Executive Board
Thursday, March 22, 2018 • 10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.
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) - Executive Dave Somers, President
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 District Board - Councilmember Terry Ryan, EDB President
6. Consent Agenda (10:20)
   a. Approve Minutes of Meeting held February 22, 2018
   b. Approve Vouchers Dated February 14 through February 28, 2018 in the Amount of $805,120.73
   c. Approve Membership for City of Des Moines
   d. Approve Contract Authority for the Second Two-year Cycle (Wave 2) of the Six-Year Puget Sound Regional Household Travel Survey Program
   e. Approve Contract Authority for 2018 General Assembly
   f. Adopt Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
   g. Approve Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for Milton
7. New Business (10:25)
   a. Approve Regional Centers Framework Update -- Liz Underwood-Bultmann and Paul Inghram, PSRC
8. New Business (10:55)
   a. Recommend Adoption of Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program FY2018-2019
      -- Diana Lauderbach, PSRC
9. Discussion Item (11:05)
   a. Regional Transportation Plan--Summary of Public Comments -- Kelly McGourty and Ben Bakkenta, PSRC
10. Information Items
    a. Update on the Regional Aviation Baseline Study
11. Other Business
12. Next Meeting: Thursday, April 26, 2018, 10 - 11:30 a.m., PSRC Board Room

13. Adjourn (11:30)

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.
March 8, 2018

**Summary of public comments on the draft Regional Transportation Plan**

PSRC has received more than 800 individual comments on the draft Regional Transportation Plan. The comments cover topics including equity, emerging transportation technology, toll and road usage charges, climate change, road capacity and more. A total of 152 respondents commented on the plan, including individuals, local jurisdictions, business organizations, nonprofits, and advocacy groups. The Transportation Policy Board heard a presentation on the comments, which are posted on the PSRC website. A searchable spreadsheet of all comments by category, including a draft response, is provided.

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

**Coordination with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency on the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy**

PSRC’s Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy was first adopted as part of Transportation 2040 in 2010, including the four elements of land use, choices, pricing and technology. The strategy has been revised to reflect current conditions, including the advancements since 2010 in fuel economy standards and implementation activities within the other elements of the strategy, as well as the revised policies and investments contained in the draft plan. It also identifies additional emission reductions that might be achieved within each of the four elements, beyond the policies and investments included in the draft plan. PSRC has been working closely with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency on an analysis of strategies and consistent information, and the Transportation Policy Board heard a presentation from the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency on their efforts related to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

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

**In other business, the board:**

- Recommended adoption of a Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program.
- Recommended Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for Milton.
March 1, 2018

2050 forecasts of population and jobs

PSRC staff briefed the board on the draft regional macroeconomic forecast for 2050. This is a long-range forecast of projected jobs, population, and households at the regional scale. It establishes the future growth assumptions for the development of the VISION 2050 plan.

For more information, please contact Carol Naito at 206-464-7535, cnaito@psrc.org, or Michael Jensen at 206-464-7538, mjensen@psrc.org.

Trends shaping the region

The board heard a presentation on regional trend data as background for the VISION 2050 planning process. Among the trends:

- The region has seen a surge of new residents since 2010, reaching over 80,000 annually for the past two years.
- Minority residents comprise a growing share of the region's population, a trend that has spread from central cities to many suburban communities.
- By the year 2030, 1 in 5 residents of the region will be 65 or over, double the share in the year 2000.
- Vehicle delay has grown significantly across major freeway corridors in the region, especially I-5.
- For the seventh year in a row, more people are riding transit.

For more information, contact Michael Hubner, AICP, Principal Planner, (206) 971-3289, mhubner@psrc.org.

Regional growth strategy update

The board discussed a proposed approach to updating the regional growth strategy for VISION 2050, including schedule, phases of work, and a process for the board to develop plan alternatives. Board members reviewed data showing performance
of the current regional growth strategy, including distribution of actual population and employment growth since 2000, at the regional scale and in each county.

