county forgoes before equipment arrives is a penny contractually harder to recover after, as Chesterfield's 30-year locks demonstrate in the companion study.

The Expenditure Side of the Ledger

The county's own ledger around the district, FY2026 to date: $250,000 appropriated to defend the adoption lawsuit (February 3, 2026); a separate $250,000 earmarked in April 2026 to oppose the Valley Link 765kV-class transmission project crossing the county, which is unrelated to the TOD and should not be conflated with the defense money; and the staff cost, uncounted in any line item, of producing an 8,500-page legislative record, a months-long FOIA stream, and a litigation calendar running into 2027.[5][65] Half a million dollars in legal appropriations, half of it for the defense and half for the unrelated Valley Link fight, against no data center revenue line in the FY2027 budget as proposed, is the current arithmetic of the bet.

PART EIGHT: WATER AND POWER

Water

The district's water architecture is contractual and cross-boundary. The Tuckahoe Creek Service District buys from Henrico: 5.25 MGD under current contract, 25 MGD at ultimate contractual capacity, with wastewater agreements to Henrico and Richmond and some 462,000 gallons per day of legacy private reservations inside the district, Capital One's 150,000 GPD the largest.[10] The TOD makes public water and sewer mandatory for data centers and the FAQ assigns connection and upgrade costs to developers.[8][66] Tract's application proposes extending TCSD lines along Hockett Road.[50] The FY2027 capital budget carries a $16.95 million bond-funded booster pump station in the eastern county; no county document ties it to the district explicitly, and the linkage is a verification item.[64]

No published analysis located for this study, as of this snapshot, models district buildout demand against the Henrico contract's headroom. The comparison the record invites: Hanover's board rejected a single 900 MW campus with water in all four supervisors' stated rationales, after staff put the campus at about 90 percent of the Elmont pressure zone's capacity at peak demand, in a 24.7 MGD system of which 20.7 MGD is contract water from Richmond and Henrico.[55] Goochland's overlay covers roughly ten times that campus's acreage, on water it buys from the neighbor whose residents opposed the district at the podium. The dependency cuts both ways and neither county has published what it means. For the infrastructure framework, the unanswered question is the same one Hanover's majority asked and Goochland's majority did not: what does peak day look like at buildout, and who bears it.

Power

Dominion moved before the first application did. In November 2025, the month of adoption, Dominion announced the West Creek project: a new substation and a new double-circuit 230kV transmission line "to ease the load on the local distribution network serving Goochland and Henrico counties and to support recently announced development projects." The community meeting came December 4, 2025; the SCC application was filed January 28, 2026, as Case No. PUR-2026-00009; public comment closed June 9; hearings are set for June 16, four days after this snapshot.[67] The case's filings named both Eli Lilly and the Technology Overlay District, on the Chief Hearing Examiner's account of them. His report of July 14, 2026 states that Dominion's application of January 28, 2026 proposed the new substation "on land provided by Eli Lilly" (Ex. 2 at 2-3) and that its appendix carried "Eli Lilly's delivery point request" for 37 MW of projected load (Ex. 2, Appendix, at 13-14); that Dominion's routing study "identified Goochland County's Technology

Overlay District in addition to the Technology Overlay District West" (Ex. 4, Appendix B, Figure 3.1-3); and that the Staff Report of May 15, 2026 discussed "the projected load associated with Eli Lilly's planned manufacturing facility" and identified "the Technology Overlay District and Technology Zone approved in the area" (Ex. 24 at 4-5). The exhibits themselves were not read for this version. The "recently announced development projects" formulation covers Eli Lilly, whom the application names, as well as any data center demand.[68] The SCC approved a comparable Dominion line for Chesterfield data center load in February 2026, so the regional pattern of transmission following entitlement is established.[69]

The case has since been decided and appealed. The evidentiary hearing went ahead on June 16, 2026 before the Commission's Chief Hearing Examiner, whose report followed on July 14. On September 10, 2026, the Commission entered a Final Order adopting the report's findings and recommendations and authorizing Dominion "to construct and operate the Project as proposed in its Application": a double-circuit 230 kV line of "approximately 6.5 miles" on the Proposed Route, Route 3, and a new substation "on land provided by Eli Lilly," at an estimated cost of "approximately $97.5 million (in 2025 dollars)." The order recites that Dominion proposed the project "to serve the projected load identified in the delivery point request of approximately 37 megawatts for a new manufacturing facility and new warehouses in Goochland County, Virginia, as well as to support future load growth in the Goochland Load Area," and adopts the examiner's finding that the project "is needed to provide electric service to Eli Lilly, while also maintaining and ensuring system reliability more broadly in the Goochland Load Area." It issued Certificate No. ET-DEV-GOO-2026-A and provides that the project "must be constructed and in service by July 26, 2028," with a certificate sunset date of July 26, 2029. On October 9, 2026, Asgard Broad Street Properties I LLC, a participant that had opposed Route 3 for the line's northern segment, filed a notice of appeal to the Supreme Court of Virginia from the Final Order, and the Commission's docket listed the case as "Under Appeal" when read on October 24, 2026. A notice of appeal is not a ruling. No petition for appeal, briefing schedule, or stay appears in the record read for this version.[70]

The record had described data center load before this snapshot. Dominion's rebuttal testimony of Dominic J. Minor, filed May 29, 2026 and admitted at the June 16 hearing as Exhibit 38, answered Commission Staff's preference for Alternative Route 5, which Staff had based in part on the lack of a firm commitment for data center development at the West Creek Industrial site. Minor testified that Dominion had issued an Engineering Study Letter of Authorization (ELOA) for "a proposed 200 MW development which will require the construction of a new substation," and that "The customer is currently reviewing the ELOA for final execution"; that "Another

customer has executed four (4) ELOAs totaling 1200 MW, which will require the construction of four (4) new substations”; and that “Another customer has executed three (3) ELOAs totaling 900 MW, which will require construction of three (3) new substations.” He added that “Route 3 crosses parcels associated with the 1200 MW development, 200 MW development, and 900 MW development,” and that this “ability to serve future load makes Route 3 more preferable.” The exhibit’s public version, as read for this version, names no customer. An ELOA is a Dominion engineering-study authorization, not a county application or a load commitment, and Staff had found the developer’s load letter not “sufficient to establish a binding commitment for data center development at the West Creek Industrial site.” The Richmond Times-Dispatch reported the testimony on August 6, 2026, with a county spokesperson’s statement that the county knew of the 1,200 MW and 200 MW requests only through the testimony in the SCC proceeding and that the only data center project the county had received was the Tuckahoe Technology Park pre-application.[71]

Above the distribution layer, the county is fighting the same buildout it is courting. Goochland passed a resolution in April 2026 opposing Valley Link’s 115-mile transmission line across the county, a project Richmond BizSense reported at $1 billion, and put $250,000 behind the opposition.[65] The juxtaposition is the energy geography framework’s to savor: a county zoned for gigawatt-class load, resisting the interregional wires that gigawatt-class load summons, while funding both positions from the same general fund.

