

Regional Staff Committee | Remote Only Date: Thursday, October 16, 2025 from 9:30-11:30 am

1. Welcome and Introductions (9:30) - Jason Sullivan, City of Bonney Lake

2. Reports (9:35)

- a. Meeting Summary for September 18, 2025*
- b. PSRC Announcements and Updates
- c. Recommendations to the 2026 WA State Legislature *Robin Koskey and Alyssa Quinn, PSRC*

3. Discussion Item (9:45)

 Regional Centers Monitoring Update* – Nancy Ferber & Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC

4. Discussion Item (10:10)

a. 2025 Housing Monitoring Update: The Year of Policy Change* – *Eric Clute, PSRC*

5. Discussion Item (10:30)

a. Regional Transportation Plan Draft Development: Financial Strategy* – Kelly McGourty & Craig Helmann, PSRC

6. Discussion Item (11:00)

- a. Regional Economic Strategy Update* Katie Enders, PSRC
- 7. Next Meeting: November 20, 2025
- 8. Adjourn (11:30)

Zoom Remote Connection Details

- To join via a smart device or web browser, go to https://psrc-org.zoom.us/j/85628010400?pwd=0XCxXVTaWj6D4Ns5J9uzwmaQvaPaNS.1 and enter Meeting ID: 856 2801 0400 and Passcode: 825548.
- To join by phone, call 833 548 0276 US Toll-free or 833 548 0282 US Toll-free and enter Meeting ID: 856 2801 0400 and Passcode: 825548.

^{*}Supporting materials attached.

• العربية | Arabic, 中文| Chinese, Deutsch | German, Français | French, 한국어 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese, visit https://www.psrc.org/contact/language-assistance.



Regional Staff Committee Meeting Summary

Date: September 18, 2025 Location: Remote Only

Presentations from the meeting are available on the PSRC website:

https://www.psrc.org/rsc-meetings.

Audio recording of the meeting is available by request.

Introductions and Announcements

Kelly Snyder, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. Participants were asked to view the meeting attendance on the "chat" feature on Zoom, and phone-in participants were asked to identify themselves verbally.

Reports

Paul Inghram, Director of Growth Management, welcomed members as he filled in for Ben Bakkenta. He shared an update about the Regional Public Meetings planned in the coming weeks, for the public to share comments and feedback on the Regional Transportation Plan. More information is available at the Regional Transportation Plan Engagement Hub.

Discussion: Legislative Update

Robin Koskey, Director of Government Relations and Communications, and Alyssa Quinn, Senior Government Relations Specialist, provided a federal and state legislative update and briefed the Regional Staff Committee on the fall 2025 process to adopt legislative recommendations to the 2026 Washington State Legislature.

You can view the presentation here.

For more information, please contact Robin Koskey, Director of Government Relations and Communications, at rkoskey@psrc.org or 206-798-4462.

Discussion: Snohomish County Little Bear Creek Advance Mitigation Project
Snohomish County staff, Oscar Fuentes, P.E. and Clarissa Barrett, shared a
presentation on the Snohomish County Public Work's Little Bear Creek Advance
Mitigation (LBCAM) project. This project establishes an innovative advance mitigation
site that restores habitat, improves water quality, and provides long-term environmental
benefits, while streamlining future transportation projects to support the visions adopted
in the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan. The project recently received a PSRC
VISION 2050 Award from Puget Sound Regional Council.

You can view the presentation here.

For more information, contact Ben Bakkenta, Director of Regional Planning, at bbakkenta@psrc.org.

Discussion: Regional Transportation Plan Scenario Analysis Results

To conclude, Craig Helmann, Director of Data, and Kelly McGourty, Director of Transportation Planning, reviewed the details and key performance results of the four scenarios outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan, as well as initial board reactions and comments when presented this information at their September 11 meeting.

You can view the presentation here.

For more information, contact Craig Helmann, Director of Data, at chelmann@psrc.org, or Kelly McGourty, Director of Transportation Planning, at kmcgourty@psrc.org.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 am.

Members and Alternates Represented at the Table

See attached attendance roster.

