



11/20/15

Exhibit B

Rural Comparison of the 2004-2024 and the Proposed 2016-2035 Comp Plan Update

Proposed Comp Plan changes should be based on compelling reasons and be understood in the context of already approved plans that have proven to be GMA compliant. The following documentation explains the compelling need to address the chronic problems that have plagued the rural community for more than 2 decades.

The Comp Plan that was first adopted in 1994 created a gross mismatch between the actual ground-truth of already developed rural patterns and an unrealistic zoning map. Subsequent Comp Plan updates have failed to address the chronic mismatch problems.

The unrealistic zoning map persists to this day and would continue to persist if Alternative 1 was selected for this Comp Plan Update. The current rural zoning map is not reasonable as demonstrated by the gross mismatch between the existing rural community that actually exists for the three basic rural zones: R, AG, and FR. That zoning map creates the following problems.

Table 1 – Mismatch between the existing rural zoning map and the real world

Rural zone	Proportion defined as non-conforming
R Zoned Parcels	6 out of 10
AG Zoned Parcels	8 out of 10
FR Zoned Parcels	9 out of 10

This mismatch is not a result of the rural community creating nonconforming parcels. Rather the mismatch was created by an incompatible zoning map that was created in 1994 that made them nonconforming. That mismatch continues to harm the rural community by increasing the cost and complexity of permits for the vast majority of rural citizens.

Further, such wide-spread negative impacts have restricted the reasonable improvements that would otherwise be appropriate for existing homes in the rural community. The needless extra cost and complexity of permits impacting the majority of rural citizens not only disregards the specific goals of listed in the GMA, but such an intolerable situation wars against those goals.

Exhibit B

Table 2 – Fulfilling the goals of the GMA:

GMA Goal	Alternative 1	Alternative 4
Affordable Housing	Higher cost	Lower cost
Economic Development	Disadvantaged	Supported
Variety of rural densities	6 total R: 5, 10, 20 AG:20 FR: 40, 80	10 total R: 1, 2.5, 5 AG: 5, 10, 20 FR: 10, 20, 40, 80
Property Rights	Diminished	Respected
Permits	Costly, burdensome, overly constrained	More affordable, straight forward, simpler, more flexible

Table 3 – Population Growth and Proposed Densities

Ref	2004-2024 Plan as approved in 2007	Proposed 2016-2035 Plan	Difference
Forecasted Rural Population Growth	19,264	16,656	13.6% less
Rural Population Capacity	19,132	16,332	14.7% less
Forecasted Rural Parcel Growth	7,438	6,262	15.8% less
Forecasted Rural Parcel Growth	7,387	6,140	16.9% less
Planned County-wide Population Density (persons / Sq Miles)	889 (584,310 / 656.6)	887 (582,092 / 656.6)	same
Planned Urban Population Density (persons / Sq Miles)	3184 ((328,123 + 173,371) / 157.5)	3224 ((386,640 + 116,591) / 156.1)	1.26% more
Planned Rural Population Density (persons / Sq Miles)	166 ((63,552 + 19,264) / 499.1)	158 ((62,205 + 16,656) / 500.5)	4.8% less

Exhibit B

The above calculations for population densities are based on the following area facts:

Table 4 – Population Growth and Proposed Densities

Square Miles	2004-2024 Base Year	2016-2035 Base Year
County-wide	656.6	656.6
Urban (cities + UGAs)	157.5	156.1
Rural	499.1 (500.6 – 157.5)	500.5 (656.6 – 156.1)

Show your work:

The following show how the forecasted population numbers were calculations based upon GIS data.

Per the 2007 plan for the target 2024:

County-wide population: $391,675 + 192,635 = 584,310$

Urban Population: $328,123 + 173,371 = 501,494$

Rural population: $63,552 + 19,264 = 82,816$

Per the proposed plan for the target 2035:

County-wide population: $448,845 + 133,247 = 582,092$

Urban Population: $386,640 + 116,591 = 503,231$

Rural population: $62,205 + 16,656 = 78,861$

What the proposed rural plan does:

The proposal provides a more realistic and sensible plan that is consistent with the ground truth. In contrast to unlikely scenarios that may be theoretically possible, the proposal corrects unrealistic assumptions to better align with the more likely circumstances that can realistically be expected to unfold.

Rather than creating numerous small rural parcels, the proposed plan recognizes predominant parcels that already exist. That real-world ground-truth foundation serves as the predominant parcel size zoning that is appropriate for each area.

What the proposed rural plan does not do:

The proposed rural plan does not de-designate any resource land.

The proposal does not increase rural density compared to the existing plan approved in 2007. Rather, the above facts show, the proposal is for a lower rural density than the existing 2007 plan approved in as GMA compliant.

The proposal does not propose a higher rural population or more rural lots than the existing plan approved in 2007. Rather, the above facts show that the proposal forecasts a lesser rural population growth and accommodates few new persons than were planned by the existing plan approved in 2007 as GMA compliant.

Conclusion:

Some have argued that we cannot afford the time to correct the known problems and suggest that perhaps in 8 to 20 years, we can conduct in-depth studies to get it right. Some shrink back from the responsibility for fear of lawsuits and prefer to kick the can down the road because would be easier.

The GMA does not excuse counties from doing their due diligence or from fulfilling their responsibilities to complete the required task of submitting the most realistic and best plan for their community.

Every effort has been made to meet or exceed all appropriate processes. That investment should not be abandoned because it is too hard or too risky. In contrast, we can now select a concise and optimized plan and complete the task in the allotted time. Our community's future is worth the effort.

Exhibit B

Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 10:02 AM
To: Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete, Albrecht, Gary, Hermen, Matt, Kamp, Jacqueline, Lebowsky, Laurie, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Wiser, Sonja
Cc: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Exhibit B
Attachments: Exhibit B Rural Comparison.docx

Here's it. Please, provide me your professional edits. Thanks

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 3:27 PM
To: Pool, Bob; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Exhibit B

Bob and Oliver,

Please check this document for accuracy and let me know if you find any errors for me to correct this afternoon.

Thanks

David

From: Madore, David
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 3:25 PM
To: Tilton, Rebecca
Subject: Exhibit B

Rebecca,

The attached file follows Exhibit A. I am sending it to planning and GIS for them to check it for accuracy. If they find anything, I will correct it and send you an update.

Thanks

David