Executive Board
Thursday, February 22, 2018 • 10:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M. [note TIME CHANGE]
PSRC Board Room • 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104

The meeting will be streamed live over the internet at www.psrc.org.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call (10:00)
2. Communications and Public Comment
3. President's Remarks
4. Executive Director’s Report
5. Committee Reports
   a. Transportation Policy Board - Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair
   b. Growth Management Policy Board - Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair
   c. Operations Committee - Executive Bruce Dammeier, Vice President
   d. Economic Development Board - Councilmember Terry Ryan, EDB President
6. Consent Agenda (10:20)
   a. Approve Minutes of Meeting Held December 7, 2017
   b. Approve Minutes of Meeting Held January 25, 2018
   c. Approve Vouchers Dated January 10 through February 8, 2018 in the Amount of $925,533.86
   d. Adopt Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
   e. Approve Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Bonney Lake and Orting
   f. Approve Puyallup Conditional Certification Extension
7. Action Item (10:25)
8. Discussion Item (10:40)
   a. Regional Centers Framework Update - GMPB Recommendation -- Liz Underwood-Bultmann and Paul Inghram, PSRC
9. Discussion Item (11:10)
   a. Port of Seattle’s Sustainable Airport Master Plan -- Lance Lyttle and Clare Gallager, Port of Seattle
10. Action Item (11:40)
    a. Regional Aviation Baseline Study -- Ben Bakkenta and Josh Brown, PSRC
11. Information Items
    b. VISION 2050 Scoping Process
12. Other Business
13. Next Meeting: Thursday, March 22, 2018, 10 - 11:30 a.m., PSRC Board Room
14. Adjourn (12:00)

Board members please submit proposed amendments and materials prior to the meeting for distribution. Organizations/individuals may submit information for distribution. Send to Sheila Rogers, e-mail srogers@psrc.org; fax 206-587-4825; or mail.

Sign language and communication material in alternate formats can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling (206) 464-7090 or TTY Relay 711. 中文 | Chinese, 한국 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese Call 206-587-4819.
February 8, 2018

Project selection guidance recommended

The Transportation Policy Board continued its discussion of the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC Funds. The framework contains all the policies and procedures for project selection for the roughly $524 million the region expects to receive in 2021 and 2022. The policy framework retains most of the same guidance as in previous years, including support for centers. It does raise the rural town centers and corridors program to $5 million.

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty at (206) 971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.

Draft Regional Transportation Plan public comment themes

PSRC received over 150 comments to date. Staff have begun to review the comments received during the formal public comment period that ended on January 31, 2018. The majority of the comments were supportive of the plan, and many of the comments regarded specific projects within the plan. In March, staff will be back with further details, suggested response to comments, and potential refinements to the plan. In April, the board is scheduled to recommend the plan for adoption to the Executive Board prior to its adoption at General Assembly on May 31, 2018. PSRC welcomes additional comment through plan adoption.

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty at (206) 971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.

VISION 2050 Scoping begins

PSRC is seeking public input on the scope for the VISION 2050 plan and State Environmental Policy Act environmental analysis. The public comment period will run through March 19, 2018 at 5 pm. The scoping notice is available online. An ADA reader-accessible version of the scoping notice is available here. What important regional issues should be the focus of the update? How should the
region's growth strategy be updated to plan for 2050? What impacts and actions should be evaluated through environmental review?

In addition to seeking written comments, PSRC will hold listening sessions in King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties to hear more input on the plan update from jurisdictions, agencies, and the community:
- February 13, 3-5 pm at the Union Station Ruth Fisher Board Room, 401 South Jackson Street, Seattle
- February 20, 3-5 pm at the Fife Community Center, 2111 54th Avenue East, Fife
- February 22, 3-5 pm at Lynnwood City Hall, 19100 44th Avenue West, Lynnwood
- February 27, 3-5 pm at the Norm Dicks Government Center, 345 6th Street, Bremerton

PSRC's Growth Management Policy Board will review comments submitted and is expected to adopt a project scope in spring 2018.

More information is available on the project website: [https://www.psrc.org/vision](https://www.psrc.org/vision).

In other business, the board:
- Recommended adoption of a Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Recommended Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Bonney Lake and Orting.
- Recommended approving City of Puyallup's request for an extension of its Comprehensive Plan's Conditional Certification.
- Enjoyed a presentation on the State Facilities Action Plan by Patty Rubstello, Assistant Secretary Office of Urban Mobility & Access for the Washington State Department of Transportation.
February 1, 2018

**Recommendation on Regional Centers Framework Update**

The Growth Management Policy Board recommended the Regional Centers Framework Update to the Executive Board. The recommended framework outlines a revised structure and criteria for regional and countywide centers and direction to update policies and procedures for center planning.

The growth board discussed and voted on amendments to the proposed framework. The amendments adopted by the board included clarifications to planning requirements, revised standards for countywide centers, and a work plan item on identifying funding for military installations.

The Executive Board will hear a briefing on the board recommendation on February 22 and is scheduled to take action in March.

For more information, contact Liz Underwood Bultmann at 206-464-6174 or lunderwood-bultmann@psrc.org.

**Regional Open Space Conservation Plan**

The Growth Management Policy Board was briefed on the draft Regional Open Space Conservation Plan. The plan aims to accelerate conservation of open space in the region by integrating and building on existing efforts across sectors, across agencies, and across jurisdictions. The draft plan is available for review on the PSRC website. Feedback is encouraged by March 8, 2018. The plan will be finalized this summer.

For more information, contact Erika Harris at 206-464-6360, eharris@psrc.org, or Maria Sandercock, at 206-971-3298, msandercock@psrc.org.

**Plan certifications for Bonney Lake and Orting**

The Growth Management Policy Board recommended full certification of the comprehensive plans for Bonney Lake and Orting. The plans had been conditionally certified in 2015 and 2016. Since then, the cities have amended their plans to address conditions for full certification. The growth board found that the plans are now fully consistent with regional policies and conform to the Growth Management Act requirements for transportation planning.

For more information, contact Michael Hubner at 206-971-3289 or mhubner@psrc.org, or Laura Benjamin at lbenjamin@psrc.org or 206-464-7134.
Extending Conditional Certification for Puyallup Comprehensive Plan

The Growth Management Policy Board recommended extending the conditional certification deadline for Puyallup’s comprehensive plan to December 2018. Puyallup has adopted amendments to partially address conditions for certification. Given the work already completed and planned for 2018, the city expects to resolve any remaining concerns with the plan within the next year.

For more information, contact Michael Hubner at 206-464-6179 or mhubner@psrc.org, or Liz Underwood-Bultmann at 206-971-3289 or lunderwood-bultmann@psrc.org.
MINUTES

Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board
Thursday, December 7, 2017
PSRC Board Room

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Executive Board was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Executive Dave Somers, President. The signatures on the Attendance Sheet, as well as documentation by staff, determined attendance and that a quorum was present.

[To watch a video of the meeting and hear the full discussion, please go to: http://psrcwa.iqm2.com/Citizens/Default.aspx.]

Members and Alternates that participated for all or part of the meeting included:

(∗∗participated via teleconference)

Executive Dave Somers, PSRC President, Snohomish County
∗∗Commissioner Glen Bachman, Port of Everett
Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, King County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Bruce Bassett, Mercer Island, King County Other Cities & Towns
∗∗Commissioner Shiv Batra, WA State Transportation Commission
Commissioner Cary Bozeman, Port of Bremerton
Mayor Suzette Cooke, City of Kent
Commissioner John Creighton, Port of Seattle
Councilmember Dino Davis, City of Bremerton
Mayor Jenny Durkan, City of Seattle
Mayor Becky Erickson, Poulsbo, Kitsap County Other Cities & Towns
∗∗Commissioner Charlotte Garrido, Kitsap County
Mayor Don Gerend, Sammamish, King County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, King County Other Cities & Towns
Councilmember Rob Johnson, City of Seattle
Mayor Ron Lucas, Steilacoom, Pierce County Other Cities & Towns
Councilmember Mike O’Brien, City of Seattle
Mayor Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, King County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Joe Pestinger, Orting, Pierce County Other Cities & Towns
∗∗Councilmember Ed Prince, City of Renton
Mayor Chris Roberts, Shoreline, King County Other Cities & Towns
Ms. Patty Rubstello, WSDOT
Councilmember Terry Ryan, Snohomish County
**Councilmember Rick Talbert, Pierce County**
Councilmember Mike Todd, Mill Creek, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Barbara Tolbert, Arlington, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
**Councilmember Stephanie Wright, Snohomish County**

Members absent included:
(*alternate present)

Councilmember Claudia Balducci, King County
Executive Dow Constantine, King County
Executive Bruce Dammeier, Pierce County
Mayor Jim Ferrell, City of Federal Way
*Mayor Denis Law, City of Renton
*Mayor John Marchione, Redmond, King County Other Cities & Towns
Commissioner Dick Marzano, Port of Tacoma
*Secretary Roger Millar, WSDOT
Mayor Ray Stephanson, City of Everett
Mayor John Stokes, City of Bellevue
Mayor Marilyn Strickland, City of Tacoma
Mayor Amy Walen, City of Kirkland

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

The following people addressed the board:
Marguerite Richard
Alex Tsimerman

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

President Dave Somers recognized the following outgoing board members and alternates and thanked them for their service:

- Commissioner Tom Albro, Port of Seattle
- Deputy Mayor Jeanne Burbidge, City of Federal Way
- Mayor Tim Burgess, City of Seattle
- Mayor Fred Butler, City of Issaquah
- Mayor Suzette Cook, City of Kent
- Commissioner John Creighton, Port of Seattle
- Councilmember Dino Davis, City of Bremerton
- Mayor Patty Lent, City of Bremerton
- Mayor Don Gerend, City of Sammamish
- Mayor Joe Pestinger, City of Orting
- Mayor Ray Stephanson, City of Everett
- Mayor Marilyn Strickland, City of Tacoma

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Josh Brown, Executive Director:
- Reported that on November 8th PSRC hosted a successful event titled *Where We're Growing: Planning Together for a Sustainable Region*. The goal of the Regional Staff
Committee event was to reach out to the “next generation” of planners in the region focusing on the work of PSRC and the policies set at the regional scale.

- Provided the board an update on work of the Economic Development District Board, Transportation Policy Board and Growth Management Policy Board.
- Reported that PSRC received from Government Finance Officers Association, a Distinguish Budget Award. He thanked CFO Diana Lauderbach, as well as accounting staff Lilly Mayer, Patty Mosure, and Andrew Werfelmann for their excellent work.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
Operations Committee Report

Mayor Ron Lucas served as Acting Chair of the Operations Committee in the absence of Executive Bruce Dammeier, Vice President, Chair, Operations Committee. Mayor Lucas reported that the Operations Committee met this morning and recommended approval of the vouchers dated September 11 through October 31, 2017 in the Amount of $1,397,351.42. The committee also approved contract authority for a Space Sector Study and contract authority for VISION 2050 Environmental Consultant Services. Additionally, the committee discussed the review process and budget assumptions for the draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program and received grant and contract status reports.

Mayor Lucas then called on Thu Le, HR Manager, who introduced new employee Mitch Koch, Transportation Planning – Data Technician.

CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Erickson/Cooke) to: (a) Approve Minutes of Meeting held October 26, 2017; (b) Approve Vouchers Dated September 11 through October 31, 2017 in the Amount of $1,397,351.42; Approve Contract Authority for Space Sector Study; Approve Contract Authority for VISION 2050 Environmental Consultant Services; Approve Funding for Projects on PSRC 2016-2017 Coordinated Grant Program Contingency List; Approve Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tukwila; and Approve Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for the Towns of South Prairie and Wilkeson. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Regional Centers Framework Update – Project Briefing

Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC Senior Planner and Paul Inghram, PSRC Senior Program Manager, briefed the board on the Regional Centers Framework Update project and board review process. PSRC received approximately 40 written comments and letters from a variety of jurisdictions, organizations, and individuals, on the draft centers proposal that was released for public comment last month. The region’s centers framework defines the types of central places that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment. The Growth Management Policy Board will continue guiding the effort to evaluate the centers framework and recommend changes to recognize different scales of centers using consistent designation criteria and procedures.

VISION 2050
Paul Inghram, PSRC Senior Program Manager, briefed the board on the VISION 2050 project, including a review of the project schedule, early work, and preparation for the formal scoping process to occur in early 2018. Over the next several months, PSRC staff will work with the Growth Management Policy Board on preparing for the project launch - including releasing new forecasts of population and job growth through the year 2050. VISION 2050 will incorporate new information on trends, planning initiatives, and public investments in the regional plan and address emerging issues facing the region as it grows. Adoption of VISION 2050 by the PSRC General Assembly is scheduled for spring 2020.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Director’s Annual Performance Evaluation

At 11:00 a.m. President Dave Somers announced that the board would adjourn to an Executive Session for 20 minutes to discuss the Executive Director’s annual performance evaluation. President Somers reconvened the board meeting at 11:20 a.m.

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Davis) to approve a merit increase for the Executive Director at 3 percent and continue the employer annual match of $6,000 to a 401a Deferred Compensation Plan. The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEM

Included in the agenda packet was the 2018 Executive Board and Operations Committee meeting schedule.

NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board will next meet on Thursday, January 25, 2018; 10 – 11:30 a.m., in the PSRC Board Room.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Adopted this 22nd day of February, 2018

______________________________
Executive Dave Somers, President
Puget Sound Regional Council

ATTEST:

______________________________
Josh Brown, Executive Director
MINUTES

Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board
Thursday, January 25, 2018
PSRC Board Room

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Executive Board was called to order at 10:09 a.m. by Executive Dave
Somers, President. The signatures on the Attendance Sheet, as well as documentation by staff,
determined attendance and that a quorum was present.

[To watch a video of the meeting and hear the full discussion, please go to:

Members and Alternates that participated for all or part of the meeting included:
(**participated via teleconference)

Executive Dave Somers, PSRC President, Snohomish County
Executive Bruce Dammeier, PSRC Vice President, Pierce County
Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, King County Other Cities & Towns
Councilmember Claudia Balducci, King County
**Commissioner Shiv Batra, WA State Transportation Commission
Commissioner Cary Bozeman, Port of Bremerton
**Mayor John Chelminiaj, City of Bellevue
Mayor Becky Erickson, Poulsbo, Kitsap County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Cassie Franklin, City of Everett
Commissioner Charlotte Garrido, Kitsap County
Commissioner Courtney Gregoire, Port of Seattle
Councilmember Kathy Lambert, King County
**Mayor Denis Law, City of Renton
Mayor Ron Lucas, Steilacoom, Pierce County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Christie Malchow, Sammamish, King County Other Cities & Towns
Secretary Roger Millar, WSDOT
Councilmember Teresa Mosqueda, City of Seattle
Councilmember Mike O’Brien, City of Seattle
**Mayor Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, King County Other Cities & Towns
**Mayor Rob Putaansuu, Port Orchard, Kitsap County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Dana Ralph, City of Kent
Mayor Chris Roberts, Shoreline, King County Other Cities & Towns
Councilmember Terry Ryan, Snohomish County
Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, King County Other Cities & Towns
**Councilmember Rick Talbert, Pierce County
Mayor Barbara Tolbert, Arlington, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
**Councilmember Bryan Wahl, Mountlake Terrace, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
**Councilmember Stephanie Wright, Snohomish County

Members absent included:
(*alternate present)

Commissioner Glen Bachman, Port of Everett
*Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, King County Other Cities & Towns
Executive Dow Constantine, King County
Mayor Jenny Durkan, City of Seattle
Mayor Jim Ferrell, City of Federal Way
Councilmember Rob Johnson, City of Seattle
Commissioner Dick Marzano, Port of Tacoma
*Commissioner Hester Serebrin
*Councilmember Mike Todd, Mill Creek, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Amy Walen, City of Kirkland
Mayor Greg Wheeler, City of Bremerton
Mayor Victoria Woodards, City of Tacoma

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

The following person addressed the board: Paul W. Locke.

PRESIDENT’S REMARKS

President Dave Somers welcomed the following new Executive Board members and alternates:
- Mayor David Baker (Kenmore), alternate representing King County Other Cities & Towns
- Mayor Cassie Franklin representing City of Everett
- Commissioner Courtney Greigore, Port of Seattle
- Mayor Christie Malchow (Sammamish), alternate representing King County Other Cities & Towns
- Councilmember Teresa Mosqueda, City of Seattle
- Mayor Dana Ralph representing City of Kent
- Deputy Mayor Lynne Robinson, alternate representing City of Bellevue
- Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford (Lake Forest Park), alternate representing King County Other Cities & Towns

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Josh Brown, Executive Director, reported on the following:
- Welcomed new Executive Board members.
- Reported that he had meetings with the new mayors from Bremerton, Everett, Issaquah, Kent and Tacoma.
- Reported that on January 31, PSRC will host a New Elected Officials Workshop in the boardroom from 9:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
- Provided an update on work of the Transportation Policy Board, Growth Management Policy Board, and Economic Development Board.
COMMITTEE REPORTS

Operations Committee Report

Executive Bruce Dammeier, Chair, Operations Committee, reported that the Operations Committee met this morning and recommended approval of vouchers dated November 9, 2017 through January 10, 2018 in the amount of $1,672,089.33. Additionally, the committee received information on the Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program for FY2018-2019, and received grant and contract status reports.

CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION: It was moved and seconded to (a) Approve Vouchers Dated November 9, 2017 through January 10, 2018 in the Amount of $1,672,089.33, (b) Adopt Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), (c) Authorize a Change in Transportation 2040 Project Status for the Sound Transit Tacoma Link Extension Project, (d) Adopt Regional Safety Performance Management Targets, (e) Approve Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Carnation, and (f) Approve Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Arlington, Duvall, Granite Falls, and Pacific. The motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Approve Funding for Projects through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program

Sarah Gutschow, PSRC Senior Planner, briefed the board on the request to approve funding for projects through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program. PSRC recently conducted a competitive process to award funds from the Federal Highway Administration’s Transportation Alternatives Program. On November 9, 2017, the Transportation Policy Board authorized the release of the projects being recommended to receive funding for public review and comment, including a prioritized contingency list should additional funds become available. At its meeting on January 11, 2018, the Transportation Policy Board reviewed comments and recommended that the Executive Board approve funding for the projects.

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Roberts/Ryan) to approve the projects to receive funding from the 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program as identified in Attachment A, along with list of recommended contingency projects. The motion passed unanimously.

Approve Policies and Procedures for the 2018 Project Selection Process for PSRC Funds

Kelly McGourty, PSRC Senior Program Manager, briefed the board on the request to approve policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process for PSRC funds. PSRC is required under federal legislation to have a documented process that provides the policies and guidance for how PSRC will approve, manage and administer projects to be selected to receive PSRC’s federal funds. PSRC has project selection authority for several sources of funds from both the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Prior to each funding cycle, the policies and procedures for the project selection process are reviewed and updated to reflect current regional priorities and requirements and are
documented in the *Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds*. At its meeting on January 11, the Transportation Policy Board considered the policies and procedures in Attachment A and recommended Executive Board approval.

Members of the Executive Board expressed concern about the revised scoring for the regional criteria, specifically regarding the recommendation to reduce the point value for the Project Readiness Criterion from 10 points to 5 points and move those 5 points to the Policy Criteria.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Dammeier/Erickson) to defer action until the February 22, 2018 Executive Board meeting, to allow the Transportation Policy Board to revisit the distribution of criteria points. The motion passed unanimously.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Regional Transportation Plan Briefing**

Kelly McGourty, PSRC Program Manager, briefed the board on the process to update the Regional Transportation Plan. The draft Regional Transportation Plan describes how the region is planning to catch up and keep up on transportation over the next two decades, while the region’s population is expected to grow to nearly five million people. The draft plan was released for public comment on December 14, 2017, with the formal comment period open through January 31, 2018.

**Regional Growth Forecast for VISION 2050**

Craig Helmann, PSRC Senior Program Manager, provided an overview of PSRC’s latest regional macroeconomic forecasts. PSRC’s macroeconomic forecast is a long-range forecast of projected jobs, population, households, and other economic and demographic variables at the regional scale. PSRC refreshes this forecast every two to four years. The agency has updated and refined the model and extended the forecast out to the year 2050 for the first time.

**Other Business**

There was no other business brought before the board.

**NEXT MEETING**

The Executive Board will next meet on Thursday, February 22, 2018; 10 – 11:30 a.m., in the PSRC Board Room.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Adopted this 22nd day of February, 2018
Executive Dave Somers, President
Puget Sound Regional Council

ATTEST:

Josh Brown, Executive Director
CONSENT AGENDA

To: Executive Board
From: Executive Bruce Dammeier, Chair, Operations Committee
Subject: Approve Vouchers Dated January 10 through February 8, 2018 in the Amount of $925,533.86

IN BRIEF

Two representatives of the Operations Committee review and sign off on the vouchers. In accordance with RCW 42.24.080, following the Operations Committee’s review, the Executive Board approves the vouchers.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend the Executive Board approve the following vouchers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUESTED WARRANT DATE</th>
<th>VOUCHER NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/10/18 - 02/08/18</td>
<td>AP Vouchers</td>
<td>$307,377.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/18 - 01/31/18</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>$618,156.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$925,533.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information, please contact Diana Lauderbach at 206-464-5416; email dlauderbach@psrc.org.
CONSENT AGENDA

February 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board

Subject: Adopt Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

IN BRIEF

Six agencies submitted six projects this month for routine amendment into the Regional TIP. These projects are summarized in Exhibit A. These projects were awarded local, state and federal funding through various processes, such as Connecting Washington funds managed by the Washington State Department of Transportation. PSRC staff reviewed the projects for compliance with federal and state requirements, and consistency with VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040. At its meeting on February 8, the Transportation Policy Board recommended adoption of the amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should adopt an amendment to the 2017-2020 Regional TIP to include the projects as shown in Exhibit A.

DISCUSSION

Under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, PSRC has project selection authority for all projects programming regional funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) - Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) - and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) - Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307), State of Good Repair (5337), Bus and Bus Facilities Formula (5339), and Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310).

While PSRC does not have project selection authority for other types of federal, state, or local funds, the Executive Board does have responsibility for adding these projects to the Regional TIP. Each project must comply with requirements regarding plan consistency, air quality, and financial constraint. The attached Exhibit A illustrates the action needed to amend the Regional TIP.
The recommended action would approve the TIP amendment request based on a finding of consistency with VISION 2040, Transportation 2040, and the air quality conformity determination of the Regional TIP. Approval is also based on a determination that funding is reasonably expected to be available to carry out the project. Information describing plan consistency, air quality conformity, and the funding basis for approving the request is described further below.

**Consistency with VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040**

The projects recommended for action were reviewed by PSRC staff and have been determined to be consistent with the multicounty policies in VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040.

**Air Quality Conformity**

The projects in Exhibit A were reviewed and it has been determined that a new air quality analysis and conformity determination is not required because each project falls into one or more of the following categories:

- It is exempt from air quality conformity requirements.
- It is an existing project already included in the current air quality modeling.
- It is a non-exempt project not able to be included in the regional model.

**Funding Reasonably Expected to be Available**

For the projects in Exhibit A, PSRC confirmed that the funds are reasonably expected to be available.

**PSRC’s Project Tracking Policies**

Request: King County Metro requests to change the scope of its project, Refurbishment of Elevators in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel, by reducing the number of elevators refurbished from 26 to 17 elevators. In 2016, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) notified Metro that it needed to re-bid its refurbishment contract. Five elevators were completed prior to the re-bid using local funds, so are no longer included in the scope. In addition, four elevators located in the Convention Place Station will not be part of the total due to the sale of that location.

The modification was found to be consistent with PSRC’s project tracking policies and was reviewed and recommended by the Transportation Operations Committee (TOC) at its meeting on January 24, 2018.

**Federal and State Fund Source Descriptions**

The following is a list of state and federal funding sources that are referenced in Exhibit A.

- **STP(W)**: WSDOT-managed funds included in the Surface Transportation Block Grant program.
- **CWA**: State Connecting Washington Account.
- **NHPP**: Provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS).
STP(BR) WSDOT-managed Local Bridge Program, providing assistance for eligible bridges on public roads.

For more information, please contact Chris Peak at (206) 464-7536 or cpeak@psrc.org.

Attachments:
Exhibit A
## Exhibit A

### Project(s) Proposed for Routine Amendment to 2017-2020 TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title and Work Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>PSRC Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Bellevue | **Mountains to Sound Greenway (B)**
New project adding a new Construction phase to design and construct a separated multi-use trail. | $14,000,000 Connecting Washington, $274,683 Local, $14,274,683 Total | ☑ |
| 2. King County Department of Transportation (Road Services) | **Coal Creek Bridge (#3035A) Replacement**
New project adding Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, and Construction phases to replace existing structurally deficient bridge with new single span concrete bridge and reconstruct approaches. | $3,093,857 Federal STP(BR), $536,278 Local, $3,630,135 Total | ☑ |
| 3. King County Department of Transportation (Transit) | **Refurbishment of Elevators in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel**
Project modification adding a new Other phase to refurbish 17 elevators located in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel. | $1,110,878 Local, $1,110,878 Total | ☑ |
| 4. Pierce County | **BR #31221-A / CRAMER RD KPN**
New project adding new Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, and Construction phases to the Project. The existing bridge will be replaced with a single span precast concrete girder bridge structure. | $3,461,465 Federal STP(BR), $865,367 Local, $4,326,832 Total | ☑ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title and Work Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>PSRC Action Needed</th>
<th>New Project Tracking</th>
<th>Project/Phase</th>
<th>UPW1 Amends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Tacoma</td>
<td>S. 19th Street -Union to Mullen</td>
<td>$2,517,865 Federal NHPP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New project adding new Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, and Construction phases to an overlay of S. 19 Street between Mullen Street to Union Avenue.</td>
<td>$752,090 Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,269,955 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WSDOT Northwest Region</td>
<td>SR 202/Evans Creek &amp; Patterson Creek - Fish Passage</td>
<td>$8,313,078 Federal STP(W)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove the existing fish passage barriers and replace them with fish passable structures.</td>
<td>$461,100 Connecting Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$169,654 Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,943,832 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT AGENDA

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board
Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair, Growth Management Policy Board

Subject: Approve Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Bonney Lake and Orting

IN BRIEF

The Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board recommend that the Executive Board certify the comprehensive plan amendments for the cities of Bonney Lake and Orting that respond to the conditions for regional certification.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should certify the transportation-related provisions of the following comprehensive plans, as amended in 2017, are consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and conform to the Growth Management requirements for transportation planning.