For more information, contact Michael Hubner, AICP, Principal Planner, (206) 971-3289, mhubner@psrc.org.

Certification for City of Milton comprehensive plan

The growth board recommended full certification of the comprehensive plan for Milton. The plan had been conditionally certified in 2016. Since then, the city amended its plan to address conditions for full certification. The growth board found that the plan is 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.

Provisional center designation for Sumner-Pacific manufacturing/industrial center

The board recommended extending the provisional center designation for the Sumner-Pacific manufacturing/industrial center to April 2019 to allow one additional year to complete the joint center subarea plan. The joint planning process between the two cities, including work on floodplain management, has added complexity to the planning effort, requiring additional time to complete the plan.

For more information, contact Liz Underwood-Bultmann at 206-971-3289 or lunderwood-bultmann@psrc.org.
February 6, 2018

Snohomish County Councilmember Terry Ryan named President of the Economic Development Board

In the same action, the board chose Pierce County Councilmember Connie Ladenburg as the new Vice-President. Each will serve the two-year term in their respective positions.

For more information, contact Ruth Wezeman at 206-464-7528 or rwezeman@psrc.org.

New Presidential Appointments ratified by Economic Development Board

As part of its charter, the board selects non-governmental representatives to create a diverse board and meet EDA requirements, including representation of business, labor, women, people with disabilities and racial minorities as well as the region's cluster industries, research institutions and institutions of higher education.

These are the new appointments:

- Neepaporn "A" Boungjaktha, Trade Development Alliance
- Kevin Clark, Argosy Cruises and Tillicum Excursion
- Tom Florino, Amazon
- Caroline King, Washington STEM
- Alex Pietsch, Washington State University
- Tony To, HomeSight

For more information, contact Josh Brown at 206-464-7515 or jbrown@psrc.org.

Daniel Malarkey presented opportunities related to automated vehicles

Billions of dollars are being invested by car and technology companies towards development of automated vehicle technologies. Google, Lyft, and Uber are engineering automated vehicle technologies from offices in the central Puget Sound region. Automated vehicle technologies, vehicle sharing services, and
electrification of the vehicle fleet have the potential to greatly change how people view and use cars in the region.

For more information, contact Jason Thibedeau at 206-389-2879 or jthibedeau@psrc.org.
MINUTES

Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board
Thursday, February 22, 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 Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair of the Transportation Policy Board. Councilmember Johnson explained that both President Dave Somers and Vice President Bruce Dammeier were unable to attend the meeting and asked that he serve as Acting Chair. 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)

**Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold, City of Kirkland
Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, King County Other Cities & Towns
**Commissioner Glen Bachman, Port of Everett
**Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, King County Other Cities & Towns
**Councilmember Claudia Balducci, King County
Councilmember Bruce Bassett, Mercer Island, King County Other Cities & Towns
Executive Dow Constantine, King County
Mayor Becky Erickson, Poulsbo, Kitsap County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Jim Ferrell, City of Federal Way
Commissioner Charlotte Garrido, Kitsap County
Councilmember Dennis Higgins, City of Kent
Councilmember Rob Johnson, City 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
**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 Chris Roberts, Shoreline, King County Other Cities & Towns
Ms. Patty Rubstello, WSDOT
**Councilmember Terry Ryan, Snohomish County
Commissioner Hester Serebrin
Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, King County Other Cities & Towns
**Councilmember Rick Talbert, Pierce County
Councilmember Mike Todd, Mill Creek, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Barbara Tolbert, Arlington, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Greg Wheeler, City of Bremerton
Mayor Victoria Woodards, City of Tacoma
**Councilmember Stephanie Wright, Snohomish County

Members absent included:
(*alternate present)

Mayor John Chelminiak, City of Bellevue
Executive Bruce Dammeier, PSRC Vice President, Pierce County
Mayor Jenny Durkan, City of Seattle
Mayor Cassie Franklin, City of Everett
Commissioner Courtney Gregoire, Port of Seattle
Commissioner Dick Marzano, Port of Tacoma
*Secretary Roger Millar, WSDOT
*Mayor Dana Ralph, City of Kent
Executive Dave Somers, PSRC President, Snohomish County
Commissioner Axel Strakeljahn, Port of Bremerton
*Mayor Amy Walen, City of Kirkland

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

The following person addressed the board: Lindsay Wolpa, Port of Seattle.