PART NINE: THE OPPOSITION ACROSS THE LINE

Who Organized

The opposition's institutional form is the Goochland Residents Alliance, which hosted the final pre-vote town hall on November 3, 2025 at Discovery United Methodist Church, drawing residents from Goochland, Henrico, and Hanover, with the Sierra Club Virginia chapter's communications director, Tim Cywinski, presenting on noise, diesel generators, and environmental impacts.[34] The neighborhood base was the corridor's HOAs: Readers Branch, whose 50-foot exposure under the original draft started the August backlash, and Mosaic at West Creek, whose designated speaker delivered the "sacrifice zone" line.[27][28] Stephen Levet ran the FOIA campaign that put the 1,000-email opposition record into the public domain.[34][35] The litigation is the same constituency by other means: the four plaintiffs are corridor-area property owners, the donor base is reported at roughly 300 residents, and Gessner, the informal counsel, frames the stakes in movement terms: "We're in it to win it."[20][42] Of the statewide network, only the Sierra Club, a Data Center Reform Coalition member, appears directly in the Goochland record read for this study as of this snapshot; the Piedmont Environmental Council's coalition lists no Goochland member group as of this snapshot, and the Alliance's relationship to the coalition is an open item (Part Thirteen).[72]

The Cross-Boundary Pattern, Named

Goochland is the third case in this series in which organized opposition crossed a county line, and the pattern now deserves its own statement. In Hanover, the Wyndham community on the Henrico side organized against Hunting Hawk, the same constituency whose resistance had driven Henrico's reforms. In Orange, the opposition drew on Spotsylvania-adjacent networks seasoned by that county's fights. In Goochland, Henrico residents and two sitting Henrico supervisors opposed an ordinance they had no vote on, in a county whose water their county supplies. The pattern: data center burdens propagate along corridors and watersheds, but representation stops at the county line, so the people most practiced in opposing a land use are persistently the people with no franchise over the next decision about it. Roundtree and Rogish could speak at Goochland's podium; their constituents could not vote at Goochland's election. The distributional justice framework should treat this as a structural feature of Virginia's county-by-county land use regime, not an accident of this case: the overlay's benefits are jurisdictionally captured, the externalities are not, and the mismatch widens with every cross-boundary instrument the template's diffusion produces.

The Henrico side of the line also supplies the counterfactual the opposition kept pointing at. Henrico spent June 2025 adopting the inverse instrument: provisional use permits for new stand-alone data centers countywide, 500-foot residential setbacks, and a White Oak overlay concentrating the industry in Varina, reform adopted after its entitlements were granted, as the companion Henrico study documents at length.[73] Roundtree's "gift" framing at the November 6 hearing was an argument from regret: Goochland still possessed the discretion Henrico had to claw back, and the overlay would spend it.

PART TEN: THE REPLICATION — NEW KENT AND THE DIFFUSION OF INSTRUMENTS

New Kent County, two counties east, presented a draft technology overlay district of its own while Goochland's was three months old and in litigation. The chronology: the board commissioned a Dewberry site-suitability study in April 2025; staff visited Louisa and Culpeper in January 2026; the director of community development presented a draft to the planning commission on February 17, 2026, and to the board a week later; BizSense's headline writer supplied the lineage explicitly, "Following Goochland's lead."[74][75] The draft covers roughly 1,800 gross acres along the Route 33 corridor at Eltham Road, 1.3 percent of county land, most of it owned by an entity tied to Jonathan Kinney.[74]

The design choices read as a markup of Goochland's experience. No SMR or peaker-plant category at all; energy generation requires a full conditional use permit. Lower height cap (85 feet including rooftop equipment), 200-foot setbacks from residential and agricultural, noise at 65/60 dBA, generator testing 9 to 5 weekdays, mandatory water-use analysis with each submittal. And on the decisive question of discretion, a hybrid: data centers would proceed by "administrative conditional use permit," no public hearing per project, Goochland's by-right machinery wearing a CUP label. Commissioner Patricia Townsend caught the substance at the February presentation, asking the staff director to confirm that once adopted, developers "would never come back to the planning commission." The answer was yes.[76]

Staff framing leaned protective: "a proactive approach to set standards... we're not doing it to cater to them, we're doing it to protect ourselves."[74] The February timeline contemplated community meetings from March, a commission hearing in May or June, and a board vote in June or July. As of this snapshot the county's planning page still labels the instrument a draft and no hearing is scheduled; the schedule has slipped, and whether the Goochland litigation caused the slip is unestablished in any source read at this snapshot. The circumstantial reading is available either way, and Part Thirteen lists it as an open item rather than resolving it here.[75]

After this snapshot the draft stopped. At its meeting of Monday, July 13, 2026, the New Kent Board of Supervisors declared that the proposed 1,800-acre district "should not proceed in its current form" and directed county staff and the planning commission to discontinue work on it; no source read reports a tally for that action. The same night the board approved, 3-2, a rezoning of about 343 acres for The Curtis Group's Eltham Business Park, and directed staff to draft a data center ordinance with "strict performance standards." On Tuesday, September 29, 2026, at a work session, the board rejected Resolution R-41-26, which would have initiated a zoning

ordinance amendment imposing a two-year moratorium on data centers: polled, Supervisors Evelyn, Moyer and Pearson voted nay and Supervisors Stiers and Stewart aye. The same session reviewed draft data center performance standards, and the county's community development director said public hearings on the ordinance should wait until February at the earliest. Richmond BizSense's account of the July decision does not mention Goochland, and whether the Goochland litigation bore on that decision is unestablished in the sources read through October 24, 2026.[77]

As of this snapshot the lineage is three iterations long and the mutation pattern is legible. Louisa invented the form and learned its costs: by-right entitlement produced an anchor tenant, then a backlash, then a retrofitted CUP and a rollback fight that continues. Goochland copied the by-right core, added money (the Technology Zone) and generation (the SMR category), compressed adoption into four months, and bought a process lawsuit. New Kent copied the pre-zoning strategy while deleting every feature that made Goochland's version combustible: no nuclear, lower noise, slower process, hearing-free approval renamed rather than removed. Each county metabolized its predecessor's controversy as design input. That is diffusion with learning, and the energy geography framework should treat the ordinance lineage the way it treats project lineages: the instrument is the organism and litigation is the selection pressure. What no iteration has yet faced is the test Goochland's lawsuit poses to the genus: whether the form's defining move, wholesale pre-entitlement, can survive the procedural scrutiny that project-by-project decisions rarely attract at this intensity.

PART ELEVEN: REGIONAL CONTEXT — THE FIFTH POSITION

The series' institutional spectrum, as of this snapshot. Henrico reformed after entitling: by-right growth to eight million grandfathered square feet, then PUPs, setbacks, and a sixfold rate increase that the already-entitled pipeline largely escapes. Hanover refused case by case: one campus approved, two refused, leverage husbanded, an increase in the price of entry weighed before any facility operates (on June 24, 2026, after this snapshot, it kept $0.45 and referred the question to committee). Chesterfield contracted its leverage away: conditional use requirements on paper, 30-year rate locks in practice. Prince William's governance was captured and corrected: the revolving door, the Digital Gateway voiding, the $4.50 rate, the standardized proffer architecture built from the wreckage. Goochland pre-entitled by ordinance: the decision Henrico, Hanover, and Chesterfield now keep project by project, Goochland made once, wholesale, in advance, and the citizens' counter-instrument was not a board campaign but a courtroom.[55][73]

Two features distinguish the fifth position. First, the locus of the citizens' check moved. In Henrico and Hanover, opposition worked through the land-use process itself: hearings, elections, applications denied or withdrawn. In Goochland the land-use process was completed in a single night, so opposition moved to the only forum left, and the operative question changed from "should this be approved" to "was this lawfully adopted." Process litigation is slower, more technical, and harder to mobilize around than a rezoning fight, and it runs on a docket clock while the entitlement runs on an administrative one. At this snapshot the Tuckahoe Technology Park application was set to complete its community meeting and possibly its hearings while the demurrer was still pending; as of October 24, 2026, the demurrer had been argued and the application had no hearing date. If the plaintiffs ultimately prevail, the county will face the question Prince William faced after the Digital Gateway voiding: what happens to approvals issued under an ordinance later held void. If the county prevails, the template is validated at its most aggressive setting and New Kent's caution becomes optional. Either outcome instructs the next county more than anything in the ordinance text.

Second, the diffusion now runs through instruments rather than projects. The Hanover study (v2.0, June 2026) closed by predicting development pressure would relocate toward "Louisa, Charles City, New Kent, Goochland, and the next ring of counties where the framework is still permissive and the opposition is not yet organized." Half of that sentence has aged well: Tract's fourteen-day pivot from Hanover rejection to Goochland filing is pressure relocating in real time. The other half this study corrects: by the Hanover study's own June 12, 2026 snapshot date,

Goochland’s framework was seven months past permissive-by-default (it was permissive by adopted design), and its opposition had been organized for nearly a year, with four plaintiffs, a donor base, and a hearing date. The frontier turns out to be territory whose organization arrives simultaneously with the instrument, both of them imported, both of them improving with each iteration.

