Today’s Meeting

Project Overview

Highlights of GMPB Recommendation
Centers are how we focus and support our region’s growth.

- VISION 2040 and regional growth allocations
- Local planning
- Funding framework to support growth
- Transit service planning
- Other planning processes
- Data collection and research
Scope of Work

[...] Evaluate the regional centers framework and recommend structural changes to recognize both regional and subregional centers using consistent designation criteria and procedures. If adopted, the new centers framework would inform future regional and local planning and investments.

Implements MPP-DP-6, DP-9, DP-12, Action-3, Action-5
120 board, committee, and outreach meetings

**Workshops**
- Joint-board working sessions
- Centers workshops in each county

**Committees**
- Technical Advisory Group
- Stakeholder Working Group

**Reports + Documents**
- Scope of Work
- Background Paper
- Peer regions appendix
- Military facilities appendix
- Market Study
- Stakeholder Working Group report
- Equity Supplement + Proposal
GMPB Deliberation

- GMPB discussed Centers Framework throughout 2017
- Developed **outline** and **draft proposal** in early fall
- Solicited **public comments** in October/November
- Three meetings to **review comments**, make revisions
- Several **amendments** adopted at Feb 1 meeting
- **Recommendation** to Executive Board at Feb 1 meeting
Decision Process

February 1, 2018 Growth Management Policy Board
Approve Recommendation to Executive Board

February 22, 2018 Executive Board
Briefing, discussion on GMPB recommendation

March 22, 2018 Executive Board
- Identify any potential amendments prior to meeting
- Scheduled for action
GMPB Recommendation
Proposal Development

- Support implementation & success of VISION 2040
- VISION seeks a “limited” number of regional centers
- Support centers we have & have already invested in
- Want system to be meaningful
- Need to be opportunities in each county
- Include performance standards and accountability
Consistent Centers

Current
Different expectations based on when designated
Some centers do not meet current standards

Recommendation
Common expectations
Additional time (2025) for consistency
Path to redesignate based on planning actions

Retain all centers, but make system consistent
Focus on local planning to support centers
Market study to support growth opportunities
Growth Centers

Current
One type
Primary focus on existing and planned density, commitment

Recommendation
Two types & consider other criteria:
- Transit
- Market potential
- Regional role
- Distribution & number of centers

Recognize different types
Expand criteria beyond density
Focus on factors that make centers successful
Industrial Centers

Current

One type
Primary focus on existing and planned jobs, commitment

Recommendation

Recognize different types
Support strategies in Industrial Lands Analysis
Expand criteria beyond employment

Two types & consider other criteria:
• Industrial zoning
• Job type
• Preservation strategies
Countywide Centers

**Current**
- No countywide designation two counties
  - Where present, criteria and designation vary

**Recommendation**
- Criteria focus on:
  - Local priority
  - Mixed use, planning for growth
  - Multimodal options
  - Industrial zoning, retention

- Recognize smaller centers
- Shared meaning between counties
- Criteria for successful centers
- Flexibility and tailoring by county
Military Installations

Current
Not in VISION 2040
All installations eligible to be countywide centers

Recommendation
Recommend major installations in VISION 2040 update
Countywide designation for smaller installations
GMPB Recommendation

What’s the status of…

**Tiers?** GMPB **does not** recommend higher or lower funding priority for different types of regional centers

**Removing centers?** GMPB **does not** recommend de-designating any existing regional centers in VISION 2050

**Role in local centers?** GMPB recommendation **does not** limit local governments from designating local centers
# Amendments Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiated By</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Directed</td>
<td>Planning, Market Study, Mix of Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Cities</td>
<td>Manufacturing/Industrial types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>Military, Countywide Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Countywide Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports</td>
<td>Planning for Industrial Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Minor Technical Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 11 amendments adopted, 3 not adopted
- Recommended full proposal (Pierce County dissenting)
Implementation

- Update Designation Procedures for New Centers
- Identify Issues for VISION 2050 Update
  - Major military installations
  - Center types
- Work with countywide organizations
- Update planning expectations
- Other work plan steps:
  - Develop performance measures
  - Displacement research
  - Transportation funding sources for military base access
Decision Process

February 1, 2018 Growth Management Policy Board
Approve Recommendation to Executive Board

February 22, 2018 Executive Board
Briefing, discussion on GMPB recommendation

March 22, 2018 Executive Board
- Identify any potential amendments prior to meeting
- Scheduled for action