PRESIDENT’S REMARKS

Councilmember Johnson welcomed the following new Executive Board members:
- Mayor Greg Wheeler, City of Bremerton
- Mayor Victoria Woodards, City of Tacoma

Councilmember Johnson stated that the board has a packed agenda today and as a courtesy to guest presenters from the Port of Seattle, the agenda would be adjusted to have items 9 and 10 be addressed before items 7 and 8.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Josh Brown, Executive Director:
- Informed the board that PSRC and the Central Puget Sound Economic Development District received clean audit reports. He noted that this is the sixth clean audit in a row for PSRC.
- Reported that the City of Des Moines voted to join PSRC.
- Reported that he continues to meet with new Executive Board members.
- Participated in the following events in the region: Sound Cities’ new Elected Training and Pierce County Regional Council General Assembly.
- Presented to Thurston Regional Planning Council.
• Provided an update on work of the Transportation Policy Board, Growth Management Policy Board and Economic Development Board

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Operations Committee Report

Mayor Ron Lucas, Acting Chair, Operations Committee, reported that the Operations Committee met this morning and recommended approval of the vouchers dated January 10 through February 8, 2018 in the amount of $925,533.86. The committee received a briefing on the Association of Washington Cities Economic Center project. Mayor Lucas reported that PSRC and the Central Puget Sound Economic Development District received clean audit reports for FY 2017. The Operations Committee also discussed the Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program for FY2018-2019. The budget has been shared with PSRC Boards, comments are due to the Operations Committee by March 9. Next month the committee will come back to the Executive Board with a recommendation. Additionally, the committee received budget, grants and contracts status reports.

CONSENT AGENDA

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Garrido/Erickson) to: (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, and (f) Approve Puyallup Conditional Certification Extension. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Port of Seattle’s Sustainable Airport Master Plan

Lance Lyttle, Managing Director of Aviation, and Clare Gallager, Director of Public Affairs, Port of Seattle, provided a report on the work completed to date on the Sustainable Airport Master Plan for Sea-Tac International Airport (SAMP). The Port of Seattle initiated its Sustainable Airport Master Plan in 2013. The primary purpose of the plan 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. The presentation focused on the early planning work and near-term projects, as well as the long-term vision for Sea-Tac Airport. The timetable and next steps were also covered, as well as a brief overview of the public outreach and stakeholder engagement that will take place in 2018.

ACTION ITEMS

Regional Aviation Baseline Study

Ben Bakkenta, PSRC Senior Program Manager, along with Josh Brown, Executive Director, briefed the board on the request to pursuing grant funding through the Federal Aviation Administration to complete a Regional Aviation Baseline Study. The Federal Aviation
Administration (FAA) 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. 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 study would be launched mid-2018 and completed by the end of 2019.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Roberts/Lambert) to direct staff to proceed with pursuing grant funding through the Federal Aviation Administration to complete a Regional Aviation Baseline Study. The motion passed unanimously.

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

Kelly McCourty, PSRC Senior Program Manager, reminded the board that at the January 25 meeting, the board reviewed and discussed the Transportation Policy Board’s recommendation to approve the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds. At that time, 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.

Ms. McCourty reported that the Transportation Policy Board meet on February 8 and, after review and discussion of the proposal, recommended approval of a revised point distribution as shown in Attachments B and C – in the agenda packet.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Erickson/Ryan) to 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. The motion passed unanimously.