PSRC Staff and Other Guests Present

Mikayla Svob, PSRC
Oscar Fuentes, P.E., Snohomish County
Clarissa Barrett, Snohomish County
Paul Inghram, PSRC
Alyssa Quinn, PSRC
Kathryn Johnson, PSRC
Craig Helmann, PSRC
Nancy Ferber, PSRC
Grant Gibson, PSRC
Mohamed
Katie Enders, PSRC

Katie Enders, PSRC Marc Daily, PSRC Gil Cerise, PSRC Erika Harris, PSRC

Pauline Mogilevsky, Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council

Kelly McGourty, PSRC

Ted Vanegas, WA State Department of Commerce

ATTACHMENTS:

A. RSC Member Attendance for the September 18, 2025, Meeting

Jurisdiction	Т	Member		Jurisdiction		Member	
King County		Ivan Miller, King County Executive Office	R	Federal, Regional, State, Tribal & Other Agencies			\forall
<u> </u>	2	McCaela Daffern, King County	Ė	FHWA		Matthew Pahs, Community Planner	
		Rebecca Maskin, Demographer Alt				Vacant Alt	
		Valerie Kendall, King County Alt		FTA	1	Danielle Casey	
At-Large	2	Vacant				Vacant Alt	
		Kwame Simmons, Policy Advisor Alt		Health	1	Cristina Ciupitu-Plath, Snohomish County	R
	┷	Dan Cardwell, Local Services/Utilities, King Co				Richard Gelb, King County Alt 1	
		Susan McLain, Local Services/Subarea Planning Alt				Jennifer Halverson Kuehn, Tacoma/Pierce Health Alt 2	
Transit	1	Peter Heffernan, King Co Metro	R	Ports	1	Geri Poor, Port of Seattle, Gov. Affairs	R
Transit	+	Hester Serebrin, King County Metro Alt		1 0110		Deirdre Wilson, Northwest Seaport Alliance Alt	R
Economic Dev.	1	Amie Danielewicz, King Co Exec Office Alt		PSCAA	1	Jennifer Keene, Program Director	
		Jesse Reynolds, Local Services/Econ Dev Alt	R			Kathy Strange, Air Quality Programs Alt	R
Seattle	2	Michael Hubner, OPCD		Puget Sound	1	Larry Epstein, Deputy Director	
		Jonathan Lewis, SDOT		Partnership		Bebhinn Dechery Alt	
	<u> </u>	Jim Holmes, OPCD Alt		Sound Transit	1	Alex Krieg, Planning & Innovation	
		Joanna Valencia, SDOT Alt			_	Vacant Alt	
Bellevue	1	Thara Johnson, Planning Manager, Comm Dev	_	Tribal	1	Vacant	
	+	Lacey Jane Wolfe, Alt	R	Representatives	4	Vacant Alt	
Cition/Tours	2	Laura Benjamin-LaPitz, Alt Minnie Dhaliwal, City of Issaguah	Б	US EPA	1	Susan Sturges	
Cities/Towns	3	Eric Perry, City of Renton	R	US HUD	1	Erik Peterson Alt Vacant	
	+	Mark Rigos, City of North Bend	ĸ	OOTIOD	Ľ	Vacant Alt	
	+	John Vicente, City of Kenmore, Alt		WA Dept. of	1	Grace Yoo	
	+	Beckye Frey, City of Redmond, Alt	R	Commerce	Ė	Keith Swenson	
	+	Rhonda Ender, City of Carnation, Alt		WSDOT	1	April Delchamps, WSDOT	R
Kitsap County	1	Rafe Wysham, Kitsap County	R			Matthew Kenna, WSDOT Alt	
		Scott Diener, Alt		PSRC Committee	es		
At-Large	1	Heather Wright, Planning Director		PSRC Co-Chair	1	Ben Bakkenta, Director of Regional Planning	
	<u> </u>	Patty Charnas, Bainbridge Island Alt		RPEC	1	Doug McCormick, RPEC Chair	
Transit	1	Edward Coviello, Kitsap Transit				Shane Weber, RPEC Vice Chair	
	+-	Vacant Alt		R = Remote attenda		ince	
Economic Dev.	1	Joe Morrison, KEDA					
Bremerton	+	Vacant Alt Andrea Spencer, Community Dev, Co-Chair	R				
Bremenon	+-	Garrett Jackson, Planning Manager, Alt	К				
Cities/Towns	1	Nick Bond, Comm Development, Port Orchard	R				
Ollics/ Fowns	Ť	Patty Charnas, Bainbridge Island Alt	- `				
Pierce County	1	Mike Galizio, Multimodal Transportation	R				
•		Supervisor	ĸ				
		Alon Bassok, PPW Long Range Planning					
At-Large	+-	Manager, Alt Tiffany Speir, Lakewood, Planning	R				
At-Large	+	Jason Sullivan, Bonney Lake, Planning, Co-Chair	IX				
	+	Ryan Windish, Sumner, Alt					
	+	Angelie Stahlnecker, Milton, Alt					
Transit	1	Andrew Arnes, Pierce Transit					
	I	Darin Stavish, Pierce Transit, Alt	R				
Economic Dev	1	Rob Allen, Economic Development	R				
	4	Vacant Alt					
Tacoma	1	Brian Boudet, Planning Division Manager	R				
OH: /T	+	Steve Atkinson, Principal Planner Alt					
Cities/Towns	<u> </u>	Kendall Wals, Puyallup	<u> </u>		_		_
On ab coule!	+	Chris Larson, Fife, Alt	R				
Snohomish County	1	Mike McCrary, PDS Director	R				
	Ļ	Darren Groth, Division Mgr, Long Range Planning	R				
At-Large	12	Kelly Snyder, Director, Co-Chair	R		_		
	+	Ken Klein, Executive Director			_		
	+	Jay Larson, Public Works Supervisor, Alt Joshua Dugan, Exec Operations Officer, Alt	_		_		-
Transit	1	Melissa Cauley, Community Transit					-
Transit	+	Sabina Araya, Everett Transit Alt			-		
Economic Dev	1	Mike Fong, Economic Dev					
	Ť	Vacant Alt					
Everett	1	Yorik Stevens-Wajda, Planning Director	R				
	I	Alice Ann Wetzel, Long Range Planning Mgr					
Cities/Towns	1	Russ Wright, Lake Stevens, Comm Dev. Director					
	Ш	Karl Almgren, Lynnwood, Alt	R				L
Total Members	45	Attended	27				<u> </u>



DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Regional Staff Committee

From: Nancy Ferber, Senior Planner, and Liz Underwood-Bultmann, Principal

Planner

Subject: Regional Centers Monitoring Update

IN BRIEF

Staff will provide an update on the process to monitor and redesignate regional centers as called for by the <u>Regional Centers Framework</u> and gather input from the committee to help inform future board discussions on redesignation.

BOARD CALENDAR

The Growth Management Policy Board will be asked to make recommendations to the Executive Board for new proposed regional centers, as well as for redesignation of existing regional centers. Staff will bring additional information for Board consideration this fall and into early 2026.

DISCUSSION

Regional centers are the hallmark of VISION 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategy. They guide regional growth allocations, advance local planning, inform transit service planning and represent priority areas for PSRC's federal transportation funding.

The region has designated 30 regional growth centers. These are locations of the region's most significant business, governmental and cultural facilities, and are areas planning for signification growth. The region's 10 designated manufacturing/industrial centers are locations for more intensive industrial activity. Both regional growth centers and regional manufacturing/industrial centers are focal points for planned growth, economic development and transportation infrastructure investments.

The Regional Centers Framework (2018) established criteria and planning expectations to ensure regional centers are developing as thriving and connected communities with sufficient market potential to accommodate new jobs and residents. When the framework was adopted, several existing centers did not meet all adopted requirements. To promote consistency among the existing centers, the Regional Centers Framework called for a redesignation process following the 2024 comprehensive plan updates. The Growth Management Policy Board and Executive Board approved the scope of work for the monitoring process in February 2024. At the first monitoring review in 2025, existing regional growth centers are expected to fully meet eligibility and designation criteria similar to new centers.