1) City of Bonney Lake (certification report)
2) City of Orting (certification report)

DISCUSSION

The 2015 comprehensive plan updates for the cities of Bonney Lake and Orting were conditionally certified in 2015 and 2016 as part of PSRC’s plan review process. Conditional certification allowed the cities to qualify for PSRC-managed federal funding while working to address the conditions.

Bonney Lake

On January 28, 2016, PSRC conditionally certified the City of Bonney Lake’s 2015 periodic update of the comprehensive plan. The December 2015 certification report for the Bonney Lake comprehensive plan update identified inconsistency between the anticipated growth included in the plan and the housing and employment growth targets adopted by Pierce County. The conditional certification called for the city to consider adjustments to the plan’s anticipated population and employment growth to more closely align with adopted countywide targets, recognize the role of designated Small Cities in accommodating growth, identify strategies to
manage growth, and ensure that proposed expansions of the Urban Growth Area (UGA) are consistent with countywide planning policies and do not add capacity for growth that is inconsistent with the city’s role as a Small City.

In March 2017, PSRC reclassified Bonney Lake from a Small City to a Larger City, recognizing the current population and employment size of the city. Under PSRC’s Regional Growth Strategy, Larger Cities are anticipated to accommodate a larger share of the county’s population, housing, and employment growth. In a separate but related process, the city coordinated closely with Pierce County and PSRC during discussions of target adjustments. As part of the 2017 target reconciliation, the city’s housing targets were increased to accommodate growth targets transferred from other communities in Pierce County. Bonney Lake revised the plan’s discussion of growth targets and demonstrated that the revised estimates of the city’s growth are reasonably close to the adopted revised Pierce County targets. The city’s analysis of growth rates leads it to anticipate population growth that is about 38% higher than the adopted growth target. In addition, actions identified in the plan are consistent with the conditions and take steps to better align city growth with the Regional Growth Strategy. These actions include:

- Use of a Residential/Conservation Zoning District
- Redesignating 163 acres to Open Space-Conservation
- Adopting the Bonney Lake Centers Plan and focusing future growth to three designated centers in the city
- Prioritizing transportation and infrastructure spending to support those three centers

Finally, the city has worked with the county’s Growth Management Coordinating Council regarding management of the Urban Growth Area (UGA). The city’s adopted plan amendments modify its discussion of the UGA and remove several areas that were previously identified for potential UGA expansion.

**Orting**

On October 29, 2015, PSRC conditionally certified the City of Orting’s 2015 periodic update of the comprehensive plan. The September 2015 certification report noted that while the plan included notable policies that address pedestrian and bicycle facilities, additional work was needed to complete the GMA-required pedestrian and bicycle component of the transportation element.

In January 2018, the city adopted amendments to the plan that address the condition and resubmitted the plan for further review and full certification. The 2017 plan amendments include new and revised policies supporting the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The city also developed a nonmotorized plan and included it in the updated transportation element.

The amendments for the plans discussed above have been reviewed in accordance with the adopted plan review process. They were found to be consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and to conform to transportation planning requirements in the Growth Management Act. PSRC staff coordinated with city staff in the review of the amendments and the development of the certification reports.
NEXT STEPS

With nearly all cities in the region fully certified, review of comprehensive plans has slowed. However, PSRC will continue to review major comprehensive plan changes, such as new and updated center subarea plans, major amendments to transportation and land use provisions of the plans, amendments that address conditional certification, and plans that have yet to receive certification for the periodic update. These new plans and plans with significant changes will be brought to the GMPB for review and action.

Many jurisdictions complete annual plan amendments, the majority of which are minor land use changes, updates to the capital improvement program, and updates to functional plans. During the next two years, most of board and planning staff capacity will be devoted to VISION 2050. Staff will continue to process all adopted plan amendments and conduct a cursory review to determine if the amendments are minor or if they require board action. Local jurisdictions can assume that minor amendments to previously fully certified plans do not affect the plan’s certification status, unless otherwise notified by PSRC.

For more information, please contact Michael Hubner at (206) 971-3289 or MHubner@psrc.org or Laura Benjamin at lbenjamin@psrc.org or (206) 464-7134.
CONSEN SE AGENDA

February 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board
         Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair, Growth Management Policy Board

Subject: Approve Puyallup Conditional Certification Extension

IN BRIEF

The Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board recommend that the Executive Board grant the City of Puyallup an extension to December 31, 2018, to allow additional time to address conditions.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should grant an extension of the conditional certification of the transportation-related provisions in the City of Puyallup’s comprehensive plan until December 2018.

DISCUSSION

In April 2016, the Executive Board acted to conditionally certify the transportation-related provisions in the City of Puyallup’s comprehensive plan. Conditional certification is recommended if only a limited set of major issues are identified during review, the jurisdiction has committed to resolve the issue(s), and the jurisdiction and PSRC have established an update schedule. Conditional certification includes regular updates to PSRC by the jurisdiction to ensure progress and satisfactory resolution of the issues.

Review of Puyallup’s plan found that it is consistent with the majority of requirements but did not provide sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated growth and included inconsistencies between plan elements. The city acknowledged these issues, and the certification action in 2016 included a schedule for the plan update to be completed by December 2017.

In a letter dated December 28, 2017 (see Attachment A), the city documents progress to date and requests extension of its conditional certification to the end of 2018. The city has taken several actions to begin resolving issues identified in the certification report. In 2017, the city adopted a subarea plan for the South Hill regional growth center and completed an updated
capacity analysis. This was an important step in accommodating additional employment and residential growth in the city. The city also adopted plan amendments to resolve internal inconsistencies between plan elements. Puyallup is working on additional planning in 2018 to increase development capacity and support additional infill development.

PSRC staff has been working with the city and supports an extension to the conditional certification deadline. Given the work already completed and planned for 2018, the city expects to resolve any remaining concerns with the plan within the next year.

For more information, please contact Michael Hubner at (206) 464-6179 or MHubner@psrc.org or Liz Underwood-Bultmann at (206) 971-3289 or LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - Puyallup Certification Extension Request 2018
City of Puyallup
Development Services Department

December 28, 2017

Paul Inghram, AICP
Senior Program Manager
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Ste 500
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Mr. Inghram,

The purpose of this letter is to address the City of Puyallup’s Comprehensive Plan conditional certification status. Following the November 2015 adoption of the City’s 2015 Comprehensive Plan periodic update, the Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board conditionally certified the City’s comprehensive plan with a requirement to amend the plan to demonstrate sufficient capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial development provided for in the plan and align the projections used in the Transportation analysis with the growth assumptions adopted in the Land Use Element.

Our City Council adopted a resolution in June 2016, which committed to working to address the conditions for regional certification by December 31, 2017. To that end, the City completed an updated capacity analysis for the South Hill sub-area following adoption of the South Hill Neighborhood Plan and associated area-wide rezoning. That analysis, which was incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan through the 2017 annual amendment cycle, demonstrated that Puyallup has capacity that exceeds the Pierce County 2030 growth targets. However, additional capacity is needed to meet the extrapolated 2035 growth projections, and the updated capacity analysis is not fully consistent with the projections used for the 2035 Transportation model update.

Following dialogue between City Planning staff and PSRC staff, we are requesting additional time to meet the requirements for full certification, acknowledging the ongoing work the City has been doing to address its conditional certification status and documenting specific additional efforts that will be completed over the next year.

In addition to this recently completed capacity analysis, the City is also moving forward on additional measures that will likely result in increased housing and employment capacity. These include:

- Completion of a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement for the Downtown Regional Growth Center (in process; anticipated completion March 2018);
- Completion of a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement for the South Hill Regional Growth Center (budgeted but not yet started; anticipated completion December 2018);
- Adoption of code amendments related to affordable and infill housing allowances (in process; anticipated completion June 2018).
At this time, based on the work that has been completed and the work anticipated to be completed over the next year, the City of Puyallup respectfully requests an extension of our Comprehensive Plan conditional certification, through December 31, 2018.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas C. Utterback, AICP
Director

Cc: Kevin Yamamoto, City Manager
ACTION ITEM

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board

Subject: Approve Policies and Procedures for the 2018 Project Selection Process for PSRC Funds

IN BRIEF

PSRC is required under federal legislation to have a documented process that provides the policies and guidance for how PSRC will approve, manage and administer projects to be selected to receive PSRC’s federal funds. PSRC has project selection authority for several sources of funds from both the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Prior to each funding cycle, the policies and procedures for the project selection process are reviewed and updated to reflect current regional priorities and requirements, and are documented in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds. At its meeting on January 11, the Transportation Policy Board considered the policies and procedures in Attachment A and recommended Executive Board approval.

At the Executive Board meeting on January 25, the board deferred action on the Framework and requested that the Transportation Policy Board review in greater detail one element of the recommendations, having to do with a redistribution of points within the regional project evaluation criteria. The Transportation Policy Board met on February 8 and, after review and discussion of the proposal, recommended approval of the revised point distributions as shown in Attachments B and C.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should approve the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process (Attachment A), including the redistribution of points within the project evaluation criteria for both PSRC’s Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration regional competitions as described in Attachments B and C. The policies and procedures will be documented in the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds.

DISCUSSION
At their meeting on January 25, the Executive Board reviewed the recommendations from the Project Selection Task Force on the policies and procedures for conducting the 2018 project selection process for PSRC’s federal funds. These recommendations included a variety of items, from the policy focus to set-asides to strengthening of criteria elements. Also included was a revision to the project evaluation criteria to reduce the point value for the project readiness criterion from ten points to five points, reflecting the fact that funds will be programmed several years in to the future, as well as the new procedure for balancing all funds by year to the estimated available amounts.

Included in the final recommendation was the decision to move the five points thus freed up to the overall “Policy” section of the criteria. The original recommendation was to allow staff and the PSRC project selection committees to finalize this work prior to the call for projects. However, at the January 25, 2018 meeting of the Executive Board, concerns were raised about these points and the implications from placing them on certain of the policy criteria. As such, the Executive Board postponed adoption of the Framework and directed staff to provide more details on this topic to the Transportation Policy Board in February.

The regional project criteria are categorized into “Policy” and “Technical” criteria. The Policy criteria include elements of support for the development of centers and serving various population groups, and transportation benefits such as mobility and accessibility, safety, etc. The Technical criteria include air quality and project readiness. With the exception of projects seeking FHWA Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds, which are heavily weighted towards emissions reduction per program requirements, the Policy criteria has historically represented 70% of the total 100 points. Within the Policy criteria, the support for centers element has represented 40-50% of the total, and the transportation benefits elements has represented 20-30%.

Attachment B contains a summary of the project evaluation criteria for the regional competition for PSRC’s Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds; Attachment C contains a summary of the project evaluation criteria for the regional competition for PSRC’s Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds. The criteria and the revised point distributions were reviewed and forwarded by the Regional Project Evaluation Committee and the Regional FTA Caucus to the Transportation Policy Board. The recommendation is to apply the freed up five points from the reduced project readiness criterion to the transportation benefits elements within the Policy criteria. This recommendation takes into consideration the existing weighting among the various criteria categories and discussions at the Project Selection Task Force regarding the importance of safety.

Following review and discussion at its February meeting, the Transportation Policy Board recommended approval of the revised point distributions to apply the freed-up five points from the reduced project readiness criterion to the transportation benefits elements within the Policy criteria. An amendment was submitted by Pierce County to revise the criteria for the FHWA regional project evaluation criteria, to allow military installations to be recognized as being equivalent to regional centers, and therefore for projects on corridors supporting military installations to be allowed to compete. This amendment did not pass, with 10 aye votes and 13 nay votes.

With Executive Board approval on February 22, the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process will be documented in the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds,
a Call for Projects will be released,¹ and the overall schedule for the project selection process can still be maintained. A draft schedule for the 2018 process follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Policy Framework adopted; Call for Projects issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Staff committee project recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Board review of recommended projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>Air quality conformity analysis and preparation of the new 2019-2022 TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>Public comment period on new TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Board adoption of new TIP; submittal to WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>State and Federal approval of new TIP; funds available to projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty at 206-971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.

Attachments:
- TIP-02 AttA - 2018 Policies and Procedures Att A
- B-Final Feb 2018 FHWA Summary Matrix
- C-Final Feb 2018 FTA Summary Matrix

¹ Per past practice, the *Policy Framework* will provide details on the requirement that local jurisdictions must have the transportation elements of their comprehensive plans certified, or conditionally certified, by PSRC to be eligible to compete for PSRC’s federal funds.
Attachment A
2018 Project Selection Task Force Recommendations

The Project Selection Task Force recommendations on the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process for PSRC’s federal funds are summarized below, encompassing both PSRC’s Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding processes. Full details on the 2018 project selection process will be documented in the final 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, which is anticipated to be released as part of the Call for Projects in February of 2018.