### DISCUSSION ITEM

**Regional Centers Framework Update – GMPB Recommendation**

Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC Senior Planner, briefed the board on the work to update the Regional Centers Framework. The Growth Management Policy Board recommended framework outlines a revised structure and criteria for regional and countywide centers and direction to update policies and procedures for center planning. The Executive Board is scheduled to take action on the framework in March.

### INFORMATION ITEMS

Included in the agenda packet was information on the Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program and information on the VISION 2050 scoping process.

### OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business brought before the board.
NEXT MEETING

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

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:49 a.m.

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

Adopted this 22nd day of March, 2018

____________________________________
Executive Dave Somers, President
Puget Sound Regional Council

ATTEST:

Josh Brown, Executive Director
CONSENT AGENDA

March 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

From: Executive Bruce Dammeier, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Vouchers Dated February 14 through February 28, 2018 in the Amount of $805,120.73

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>02/14/18 - 02/27/18</td>
<td>AP Vouchers</td>
<td>$191,950.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/15/18 - 02/28/18</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>$613,170.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$805,120.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

March 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

From: Executive Bruce Dammeier, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Membership for City of Des Moines

IN BRIEF

The City of Des Moines has requested membership in the Puget Sound Regional Council.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Recommend that the Executive Board recognize the City of Des Moines as a member of the Puget Sound Regional Council, effective April 1, 2018.
2. Recommend the Executive Board authorize the Executive Director to assess the City of Des Moines membership dues beginning in fiscal year 2019 (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019).

BUDGET IMPACT

The estimated annual dues for the City of Des Moines will be approximately $9,600. The addition of the City of Des Moines will not change the overall amount of budgeted PSRC dues revenue but will affect the allocation of dues to all member cities and towns. The actual dues allocation will be calculated in July 2018 and invoiced in August 2018. The dues are allocated based on the most recent Office of Financial Management population and assessed values of all member jurisdictions. The addition of Des Moines will be reflected in the Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program.

For more information, contact Mark Gulbranson at 206-464-7524 or mgulbranson@psrc.org.

Attachments:
City of Des Moines PSRC Membership Request

Doc ID 2229
March 7, 2018

Dave Somers, President
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle WA 98104-1035

Dear Mr. Somers:

The Des Moines City Council unanimously passed a motion directing City staff to contact the Puget Sound Regional Council for the purpose of applying for membership. The current City Council recognizes the value derived from participation in regional issues and the efforts of PSRC.

Please accept this letter as a formal request from the City of Des Moines for membership in Puget Sound Regional Council. I look forward to hearing from you on our membership request.

Sincerely,

Michael Matthias
City Manager
CONSENT AGENDA

March 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

From: Executive Bruce Dammeier, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Contract Authority for the Second Two-year Cycle (Wave 2) of the Six-Year Puget Sound Regional Household Travel Survey Program

IN BRIEF

Authorization by the Executive Board is required for the Executive Director to enter into a contract in excess of $10,000. A request is being made to authorize a consultant contract to perform work on the second two-year cycle (Wave 2) of the six-year Puget Sound Regional Household Travel Survey Program. There is a consultant contract for the entire six-year program authorized by the Operations Committee in September 2016, but each two-year cycle is subject to contract renewal based on budget availability and approval.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a consultant contract for the second two-year cycle (Wave 2) of the six-year Puget Sound Regional Household Travel Survey Program up to the amount of $150,000.

BUDGET IMPACT

The adopted Biennial Budget and Work Program for 2018-2019 includes $150,000 for this survey program.

DISCUSSION

The Puget Sound Regional Council is wrapping up work on the 2017 household travel survey (Wave 1, scheduled to be publicly available in March 2018), and preparing to conduct another survey in spring 2019 (Wave 2), both as part of the six-year survey program for three waves (i.e., three two-year survey cycles). These efforts build upon previous household travel surveys to continue to support a wide variety of agency and member data and analysis needs. A consultant for the entire six-year program was hired in 2017 through a competitive selection process, authorized by the Operations Committee in September 2016, but each two-year cycle is subject to contract renewal based on budget availability and approval.
The multi-year program is PSRC’s approach to do more frequent surveying – smaller surveys at regular, short intervals rather than large surveys every six to 10 years. We believe this is a more cost-effective and timely approach to collect the data needed for monitoring and modeling regional travel and land use patterns. Because we will have more current data than what has been available in the past, we will be able to better evaluate how different factors relate to and affect travel behavior as well as how they change over time.