The redesignation process will evaluate individual regional centers to determine how they meet criteria, review subarea planning the jurisdiction has completed, and the board will be asked to redesignate as appropriate.

Redesignation Policy Topics

At the October GMPB meeting, the board discussed key policy areas outlined below. Staff will summarize the board discussion and welcome additional feedback or questions from Regional Staff Committee members.

Center Subarea Plans

For the monitoring process, the Regional Centers Framework identifies the need for a center plan that meets subarea planning criteria. These are outlined in consistency checklists for <u>regional growth centers</u> and <u>manufacturing/industrial centers</u>.

Of the 40 designated regional centers, 10 centers do not have current adopted subarea plans. A few centers have new subarea plans that have been substantially developed and are expected to be adopted within the next few months. Some centers with adopted plans do not fully meet the regional planning requirements for regional growth centers or manufacturing/industrial centers.

Growth and Density

New regional growth centers must demonstrate a current density of at least 18 people per acre, which is measured by combining the number of residents and employees in the center. The Regional Centers Framework states that existing centers will remain designated if they do not meet the new center density criteria, provided that the center is consistent with other criteria for regional centers.

Regional growth centers that have existing density levels below the level required for new regional centers at the time of the review are required to complete a market study to evaluate the potential for and opportunities to best support center growth. The market study must consider a planning horizon reasonably beyond the monitoring period (2025). The market study should show how the center can meet targeted levels of

growth within the planning period. The jurisdiction should demonstrate its work to address opportunities identified in the market study.

Three regional growth centers and one manufacturing/industrial center are currently below the minimum required densities or employment thresholds. Each jurisdiction has prepared a market study to document future potential for these areas.

Size and Walkability

The regional growth center criteria emphasizes walkability and provides for a maximum center size of 640 acres, unless a center is served by an internal high-capacity transit system (such as a streetcar). Some existing regional growth centers are divided by major barriers to walkability, such as state highways, and some continue to be larger than the maximum size.

Staff will provide an overview of these key policy issues and welcome input from the committee.

Designation of New Regional Centers

PSRC has been accepting applications for new regional centers through the end of September. The <u>designation procedures</u> provide criteria for designation and information about the process. New center proposals were due by Friday, September 26, 2025. The next opportunity to apply for new regional centers will be in 2027/28. Two proposals from Snohomish County were received and are under review.

NEXT STEPS

In the coming months, the GMPB will be asked to provide recommendations to the Executive Board regarding the redesignation of existing regional centers and the potential designation of new centers. Staff will continue to update the Regional Staff Committee on the process.

For additional information, please contact Liz Underwood Bultmann, Principal Planner, lunderwood-bultmann@psrc.org or Nancy Ferber, Senior Planner, nferber@psrc.org



DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Regional Staff Committee

From: Eric Clute, Associate Planner

Subject: 2025 Housing Monitoring Update: The Year of Policy Change

IN BRIEF

The committee will review the 2025 Regional Housing Strategy monitoring update, including new data and analysis on the production of emergency housing and permanent supportive housing. The committee will be asked for feedback on how housing monitoring data can help jurisdictions meet new state housing requirements and implement recently adopted comprehensive plans.

BOARD CALENDAR

This item will be presented to the Growth Management Policy Board at their November 6, 2025 meeting.

DISCUSSION

The <u>Regional Housing Strategy</u> is a playbook of regional and local actions to preserve, improve and expand housing stock in the region. The aim is to make a range of affordable, accessible, healthy and safe housing choices available to every resident and to promote fair and equal access to housing for all people.

The strategy calls for PSRC to track performance and outcomes over time and identify challenges or barriers in consultation with jurisdictions and other stakeholders. Performance measures support the housing goal in VISION 2050 to meet the region's housing and affordability needs.

Affordability in both the renter and ownership markets continue to be constrained, driven by high rents and home prices as well as elevated interest rates. Large majorities of

low-income and even moderate-income households are cost burdened, spending more than 30% of their income on rent.