Administrative Details

1. Funding years to program = FFY 2021 and 2022
2. Funding estimates will be based on 2017 final allocations, per consultation with FHWA, FTA and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Refer to Attachments B and C for further details on the funding breakdown.
3. A four-part selection process will be conducted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHWA Funds</th>
<th>FTA Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Competitions</td>
<td>Earned Share Distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSRC’s FHWA funds will be split between a regional competition and competitions conducted by each of the four countywide forums. The distribution is 50/50% after the set-asides have been applied to the total available funding. A limit of 36 applications is set for the regional FHWA competition; each countywide forum sets their own procedures for the countywide competitions.

PSRC’s FTA funds will be split between a regional competition and earned share distributions to the region’s transit operators. There are three Urbanized Areas (UZAs) in the region – Marysville, Bremerton and Seattle-Tacoma-Everett – and FTA funds come to the region based on both regional attributes and the individual operating characteristics of each transit agency. Per policy, this latter portion of the funds is distributed to each transit agency based on their earnings, called the "earned share" distribution. Within the Marysville and Bremerton UZAs there is only one transit operator; therefore only an earned share distribution is conducted within those areas. Within the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett UZA approximately 86% of the FTA funds received is based on the service and operating characteristics of the nine transit operators within the UZA, and is distributed via the earned share distribution. The remaining 14% is based on regional attributes and is distributed via a regional competition. There are no limits to the number of applications for the FTA regional competition.

Prioritized contingency lists of projects will continue to be created as part of each competitive process, should additional funds become available prior to the next process.
Set-Asides

1. The bicycle/pedestrian set-aside is retained at 10% of the total estimated FHWA funds and will be allocated by population among the four countywide forums, to be distributed via a competitive process.

2. The preservation set-aside for PSRC’s FHWA funds is retained at 20% of the total estimated Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funds, with retention of the provision in 2016 to add 5% to the countywide processes. The preservation set-aside for PSRC’s FTA funds is retained at 45% of the regional competitive FTA funds.

3. The Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program is increased from $3 million to $5 million of FHWA STP funds from the regional competitive portion of funds. This program was created in 2003 to assist rural communities in implementing town center and corridor improvements, in coordination with state highway corridor interests. This program is above and beyond the minimum amount of STP funds required to be spent in the federally designated rural area. Normally, this program is conducted one year later than the main project selection process; staff is reviewing options for whether to conduct this process in 2018 or 2019.

4. The methodology to allocate funds for the Kitsap countywide competition by applying their population share to the total estimated STP funds, rather than after other set-asides have been applied as is done for the other counties, is retained. Kitsap County jurisdictions are ineligible to utilize the other PSRC FHWA funding source - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds – and this methodology provides a modest increase to the amount that would otherwise be available for the Kitsap countywide competition.

5. The minimum floor set-aside, which provides an adjustment for those transit operators earning less than 1% of the total earned share FTA funding within the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett Urbanized Area, is retained, and remains capped at FFY2015 levels. In addition, staff is directed to consider the full range of transit operations and ownership of assets when conducting the calculation.

6. The amount of funds from both FHWA and FTA for PSRC’s work program is retained at $1 million per year of FHWA funds and $1.25 million per year of FTA funds.

Policy Details

1. The policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them is retained. For the regional FHWA competition centers are defined as regionally designated growth and manufacturing/industrial centers; for all other competitions centers are broadened to include locally identified centers. The provision to include military bases as locally defined centers for the countywide processes is retained.

2. The project evaluation criteria address elements such as supporting centers, safety, mobility, populations served, accessibility, emissions, project readiness and other elements. The Task Force recommended the following improvements for the 2018 process:

In 2016, the preservation set-aside for FHWA funds was reduced from 25% to 20%, with the 5% delta distributed to the countywide processes.
• the elements of safety and equity are included in the criteria, but should be made more explicit and be called out individually
• the improvements adopted in 2016 to strengthen the CMAQ program were retained: setting a higher amount of CMAQ funds in the regional process; setting a higher weighting for the air quality score for CMAQ projects; and utilizing cost-effectiveness in the air quality score for CMAQ projects
• the provision of transit projects being coordinated and integrated with the local system should be strengthened by ensuring consistency with state, local and transit agency plans
• given the advanced programming to FFY 2021-2022, and given that a set amount of funds, by source, is available to be utilized in any given year, the project readiness criterion is modified in the following ways: 1) evaluation will be based on a risk / feasibility assessment of delivery by the expected timeline, rather than seeking projects that are “ready to go” at point of application; and 2) points are reduced from ten to five points. The remaining five points will be moved to the Policy section of the criteria.

3. Information was provided to the Task Force on the process to distribute PSRC’s FTA funds for special needs populations (specifically, seniors and people with disabilities). This process is conducted separately from the main project selection process, the details of which have not historically been included in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds. PSRC’s competition has been conducted in concert with the state’s coordinated grant process, and staff has been working with WSDOT and PSRC’s Special Needs Transportation Committee to discuss opportunities to streamline the overall process, which would result in a greater role by WSDOT and more coordination and strategic planning on the part of PSRC. These discussions are ongoing, with more details to be determined; staff will present additional information to the Board in the future as these proposals unfold.

New for 2018

1. Both FHWA and FTA funding awards must now be balanced by year, and the amount of funds able to be utilized in a given year is limited by the annual estimated allocation amount by funding source. This has been standard practice for PSRC’s FTA funds for many years, but is new to PSRC’s FHWA funds and is a result of the region “catching up” on the use of older, previously awarded funds. Since only a certain amount of funding may be used each year, and to ensure the region continues to meet its annual FHWA delivery targets, the amount that may be requested in the FHWA regional competition is limited to 50% of each year’s available funding, by source. There is no limit to the FTA regional competition, as there are fewer applicants and the process has been conducted in this manner since 2004.

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty at (206) 971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.
### ATTACHMENT B: FHWA Regional Project Evaluation Criteria Scoring Matrix Summary

**FHWA REGIONAL COMPETITION**

Note 1: Projects select a category based on their location, and answer criteria specific to that category - A) Projects located within a Regional Growth Center; B) Projects located within a Manufacturing/Industrial Center; or C) Projects located on a corridor serving either a Regional Growth or Manufacturing/Industrial Center. The criteria are similar, but tailored to each of the three categories. Each category has a total of 100 points available, and there is no priority between categories.

Note 2: Projects select the funding source for which they will compete, which have different weightings of the criteria; STP (Surface Transportation Program) or CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program), which is more heavily weighted towards the reduction of emissions.

#### 2016 SCORING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY A: Projects Located in a Designated Regional Growth Center</th>
<th>STP Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>CMAQ Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED 2018 SCORING STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1: Policy Criteria (Category Specific Questions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Growth Center Development</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(supports housing/employment densities in the center; supports development/redevelopment plans and activities of the center; supports jobs/businesses)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to the Regional Growth Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(remedies a problem; serves user groups and equity populations)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation within the Regional Growth Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(improves accessibility; fills a gap; provides a missing mode; improves circulation; provides active transportation opportunities; addresses safety and security)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2: Technical Criteria for all Projects</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/Climate Change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness/Financial Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CATEGORY B: Projects Located in a Designated Manufacturing / Industrial Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1: Policy Criteria (Category Specific Questions)</th>
<th>STP Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>CMAQ Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>STP Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>CMAQ Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development and User Benefit</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(supports development plans and activities of the center; supports jobs/businesses; serves user groups and equity populations)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility and Accessibility Benefit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(enhances freight movement; completes a gap or provides a link in the freight system; addresses safety &amp; security; improves access; provides active transportation opportunities; promotes TDM options)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Technical Criteria for all Projects</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Climate Change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness/Financial Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The recommendation is to move the 5 points – within each of the three project categories – from project readiness to that section of the policy criterion dealing with mobility, accessibility, safety, and general transportation benefits, rather than the section on support for centers, since that is already weighted more heavily.

### CATEGORY C: Projects Located on a Corridor Serving a Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1: Policy Criteria (Category Specific Questions)</th>
<th>STP Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>CMAQ Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>STP Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>CMAQ Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Regional Growth or Manufacturing/Industrial Center</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(supports housing/employment development in a center; provides a range of modes; serves user groups and equity populations; supports new jobs/businesses)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Continuity/Long-Term Benefit and Sustainability</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(supports efficiency of corridor; provides a logical segment; fills a missing link; relieves pressure on system; addresses safety &amp; security; provides active transportation opportunities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Technical Criteria for all Projects</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Climate Change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness/Financial Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT C: FTA Regional Project Evaluation Criteria Scoring Matrix Summary

### FTA REGIONAL COMPETITION

Note: There is only one project category and one set of criteria for the FTA regional competition.

### 2016 SCORING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1: Policy Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Regional Growth, Manufacturing/Industrial and/or Locally Identified Center</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Continuity/Long Term Benefit-Sustainability</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 2: Technical Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality and Climate Change</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness/Financial Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 100 | 100.0% | 100 | 100.0%
DISCUSSION ITEM

February 15, 2018

To: Executive Board
From: Josh Brown, Executive Director
Subject: Regional Centers Framework Update - GMPB Recommendation

IN BRIEF

The Growth Management Policy Board’s recommendation to update the Regional Centers Framework will be presented to the Executive Board. The board will be asked to provide direction to staff to bring the item back for action at the March meeting.

DISCUSSION

At its February 1 meeting, GMPB recommended the Regional Centers Framework Update to the Executive Board. This recommendation is based on a year-long board review process that sought common ground to update criteria and expectations for regional growth centers, manufacturing/industrial centers, military installations, and countywide centers. The full GMPB recommendation is provided as Attachment A. A summary overview of the recommendation is provided in Attachment B.

Centers play a pivotal role in how the region accommodates growing population and employment. Centers are places where cities and counties plan to focus most new jobs and housing in compact, walkable communities well connected to transit. Manufacturing/industrial centers preserve key industrial land into the long-term and support job growth. The region has designated 29 regional growth centers and nine manufacturing/industrial centers.

Since 2015, PSRC has been working with its members and other partners to evaluate the regional centers framework to better recognize and support centers throughout the region. This effort carries out a scope of work adopted by GMPB.

The scope of work identified several guiding principles to inform the work:

- Support the Growth Management Act and VISION 2040
- Focus growth consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy
- Recognize and support different types and roles of regional and subregional centers
- Provide common procedures across the region
• Guide strategic use of limited regional investments
• Inform future planning updates at regional, countywide, and local levels

Project Background
The Regional Centers Framework Update project has included multiple phases, significant member engagement, and extensive board and committee discussion.

PSRC held county-level workshops in 2015 and convened two Joint Board Work Sessions in 2016 to discuss project findings and provide direction for the stakeholder planning process.

A staff-level Centers Stakeholder Working Group met monthly from June 2016 through January 2017 to develop recommendations. Membership on the Stakeholder Working Group followed the composition approved by GMPB and includes representation from all four counties, the ports, Navy, and business and environmental interests.

The Stakeholder Working Group issued a report in February 2017 with recommended changes, structural options for board consideration, and a summary of how the recommendations and alternatives responded to the background research findings. The report also identified additional policy and technical for the board to consider in its review.

GMPB Recommendation
Throughout 2017, GMBP held several extended work sessions to discuss updates to the centers framework and develop a board recommendation. The board reached broad agreement that it is important for the framework to manage the number of regional centers, to be meaningful, to provide opportunities in each county, and to establish standards and maintain accountability.

The recommended framework outlines the structure and criteria for regional and countywide centers and updates policies and procedures. The recommendation:

• Encourages larger centers to plan for more growth
• Creates a new path for designating manufacturing/industrial centers
• Sets approach to redesignate all existing regional centers
• Recognizes major military installations in VISION 2050 and encourage identification of funding options for military installations
• Increases planning and performance expectations for all centers
• Establishes guidelines for consistent designation of countywide centers

The board solicited public comments in the fall of 2017 and incorporated changes based on comments received. In February, GMPB discussed and voted on amendments to the proposed framework. Several of these amendments passed with broad support. They included clarifications to planning requirements, revised standards for countywide centers, and a work plan item on identifying funding options for military installations.
Two amendments resulted in split votes and lengthy discussion by the GMPB:
  • A proposal regarding project funding for military installations and
  • Standards for countywide centers.

After acting on the amendments, the GMPB acted to approve the centers framework and forward their recommendation to the Executive Board with one dissenting vote on the full proposal from Pierce County.

At its meeting on February 22, the Executive Board will hear a briefing on the GMPB recommendation and is scheduled to take action in March. Additional details are available on the Centers Framework project page.

For more information, please contact Liz Underwood-Bultmann at 206-464-6174, LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - Regional Centers Framework - GMPB Recommendation
B - GMPB Recommendation Overview (Feb 2018)
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1. Purpose and Background

Purpose

Centers are the hallmark of VISION 2040 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.