PART TWELVE: READINGS BY RESEARCH SPECIALTY

The Institutional Behavior Reading

Goochland offers the portfolio's cleanest natural experiment on the question of whether pre-entitlement by ordinance outruns democratic and judicial checks. The chronology is the evidence: adoption November 6, 2025; suit December 4; first pre-application June 10, 2026, and formal application August 5; first merits-adjacent hearing October 20, 2026, with no ruling reported as of October 24; no project hearing date set as of that date, and the application's review proceeding throughout. The richest artifacts are the night-of amendments (each one resident-protective, each one post-notice, the tightening and the alleged defect being the same act); the tandem-hearing deferral that gave both ordinances a single midnight vote; the died-without-a-second pattern around Lyle's motions, which isolates where deferral failed; and the county's litigation-confidence posture ("a model of good government in action") set against its capacity admission ("we don't have the staffing"). The 122-day adoption arc against the sixteen months Louisa took to retrofit a conditional use permit onto its district (April 2023 to August 2024) measures how much faster the second iteration of an instrument moves than the first.

The Distributional Justice Reading

The corridor's burden-bearers are identifiable: Readers Branch (300+ homes, 50 feet from entitled land under the pre-TOD rules), Mosaic at West Creek (a 55+ community bordering an application of roughly 900 acres at this snapshot, 871 acres in the county's September 2026 description), and the Hockett Road edge. The benefit side is the county general fund and the Technology Zone's qualifying firms. The structural finding is the franchise mismatch of Part Nine: the opposition was partly extraterritorial, Henrico residents and officials with no vote over the board that decided, and the watershed and viewshed do not respect the line that the ballot does. Unlike Henrico's Varina record, no racial siting pattern is visible in the available demographics, and unlike Hanover's Tract 3202, no income disparity has been established for the corridor; the tract-level analysis has not been done for this study and is listed in Part Thirteen rather than asserted. What is already established is procedural: the accounts of the adoption report 1,000-plus emails, most of them opposed, more than 80 speakers in opposition and, by BizSense's account, no speaker in favor, and the instrument passed 4-1. Whatever the corridor's demographics turn out to be, the decision-to-consent ratio is already a finding.

The Utility Finance Reading

Three mechanisms. First, the unrepriced rate: a class created in 2019 at $0.40, now $0.44 and re-adopted unchanged in April 2026, second-cheapest in the region, while

Henrico and Prince William repriced upward and Hanover weighed an increase; Tract's projection of more than $600 million in personal property tax over twenty years does not state, in the coverage read for this case study, the rate it assumes. Second, the incentive stack: TZ fee reimbursements up to 100 percent on top of the equipment discount on top of the state sales tax exemption documented in the companion statewide report, a triple subsidy whose fiscal side rests, in the coverage read for this case study, on Tract's $600 million personal property figure; the applicant's tax model posted by the county was not read. Third, the expenditure side: $250,000 to defend the adoption, beside a separate $250,000 against Valley Link, against no data center revenue line in the FY2027 budget as proposed, the litigation cost of pre-entitlement being a category the instrument's fiscal advocates never priced. The Dominion West Creek SCC file (PUR-2026-00009) and the GS-5 rate class treated in the companion Hanover study connect the county ledger to the ratepayer one.

The Energy, Labor, and Infrastructure Reading

The infrastructure record is thinner than Hanover's because no project has been decided, which is itself the point: the entitlement preceded the engineering. As of this snapshot, no published analysis located for this study modeled district buildout against the 5.25/25 MGD Henrico water contract, and no MW figure appeared in the first application's coverage (a 900 MW figure has since appeared in press accounts of the formal application; Part Six); the transmission response (a 230kV line and substation) was announced the month of adoption, before any data center application had been filed with the county; Dominion's application to the Commission, filed January 28, 2026, carried Eli Lilly's delivery point request (Part Eight). The Commission's September 10, 2026 final order adopts a finding that the line is needed to serve Eli Lilly and system reliability in the Goochland Load Area; the data center load in the case record is described in Part Eight. The labor evidence at this stage is projection-only: Tract's projected 350 permanent jobs on roughly 900 acres (June 2026 coverage), against the Eli Lilly comparator next door (650 permanent jobs on 227 acres) and JLARC's December 2024 finding, as the companion Hanover study records it, of roughly 25 to 50 permanent jobs per data center building.[55] The construction-versus-permanent employment structure documented in the Hanover Tyson comparison will become testable here when hearings produce project-level commitments.

The Energy Geography Reading

Two diffusion processes, now distinguishable. Projects relocate: Tract, whose Chesterfield proposal died at the commission stage and whose Hanover campus the board refused, filed a pre-application in Goochland within a fortnight of the Hanover

vote. Instruments replicate: Louisa to Goochland to New Kent, each iteration faster to draft and more defensive in design, the ordinance text itself the diffusing object (as of this snapshot; Part Ten records New Kent's July 13, 2026 decision). The SMR category is the frontier observation: co-located generation entering land-use law ahead of any generation proposal, the energy system's supply side beginning to pre-position in zoning code the way its demand side did a decade ago in Loudoun. The Valley Link fight adds the interregional layer: the county simultaneously courts terminal load and resists through-wires, a posture only coherent at the county scale and incoherent at the grid scale, which is precisely the scale mismatch the framework studies.

PART THIRTEEN: GAPS IN THE RECORD

Each item below is an open documentary question with an address. Items marked with an asterisk correspond to asterisk-flagged claims in the body that rest on secondary sources.

Status of Pending Matters

Status as of October 24, 2026.

The demurrer. Argued October 20, 2026 before Judge Timothy K. Sanner, who said he would issue a written opinion; the county reports no timeframe was given, and no ruling had been reported. Primary sources: the opinion and order when they issue, and the clerk's file (Goochland Circuit Court).

The record sequence. The county filed its modified legislative record on June 30, 2026, and both parties filed briefs on the demurrer during the summer, on the county's account. The filings themselves are acquisition targets from the clerk's file.

The Tuckahoe Technology Park process. Formal application CU-2026-00014 received August 5, 2026; Completeness Letter #1 issued August 20; no Planning Commission or Board hearing date posted. The hearings, when set, are the first occasion for project-level water, power, and employment numbers on the county's record. Sources: the county's project page (goochlandva.us/1480) and posted agendas.

The county's two ordinance amendments. Data centers confined to the TOD; the TOD's uses and standards re-adopted. The Planning Commission's recommendation is due by January 22, 2027; no hearing dates were posted (goochlandva.us/1490).

Hanover and New Kent. Hanover kept its $0.45 rate for calendar year 2026 on June 24, 2026 and referred the rate to its Finance Committee for FY2028 (Part Seven). New Kent's board stopped its draft overlay on July 13, 2026 and rejected a two-year moratorium on September 29, 2026; an ordinance was being drafted, and the county's community development director said public hearings on it should wait until February 2027 at the earliest (Part Ten).

The Dominion West Creek case (PUR-2026-00009). Final Order entered September 10, 2026; notice of appeal to the Supreme Court of Virginia filed October 9, 2026 by Asgard Broad Street Properties I LLC (Part Eight). Open: any petition for appeal, record certification, or stay; and Dominion's application, routing study and Staff Report themselves, which this version reads only through the Chief Hearing Examiner's account of them (Part Eight). Source: the Commission's docket (scc.virginia.gov/docketsearch, case 146726).

Primary-Source Verification Priorities

*The complaint and all pleadings. The county posts the complaint as a non-searchable scan; the nine-count structure, the statutory citations pleaded, and the specific advertised-versus-adopted changes alleged are reported here only through news coverage. Obtain the file from the Goochland Circuit Court clerk, including the case number, which no published source read through October 24, 2026 reports.