More of the region's residents are experiencing homelessness than ever before. As of 2024, more than 21,000 people in the region did not have a place to live, with nearly 50% of these residents living without proper shelter. The region's stock of emergency shelter and permanent supporting housing have grown 16% and 28% respectively, though the need has risen even faster.

Even with these headwinds, the housing landscape has been evolving at all levels of government. Local governments are implementing their comprehensive plans and the Legislature has passed several bills intended to ease the region's affordability woes. The effects coming from the federal level have yet to be seen, though PSRC will continue to monitor as the landscape evolves.

PSRC staff will present findings of the 2025 housing monitoring report and welcome feedback from the committee.

NEXT STEPS

As stated in the Regional Housing Strategy, PSRC will provide an annual update on housing data monitoring efforts to the board. Looking ahead, some data measures may be updated more or less frequently based on data availability.

For additional information, please contact Eric Clute, Associate Planner, at eclute@psrc.org.



DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Regional Staff Committee

From: Kelly McGourty, Director of Transportation Planning and Craig Helmann,

Director of Data

Subject: Regional Transportation Plan Financial Strategy

IN BRIEF

The Transportation Policy Board spent several months in 2024 reviewing the requirements and assumptions for developing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) financial strategy. This included information on available current law revenues and potential new revenue sources that may be needed to fully fund the investments and operations to be included in the plan. The board identified key parameters under which new revenue sources would be determined and identified five specific sources to focus on for the RTP financial strategy.

Over the last several months, the board has discussed distinct plan scenarios that include varying levels of new revenues needed by 2050. At their meeting on October 9, the Transportation Policy Board directed staff to advance one of the four scenarios (Scenario 2B) into development of the draft plan to be released for public comment in December. PSRC staff will review Scenario 2B and the evolving RTP financial strategy with the RSC at the October meeting.

BOARD CALENDAR

This topic will be a standing item on the Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board agendas through the end of the year. The Transportation Policy Board is scheduled to make a recommendation on direction for a plan financial strategy at their November meeting.

DISCUSSION

Per federal and state requirements the RTP must include a financial plan demonstrating how transportation investments, including maintenance, preservation and operations,

can be funded over the life of the plan. The financial plan must include system-wide estimates of both costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available and should also include recommendations on additional financing strategies necessary to fully fund plan investments and an assessment of their viability.

Between June and October 2024, the board was provided details on the RTP financial strategy, including federal and state requirements, current revenue sources and forecast assumptions, new funding sources and their revenue potential and overall revenue and system performance impacts. Preliminary feedback was sought on the types and feasibility of potential new revenue sources.

In November and December 2024, an analysis of various financial sensitivity tests was provided, including different assumptions of a road usage charge, the impact of greater percentages of zero emission vehicles throughout the region and indexing of various fees and taxes. The consensus of the board was to focus on those sources that could be implemented consistently across the region and that are more likely to generate greater potential revenue when developing the RTP financial strategy. Five sources were identified, including a road usage charge, transit sales tax rates, vehicle fees, county road levy rates and a retail delivery fee.

Four draft plan scenarios developed, analyzed, and discussed over the last several months include varying levels of new revenues needed to fully fund investments through 2050. At their meeting on October 9, the Transportation Policy Board directed staff to advance Scenario 2B into development of the draft plan. Scenario 2B will require approximately \$49.3 billion in additional revenue beyond projections of current transportation funding sources.

Following their action, the TPB resumed discussions of the RTP financial strategy, including refinements and details of the potential new revenue sources, policy issues that may need to be addressed, and any related action items to include in the draft RTP. These discussions will continue at the November meeting, with the goal of releasing the draft plan for public comment in December.

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty, Director of Transportation Planning, at kmcgourty@psrc.org or 206-971-3601 or Craig Helmann, Director of Data, at chelmann@psrc.org or 206-389-2889.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Summary Comparison of Scenarios

ATTACHMENT A: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF SCENARIOS

The following chart illustrates how each scenario compares to the others across selected performance metrics related to key policy priorities identified by the board: safety, climate, equity, transit and accessibility, maintenance and preservation, and congestion and mobility. The darker color represents the scenario(s) that performed the best for each particular metric.

