Table 2: Planning Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>A (existing)</th>
<th>B (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The 20 year urban population is forecasted to increase by 116,591.</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The actual urban/rural split has consistently been 86/14 for decades. But a 90/10 split shall be used instead to lower the rural population growth forecast to only 12,955 persons.</td>
<td>The actual urban/rural split has consistently been 86/14 for decades and is a viable policy option. The 1994 approved plan used 80/20. A more moderate policy of 87.5/12.5 forecasts 16,656 new rural persons for this plan update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The annual county-wide population is forecasted to grow by 129,546 from 448,845 in 2015 to 578,391 in 2035 which calculates to an annual growth rate of 1.28%.</td>
<td>The county-wide population is forecasted to grow by 133,247 from 448,845 in 2015 to 582,092 in 2035. That is a 1.31% annual growth rate. That total is 0.6% higher than choice A. The annual rate is 0.03% higher than choice A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The choice A assumptions assert that Alternative 1 would add 18,814 new persons in the rural area which is 45% more impact than necessary since choice A forecasts a need for 12,955 new persons in the rural area.</td>
<td>The choice B assumptions show that Alternative 1 can fit 8,182 new persons which is 51% too low. Thus Alternative 1 is not a viable option since it cannot comply with the GMA requirement to provide for the forecasted growth. (8,182 / 16,656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The choice A assumptions assert that the original draft Alternative 4 map would add 32,987 new persons which is 155% more impact than necessary since choice A forecasts a need for 12,955 new persons in the rural area.</td>
<td>The choice B assumptions assert that the updated Alternative 4 map can accommodate 16,332 new rural persons. That falls within 2% of the forecasted rural population growth of 16,656 persons. Therefore, Alternative 4 is the appropriate choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No improvements or mitigations that were identified in the public process should be allowed. Each draft alternative must be accepted or rejected as is. Any revisions would require the process to start over and result in missing the required deadline.</td>
<td>The Alternative 4 updated maps include mitigations that increase the variety of lot sizes including AG-20, preserve large parcels near the UGBs for future employment, and better preserve the rural character. These revisions and planning assumptions should be allowed as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cluster options are not necessarily included in any Alternative and therefore may not be available to preserve open space or large areas of habitat.</td>
<td>Rural cluster options are to be integrated into Alternative 4 within the limits of the law per previous direction given by the Board for R, AG, and FR zones to provide flexibility, to preserve open space, and to better provide for larger aggregated areas of habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The existing Alternative-1 map defines 57% of existing R parcels as nonconforming, 76% of existing AG parcels as nonconforming, and 89% of existing FR parcels as nonconforming. It is not realistic since it does not fit the already developed patterns that actually exist.</td>
<td>The updated Alternative-4 map should be adopted to correct the mismatch between Alternative 1 map and the already developed patterns that actually exist, to respect predominant lots sizes, to resolve some spot zoning problems, and to best accommodate the forecasted population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>