*The rejected 8,500-page record's index and the pared-down set. The index alone would map the county's own theory of its adoption record; the difference between the two filings will show what the county itself treats as essential.

*The ordinance adoption file: the published advertisements themselves (the heart of the Glazebrook question), staff reports, and redlines between the October 20 posted version and the adopted version. The county's own news flashes describe the night-of amendments; the redline would establish them character by character.

*The hearing recordings. The November 6 meeting (available on the county's YouTube channel) is prime ethnographic material: six hours, 80-plus speakers, the night-of amendments presented live, each supervisor's full reasoning including Christy's, which print coverage never captured. The September 18 and 25 commission sessions likewise.

*The two town hall dates and records, confirmed by the county but undated in any posting.

*TZ incentive agreements, if any yet exist, and any performance agreements under Section 8-104(3).

*Corridor land records: the Tract contract terms if recorded at closing, the DeedBook series behind BizSense's paywall, and the December 2024 rezoning file for the TOD West parcels.

*The Glazebrook opinion itself, described here through the Court of Appeals' 2026 opinion; pull 266 Va. 550 directly.

*The Lyle email and the FOIA production around it, reported by an advocacy site; obtain the documents themselves.

*The $250,000 appropriation vote tally, unreported in coverage; board minutes, February 3, 2026.

*The model behind Tract's $600 million personal property projection: the applicant's tax model posted with the CUP application on the county's project page (goochlandva.us/1480).

*Henrico’s current data center rate as applied: the official revenue page still shows $0.40 against reporting of $2.60; the adopted Henrico FY2026 ordinance settles it.

Data Gaps

Corridor demographics. No tract-level income or race analysis of the TOD-adjacent population has been done; ACS tables for the Centerville/West Creek tracts would put the distributional reading on the same footing as Henrico’s and Hanover’s.

The water arithmetic. District buildout demand against the Henrico contract: no document located for this study models it. The 16.95 million dollar booster pump station’s relationship to the TOD. TCSD reserved-capacity accounting.

The overlay’s new entitlement. The adopted TOD ordinance and map (goochlandva.us DocumentCenter), to size how much land outside West Creek’s 1987 zoning and TOD West the overlay opened to by-right data centers.

Institutional capacity baseline. Total county FTEs, planning department staffing, and the administrative load of CMP/POD review at buildout; McGee’s staffing admission suggests the comparison to Orange’s thin-staff record will be direct.

The Alliance and the coalition. Whether the Goochland Residents Alliance has formal ties to the Data Center Reform Coalition; its membership, funding, and relationship to the plaintiffs.

New Kent’s stop. The New Kent Board of Supervisors’ record for July 13, 2026 (newkent-va.us Agenda Center): the tally on the overlay directive, and whether it ties that decision to the Goochland litigation. The September 29, 2026 action agenda, packet and meeting video do not mention Goochland.

The end users. Tract’s model leaves operators unidentified at entitlement, in Goochland as in Hanover. Who would operate the campus’s roughly twelve buildings is not identified in the public record read through October 24, 2026.

APPENDIX: TIMELINE OF TURNING POINTS, 2019–2026

Date	Event
Apr. 2019	County creates $0.40 data center equipment rate (now $0.44, 88% below the $3.75 general rate)
Apr. 3, 2023	Louisa adopts Virginia's first Technology Overlay District (Ord. 2023-6, 6-1)
Jan. 2024	Board special meeting sets tax-base diversification priority; 70/30 revenue goal
Aug. 5, 2024	Louisa retrofits CUP requirement onto TOD uses (Ord. 2024-11)
Dec. 2024	Board approves West Creek-area rezoning of TOD West families' parcels over neighbors' objections
Jul. 7, 2025	Goochland TOD/TZ introduced at first community meeting
Aug. 2025	Planning commission hearing postponed "after hearing public outcry"; Readers Branch 50-foot exposure reported
Sep. 8, 2025	Second community meeting; ~700 attend; data-center-and-nuclear alarm peaks
Sep. 16, 2025	Eli Lilly announces $5B West Creek facility
Sep. 18 / 25, 2025	Planning commission hearings; continued 4-1, then 3-2 recommendation with four conditions
Oct. 7, 2025	TZ hearing deferred to be heard in tandem with TOD
Oct. 20-21, 2025	Revised ordinances posted; the last published version before adoption
Nov. 3, 2025	Goochland Residents Alliance town hall; Sierra Club presents; three counties' residents attend
Nov. 6, 2025	Board adopts TOD and TZ 4-1 just after midnight; floor amendments adopted same night; ~350 attend, 80+ speak in opposition, none in favor by BizSense's account
Nov. 2025	Dominion announces West Creek 230kV line and substation
Dec. 4, 2025	Haas, Knisley, Reed, and Minnick sue (day 28 of the 30-day window); Dominion community meeting same day
Jan. 28, 2026	Dominion files SCC Case No. PUR-2026-00009
Feb. 3, 2026	Board appropriates $250,000 for outside counsel (Gentry Locke)
Feb. 17-24, 2026	New Kent staff presents draft technology overlay district to planning commission and board
Apr. 7, 2026	County resolves to oppose Valley Link; second $250,000 follows

Date	Event
Apr. 14, 2026	CY2026 tax rates re-adopted; $0.44 data center rate unchanged
May 5, 2026	FY2027 budget adopted, $171M, no TOD revenue assumed
May 26, 2026	Sanner rejects 8,500-page record filing; pared-down set ordered
May 27, 2026	Hanover rejects Tract's Mountain Road campus 4-3
Jun. 10, 2026	Tract files Tuckahoe Technology Park CUP pre-application: ~900 acres, 12 buildings, TOD West
Jun. 12, 2026	Evidence snapshot
Jun. 16, 2026	SCC evidentiary hearing, Dominion West Creek case, before the Chief Hearing Examiner
Jun. 24, 2026	Hanover keeps its $0.45 equipment rate for calendar year 2026, 7-0; question referred to committee
Jun. 30, 2026	County files its modified legislative record
Jul. 13, 2026	New Kent board directs that its draft technology overlay district not proceed in its current form
Jul. 14, 2026	Chief Hearing Examiner's report, Dominion West Creek case
Summer 2026	Parties file briefs on the county's demurrer (county's account)
Aug. 5, 2026	County receives Tract's formal CUP application, CU-2026-00014
Aug. 24, 2026	County files pre-applications to confine data centers to the TOD and to re-adopt the TOD
Sep. 1, 2026	Board refers the proposed prohibition of data centers outside the TOD to the Planning Commission
Sep. 10, 2026	SCC Final Order approves the West Creek line and substation on Route 3
Sep. 29, 2026	New Kent board rejects a two-year data center moratorium, 3-2 (county Action Agenda)
Oct. 6, 2026	Board extends the Planning Commission's deadline on the two amendments to Jan. 22, 2027
Oct. 9, 2026	Asgard files notice of appeal to the Supreme Court of Virginia from the SCC order
Oct. 20, 2026	Demurrer argued, Goochland Circuit Court; written opinion to follow, no ruling reported as of Oct. 24

ENDNOTES

[1] The research framework categories used in this case study are the author's analytic categories, applied by type of work.

[2] Tommy N. Turner, What Virginia Is Spending, What Virginia Is Getting: The Commonwealth Data Center Reference, v5.3, August 2026, 10.5281/zenodo.20679292. Companion case studies, cited by concept DOI: Henrico County, 10.5281/zenodo.20671031; Hanover County, 10.5281/zenodo.20672048; Orange County and the Town of Orange, 10.5281/zenodo.20672496; Louisa County, 10.5281/zenodo.20673455; Prince William County, 10.5281/zenodo.20673498; Chesterfield County, 10.5281/zenodo.20672436; The Google-CFS Power Purchase Agreement, 10.5281/zenodo.20679935.

[3] Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, Virginia Population Estimates, July 1, 2025 (official estimates file published February 24, 2026): Goochland County 28,432. 2020 Census: 24,727. A 29,187 figure circulating in secondary summaries does not match the Cooper Center's published file.