The survey is designed to be representative of the Puget Sound region, but there may not be enough data in smaller geographies to answer travel and land use questions for specific jurisdictions within the region. The PSRC has, therefore, made it possible for jurisdictions to purchase extra survey samples, or add-ons, for their areas to ensure that there is enough data for their travel analyses.

In Wave 1 (2017), the PSRC budgeted $153,000 for a survey sample from across the four-county area to satisfy regional analytic needs. In addition, the City of Redmond committed $75,000 for its add-on sample and the City of Seattle committed $250,000, with an additional $50,000 contingency.

The Wave 1 (2017) survey is on target to remain on budget for the entire contracted amount of $452,983 for all three agencies. The PSRC share is higher than expected, while those for the two add-ons are lower. This is due to the lower estimated survey response rate in rural areas of the region relative to the urban cities. To help compensate for the lower expected return and to help ensure sufficient responses from the rural areas, PSRC purchased proportionally more addresses and paid for more print/postage to send more survey invitations. As such, the PSRC share is estimated to reach up to $160,450 in the most conservative scenario, but it will likely be less than this amount. To help cover this overage, PSRC proposes to use funds from the Wave 2 (2019) survey, which will benefit from the set-up costs for the entire six-year program and other lessons learned in the Wave 1 (2017) survey.

For more information, please contact Brian Lee at (206) 971-3270 or blee@psrc.org, or Neil Kilgren at (206) 971-3602 or nkilgren@psrc.org.
CONSENT AGENDA

March 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

From: Executive Bruce Dammeier, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Contract Authority for 2018 General Assembly

IN BRIEF

Authorization by the Executive Board is required for the Executive Director to enter into a contract in excess of $10,000 per year. A request is being made to authorize the Executive Director to enter into one or more contracts for space rental, catering, and audio/visual expenses related to the 2018 General Assembly.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend that the Executive Board authorize the Executive Director to enter into one or more contracts for support of the 2018 General Assembly. The total cost for all contracts will not exceed $20,000.

BUDGET IMPACT

The adopted Biennial Budget and Work Program for fiscal year 2018-2019 includes funding for this project. Total budget for the contract is not to exceed $20,000.

DISCUSSION

The Puget Sound Regional Council General Assembly includes all mayors, county executives, commissioners, and councilmembers of PSRC member jurisdictions, tribes and statutory members. Each elected representative is a voting member of the General Assembly. The General Assembly will meet on May 31, 2018, to establish the FY 2018-2019 supplemental biennial budget and work program, act on the Regional Transportation Plan and elect new officers.

For more information, please contact Rick Olson at 206-971-3050 or rolson@psrc.org; or Sheila Rogers at 206-464-5815 or srogers@psrc.org.
CONSENT AGENDA

March 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

Two 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. PSRC staff reviewed the projects for compliance with federal and state requirements, and consistency with VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040. At its meeting on March 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

This month’s amendment includes no Project Tracking actions.

Federal and State Fund Source Descriptions

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

NHPP Provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS).