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b	Scenario 3					
Metric	Percentage above today								
Regional Lane Miles	1.4%	2.1%	2.1%	2.4%					
Transit Service Hours	53.4%	71.4%	90.0%	91.5%					
Transit Trips	183.7%	191.3%	189.9%	188.8%					
Walk Trips	89.5%	89.2%	89.2%	89.3%					
Bike Trips	59.6%	59.2%	59.6%	59.6%					
Vehicle Trips	21.8%	21.7%	21.8%	21.8%					
Vehicle Miles Traveled	19.3%	19.6%	19.7%	19.7%					
Hours of Delay	59.2%	56.3%	55.9%	56.3%					
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	-83.0%	-82.8%	-82.8%	-82.8%					
Truck Metrics									
Daily Truck Trips	386,000	386,000	386,000	386,000					
Annual Truck Delay per Trip	23.0	22.5	22.5	22.3					
Daily Truck Miles per Trip	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.5					
% of Freight Network with Severe	8.9%	8.5%	8.4%	8.4%					
	Active Transp	ortation							
Walk Trips	4,460,000	4,452,000	4,452,000	4,454,000					
Bike Trips	391,000	390,000	391,000	391,000					
Minutes Walking & Biking per day	14.2	14.2	14.2	14.2					
	Spatial / Qualita	tive Metrics							
Programmatic System Investments									
Above Current Plans	-4%	9%	-4%	37%					
Maintenance and Preservation									
Investments Above Today's Levels	0%	10%	20%	20%					
Regional Capacity Projects on the									
Regional High Injury Network	26%	55%	55%	63%					
Increase in Annual Household Costs	\$0	\$800	\$925	\$1,500					
New Revenues Needed (in billions)	\$0	\$42	\$48	\$78					

Transit Supportive Densities and Gaps in Service Gaps in service for Local Transit

Gaps in service for Local Transit											
Total People	1,408,000 (33%)	1,324,000 (31%)	639,000 (15%)	639,000 (15%)							
People of Color	803,000 (27%)	763,000 (25%)	303,000 (10%)	303,000 (10%)							
People with Lower Incomes	870,000 (30%)	816,000 (28%)	338,000 (12%)	338,000 (12%)							
People with Limited English	651,000 (25%)	604,000 (23%)	227,000 (9%)	227,000 (9%)							
People with a Disability	971,000 (33%)	908,000 (30%)	395,000 (13%)	395,000 (13%)							
Older adults	871,000 (30%)	822,000 (28%)	375,000 (13%)	375,000 (13%)							
Youth	1,128,000 (44%)	1,057,000 (41%)	504,000 (20%)	504,000 (20%)							
Gaps in service for All-Day Transit											
Total People	719,000 (28%)	661,000 (26%)	651,000 (25%)	649,000 (25%)							
People of Color	501,000 (26%)	466,000 (24%)	455,000 (24%)	455,000 (24%)							
People with Lower Incomes	575,000 (30%)	530,000 (28%)	520,000 (27%)	518,000 (27%)							
People with Limited English	364,000 (22%)	325,000 (19%)	314,000 (19%)	314,000 (19%)							
People with a Disability	605,000 (31%)	556,000 (29%)	545,000 (28%)	544,000 (28%)							
Older adults	499,000 (28%)	464,000 (26%)	453,000 (26%)	452,000 (26%)							
Youth	500,000 (39%)	457,000 (36%)	449,000 (35%)	447,000 (35%)							
Gaps in service for Frequent Transit											
Total People	298,000 (17%)	248,000 (14%)	105,000 (6%)	105,000 (6%)							
People of Color	213,000 (16%)	173,000 (13%)	52,000 (4%)	52,000 (4%)							
People with Lower Incomes	249,000 (19%)	206,000 (15%)	83,000 (6%)	83,000 (6%)							
People with Limited English	157,000 (13%)	117,000 (10%)	44,000 (4%)	44,000 (4%)							
People with a Disability	228,000 (17%)	185,000 (14%)	80,000 (6%)	80,000 (6%)							
Older adults	166,000 (14%)	142,000 (12%)	68,000 (6%)	68,000 (6%)							
Youth	219,000 (31%)	183,000 (26%)	69,000 (10%)	69,000 (10%)							
	Gaps in service f	or High-Capacity	Transit								
Total People	420,000 (34%)	412,000 (33%)	412,000 (33%)	412,000 (33%)							
People of Color	301,000 (30%)	301,000 (30%)	301,000 (30%)	301,000 (30%)							
People with Lower Incomes	318,000 (32%)	318,000 (32%)	318,000 (32%)	318,000 (32%)							
People with Limited English	262,000 (31%)	262,000 (31%)	262,000 (31%)	262,000 (31%)							
People with a Disability	293,000 (30%)	293,000 (30%)	293,000 (30%)	293,000 (30%)							
Older adults	270,000 (30%)	262,000 (29%)	262,000 (29%)	262,000 (29%)							
Youth	195,000 (47%)	195,000 (47%)	195,000 (47%)	195,000 (47%)							
Total increase in people within 1/4 mile of High-Capacity transit											
Total People	329,000	378,000	378,000	482,000							
People of Color	220,000	251,000	251,000	304,000							
People with Lower Incomes	191,000	222,000	222,000	267,000							
People with Limited English	174,000	203,000	203,000	244,000							
People with a Disability	171,000	202,000 202,000		243,000							
Older adults	133,000	148,000	148,000	175,000							