[4] Goochland County, FY2027 budget: proposed February 17, 2026 at $170,997,815 all funds (including $16,951,055 in proposed bond proceeds for the Ridgefield Booster Pump Station); adopted May 5, 2026 with no tax rate increases. County news releases, February 17 and May 5, 2026; County Administrator's Proposed FY27 Budget presentation, goochlandva.us DocumentCenter.

[5] Virginia Business, "Goochland sued over technology overlay district," February 10, 2026: lawsuit filed December 4, 2025 by Cynthia Haas, Peggy Knisley, Virginia H. Reed, and Gail A. Minnick against the county, Board of Supervisors, and Planning Commission; $250,000 outside-counsel allocation at the February 3, 2026 board meeting; Gentry Locke (Roanoke) retained; VACo coverage up to $100,000; County Attorney Tara McGee staffing quote; Winfree quote; complaint language on objective standards quoted therein.

[6] Goochland County, FY2026 budget adopted April 15, 2025: $148.5 million total (+9.2%), County General Fund $65.7 million, real estate rate $0.53, thirteen new positions countywide. County news release.

[7] Goochland County, Planning Commission presentation on the TOD and TZ, September 18, 2025 (goochlandva.us DocumentCenter/View/12587), read by WebFetch October 24, 2026: "3,500 acres rezoned to industrial create West Creek Business Park" (1987); "West Creek may develop utilizing the by-right zoning that has been in place since 1987."

[8] Goochland County, “Technology Overlay District & Technology Zone” page, goochlandva.us/1408, including the litigation update of May 2026 (modified record due end of June 2026; plaintiffs’ response due July 21; additional county records late August; next hearing October 20, 2026), the outreach chronology (community meetings July 7 and September 8, 2025; two town halls; HOA meetings), and the county’s pre-TOD/post-TOD setback framing quoted in Part Three.

[9] Goochland County news release, September 16, 2025; Richmond BizSense, September 17, 2025: Eli Lilly $5 billion pharmaceutical manufacturing facility on a 227-acre Markel-owned site at 12575 West Creek Parkway; 1,800 construction jobs, 650 permanent jobs.

[10] Goochland County, Tuckahoe Creek Service District FAQ pages: district created 2002; $0.32 ad valorem surtax since 2012; water purchased from Henrico County, 5.25 MGD current and 25 MGD ultimate contractual capacity; wastewater agreements with Henrico and Richmond; ~462,000 GPD in legacy private capacity reservations, Capital One’s 150,000 GPD largest.

[11] Goochland County news flash, “Goochland County Board of Supervisors Vote to Approve Technology Overlay District as Amended,” November 7, 2025: the January 2024 special meeting setting the board’s priorities, economic development among them; first community presentation July 7, 2025; Vaughters’ motion to approve the TOD with amendments “increasing the requirements to minimize sound from generators,” seconded by Spoonhower; both ordinances adopted 4-1, Lyle opposed.

[12] Richmond BizSense, “Goochland supervisors approve tech overlay district in 4-1 vote after marathon meeting,” November 10, 2025: 4-1 votes on both ordinances; ~350 attendees; 4+ hours of comment; no supporting speakers; Lyle deferral motion to July 2026 and TOD West removal motion, each dying without a second; Vaughters motion; staff amendments presented the night of the vote including the Sec. 15-448.B(3) clarification; supervisor quotations; TOD West family ownership.

[13] Goochland County news release, FY2020 budget (adopted April 2019): creation of the data center business personal property classification at $0.40 per $100 “to promote further investment in this market sector.” The date of the subsequent move to $0.44 is not pinned down in available sources.

[14] Louisa County Code §§ 86-330 through 86-334 (Technology Overlay District), Municode, codified through Ord. 2026-6 (March 16, 2026): purpose, establishment (125 contiguous acres minimum, 115kV proximity, 1%/3,266-acre cap), design standards (200-ft residential and 300-ft agricultural buffers; § 86-332(e), “Daytime

Level: 65dB. Nighttime Level: 60dB."), and uses. The editor's note to § 86-333 records Ord. 2024-11 (August 5, 2024) retitling the section from "Permitted uses—Generally," marking the conversion of principal uses from by-right to conditional use permit.

[15] The Central Virginian, "County OKs tech overlay districts," April 2023: Ordinance 2023-6 adopted April 3, 2023 by a 6-1 vote, Cuckoo District Supervisor Willie Gentry dissenting.

[16] Louisa County news release, August 2023: $11 billion Amazon Web Services two-campus commitment within the Technology Overlay District, announced August 30, 2023, 149 days after the district's adoption.

[17] Tommy N. Turner, Case Study: Louisa County — The First Overlay, the Amazon Retreat, and the $17 Billion Bet, 10.5281/zenodo.20673455 (companion study in this series): the AWS announcement of August 30, 2023, 149 days after the TOD's adoption; the August 2024 amendment converting the district's uses to conditional use permits; the board's unanimous January 20, 2026 vote directing the planning commission to consider removing about 2,600 acres, and the commission's pulling of the hearing on February 12 and April 9, 2026.

[18] Engage Louisa (Tammy Purcell), 2024-2026 coverage: 2024 district shrinkage; January 2026 AWS purchase of ~1,925 acres including the Fisher Chewning tract for $72.45 million; Supervisor Duane Adams's push to remove ~2,600 acres from the district; planning commission's 7-0 February 12, 2026 vote pulling the rollback hearing from its agenda. See also The Central Virginian, "County defers decision on tech overlay district removal." No final rollback decision as of June 12, 2026.

[19] Virginia Mercury, "Amazon pulls Louisa County data center proposal after strong resistance," July 28, 2025: AWS withdrawal of the third-campus CUP (up to 7.2M sq ft on the ~1,400-acre Fisher Chewning tract).

[20] Richmond BizSense, "As lawsuit hearing looms, Goochland residents keep up fight against controversial tech overlay district," May 20, 2026: district acreage (~4,400 total, ~3,500 in West Creek under Pruitt Associates control); complaint allegations ("wholly inadequate," "confusingly defective," adopted version "differed materially" from late-October notices); Haas quotations; county responsive-pleading characterizations; ~300-resident donor base.

[21] Goochland County, Board of Supervisors Approved TOD Ordinance, November 6, 2025 (CP-2025-00002; ZOA-2025-00001), goochlandva.us DocumentCenter: Article 27.A, Secs. 15-448 through 15-450; siting criteria (100 contiguous acres, 115kV proximity); use table (Sec. 15-450) including data centers by right except TOD West, and utility generating stations (natural gas peaking plants and small

modular nuclear reactor facilities under 300 MWe) by CUP; development standards (Sec. 15-449): 300-ft/500-ft setbacks, 250-ft vegetated buffers, 55 dBA/65 dBC, generator testing and screening requirements, Tier 4 diesel, 120-ft height cap with 80-ft adjacency ceiling, mandatory public water and sewer; planning commission procedural recital (hearings September 18 and 25, 2025; 3-2 recommendation); Sec. 15-448.B(3); enabling authority citations including Va. Code § 15.2-2204.

[22] Goochland County, Ordinance No. 6453 (Technology Zone), adopted November 6, 2025, goochlandva.us DocumentCenter: Secs. 8-100 through 8-106 under Va. Code § 58.1-3850; up to 75% building permit fee and 100% utility connection fee reimbursement for up to ten years; qualification thresholds; clawback (Sec. 8-106); Tuckahoe Creek surtax preserved (Sec. 8-105); recital deferring the October 7, 2025 hearing to November 6 for tandem consideration; printed vote block recording the 4-1 vote, Christy seconding; boilerplate recital placing the meeting in the Goochland County Administration Building.

[23] Cardinal News, “Goochland County will help us gauge the public acceptance of the next generation of nuclear reactors,” September 23, 2025: no other Virginia locality had a zoning ordinance written specifically to allow SMRs alongside data centers.