In 2015, the Growth Management Policy Board adopted a scope of work to review the existing centers framework. The regional centers have been integral to regional planning for over 20 years, and this update represented an opportunity to reassess the system in place today and opportunities to recognize other places that are serving important roles in the region. The Regional Centers Framework outlines a revised structure and criteria for regional and countywide centers and direction to update policies and procedures to update to the regional centers framework.

This update will:

- Clearly define the types of central places—both larger and smaller—within the region that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment.
- Establish criteria and planning expectations that ensure centers are developing as thriving and connected communities with sufficient market potential to accommodate new jobs and residents.
- Provide for consistent designation of centers at the regional and countywide levels across the region.
- Address requirements for new centers and redesignation of existing regional centers.

Growth in centers has significant regional benefits, including supporting multimodal transportation options, compact growth, housing choices near jobs, climate goals, and access to opportunity. As important focal points for investment and development, regional centers represent a crucial opportunity to support equitable access to affordable housing, services, health, quality transit service, and employment, as well as to build on the community assets currently present within centers.

Implementation

This framework establishes key opportunities for the region to support VISION 2040’s objective of encouraging development of compact, livable centers as an opportunity to accommodate a significant portion of the region’s growth. Adoption of the framework in itself does not change regional or local policies, regulations, or funding mechanisms. Implementation of the framework will take several steps that are discussed in Section 12 of the framework:

- Updating new center designation procedures
- Developing new administrative procedures for monitoring of existing centers
- Updating VISION 2040, including guidance on growth expectations for centers
- Updating countywide planning policies with countywide criteria and designations
- Measuring performance and outcomes over time
- Completing additional analysis on social equity strategies for centers
- Completing additional review and consultation with tribes on the role of tribal lands in the centers framework
- Research funding opportunities for centers
- Research the number and distribution of centers
The framework proposal focuses on the criteria and process to designate and evaluate regional and countywide centers. The proposal does not recommend prioritizing funding based on center size or type. The proposal identifies different types and sizes of regional centers to better tailor expectations for future growth and development in centers.

Development of the board proposal has focused on providing opportunities for jurisdictions to designate new centers and flexibility to maintain existing centers, including at least two growth centers and one manufacturing/industrial center in each county. The centers framework should continue to maintain appropriate regional distribution and provide for opportunities to designate new centers.

**Guiding Principles & Objectives**

In the project scope of work, the Growth Management Policy Board adopted the following guiding principles for the project:

- Support the Growth Management Act and VISION 2040.
- Focus growth consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.
- Recognize and support different types and roles of regional and subregional centers.
- Provide common procedures across the region.
- Guide strategic use of limited regional investments.
- Inform future planning updates at regional, countywide, and local levels.

Objectives to guide the project were establish at a joint board session in 2016:

**Growth:** Centers attract robust population and employment growth—a significant and growing share of the region’s overall growth.

**Mobility:** Centers provide diverse mobility choices so that people who live and work in centers have alternatives to driving alone.

**Environment:** Centers improve environmental sustainability by diverting growth away from rural and resource lands, habitat, and other critical areas, and towards urban areas with existing infrastructure.

**Social Equity and Opportunity:** Centers offer high access to opportunity, including affordable housing choices and access to jobs, to a diverse population.

**Economic Development:** Centers help the region maintain a competitive economic edge by offering employers locations that are well connected to a regional transportation network, and are attractive and accessible to workers.

**Public Health:** Centers create safe, clean, livable, complete and healthy communities that promote physical, mental, and social well-being.

The Regional Centers Framework Update project included significant outreach and committee and board discussions. The process was informed by staff-level Technical Advisory Group and Stakeholder Working Group, joint board sessions, county-level workshops, and ongoing outreach to local governments. A staff-level Stakeholder Working Group met from June 2016 through January 2017 and identified recommendations and alternatives for PSRC’s boards to consider. Their final report informed deliberation by the Growth Management Policy Board in 2017.
2. Regional Centers Designation Procedures

The Designation Procedures for New Centers contains detailed requirements for designation and review of regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers. The procedures are adopted by the Executive Board.

As part of the implementation of this framework, PSRC will update the Designation Procedures for New Centers to incorporate the following procedural changes:

- When designating new regional centers, the PSRC boards will also consider:
  - Distribution of centers throughout the region, including by county, and whether new center locations would be advantageous for overall regional growth objectives. Centers should be distributed in locations consistent with the regional vision, and in areas that do not place additional development pressure on rural and resource lands. Environmental factors may be considered in designating new centers.
  - The overall number of centers in the region, supported by research on the number and distribution of centers.

- Application and review of new regional centers will be limited to major regional growth plan updates (VISION 2040 and its successor plans) and approximately every five years, following the results of performance monitoring. As an interim measure, the application period for new centers will remain open through the fall of 2019.

- Employment and/or activity thresholds for new regional centers will be reviewed and potentially updated when the regional growth plan is updated to account for overall growth in centers over time. Center designations should remain relatively stable over the long term, but will allow centers to change into new types when they have achieved higher levels of activity and other criteria.

3. Regional Growth Centers Eligibility and Criteria

Regional growth centers are locations of more compact, pedestrian-oriented development with a mix of housing, jobs, retail, services, and other destinations. The region’s plans identify centers as areas that should receive a significant share of the region’s population and employment growth compared with other parts of the urban area, while providing improved access and mobility—especially for walking, biking, and transit.

Eligibility Criteria for New Regional Growth Centers

The minimum eligibility requirements for new centers ensure consistency in centers designation and ensure that new regional growth centers meet the intent of VISION 2040 while allowing for flexibility. The Designation Procedures for New Centers will be updated to identify additional supporting documentation:

- Local commitment. Evidence center is a local priority and sponsor city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in creating a walkable, livable center.
o **Planning.** Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) that meets regional guidance in advance of designation. Environmental review that demonstrates center area is appropriate for dense development.
  • Assessment of housing need, including displacement risk, as well as documentation of tools, programs, or commitment to provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes and strategies to further fair housing

o **Jurisdiction and Location.** New regional growth centers should be located within a city, with few exceptions. LINK light rail stations in unincorporated urban areas (including those funded through the Sound Transit 3 ballot measure) may be eligible for center designation at any scale, provided they are affiliated for annexation or planned for incorporation. Joint planning of unincorporated center areas is encouraged. Other unincorporated urban areas may be eligible for countywide center status, provided they are affiliated for annexation or planned for incorporation.

o **Existing Conditions.** Existing infrastructure and utilities sufficient to support new center growth, a mix of both existing housing and employment, justification of size and shape. Recommend centers to be nodal with a generally round or square shape and avoid linear or gerrymandered shapes that are not readily walkable or connected by transit. Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, amenities, and a street pattern that supports walkability

**Designation Criteria for New Regional Growth Centers**
The Regional Centers Framework Update defines two distinct types of regional growth centers with tailored minimum criteria as described in this section. The type of regional center does not establish a distinction for the purpose of PSRC’s regional funding process. The criteria are expanded to include discussion of appropriate size, minimum transit service, market potential, and regional role. Transit service is an important factor for growth in centers. Local governments should work with transit providers to plan for appropriate transit service levels in centers. The center types will be used to inform future growth planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Growth Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Growth Center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These centers have an important regional role, with dense existing jobs and housing, high-quality transit service, and planning for significant growth. These centers may represent areas where major investments – such as high-capacity transit – offer new opportunities for growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Metro Growth Center**         |
| These centers have a primary regional role – they have dense existing jobs and housing, high-quality transit service, and are planning for significant growth. They will continue to serve as major transit hubs for the region. These centers also provide regional services, and serve as major civic and cultural centers. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Growth Center Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center must meet each the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>Existing density.</strong> 18 activity units per acre minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>Planned target density.</strong> 45 activity units per acre minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Growth Center Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center must meet each the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>Existing density.</strong> 30 activity units per acre minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>Planned target density.</strong> 85 activity units per acre minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Size. 200 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit. Existing or planned fixed route bus, regional bus, Bus Rapid Transit, or other frequent and all-day bus service. May substitute high-capacity transit mode for fixed route bus. Service quality is defined as either frequent (&lt; 15-minute headways) and all-day (operates at least 16 hours per day on weekdays) –or- high capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market potential. Evidence of future market potential to support planning target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role. Evidence of regional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear regional role for center (serves as important destination for the county)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Size. 320 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit. Existing or planned light rail, commuter rail, ferry, or other high capacity transit with similar service quality as light rail. Service quality is defined as either frequent (&lt; 15-minute headways) and all-day (operates at least 18 hours per day on weekdays) –or- high capacity (e.g., ferry, commuter rail, regional bus, Bus Rapid Transit). Evidence the area serves as major transit hub and has high quality/high capacity existing or planned service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market potential. Evidence of future market potential to support planning target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role. Evidence of regional role:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear regional role for center (for example, city center of metropolitan cities, other large and fast-growing centers; important regional destination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Manufacturing/Industrial Centers Eligibility and Criteria

Manufacturing/industrial centers preserve lands for family-wage jobs in basic industries and trade and provide areas where that employment may grow in the future. Manufacturing/industrial centers form a critical regional resource that provides economic diversity, supports national and international trade, generates substantial revenue for local governments, and offers higher than average wages.

VISION 2040 calls for the recognition and preservation of existing centers of intensive manufacturing and industrial activity and the provision of infrastructure and services necessary to support these areas. These centers are important employment locations that serve both current and long-term regional economic objectives.

---

Footnote: 1 "Planned" transit means funded projects or projects identified in the constrained portion of Transportation 2040. The Transportation 2040 constrained project list incorporates projects in transit agency long-range plans where funding is reasonably expected during the 2040 planning horizon.
Manufacturing/industrial centers have very different characteristics and mobility needs than regional growth centers. For example, transit may not be viable for all types of manufacturing/industrial centers, but identifying transportation demand management strategies, including carpool and vanpools, can help reduce congestion impacts regardless of transit access. The criteria to designate manufacturing/industrial centers focuses on these and other factors to support the long-term industrial base of the region. Moving freight and goods to and through MICs is critical, on trucks, as well as other modes, such as marine, air and rail.

The Industrial Lands Analysis (2015) identified strategies to ensure an adequate supply of industrial land in the region, including protecting priority users of industrial land and limiting commercial and office uses that compete with industrial use. The centers designation criteria provide some flexibility for non-industrial uses in manufacturing/industrial centers, which may include amenities and services for employees, some commercial uses, and other types non-industrial uses.

Eligibility Criteria for New Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers
Minimum eligibility requirements ensure consistency in centers designation and ensure that new regional growth centers meet the intent of VISION 2040 while allowing for flexibility. The Designation Procedures for New Centers should be updated to identify additional supporting documentation:

- **Local commitment.** Evidence center is a local priority had city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in infrastructure and transportation. Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, strategies and incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and established partnerships with relevant parties to ensure success of manufacturing/industrial center
- **Planning.** Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) that meets regional guidance in advance of designation. Where applicable, the plan should be developed in consultation with public ports and other affected governmental entities. Environmental review that the area is appropriate for development
- **Location.** Manufacturing/industrial centers should be located within a city with few exceptions.
- **Existing Conditions.** Adequate infrastructure and utilities to support growth, access to relevant transportation infrastructure, documentation of economic impact, and justification of size and shape of manufacturing/industrial center

Designation Criteria for New Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers
The Regional Centers Framework Update identifies two distinct pathways to designate new manufacturing/industrial centers. Minimum eligibility for regional designation is described in this section. The criteria are expanded to include discussion of appropriate employment type, core industrial zoning, industrial preservation strategies, and regional role. The center pathways may be used to inform future growth planning.
## New Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

### Industrial Employment Center

These centers are highly active industrial areas with significant existing jobs, core industrial activity, evidence of long-term demand, and regional role. They have a legacy of industrial employment and represent important long-term industrial areas, such as deep-water ports and major manufacturing. The intent of this designation is to, at a minimum, preserve existing industrial jobs and land use and to continue to grow industrial employment in these centers where possible.

Center must meet each the following criteria:

- Existing jobs: 10,000 minimum
- Planned jobs: 20,000 minimum
- Minimum 50% industrial employment
- Access to transit or defined transportation demand management strategies in place
- Presence of irreplaceable industrial infrastructure ²
- At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses ³
- Industrial retention strategies in place
- Regional role
- Regional growth centers should have a goal for a minimum mix of at least 15% planned residential and employment activity in the center.

### Industrial Growth Center

These regional clusters of industrial lands have significant value to the region and potential for future job growth. These large areas of industrial land serve the region with international employers, industrial infrastructure, concentrations of industrial jobs, and evidence of long-term potential. The intent of this designation is to continue growth of industrial employment and preserve the region’s industrial land base for long-term growth and retention.

Center must meet each the following criteria:

- Minimum size of 2,000 acres
- Existing jobs: 4,000 minimum
- Planned jobs: 10,000 minimum
- Minimum 50% industrial employment
- Access to transit or defined transportation demand management strategies in place
- At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses
- Industrial retention strategies in place
- Regional role
- Regional growth centers should have a goal for a minimum mix of at least 15% planned residential and employment activity in the center.

---

² Industrial-related infrastructure that would be irreplaceable elsewhere, such as working maritime port facilities, air and rail freight facilities.