50,000

67,000

67,000

92,000

Youth



DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Regional Staff Committee

From: Jason Thibedeau, Economic Development Program Manager

Subject: Regional Economic Strategy Update

IN BRIEF

Staff will provide an update on the development of the Regional Economic Strategy and gather input from the committee to help inform future discussions on PSRC's role in economic development and approaches to strategic implementation.

BOARD CALENDAR

Feedback from the Regional Staff Committee and other stakeholder input will be discussed with the Growth Management Policy Board at their November 6 meeting and the Economic Development District Board at its December 3, 2025 meeting.

DISCUSSION

The Central Puget Sound Economic Development District (EDD) is responsible for updating the region's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) every five years. The CEDS is designed to build capacity and guide the economic prosperity and resiliency of a region, building off other regional planning efforts. The CEDS is required to include a summary background of the region's economic conditions, a SWOT analysis, and a set of strategies to address the identified challenges and opportunities.

Implementation of the CEDS is accomplished by a broad set of regional stakeholders, highlighting important ongoing economic development programs and initiatives as well as identifying new opportunities for implementation. Adoption of a regional CEDS enables local jurisdictions and eligible organizations to qualify for funding under U.S.

Economic Development Administration programs. The EDD Board adopted the current CEDS, referred to locally as the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), at its December 2021 meeting. The EDD is required to adopt an updated 5-year CEDS by the end of 2026.

To inform the development of the strategy, staff coordinated the development of a regional profile and SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats) analysis assessing high-level challenges and opportunities that the region's economy is facing. The SWOT analysis is organized around four goal areas: Economic Opportunity, Quality of Life, Global Competitiveness, and Business Climate.

The SWOT analysis was informed by other state and regional economic strategies and analysis, as well as changes to state and federal policy and funding. Staff sought input from PSRC boards and committees, regional economic stakeholders, and the public. At the June RSC meeting, staff provided an overview of the draft SWOT analysis, analysis of local employment and economic development goals, and led a discussion to gather feedback from committee members to help inform the Regional Economic Strategy.

To enable a broad set of input, staff developed an <u>RES Engagement Hub</u>, which provides an opportunity for stakeholders and the public to review a draft SWOT analysis, provide input on the challenges and opportunities that the region faces, and what strategies are needed address them.

At the October RSC meeting, staff will provide an update on the Regional Economic Strategy update process as well as provide an overview of a set of draft 5-year strategies designed to address the findings in the SWOT analysis.

NEXT STEPS

At the December Economic Development District Board meeting, staff will lead a discussion on PSRC's role in regional economic development and an approach to implementation in the Regional Economic Strategy.

For more information, contact Jason Thibedeau, Economic Development Program Manager, at ithibedeau@psrc.org or 206-389-2879.