[24] Goochland County, “2026 Ordinance Update” page, goochlandva.us/1490, last updated October 9, 2026, read October 24, 2026: the two proposed amendments (“Prohibiting Data Centers Outside of the TOD”; “Aligning the ordinance with new state law on high energy use facilities; Re-adopting and re-affirming the Technology Overlay District”); the county’s description of Va. Code § 15.2-2209.5; “M1 M2 Pre-Application” and “TOD Re-Adoption Pre-Application,” both filed August 24, 2026; community meeting of August 27, 2026, and the postponement of a second; the board’s October 6, 2026 resolution extending the Planning Commission’s time to January 22, 2027; “Nothing is decided yet.” WTVR CBS 6, September 2, 2026: the board’s Tuesday vote to refer the proposed prohibition to the Planning Commission, not a final approval; no tally reported.

[25] Tommy N. Turner, Case Study: Chesterfield County — The $0.24 Rate, the Thirty-Year Lock, and the Two-Corridor County, 10.5281/zenodo.20672436 (companion study in this series): ZOMod, Ordinance No. 2025-18, adopted September 17, 2025, effective January 1, 2026, Sec. 19.2-32 data center use standards (60 dBA at the property line; 200-foot setback from residential or agricultural property; generator testing 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. weekdays; conditional use in the EC and EG districts).

[26] Hanover row: companion Hanover study (10.5281/zenodo.20672048), Part Five: Proffered Condition 13(a) of April 30, 2026 (57 dBA day, 52 night; 73 dBC day, 68 night), tightened May 21 to 50 dBA at night; 300-foot setback; Tier IV generators tested 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. weekdays; an M-1 receiving limit of 77 dBA under the county ordinance. Prince William and Loudoun rows: as tabled in the same study from the Prince William Sustainability Commission's draft recommendations (March 2025) and Loudoun ZOAM-2024-0001 (March 2025); those sources were not read for this version. Prince William's adopted amendment: companion Prince William study, v3.2 (10.5281/zenodo.20673498), DPA2026-00006, Ord. No. 26-67, September 22, 2026.

[27] Richmond BizSense, "Goochland delays planning commission hearing on proposed tech overlay district," August 7, 2025: County Administrator Jeremy Raley's postponement of the August 21 hearing "after hearing public outcry"; Readers Branch (300+ homes); the original draft's allowance of a data center under 80 feet within 50 feet of the subdivision.

[28] Richmond BizSense, "Goochland residents come out against proposed tech overlay district at commission meeting," September 19, 2025: ~700 attendees at the September 8 community meeting; residents speaking "in the dozens" at the September 18 meeting; the 4-1 continuance; Mosaic at West Creek HOA "sacrifice zone" statement; "Chernobyl on the James"; West Creek tenant context.

[29] Richmond BizSense, "Proposed Goochland tech overlay district moves forward after planning commission thumbs-up," September 26, 2025: September 25 vote 3-2 (McLaughlin, Cosby, Pituck for; Kowalski, Kemmerly against); Kemmerly's motion attaching four recommended conditions; West Creek acreage and tenants.

[30] WRIC ABC 8, "Controversial high-tech development proposal narrowly advances in Goochland" (September 2025). WRIC pages block automated retrieval; the 3-2 vote and dates are confirmed by the adopted TOD ordinance's recitals and the county TOD/TZ page.

[31] Goochland County news flash, October 21, 2025: revised ordinances and maps posted October 20 for public review ahead of the November 6 hearing, incorporating planning commission recommendations (no by-right energy generation; CUP for TOD West data centers; 55 dBA/65 dBC; 500-ft agricultural setback; 80-ft adjacency cap; mandatory public water; no residential street access); hearing noticed for Thursday, November 6, 2025, 6:30 p.m., Goochland High School auditorium; the October generator-mitigation menu language compared against the adopted mandate.

[32] Virginia Mercury, “Goochland approves tech overlay district after hours of resident backlash,” November 10, 2025: corridor geography; six-hour meeting; more than 80 residents of Goochland and surrounding counties speaking in opposition; “several changes were made to the original proposal”; characterization of Lyle’s motion as a one-year delay; Winfree and Spoonhower quotations; the “Tim Winfree” misnomer noted in Part Four.

[33] WTVR CBS 6, November 6-7, 2025 coverage: three hours of public comment within a six-plus-hour meeting; Spoonhower and Lyle day-after quotations.

[34] Richmond BizSense, “Ahead of today’s Goochland tech zone vote, residents continue to express concerns,” November 6, 2025: Goochland Residents Alliance town hall of November 3, 2025 at Discovery United Methodist Church; attendees from Goochland, Henrico, and Hanover; Sierra Club Virginia chapter communications director Tim Cywinski’s presentation; Stephen Levet FOIA campaign and the 1,000+ email record.

[35] VPM News, “Goochland supervisors OK controversial data center district proposal” (slug: goochland-county-data-centers-tech-district-lyle-vaughters-levet), November 10, 2025: hearing past midnight at Goochland High School; Henrico supervisors Jody Rogish (Tuckahoe) and Misty Roundtree (Three Chopt) speaking against, with Roundtree’s “gift” quotation; Vaughters “cotton out of my ears” quotation; Lyle deferral quotation; Levet email figures; photo-caption mislabeling of Lyle as District 2 noted in Part Four.

[36] NBC12/WWBT, “Goochland County approves controversial data center plan,” November 7, 2025 (12onyourside.com), read October 24, 2026: a meeting of more than six hours that included three hours of public comment, with no speaker count given; Winfree and Lyle quotations.

[37] Goochland County, Board of Supervisors roster, goochlandva.us/158: Christy (D1), Spoonhower (D2), Winfree (D3), Vaughters (D4), Lyle (D5); leadership news flashes (Winfree chair 2025; Christy chair 2026).

[38] Neighbors For Change, “Goochland grapples with accusations of undisclosed data center contract” (fall 2025): Supervisor Lyle’s email, surfaced via resident FOIA request, asserting a landowner-developer contract for an eight-building, ~2-million-sq-ft data center campus contingent on TOD inclusion. Advocacy-site sourcing; the underlying documents are a Part Thirteen acquisition target.

[39] Goochland County FAQ (TOD series), QID 522: county awareness of “discussions between a private developer and several landowners regarding a contract for a potential data center project on approximately 900+ acres near Mosaic and Richmond Country Club along Hockett Road (TOD West)”; the

statement that the district “does not authorize or approve the construction or installation of a small modular reactor”; NRC/DEQ review requirements; SMR siting limits; TOD West CUP process (community meeting plus commission and board hearings).

[40] Goochland County, “Tuckahoe Technology Park” page, goochlandva.us/1480, read October 24, 2026: the county’s nondisclosure-agreement timeline (November 2023; August 2025; November 6 and 17, 2025; June 10 and June 17, 2026), with the three agreements posted at goochlandva.us DocumentCenter/View/13611 (2023, Economic Development Authority), 13616 (2025, Economic Development Authority) and 13617 (2025, County).

[41] Va. Code § 15.2-2204 (Advertisement of plans, ordinances, etc.), law.lis.virginia.gov: read October 24, 2026: advertisement by reference identifying where copies may be examined; two published notices (first no more than 28 days, second no less than five days before the meeting); written notice to the owner of each parcel involved, and to abutting and across-the-street owners where 25 or fewer parcels are involved (boundary description plus map link permitted above 100 parcels); amending acts listed through 2025 Va. Acts chs. 52, 171; the inadvertent-failure savings clause and the actual-notice/participation waiver provision; subsection E’s 30-day limitations period for advertisement-based challenges.

[42] WTVR CBS 6, “Goochland data center lawsuit” feature, April 9, 2026: Haas’s residence adjacent to TOD-permitted land; the demurrer pending; the “David and Goliath” and “$350,000” quotations (the latter combining the $250,000 appropriation with the $100,000 VACo coverage and treated here as a plaintiff’s characterization).