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

Attachments:
Exhibit A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title and Work Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>PSRC Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Kitsap Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton Way Transit Center</td>
<td>$9,000,000 State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding a new Construction phase to provide a transit center and park &amp; ride in East Bremerton, Washington.</td>
<td>$1,443,000 Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,443,000 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Kitsap Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Only Ferry: Southworth - Downtown Seattle</td>
<td>$9,126,899 Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding new Preliminary Engineering and Construction phases that will provide approximately one boat and improve the existing ferry terminal in Southworth for passenger-only ferry (POF) service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,126,899 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Kitsap Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Only Ferry: Kingston - Downtown Seattle</td>
<td>$19,274,714 Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding new Preliminary Engineering and Construction phases that will provide approximately two boats and improve the existing ferry terminal in Kingston for passenger-only ferry (POF) service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19,274,714 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Kitsap Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Only Ferry: Bremerton-Downtown Seattle</td>
<td>$12,530,046 Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Preliminary Engineering and Construction phases that will provide approximately two boats and improve the existing ferry terminal in Bremerton for passenger-only ferry (POF) service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,530,046 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title and Work Description</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WSDOT Northwest Region</td>
<td>I-5/Northbound Seneca St to Olive Way - Mobility Improvements</td>
<td>Adding new Construction phase that will provide an additional northbound lane between Seneca Street and the Olive Way off ramp to provide mobility along the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WSDOT Northwest Region</td>
<td>I-5/Northbound I-90 to SR 520 - Active Traffic Management</td>
<td>Adding new Construction phase to install metering on the Cherry Street to northbound I-5 ramp and the northbound I-5 collector distributor ramp and extend the Active Traffic Management System on northbound I-5 from I-90 to SR 520.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT AGENDA

March 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

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

Subject: Approve Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for Milton

IN BRIEF

The Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board recommend that the Executive Board certify the 2018 comprehensive plan amendments for the City of Milton.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should certify that the transportation-related provisions of the comprehensive plan for the City of Milton, as amended in 2018, are consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and conform to the Growth Management requirements for transportation planning. (certification report)

DISCUSSION

On January 28, 2016, PSRC conditionally certified the City of Milton’s 2015 periodic update of the comprehensive plan. Conditional certification allowed the city to qualify for PSRC managed federal funding while working to address the conditions. As a condition for full certification, the city was asked to amend the comprehensive plan to address inconsistencies between land use assumptions used in the plan and housing growth targets adopted by Pierce and King counties and make clear that all elements of the plan assume consistent 20-year growth in housing and jobs.

RCW 36.70A.130 requires that local comprehensive plan updates accommodate the growth projected to occur over the subsequent 20-year period. VISION 2040 (MPP-DP-3) calls for countywide adoption of housing and employment growth targets that promote the Regional Growth Strategy. MPP-T-9 calls for coordination of state, regional, and local transportation planning in support of that strategy. RCW 36.70A.070 requires the transportation element of local comprehensive plans to implement and be consistent with the land use element.

Located within two counties, the City of Milton plans for targets set in both King and Pierce
counties. For the 20-year planning period in this update, the estimated combined housing target is 300 units and the employment target 1000 jobs.

The 2018 amendments clarify the basis for the land use assumptions and bring the household growth assumption in the land use, housing, and transportation elements into alignment with each other and with the adopted targets.

The amendments 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.

For more information, please contact Principal Planner Michael Hubner at (206) 971-3289 or MHubner@psrc.org or Associate Planner Laura Benjamin at Ibenjamin@psrc.org or (206) 464-7134.
ACTION ITEM

March 15, 2018

To: Executive Board

From: Josh Brown, Executive Director

Subject: Approve Regional Centers Framework Update

IN BRIEF

At its March meeting, the Executive Board will be asked to take final action to approve the Regional Centers Framework Update.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should approve and initiate implementation of the Regional Centers Framework Update.

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 as Attachment B.

Proposed amendments to the GMPB recommendation are included in Attachment C for Executive Board consideration. Staff expect additional amendments to be submitted and will provide those to the board when available. If members wish to propose additional amendments, board members are asked to submit amendments as soon as possible so the Executive Board has adequate time to review prior to the meeting.

Project Background

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 Regional Centers Framework Update project 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, GMPB 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 GMPB-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 encourages 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. GMPB had lengthy discussions on amendments regarding project funding for military installations and standards for countywide centers, and did not adopt three of the amendments proposed.

After voting on the amendments, 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 March 22, the Executive Board will be asked to take action on the board recommendation. Additional project details are available on the [Centers Framework project page](https://www.wa.gov).