³ Zoning designations dominated by traditional industrial land uses such as manufacturing, transportation, warehousing and freight terminals. Commercial uses within core industrial zones shall be strictly limited.
5. Regional Center Redesignation Standards

Regional centers have been a central strategy of the regional plan for decades, although centers have been designated through different procedures depending on when they were first designated. An objective with the regional centers framework update is to establish a more consistent system between new and existing centers. Recognizing both that existing centers were designated through different processes and the objective of working toward greater consistency, PSRC will develop administrative procedures for review of existing centers. The procedures are anticipated to be drafted in the first half of 2018, with a review of existing centers to follow in 2018 and 2019 during the VISION 2050 planning process.

- **Initial redesignation.** The first evaluation of existing centers will occur in 2018-2020 as part of the VISION 2040 update. All designated regional centers as of 2017 are automatically redesignated, provided that they meet the following criteria:
  - Adopted center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) should be completed by 2020. Jurisdictions may request an extension from the Growth Management Policy Board if substantial progress on subarea planning has been made by 2020. Different approaches to subarea planning may be appropriate and input from other affect government entities, such as public ports, will be considered, but future updates should be equivalent to a subarea plan by 2025. Plans should include goals and policies that specifically address the center and should be adopted by the jurisdiction(s) with local land use authority for the center. Plan adoption should meet public notice and involvement requirements established under the Growth Management Act.
  - Designation of the regional center in the adopted local comprehensive plan and countywide planning policies.

- PSRC staff will work with cities and counties to identify the applicable center types and whether all the criteria are already met or could be met.

- **Monitoring review of regional growth centers.** A first monitoring review period, scheduled for 2025, will follow the next major comprehensive plan periodic update (due in 2023 and 2024) and will reoccur about every five years thereafter. At the first monitoring review in 2025, existing regional growth centers will be expected to fully meet eligibility and designation criteria similar to new centers:
  - **Local commitment.** Evidence center is a local priority and sponsor city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in creating a walkable, livable center.
  - **Planning.** An updated center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) that addresses regional guidance, and plans for a mix of housing and employment, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, amenities, and a street pattern that supports walkability.
    - Assessment of housing need, including displacement risk, as well as documentation of tools, programs, or commitment to provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes and strategies to further fair housing.
  - **Location.** Existing regional growth centers not located within a city should be affiliated for annexation or in a location planned for incorporation. Joint planning of the center area is encouraged.
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- **Capital investments.** Capital investments by the local government in the center in the current or prior 6-year capital planning cycle, and commitment to infrastructure and utilities in the jurisdiction’s capital improvement program sufficient to support center growth, pedestrian infrastructure, and public amenities.

- **Center criteria.** Consistent with designation criteria for size, planning, transit, market potential, and role for new regional growth centers in Section 3. Existing centers will remain designated if they do not meet the new center density criteria, provided that the center is consistent with other criteria identified in this section.

- **Market study.** Regional growth centers that have existing density levels below the level required for new regional centers at the time of the review must 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.

  - **Monitoring review of manufacturing/industrial centers.** A first monitoring review period, scheduled for 2025, will follow the next major comprehensive plan periodic update (due in 2023 and 2024) and will reoccur about every five years thereafter. At the first monitoring review in 2025, existing manufacturing/industrial centers will be expected to fully meet eligibility and designation criteria similar to new centers:
    - **Local commitment.** Evidence center is a local priority and sponsor city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in infrastructure and transportation. Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, strategies and incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and established partnerships with relevant parties to ensure success or the manufacturing/industrial center.
    - **Planning.** Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) that addresses regional guidance and plans for access to transportation infrastructure and economic development. Where applicable, the plan should be developed in consultation with public ports and affected governmental entities.
    - **Location.** If existing manufacturing/industrial centers are not located within a city, joint planning and annexation/incorporation are encouraged as feasible.
    - **Capital investments.** Capital investments by the local government in the center in the current or prior 6-year capital planning cycle, and commitment to infrastructure and utilities in the jurisdiction’s capital improvement program sufficient to support center growth and planned transportation infrastructure.
    - **Center criteria.** Consistent with designation criteria for new manufacturing/industrial centers in Section 4. Existing centers will remain designated if they do not meet the new center existing or planned jobs criteria, provided that the center is consistent with other criteria identified in this section.
    - **Market study.** Manufacturing/industrial centers that have existing employment levels below the level required for new centers at the time of the review must 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.

- The board will maintain flexibility in evaluating existing centers to consider when centers are very close to the existing conditions criteria, to account from economic recessions, progress and growth, local investments or the lack of investments, and regional importance of a particular area.
- Criteria related to physical improvements should be included in center plans, but may need to be addressed over the long-term, such as developing a complete walkable street network.

6. Countywide Centers

Each county’s countywide planning policies include criteria and processes for countywide centers, though the approach currently varies significantly by county. Through the Centers Framework Update, designation of countywide centers remains delegated to a countywide process while providing a baseline of consistent regional standards for each county to use. PSRC reviews and certifies countywide planning policies, but PSRC’s role does not include review of countywide centers.

Countywide growth centers serve important roles as places for concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. These are often smaller downtowns, high-capacity transit station areas, or neighborhood centers that are linked by transit, provide a mix of housing and services, and serve as focal points for local and county investment. Countywide industrial centers serve as important local industrial areas. These areas support living wage jobs and serve a key role in the county’s manufacturing/industrial economy. The checklist below represents basic standards expected for countywide centers in each county. Depending on county circumstance and priorities, countywide planning policies may include additional criteria (such as planning requirements or mix of uses) or other additional standards within this overall framework. Countywide center designations will be reviewed by an established timeframe and process set by the countywide planning body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide Centers</th>
<th>Countywide Industrial Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countywide Growth Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center must meet each the following criteria:</td>
<td>Center must meet each the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified as a countywide center in the countywide planning policies</td>
<td>Identified as a countywide center in the countywide planning policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located within a city or unincorporated urban area</td>
<td>Located within a city or unincorporated urban area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Countywide Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Countywide Growth Center</strong></th>
<th><strong>Countywide Industrial Center</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(cont.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(cont.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration that the center is a local planning and investment priority:</td>
<td>Demonstration that the center is a local planning and investment priority:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Identified as a countywide center in a local comprehensive plan; subarea plan recommended</td>
<td>o Identified as a countywide center in a local comprehensive plan; subarea plan recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Clear evidence that area is a local priority for investment, such as planning efforts or infrastructure</td>
<td>o Clear evidence that area is a local priority for investment, such as planning efforts, or infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The center is a location for compact, mixed-use development; including:</td>
<td>The center supports industrial sector employment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A minimum existing activity unit density of 10 activity units per acre</td>
<td>o Minimum 1,000 existing jobs and/or 500 acres of industrial land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Planning and zoning for a minimum mix of uses of 20 percent residential and 20 percent employment, unless unique circumstances make these percentages not possible to achieve.</td>
<td>o Defined transportation demand management strategies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Capacity and planning for additional growth</td>
<td>o At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The center supports multi-modal transportation, including:</td>
<td>o Industrial retention strategies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transit service</td>
<td>o Capacity and planning for additional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Pedestrian infrastructure and amenities</td>
<td>o Important county role and concentration of industrial land or jobs with evidence of long-term demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Street pattern that supports walkability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bicycle infrastructure and amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Compact, walkable size of one-quarter mile squared (160 acres), up to half-mile transit walkshed (500 acres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Local Centers and Other Types of Centers

VISION 2040 calls for central places in all jurisdictions to support a centers-based approach to development in the region. These places range from neighborhood centers to active crossroads in communities of all sizes. These centers play an important role in the region and help define our community character, provide local gathering places, serve as community hubs, and are often appropriate places for additional growth and focal points for services.

The Regional Centers Framework recognizes the importance of these places, but does not envision a regional or county designation for all types of local centers. The designation criteria outlined in this document may provide a path to regional or county designation for locations that continue to grow and change over time.
Per program eligibility requirements, rural centers that participate in PSRC’s Rural Town Centers and Corridors funding competition are located in either a freestanding city or town that is outside the region’s contiguous urban growth area or a county’s unincorporated rural area. These centers are designated through a local planning process, not through the Regional Centers Framework process.

8. Military Installations

Military installations are a vital part of the region, home to thousands of personnel and jobs and a major contributor to the region’s economy. While military installations are not subject to local, regional, or state plans and regulations, PSRC recognizes the relationship between regional growth patterns and military installations, and recognizes the importance of military employment and personnel all aspects of regional planning.

Recognition of military installations in the update to VISION 2040 can better acknowledge the role these installations play in the regional economy and in regional growth patterns. Designation criteria for installations can also help establish common expectations for how the region works with and supports military installations. Stakeholders throughout the process have emphasized the need to address base transportation access to benefit surrounding communities, as well as the installations. Per federal statutes, PSRC transportation funds cannot be spent on military installations, but surrounding communities may be eligible to receive funds for projects that connect to installations.

Designation Criteria for Types of Military Installations

PSRC’s Executive Board will identify Major Military Installations in the update to VISION 2040, subject to adoption of the plan by the General Assembly. Major installations are defined as installations with more than 5,000 enlisted and service personnel. As of 2017, four installations met the minimum size criteria: Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Pierce County, Naval Base Kitsap–Bangor and Naval Base Kitsap–Bremerton in Kitsap County, and Naval Station Everett in Snohomish County.

This recognition in the regional plan advances active collaboration between military installations, neighboring jurisdictions, and the region. The region recognizes military installations are major employers, associated with congestion, and that regional designation can help work to alleviate impacts. Through this recognition, regional expectations include:

- Ongoing coordination between the military installation, countywide planning forum, and neighboring jurisdictions regarding planned growth, regional impacts, and implementation of multimodal transportation options
- Support for multimodal commute planning and mode split goals for installation
- Completed Joint Land Use Study or similar coordinated planning effort

Smaller military installations may continue to be recognized by countywide planning forums as a type of countywide center or equivalent. The minimum size criteria for countywide center designation will be as specified by RCW 36.70a.530 and identify “federal military installation[s], other than a reserve center, 4

---

4 For the purpose of regional centers designation, jurisdictions may count military activity towards center thresholds when the installation is directly adjacent or surrounded by the center (such as Naval Base Kitsap-Bremerton and the downtown Bremerton regional growth center).
that employs one hundred or more full-time personnel." As of 2017, five installations met the minimum criteria: Naval Base Kitsap Keyport, Seattle Coast Guard Station, Naval Base Kitsap Jackson Park, Camp Murray, and Naval Base Everett – Smokey Point Support Complex.

9. Planning Requirements

PSRC’s Plan Review Manual contains guidance and requirements for comprehensive plan certification, including center subarea plans. The Regional Center Plans Checklist in the PSRC’s Plan Review Manual addresses planning expectations for center subarea plans. PSRC will work with the Regional Staff Committee to update the Plan Review Manual to amend requirements and provide best practices, with consideration for local variability.

The Regional Growth Center Plan Checklist will be updated to address the following topics:

- Affordable housing, including housing targets, needs assessment, affordable housing goals, and strategies to encourage new housing production with long-term affordability
- Displacement risk analysis and strategies to prevent or mitigate displacement
- Transit access, including transit service, transit-dependent populations, and safe and connected pedestrian and bicycle networks
- Equitable community engagement
- Access to opportunity, including employment and education opportunities and neighborhood quality of life
- Environmental justice impacts
- Specific transportation planning investments, programs, and resources identified.
- Availability of public services, like K-12 education, to meet needs of households with children.

The Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center Plan checklist will be updated to address the following topics:

- Equitable community engagement
- Access to opportunity, including employment and education opportunities
- Environmental justice impacts
- Expectations around core industrial uses, residential encroachment, transitional buffers, and commercial and office uses that do not support manufacturing/industrial function
- Clearly articulated long-term commitment to protect and preserve manufacturing/industrial land uses and businesses in the center
- Specific transportation planning investments, programs, and resources identified

10. Regional Support

Funding to Support Centers

Staff will research and identify other potential funding sources or programs to support development in centers. This may include housing in regional growth centers, economic development, other capital funds, additional state resources, marketing, and other strategies. PSRC should collaborate with other agencies and funders to identify additional funding sources for designated centers. PSRC will also explore funding for centers planning and technical assistance.

Regional Center Types

The Regional Centers Framework does not establish a distinction between different types of regional centers for the purpose of PSRC’s funding framework.
11. Performance Measures

In the VISION 2040 update, PSRC will work with local governments and other stakeholders to develop performance measures for centers as a whole to evaluate success of the overall framework. Like previous monitoring studies, PSRC will lead the effort, with support and review from local governments. Performance measures should focus on a limited number of centers and consider the project outcome statements to support growth, mobility, environment, social equity and opportunity, economic development, and public health. Metrics may include overall growth goals or mode split goals for centers, level of local or regional investment, greenhouse gas emissions reductions, or other measures as appropriate, such as housing affordability, mix of uses, and health and equity.

PSRC will continue to conduct ongoing monitoring of performance measures for individual centers. This may include progress towards growth targets and mode split goals, tracking implementation actions, or tracking other measures consistent with the designation requirements.