[43] Richmond BizSense, “Judge rejects county’s full 8,500-page filing in Goochland TOD lawsuit,” May 27, 2026 (reporting the Tuesday, May 26 hearing): Judge Timothy K. Sanner’s denial of the county’s motion to admit the full legislative record; Strother’s “dump” argument and the post-adoption Virginia Mercury article example; Finney’s legislative-record argument; the pared-down set ordered, with the county free to return after reviewing the plaintiffs’ theory; the withdrawn Count VIII (arbitrary and capricious) with Strother and Raley quotations; the October 20, 2026 demurrer setting; plaintiff counsel and informal-adviser identifications.

[44] Goochland County DocumentCenter: “Technology Overlay District Lawsuit” (complaint, scanned image without machine-readable text) and “Defendants’ Responsive Pleading” (66 pages). The circuit court case number is unreported in

any published source read through October 24, 2026; obtaining the clerk's file is a Part Thirteen priority.

[45] Goochland on my mind (civic blog), "TOD pretrial motions," May 2026: nine-count structure; relief sought (declaration of nullity, public-hearing compliance, legal fees); hearing account consistent with BizSense; demurrer hearing October 20, 2026, 9:30 a.m. (the county's August 2026 update gives 9:00 a.m.; note 49)

[46] Glazebrook v. Board of Supervisors of Spotsylvania County, 266 Va. 550, 587 S.E.2d 589 (2003), as described in the Court of Appeals' Digital Gateway opinion of March 31, 2026: an ordinance whose advertisement lacked the descriptive summary then required was void ab initio, and the Court enforced subsection A without regard to the plaintiffs' actual notice. The 2003 opinion itself was not retrieved for this version (Part Thirteen).

[47] Court of Appeals of Virginia, Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County v. Oak Valley Homeowners Association, Inc., Record No. 1590-25-4, with Record Nos. 1584-25-4 and 1592-25-4, opinion by Judge Raphael, March 31, 2026: pp. 29-30 and n.21 (the 2023 amendments, 2023 Va. Acts chs. 506, 507, eliminating the descriptive-summary requirement and keeping the where-to-review requirement; the removal of the "descriptive summary" noted again later in the opinion); Part III, p. 40 (the actual-notice waiver in subsection B "does not excuse advertising deficiencies under subsection A"); its account of Glazebrook, 266 Va. at 554-557.

[48] Tommy N. Turner, Case Study: Prince William County — Governance Capture, the Revolving Door, and the Democratic Correction, v3.2, October 2026, 10.5281/zenodo.20673498: the July 2, 2026 notice by GW Acquisition Co., LLC and GW Acquisition Co. I, LLC withdrawing their petition to the Supreme Court of Virginia, after which the judgment voiding the Digital Gateway rezonings took full effect.

[49] Goochland County, "Technology Overlay District & Technology Zone" page, goochlandva.us/1408, read October 24, 2026: June 2026 update (modified legislative record filed June 30, 2026); August 2026 update (both parties' briefs filed; hearing scheduled October 20, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.); October 21, 2026 update (a hearing of almost three hours on the county's demurrer; claims dropped at its opening, in the county's count; no ruling at the hearing; a written opinion to follow, no timeframe given). The page is one party's account of its own case.

[50] Richmond BizSense, "Tuckahoe Tech Park data center campus planned on 900-acre tract in Goochland," June 11, 2026: Tract's initial CUP application filed June 10, 2026; thirteen parcels, ~900 acres, Haddock/Stern/Arenstein ownership,

under contract; seven development areas, twelve buildings, 60-80 ft heights, 500-ft setbacks; $3 billion construction over 20 years; $400M real property and $600M+ personal property tax projections; 350 permanent jobs; TCSD service extended along Hockett Road; no megawatt figure disclosed.

[51] Goochland County, “Tuckahoe Technology Park” page, goochlandva.us/1480, read October 24, 2026: formal application received August 5, 2026, case CU-2026-00014; Completeness Letter #1, August 20, 2026; the county’s list of additional documentation; the September 1, 2026 update; “The CUP process generally takes 90 to 120 days”; no Planning Commission or Board hearing date listed. Goochland Planning Commission, regular meeting agenda for October 26, 2026, as posted (goochlandcova.portal.civicclerk.com), read October 24, 2026: four public hearings, none on CU-2026-00014. Richmond BizSense, “Formal permit application filed for Tuckahoe Tech Park data center campus in Goochland,” August 11, 2026.

[52] WTVR CBS 6, “Goochland County residents voice concerns over proposed data center and nuclear reactor development,” September 8, 2025; companion NBC12 coverage September 4-26, 2025: the summer amendment adding small modular nuclear reactor facility, natural gas peaking plant, and utility generating station definitions to the draft.

[53] Henrico Citizen, September 2025: county administrator’s hypothetical SMR siting comment (north of I-64, near the landfill and rock quarry); ~300 MWe ordinance cap. Paywalled; flagged secondary.

[54] Utility Dive and VPM News coverage, 2024-2025: Dominion Energy’s SMR development activity at North Anna (Louisa County), including the RFP for SMR designs and the Amazon nuclear partnership. No Dominion filing or statement connects an SMR to any Goochland site.

[55] Tommy N. Turner, Case Study: Hanover County — Mountain Road, Tract, and the Search for Leverage, 10.5281/zenodo.20672048 (companion study in this series; v2.0, June 2026, and v3.0, September 2026): the Mountain Road proffer record and 4-3 rejection of May 27, 2026; Hanover’s $0.45 rate (2023), the June 24, 2026 hearing on a rate of up to $3.00, and, from the adopted minutes (v3.0), the board’s 7-0 adoption of $0.45 for calendar year 2026 with referral of the rate to the Finance Committee for the FY2028 budget process; the Dominion 2024 IRP figures including approximately 1.3 GW of small modular nuclear capacity through the late 2030s; the GS-5 rate class; the regional diffusion passage corrected in Part Eleven of this study.

[56] Richmond BizSense, “HCA sells long-closed emergency center on 60 acres in Goochland for $11M,” October 13, 2025: ~57 acres at 12720 Tuckahoe Creek Parkway; buyer entity tied to Rob Chesson; HCA paid $10.5M for the land in 2006.

[57] Thalhimer announcement; GlobeNewswire, January 8, 2026; Richmond BizSense, January 22, 2026: Summit Real Estate Group/Loci Capital purchase of 23.18 acres in West Creek Business Park from Brandywine Realty Trust for $4.6 million (October 2025); 221,231-sq-ft speculative West Creek Commerce Center, ground broken January 2026.

[58] Richmond BizSense, “Goochland board OKs West Creek parcel rezoning despite neighbors’ claims of landlocking,” December 5, 2024.

[59] Goochland County Commissioner of the Revenue, tax rate schedule, goochlandva.us/592: Real Estate $0.53; TCSD ad valorem $0.32; Personal Property and Business Personal Property $3.75; Machinery & Tools $1.00; Business Personal Property for Data Centers $0.44. Discount arithmetic: 1 − (0.44 ÷ 3.75) = 88.3%.

[60] Goochland County, Resolution 6636 (CY2026 tax rates), adopted April 14, 2026: “$0.44 per $100 assessed valuation — Business Personal Property for Data Centers.” The resolution’s extracted text shows a strikethrough artifact on this line; the published rate schedule confirms $0.44.

[61] Goochland County Department of Economic Development, goochlandforbusiness.com/170/Taxes: marketed effective rate of $0.24 per $100 for data center business personal property after depreciation and assessment schedules.