**WA State Environmental Policy Act**

PSRC has issued an Addendum to the 2008 VISION 2040 FEIS, per Revised Code of Washington 43.21C and Washington Administrative Code 197-11, on January 25, 2018 to support final action on the Regional Centers Framework Update. The addendum is available online.

**Major Military Installations**

Members have asked how the centers framework recommendation recognizes military installations. Throughout the centers framework process, one of the key objectives was to better recognize the importance of military installations in the region. Major military installations, like JBLM and Naval Base Kitsap, play an important role in our regional economy and the make-up of our communities, which include thousands of active and retired military personnel.

The Centers Stakeholder Working Group explored several options for treating military installations like regional centers and presented three different options for the Growth Management Policy Board to consider. GMPB noted that, while regionally important, military installations have significant differences from regional growth centers. Installations don’t plan under the Growth Management Act, PSRC can’t fund on-base projects, and the nature of the controlled access makes their transportation patterns different from other urban locations. The board discussed that the objective for military installations is less about focusing new growth and more about how to mitigate impacts on neighboring communities. Ultimately, GMPB recommended recognizing Major Military Installations in VISION 2050 and directing staff to research additional funding opportunities.

During the parallel work of the Transportation Policy Board on the regional funding process, the TPB recognized that PSRC’s regional funding criteria are focused on projects that support growth of jobs and people in regional centers. If military installations were similarly prioritized for funding, new criteria would need to be developed that are specific to their nature and local impacts. Military installations are already prioritized for countywide funding competitions.

The Regional Centers Framework recommendation from the Growth Management Policy Board includes the following recommendations related to military installations:

1. **Identify Major Military Installations in VISION 2050.** Major installations are defined as installations with more than 5,000 enlisted and service personnel (which includes Joint Base Lewis McChord, Naval Base Kitsap – Bangor and Bremerton, and Naval Station Everett). The recommendation also defines smaller installations which may be recognized as countywide centers or equivalent as a federal installation that employs one hundred or more full-time personnel.

2. **Establish expectations for regional recognition, including ongoing coordination regarding planned growth, regional impacts, and multimodal transportation options; support for multimodal commute planning and mode split goals for the installation, and a completed Joint Land Use Study or similar coordinated effort.**
3. Implementation step for PSRC staff to 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.

Identifying Major Military Installations in VISION 2050 is an important step toward additional coordinated planning, which may include participation in future regional funding competitions.

For more information, please contact Liz Underwood-Bultmann at 206-464-6174, LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org or Paul Inghram at 206-464-7549, PInghram@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - Regional Centers Framework Proposal GMPB Recommendation
B - GMPB Recommendation Overview
C - Centers Framework Amendments
* This version corrects an error incorporating an amendment approved by the GMPB on February 1. Language regarding mix of uses in regional growth centers has been moved from page 8 to page 6, consistent with the amendment adopted by the board.
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 contain 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.
Regional Centers Framework Update – GMPB Recommendation
February 2, 2018

- **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
- **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.
- **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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Growth Center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Urban Growth Center Criteria</strong></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><strong>Metro Growth Center Criteria</strong></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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- **Mix of uses.** Regional growth centers should have a goal for a minimum mix of at least 15% planned residential and employment activity in the center.
  <Corrected in this version - mix of uses language moved from p. 8>
- **Size.** 200 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)
- **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 (< 15-minute headways) and all-day (operates at least 16 hours per day on weekdays) –or- high capacity
- **Market potential.** Evidence of future market potential to support planning target
- **Role.** Evidence of regional role
  - Clear regional role for center (serves as important destination for the county)
  - Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy

- **Mix of uses.** Regional growth centers should have a goal for a minimum mix of at least 15% planned residential and employment activity in the center.
  <Corrected in this version - mix of uses language moved from p. 8>
- **Size.** 320 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)
- **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 (< 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.
- **Market potential.** Evidence of future market potential to support planning target
- **Role.** Evidence of regional role:
  - Clear regional role for center (for example, city center of metropolitan cities, other large and fast-growing centers; important regional destination)
  - Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy

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.