- PSRC will publish a centers performance monitoring summary every five years in order to stay on top of regional trends in centers development.
- PSRC will review centers for performance as part of the monitoring review and prior to regional plan update years, and consider possible changes or reclassification if the local jurisdiction is not taking steps to plan and support growth in center to meet targets or goals.

12. Implementation

Procedures and Planning Expectations. The board directs staff to prepare updates to the Designation Procedures for New Centers, Regional Center Plans Checklist, and develop administrative procedures for existing centers.

Plan Updates. The board directs staff to identify issues for VISION 2040 update:
- Identification of military installations a regional geography
- Preservation of industrial land, both within designated manufacturing/industrial centers and in other industrial areas in the region
- Growth goals for regional centers

Countywide Planning Policies. The board requests updates to the countywide planning policies in each county during the next GMA update cycle (by 2023/2024) to implement countywide centers and achieve consistency with the regional framework. PSRC staff should work collaboratively with countywide groups on technical assistance and implementation of updated criteria.

PSRC Work Plan. The board directs staff to develop an implementation work plan and schedule to engage with PSRC membership and other stakeholders as appropriate on additional analysis, research,

---

5 The framework may inform an update to the Regional Growth Strategy but does not commit the region to any particular distribution of growth or definition of regional geographies.
and guidance. The work plan should incorporate the following tasks to support ongoing work on regional and countywide centers:

- **Performance measures.** In consultation with jurisdictions and other stakeholders, develop a framework to track performance and outcomes over time and identify challenges or barriers over time. Performance measures should consider project outcome statements to support growth, mobility, environment, social equity and opportunity, economic development, and public health. Measures may include assessment of demographic characteristics, housing affordability, employment, amenities, and access to opportunity.

- **Update growth planning guidance.** Update the guidance paper on center targets to discuss changes to growth expectations for centers and the mix of employment and residential activity envisioned in regional growth centers.

- **Market studies.** Provide additional guidance on recommended components of market studies for centers.

- **Social equity**
  - **Complete additional analysis and research on displacement and displacement risk in centers.**
  - **Provide additional resources and best practices addressing equitable community engagement, including opportunities for local planning staff and policy-makers to learn about tools that have been successfully used by cities and counties in the region.**
  - **Research and recommend a best practice approach to a comprehensive equity impact review tool to address social equity through policies and implementation decisions for centers throughout the region.**

- **Tribal land & centers.** Complete additional review and consultation with tribes on the role of tribal lands in the centers framework.

- **Funding opportunities.** To achieve the vision of growth in centers, research other funding opportunities and opportunities to leverage existing designations. Collaborate with other agencies and funders to identify additional funding sources to designated centers. Explore funding, including a set-aside, for centers planning and technical assistance.

- **Military installations.** Staff will research other potential funding sources or programs to support improvement of transportation corridors serving recognized military installations. PSRC, countywide groups, and local jurisdictions should continue to work with state and federal partners to secure infrastructure resources, provide support for military installations, and address impacts on surrounding jurisdictions.

- **Economic measures.** Given their important role in the regional economy, PSRC should consider additional research on economic impact measures for manufacturing/industrial centers (e.g. revenue generators, export value).

- **Projects supporting centers.** Review and develop policy guidance on types of projects that support development in centers and corridors connecting centers.

- **Number and distribution of centers.** During the VISION 2040 update, research guidelines to manage the number and distribution of centers, factoring in minimum density standards, projected growth, jurisdictional size, location within the county, competition for market share, and allocation of limited regional resources.
Regional and local centers are the cornerstone of the region’s long-term plan for growth in VISION 2040. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has identified regional-scale mixed use and industrial centers that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment. These centers include metropolitan downtowns like Seattle, Tacoma and Bremerton; growing areas supported by regional transit investments like Lynnwood and Redmond; and major industrial areas, such as Paine Field and the Port of Tacoma.

Working with its members, PSRC initiated the first comprehensive review of the system since most centers were designated in 1995.

The project had several goals:

- **Identify shared expectations.** The standards for centers have varied by county and over time – this project provides an opportunity to review the expectations for new centers and existing centers. Establishing common designation criteria and procedures would improve overall consistency and coordination for centers planning.
- **Define the role of places.** The current centers framework only formally identifies regional centers. This project has allowed the region to consider the role of other types of places, such as countywide centers, transit stations, and military installations.
- **Implement regional policy and recommendations.** The project implements VISION 2040 policies, along with recommendations from Growing Transit Communities Strategy and the Regional Industrial Lands Analysis.

**Features from the GMPB Regional Centers Framework Recommendation**

- Encourage larger centers to plan for greater growth by establishing different types of regional growth centers
- Create a new path to designate manufacturing/industrial centers to preserve industrial lands for the future
- Retain existing centers, with option to meet minimum criteria through market study and planning actions
- Recommend recognizing the role of major military installations in VISION 2050
- Create minimum standards to designate countywide centers in each county
- Add new planning expectations to advance social equity
- Better reflect existing policy and goals, including a focus on transit service, regional role, market potential, and core industrial zoning, in the designation process.
What Would These Changes Mean?

**Implementation over time.** The centers framework recommendation provides direction on how the plans, policies, and procedures should be updated to reflect our vision for regional centers. Upcoming updates to PSRC plans, policies, and procedures will implement the revised framework.

**New regional centers.** The draft proposal changes the regional criteria, which may allow some new regional centers to be designated. In particular, the criteria propose a lower employment threshold for manufacturing/industrial centers, which may lead to designation of new manufacturing/industrial centers.

**New types of growth centers.** By establishing different types of regional growth centers, larger centers would be encouraged to plan for greater levels of growth, and VISION 2050 could better address the different characteristics and growth trajectories of centers.

**New countywide centers.** The draft proposal establishes basic standards for countywide centers, which would create a more consistent system of places planning for growth and prioritized for countywide transportation funds. This may lead to designation of new countywide centers.

**Military installations.** The draft proposal recommends identifying major military installations in VISION 2050 to recognize the influence these installations have on regional growth patterns, the economy, and transportation system. This may provide new opportunities for collaboration. Smaller military installations may be designated as a type of countywide center to recognize their role.

**A more consistent system.** The proposal establishes a time period and expectations for existing regional centers to meet the revised criteria. The draft proposal does not recommend removing regional designation for any existing regional centers in VISION 2050.

**Track progress over time.** The draft proposal focuses on evaluating progress for individual centers over time.

**Many existing policies won’t change.** The framework incorporates procedural changes, but the basic structure of designating new centers doesn’t change. Local governments will be responsible for seeking designation, with the concurrence of the countywide organization in each county. PSRC’s Executive Board will continue to be responsible for designating new regional centers.

The draft proposal does not recommend higher or lower funding priority for different types of regional centers and encourages local governments to designate other types of local centers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMBP Centers Framework Recommendation</th>
<th>Current Standards</th>
<th>GMBP Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Growth Centers</strong></td>
<td>One type of regional center</td>
<td>Two types of regional growth centers -- metro growth center and urban growth center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                      | Primary focus on existing and planned density, commitment when reviewing new centers | Include additional criteria:  
  - Transit  
  - Market potential  
  - Regional role  
  - Distribution & number of centers |
| **Manufacturing/Industrial Centers** | One pathway | Two types of industrial centers -- industrial employment centers and industrial growth centers |
|                                      | Primary focus on existing and planned jobs, commitment when reviewing new centers | Include additional criteria:  
  - Core industrial zoning  
  - Job type  
  - Preservation strategies |
| **Military Installations**           | Major installations like Joint Base Lewis McChord and the Bremerton Shipyard are not fully addressed in VISION 2040 | Recommend to recognize major installations in VISION 2050 |
|                                      | All installations are eligible to be countywide centers | Guidance on countywide designation for smaller installations |
| **Redesignation**                   | Some centers do not meet current standards | Common expectations  
  2025 performance check-in, with option to meet minimum criteria through market study and planning actions |
|                                      | Different expectations based on when designated |  |
| **Social Equity**                   | Subarea planning required  
  - Provisions for affordable housing and special housing needs  
  - Plan for amenities like parks and civic places | Additional housing planning prior to designation |
<p>|                                      | Update center plan checklist to address topics like displacement, access to opportunity, and environmental justice |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Standards</th>
<th>GMPB Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Encourage walkability and</td>
<td>New regional analysis and guidance on equitable community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transit-supportive planning</td>
<td>engagement + displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop framework to measure progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling application window</td>
<td>Application window every five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc review of thresholds</td>
<td>Revisit thresholds during updates to VISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review based on checklist alone</td>
<td>Consider distribution, location, and number of centers in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>designation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No shared definition of countywide centers</td>
<td>Establish shared criteria for countywide centers; recognize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>places beyond regional centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only regional centers have common definition and</td>
<td>Criteria focus on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition</td>
<td>• Local priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed use, planning for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multimodal options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Industrial zoning, retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria and designation vary by county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance monitoring reports on ad hoc schedule</td>
<td>Five-year monitoring report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional review if not meeting performance expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Executive Board
From: Josh Brown, Executive Director
Subject: Port of Seattle's Sustainable Airport Master Plan

IN BRIEF

At its February 22 meeting, the Executive Board will hear a presentation by Port of Seattle staff on the work completed to date on the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) for Sea-Tac International Airport.

DISCUSSION

The Port of Seattle initiated its Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP) in 2013. The primary purpose of the SAMP is to identify facility improvements required to satisfy demand over the 20-year planning horizon and to balance capacity in all key functional areas to the fixed capacity of the airfield. As part of the planning process, alternatives for facilities that satisfy future demand were developed, along with alternatives for a phased capital program to deliver the needed capacity. With the planning work nearing completion, Port of Seattle staff will provide the Executive Board an update on the SAMP and outline next steps in the process.

The presentation will include an overview of the early planning work and a discussion of the near-term projects, as well as the long-term vision identified for Sea-Tac Airport. A timetable and next steps also will be covered, as well as a brief discussion of the public outreach and stakeholder engagement that will take place in 2018.

For more information, please contact Clare Gallagher at Gallagher.c@portseattle.org or 206-787-3718.
ACTION ITEM  
February 15, 2018

To: Executive Board
From: Josh Brown, Executive Director
Subject: Regional Aviation Baseline Study

IN BRIEF

As discussed at the January 25th Executive Board meeting, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has requested that PSRC lead a new regional aviation baseline study that would build on the master planning work underway at many of the region’s airports and set a regional stage for future planning. At its February 22nd meeting, the Executive Board will receive a briefing on the proposed scope of work and will be asked for direction for staff to proceed.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should direct staff to proceed with pursuing grant funding through the Federal Aviation Administration to complete a Regional Aviation Baseline Study.

DISCUSSION

Master planning is underway at several airports within the central Puget Sound region, including King County International Airport (Boeing Field), Renton Municipal Airport, and Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Sea-Tac has also seen significant growth in the number of passengers served and aircraft operations over the past several years. New commercial service is expected to begin at Paine Field in Everett in late 2018.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has requested that the PSRC lead a new regional aviation baseline study that would build on the emerging master plans and set the stage for future planning. It is a timely opportunity to understand the dynamics of the region’s growing aviation activity, the unique role of the regional aviation system in supporting this global center for aerospace manufacturing, the economic impact of the region’s airports, and the impact of airport activities on surrounding communities.

PSRC staff has worked with the FAA and the region’s airport operators to develop a draft scope of work for the study, which is included in Attachment A. The baseline study is expected to produce information critical for understanding the region’s aviation needs and options for policy makers to consider for meeting those needs. The proposed study would be launched mid-2018 and completed by the end of 2019.
For more information, please contact Jeff Storrar at jstorrar@psrc.org or (206)587-4817 or Ben Bakkenta at bbakkenta@psrc.org or (206) 971-3286.

Attachments:
Scope - Regional Aviation Baseline Study 2_14_18
OVERVIEW

The objective of the Regional Aviation Baseline Study is to provide a clear picture of the aviation activities and needs in the central Puget Sound region (King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish) and set the stage for future planning. Master planning is underway at several airports within the central Puget Sound region, including King County International Airport (Boeing Field), Renton Municipal Airport, and Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Overall growth in activity at the region’s airports is increasing due to the strength of the regional economy and therefore, now is the time to identify how future demand for air transportation will be met. The baseline study is expected to produce information critical for understanding the region’s aviation needs and options for policy makers to consider for meeting those needs in the future.

SCOPE OF WORK

- **Project Administration and Management** – This task includes the overall management of the project, including working closely with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) on grant administration, invoicing and billing with the selected consultant, and providing oversight on the other study tasks and adjusting work accordingly.