[62] Rate table sources: Loudoun FY2027 budget adoption news flash, April 7, 2026 ($4.15 general PP); Fairfax County EDA tax facts, September 2025 ($4.57 BTPP, accelerated computer-equipment depreciation to a 2% floor); Prince William FY2027 budget adoption, April 21, 2026 ($4.50 data center computer equipment, from $4.15); Henrico FY2025-26 budget coverage, Richmond BizSense February 26, 2025, and corrected BizSense reporting April 27, 2026 ($2.60, from $0.40); Louisa: the companion Louisa study ($1.25 data center equipment class adopted September 18, 2023; $1.90 business personal property; FY2027 levies of April 27, 2026); New Kent Commissioner of the Revenue 2026 schedule ($3.75 TPP, no class); Orange County proposed FY2026 rate schedule ($1.25); Spotsylvania official rate page ($1.25, class effective January 1, 2020) and Fredericksburg Free Press, February 25, 2026 (SUP requirement and advertised-rate action, outcome unconfirmed); Caroline County business taxes page ($3.50 BPP/M&T; countywide technology zone rebates); Chesterfield: the companion Chesterfield study ($0.24

classification rate, April 2019) and Richmond BizSense, June 27, 2025 (30-year rate locks in incentive agreements).

[63] Richmond BizSense, “Hanover supervisors to consider raising tax rate on data center equipment,” April 27, 2026 (corrected): Hanover’s $0.45 rate created in 2023; the rate’s absence from the FY2027 budget adopted April 8, 2026, which the article calls a removal; a June 24, 2026 public hearing at up to $3.00 (the companion Hanover study records from the minutes that the rate is set by calendar-year resolution and that the budget’s omission was not a repeal); Henrico current-rate confirmation. Henrico’s official revenue division page still displays $0.40 and conflicts with this reporting; flagged in Part Thirteen.

[64] Goochland County, County Administrator’s Proposed FY27 Budget presentation, February 17, 2026: General Fund $107.8 million proposed (+3.7% over the FY2026 GF of $103,940,253 on a transfers-inclusive basis; the FY2026 county-operations GF figure of $65.7 million is definitionally narrower); Personal Property and Business Equipment revenue line essentially flat at $21.448 million (FY2026: $21.5 million); no data center revenue line; $16,951,055 bond-funded Ridgefield Booster Pump Station.

[65] Richmond BizSense, “Goochland earmarks $250K to oppose $1B Valley Link transmission project,” April 20, 2026; Goochland County news release and Valley Link project page; Cardinal News, March 26, 2026: $1 billion, 115-mile transmission line (Joshua Falls to Yeat) crossing Goochland; county opposition resolution April 7, 2026; a preferred route filing with the SCC then expected around September 2026. Valley Link said in June 2026 that it would file its certificate application with the SCC in the fall; as of October 7, 2026, the SCC’s case index showed no certificate case for the line (companion Orange County study, v3.1, endnote 54, 10.5281/zenodo.20672496).

[66] Goochland County FAQ (TOD series), QID 519: developers bear water/sewer connection and upgrade costs.

[67] Dominion Energy, West Creek project page (dominionenergy.com/westcreek): new substation and double-circuit 230kV line “to ease the load on the local distribution network serving Goochland and Henrico counties and to support recently announced development projects”; announcement letter November 2025; community meeting December 4, 2025 (Residence Inn Short Pump); SCC application filed January 28, 2026, Case No. PUR-2026-00009; public comment deadline June 9, 2026; public witness and evidentiary hearings June 16, 2026.

[68] Report of D. Mathias Roussy, Jr., Chief Hearing Examiner, Case No. PUR-2026-00009, July 14, 2026: p. 2 and n.3 (the application’s project description,

citing Ex. 2 (Application) at 2-3); p. 9 and n.43 (the routing study, citing Ex. 4 (Routing Study) at Appendix B, Figure 3.1-3); p. 28 and nn.182-183 (Staff witness Jay-Ar Llamido, citing Ex. 24 (Staff Report) at 4-5 and 5); p. 42, n.264 (citing Ex. 2 (Appendix) at 13-14). The exhibits themselves were not read for this version.

[69] VPM News, February 9, 2026: SCC approval of a Dominion transmission line near Chesterfield's Hallsley area serving data center load.

[70] Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUR-2026-00009, docket read October 24, 2026 (scc.virginia.gov/docketsearch, case 146726): case summary ("Status: Under Appeal"; disposition "Approved," September 10, 2026); Report of D. Mathias Roussy, Jr., Chief Hearing Examiner, July 14, 2026; Final Order, September 10, 2026 (DocID 392087), pp. 1-3 (project, purpose, routes, cost), 5-6 (findings adopted), 8-9 (ordering paragraphs 3, 5 and 8); Notice of Appeal of Asgard Broad Street Properties I LLC to the Supreme Court of Virginia under Rule 5:21(a)(3), filed October 9, 2026 (DocID 392785).

[71] Virginia State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUR-2026-00009, Exhibit 38, Rebuttal Testimony of Dominic J. Minor on behalf of Virginia Electric and Power Company, filed May 29, 2026, as corrected in proceeding, admitted June 16, 2026 (DocID 390225), public version, pp. 5-7, read on the Commission's docket October 24, 2026. The developer's load letter the testimony refers to was produced to Staff under the Hearing Examiner's protective ruling of March 17, 2026 and is not in the public exhibit. Richmond Times-Dispatch, August 6, 2026 (Sean Jones).

[72] Piedmont Environmental Council, Virginia Data Center Reform Coalition member list (pecva.org): Sierra Club Virginia Chapter listed; no Goochland member group listed as of June 12, 2026; Henrico Conservation Action Network the coalition's only Richmond-area locality member.

[73] Henrico County, Data Center Guidelines Comprehensive Plan Amendment, adopted June 10, 2025 (henrico.gov); Richmond BizSense, May 15, 2025; VPM News, May 19, 2025: provisional use permits for new stand-alone data centers countywide, 500-ft residential setbacks, generator-testing limits, noise studies, and the White Oak Technology Park overlay concentrating data centers in Varina. Treated at length in the companion Henrico case study.

[74] Richmond BizSense, "Following Goochland's lead, New Kent County mulling data center-centric tech overlay district," February 19, 2026: ~1,800 gross/1,260 net acres on the Route 33 corridor at Eltham Road (1.3% of county land); majority ownership by a Jonathan Kinney-tied entity; Dewberry study (April 2025); staff visits to Louisa and Culpeper (January 2026); February 17 planning commission presentation and February 24 board work session; draft standards (administrative

CUP, no SMR/peaker category, 200-ft setbacks, 85-ft height cap including rooftop equipment, 65/60 dBA, water use analysis); Airaghi quotations; contemplated timeline (community meetings from March; commission hearing May or June; board vote June or July).

[75] New Kent County news flash, February 20, 2026; staff TOD presentation (newkent-va.us DocumentCenter); New Kent County Planning page, accessed June 12, 2026, still labeling the instrument “(Draft) Technology Overlay District” with no public hearing scheduled.

[76] New Kent–Charles City Chronicle, “Consideration for development of Technology Overlay District targets data center development,” March 8, 2026: Commissioner Patricia Townsend’s exchange with community development director Josh Airaghi on the no-further-hearings feature.

[77] Richmond BizSense (Jackie DiBartolomeo), July 15, 2026, reporting the board’s Monday, July 13, 2026 meeting: the overlay directive, Supervisor Amy Pearson’s motion, the 3-2 Eltham Business Park rezoning, and the direction to draft a data center ordinance. New Kent County Board of Supervisors, Work Session, September 29, 2026: Action Agenda, item 3.e (Resolution R-41-26; members polled, Evelyn, Moyer and Pearson nay, Stiers and Stewart aye; “The motion failed.”), items 3.f and 3.g; agenda packet of the same date (text of R-41-26); meeting video, newkentcountyva YouTube channel, auto-generated transcript at about 1:07:50 (Community Development Director Joshua Airaghi on holding public hearings “until February at the earliest”). The county’s record of July 13, 2026 was not read for this version (Part Thirteen).

This case study draws on Goochland County ordinances and county records, Goochland County Circuit Court coverage, Virginia Code and case law, State Corporation Commission filings, census and budget data, and sustained local and regional news coverage from 2023 through June 2026, with the items dated in the text carried to October 24, 2026. It is a companion to What Virginia Is Spending, What Virginia Is Getting: The Commonwealth Data Center Reference (v5.3, August 2026), which covers the statewide fiscal, ratepayer, and employment picture in detail.