Table 2: Planning Assumptions

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