- **Stakeholder Engagement and Education** - The study will be conducted with an emphasis on transparency and education with all interested stakeholders. A focus will be placed on providing clear communication for a diverse audience and robust communication and regular engagement with interested parties. Expected work will:
  - Develop and implement a communication and engagement strategy, including social media, web based communication, media and community relations, and a mechanism for stakeholders to provide meaningful input
  - Identify stakeholders and provide regular outreach and engagement opportunities, including community members, aviation stakeholders, and businesses
  - Develop and complete a public opinion survey on the region’s aviation activities to identify views about the region’s current and future aviation activities
  - Develop visuals and infographics to communicate on topics identified in the study
  - Perform government relations and engagement with policy makers (local, state, and federal) and prepare and provide presentations to a wide variety of interested parties

- **Identify Existing Conditions and Trends** – This task will identify existing conditions and recent trends that form the baseline for current aviation activity in the region. Work products associated with this task will provide an overview of the region’s civil and military airports, indicate the share, interaction between, and recent growth of different aviation sectors, describe the economic impact of airports and aviation sectors to the region, and identify the key relationships and dependencies between airports within and outside the region. Expected work will:
  - Develop an inventory of all airports in the region and identify significant trends, issues and anticipated needs among them, beginning with information from existing plans
  - Conduct an economic analysis of the region’s airports and describe how the region’s population and economic growth pressures are influencing each airport within the region
  - Identify the aviation markets and sectors in the region (e.g. commercial service, air cargo, aerospace manufacturing, general aviation, etc.) and conduct an analysis that identifies trends and influencing factors by sector
  - Identify how the airspace is currently configured within the region to serve each airport. Identify the current challenges facing operation of that airspace given the regional population and economic growth pressures
• **Evaluate Aviation Issues and Needs** - This task draws on the findings and products from the work described above, as well as the outputs associated with various airport master planning efforts currently underway. It will evaluate known and anticipated issues and needs for the continued operation of a safe, efficient, and high-functioning aviation system that underpins the region’s economy and population growth. To the extent practicable, implications and trade-offs would be clearly identified. Expected work will:
  - Summarize existing airport master planning and air cargo study efforts
  - Conduct a high-level analysis of future regional aviation needs vis-à-vis existing and future demand by activity type. This includes both landside and airside
  - Conduct an assessment of the highest priority challenges and implications of approaches to address them
  - Provide options for addressing the central Puget Sound region’s future aviation needs
  - Summarize issues that need further analysis

• **Final Report & Presentation** - This task would summarize the key findings of the study in a variety of formats (e.g. executive summary, final report, presentation, etc.) and to communicate these to study stakeholders and policy makers to set the stage for future planning.
INFORMATION ITEM

To: Executive Board
From: Diana Lauderbach, Chief Financial Officer
Subject: Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program FY2018-FY2019

IN BRIEF

At its February meeting, the Executive Board will be given information on the budget assumptions and schedule for the Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program FY2018-FY2019.

BACKGROUND

Last May, the Puget Sound Regional Council’s General Assembly adopted a two-year budget and work program which runs from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2019. The adopted biennial budget includes the option for adjustment after the first year with a supplemental budget. The Operations Committee has primary responsibility for developing the supplemental budget and work program.

The draft supplemental budget is a steady-state budget with no overall changes in revenues and expenditures as shown in Tables 1-8. A full draft budget is available online: https://www.psrc.org/about/budget.

Throughout February, information on the draft supplemental budget will be made available to the Transportation Policy Board, Growth Management Policy Board, Economic Development Board and Regional Staff Committee.

Next month, the Operations Committee will prepare a recommended Supplemental Budget and Work Program for final consideration and recommendation by the Executive Board in March or April 2018, and adoption by the General Assembly in May 2018.

If you have any questions, please contact Diana Lauderbach at 206-464-5416 or dlauderbach@psrc.org.

Attachments:
Draft Supplemental Budget Tables 1-8
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### Table 1 - Revenue Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$15,733,000</td>
<td>$15,733,000</td>
<td>$15,733,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds, EDD and Service Income</td>
<td>$4,404,000</td>
<td>$4,441,000</td>
<td>($37,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover (a)</td>
<td>$5,672,000</td>
<td>$5,635,000</td>
<td>$5,672,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement Reimbursement Carryover</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Federal/Local Anticipated</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 - Expenditure Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries (b)</td>
<td>$11,493,000</td>
<td>$11,505,000</td>
<td>($12,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (c)</td>
<td>$7,107,000</td>
<td>$7,108,000</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$3,854,000</td>
<td>$3,854,000</td>
<td>($0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>s+b+oh</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,454,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,467,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,454,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>($13,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$874,000</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$1,399,000</td>
<td>$1,424,000</td>
<td>($25,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>($0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>($0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encumbered for Future Work</td>
<td>$596,000</td>
<td>$587,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Reserve PSRC</td>
<td>$1,583,000</td>
<td>$1,583,000</td>
<td>($0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 - Staffing Comparison by Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Growth Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Range Transportation Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Range Transportation/PSRC Funding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development District (d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Relations and Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services (e)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) Carryover are available funds that remain unspent in the previous budget cycle and can be used in the next budget cycle.
(b) Includes all agency staff salaries for the two year period. Assume 3% merit pool first year and 3% merit pool second year.
(c) Benefits include vacation, sick leave, holiday, retirement medical, dental, short and long term disability, life, a deferred compensation plan, etc.
(d) Staffing reduced due to restructuring of roles.
(e) Administrative Services include: Finance, HR, IT, Information Center, and Graphics.
Any and all lobbying will be paid with local funds.
Table 4 - Revenue Comparison by Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Funding</th>
<th>Proposed FY2018-2019</th>
<th>October-17 Amended FY2018-2019</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant and Local Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Planning Org (c)</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (MPO) and Federal Highway Administration (MPO)</td>
<td>$3,094,000</td>
<td>$3,094,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Planning funds</td>
<td>$12,799,000</td>
<td>$12,799,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA/5307 (a)</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated STP (a)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA/5310</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Project Funds</td>
<td>$3,950,000</td>
<td>$3,950,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Membership Dues</td>
<td>$3,113,000</td>
<td>$3,113,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD Membership Dues</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Membership Dues</td>
<td>$3,386,000</td>
<td>$3,386,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Agency Dues</td>
<td>$998,000</td>
<td>$998,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Local Funding (b)</td>
<td>$4,384,000</td>
<td>$4,384,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant and Local Revenue Subtotal</td>
<td>$21,133,000</td>
<td>$21,133,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Specific Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiDAR</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle - Household Survey</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redmond - Household Survey</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Endowment for Forestry</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Integration Grant - WSDOT</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Project Specific Revenue</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSEDD Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSEDD - EDA Planning Grant</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSEDD - IMCP Carryover</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>($37,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD/OEA Match Carryover</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal CPSEDD Revenue</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$257,000</td>
<td>($37,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover PSRC</td>
<td>$5,672,000</td>
<td>$5,635,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement Allowance Carryforward</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Funding Total</td>
<td>$27,090,000</td>
<td>$27,090,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA Anticipated</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated MPO</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Funding Total</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$27,521,000</td>
<td>$27,521,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) FTA5307 and Estimated STP funding increase beginning FY2019
(b) Dues Increase in 2018 and 2019
(c) RTPO based on December 2017 WSDOT funding estimate
### Table 5 - Distribution of Matching funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Funding Match</th>
<th>Proposed Supplemental FY2018-2019</th>
<th>October-17 Amended FY2018-2019</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration combined</td>
<td>$1,806,000</td>
<td>$1,806,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal - FTA 5307</td>
<td>$563,000</td>
<td>$563,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal STP</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD - Matched with EDD Dues</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Endowment for Forestry</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Integration Grant - WSDOT</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Funding Match</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA Anticipated</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Federal</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated MPO</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Local Dues</td>
<td>$1,048,000</td>
<td>$924,000</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,111,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,111,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>SALARIES BENEFITS</td>
<td>OVERHEAD*</td>
<td>DIRECT COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000 PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>$762,000</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>$1,304,000</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>$2,915,000</td>
<td>$1,560,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>$1,418,000</td>
<td>$759,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 DATA</td>
<td>$5,003,000</td>
<td>$2,679,000</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>$1,411,000</td>
<td>$755,000</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>$1,169,000</td>
<td>$626,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>$542,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$14,814,000</td>
<td>$7,640,000</td>
<td>$874,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overhead includes Administrative Staff, Direct Costs, and Consultants associated with Finance, Human Resources, Information Technology, Graphics, and Information Center
## TABLE
### FY2018 & FY2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>RTPO</th>
<th>FHWA</th>
<th>FHWA Match 13.5%</th>
<th>FHWA Carryover</th>
<th>FHWA Carryover match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000 PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>819,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>663,000</td>
<td>359,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>384,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>663,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>298,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>474,000</td>
<td>74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 DATA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,409,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>384,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,432,000</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,148,000</td>
<td>179,000</td>
<td>384,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

1,226,000 8,479,000 1,323,000 2,306,000 360,000

### Revenue Allocation (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STP 2018</th>
<th>FTA 5310 Match 13.5%</th>
<th>STP 2018 Carryover</th>
<th>EPA Watershed Carryover</th>
<th>EPA Watershed Match 13.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000 PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 DATA</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

1,500,000 200,000 234,000 142,000 47,000

### Revenue Allocation (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>EDD EDA grant</th>
<th>EDA grant Dues</th>
<th>EDD IMCP Tenant Improvement Carryover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000 PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>73,000 19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 DATA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

200,000 200,000 73,000 19,000 55,000
## REVENUE ALLOCATION

### Table 7: FY2018 & FY2019 Revenue Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTA5303 Local Match 13.5%</th>
<th>FTA 5303 Carryover</th>
<th>FTA5303 2018 Carryover</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Match 20.0%</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover 2018</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>1,345,000</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,046,000</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,367,000</td>
<td>213,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>905,000</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,094,000</td>
<td>483,000</td>
<td>327,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>563,000</td>
<td>182,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSTC Carryover Match</th>
<th>PSTC PSRC Carryover Match</th>
<th>PSTC Transit Carryover Match</th>
<th>Seattle HH Carryover Match</th>
<th>Redmond HH Carryover Match</th>
<th>LIDAR Carryover Match</th>
<th>SHRP 2 Carryover Match</th>
<th>SHRP 2 Carryover Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>248,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carryover Match Local</th>
<th>Local Funding Subtotal</th>
<th>Basic Federal Anticipated</th>
<th>Federal Match Anticipated</th>
<th>Anticipated and match Subtotal</th>
<th>FY2018-19 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,187,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>4,964,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,964,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,213,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>518,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>8,453,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>8,503,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td>2,542,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,592,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>1,984,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>1,192,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>444,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,252,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>1,583,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,583,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,770,000</td>
<td>1,379,000</td>
<td>26,961,000</td>
<td>431,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table provides a detailed breakdown of revenue allocation for various projects and matches, including local funding, federal funds, and anticipated match amounts for the fiscal years 2018-2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Grant Funds Remaining</th>
<th>Contractual Remaining</th>
<th>Other Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>2,305,739</td>
<td>247,660</td>
<td>2,058,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5303*</td>
<td>326,963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>326,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>182,443</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>182,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA Healthy Watershed Consortium</td>
<td>141,624</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>141,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Transit Coordination (PSTC)</td>
<td>247,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTC - Transit Agency Match</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle Household Survey</td>
<td>131,899</td>
<td>116,260</td>
<td>15,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redmond Household Survey</td>
<td>29,736</td>
<td>25,065</td>
<td>4,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDA IMCP</td>
<td>19,020</td>
<td>19,455</td>
<td>(435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement</td>
<td>55,193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRP2</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,456,692</strong></td>
<td><strong>408,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,048,252</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover local match</td>
<td>520,278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover local funds</td>
<td>517,646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Reserve Carryover</td>
<td>1,252,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Carryover from FY2017</strong></td>
<td>$ 5,746,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less EDD Carryover</td>
<td>19,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSRC Carryforward</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,727,596</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN INFORMATION ITEM  

To: Executive Board  
From: Josh Brown, Executive Director  
Subject: VISION 2050 Scoping Process  

IN BRIEF  

PSRC initiated formal scoping for the VISION 2050 plan on February 2 and will be seeking comments through Monday, March 19, 2018.  

DISCUSSION  

VISION 2040 is the region’s current long-term growth strategy, addressing land use, transportation, economic prosperity, and the environment. PSRC is extending the region’s growth plan to 2050. VISION 2050 will build on the region’s existing plan to keep the central Puget Sound region healthy and vibrant as it grows and will consider updated information and perspectives about a changing region.  

PSRC is seeking community input to shape the plan. What important regional issues should we focus on during the update? How should the region accommodate new population and employment growth into the future? What impacts and actions should be evaluated through environmental review?  

Starting February 2, information about the plan update, the scoping notice, and ways to comment were posted on the project website: https://www.psrc.org/vision  

In addition to soliciting written comments, PSRC is holding listening sessions in each of the counties to hear more comments from jurisdictions, agencies, and the community. The March 1 Growth Management Policy Board meeting will include a special opportunity to speak directly to the board about VISION 2050.  

Following the scoping period, the Growth Management Policy Board will be asked to review the comments received and develop a project scope of work. The Executive Board will be briefed regularly throughout the project.
There will also be continuous opportunities to provide input throughout the project, including PSRC meetings, workshops, surveys, online open houses, and opportunities to comment on the draft plan and environmental review document.

For more information, please contact Paul Inghram at 206-464-7549 or pinghram@psrc.org or Michael Hubner at 206-769-0680 or mhubner@psrc.org.