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.

6
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.

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 of 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
- At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses
- Industrial retention strategies in place
- Regional role

**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 of 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. <Corrected in this version - moved to regional growth center table (p.6)>

---

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.

• **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.

  o **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.
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><strong>Countywide Industrial Center</strong></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>
Regional Centers Framework Update – GMPB Recommendation
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### Countywide Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide Growth Center</th>
<th>Countywide Industrial Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(cont.) Demonstration that the center is a local planning and investment priority:</td>
<td>(cont.) 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>
</tbody>
</table>

The center is a location for compact, mixed-use development; including:

| o A minimum existing activity unit density of 10 activity units per acre | The center supports industrial sector employment: |
| 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. | o Minimum 1,000 existing jobs and/or 500 acres of industrial land |
| o Capacity and planning for additional growth |

The center supports multi-modal transportation, including:

| o Transit service | o Defined transportation demand management strategies in place |
| o Pedestrian infrastructure and amenities | o At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses |
| o Street pattern that supports walkability | o Industrial retention strategies in place |
| o Bicycle infrastructure and amenities | o Capacity and planning for additional growth |
| o Compact, walkable size of one-quarter mile squared (160 acres), up to half-mile transit walkshed (500 acres) | o Important county role and concentration of industrial land or jobs with evidence of long-term demand |

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 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 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.
### GMBP Centers Framework Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Standards</th>
<th>GMPB Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Growth Centers</strong></td>
<td>One type of regional center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary focus on existing and planned density, commitment when reviewing new centers</td>
<td>Two types of regional growth centers -- metro growth center and urban growth center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include additional criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Market potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distribution &amp; number of centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing/Industrial Centers</strong></td>
<td>One pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary focus on existing and planned jobs, commitment when reviewing new centers</td>
<td>Two types of industrial centers -- industrial employment centers and industrial growth centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include additional criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Core industrial zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preservation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Installations</strong></td>
<td>Major installations like Joint Base Lewis McChord and the Bremerton Shipyard are not fully addressed in VISION 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All installations are eligible to be countywide centers</td>
<td>Recommend to recognize major installations in VISION 2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance on countywide designation for smaller installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redesignation</strong></td>
<td>Some centers do not meet current standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different expectations based on when designated</td>
<td>Common expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2025 performance check-in, with option to meet minimum criteria through market study and planning actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong></td>
<td>Subarea planning required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provisions for affordable housing and special housing needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan for amenities like parks and civic places</td>
<td>Additional housing planning prior to designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update center plan checklist to address topics like displacement, access to opportunity, and environmental justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity (cont.)</td>
<td>Current Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| o Encourage walkability and transit-supportive planning | New regional analysis and guidance on equitable community engagement + displacement  
Develop framework to measure progress |  
| Process | Rolling application window | Application window every five years  
Revisit thresholds during updates to VISION  
Consider distribution, location, and number of centers in designation process |  
| Countywide Centers | No shared definition of countywide centers  
Only regional centers have common definition and recognition  
Criteria and designation vary by county | Establish shared criteria for countywide centers; recognize places beyond regional centers  
Criteria focus on:  
- Local priority  
- Mixed use, planning for growth  
- Multimodal options  
- Industrial zoning, retention |  
| Performance Measures | Performance monitoring reports on ad hoc schedule | Five-year monitoring report  
Set performance measures  
Additional review if not meeting performance expectations |
This document compiles potential amendments submitted for consideration for the March 2018 Executive Board meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment 1 (King County - Councilmember Lambert) | p. 3 | In the list under “Objectives to guide the project were establish at a joint board session in 2016;” make the following changes:  
**Environment:** Centers improve environmental sustainability, (by diverting growth away from) protecting rural and resource lands, habitat, and other critical areas (and) by focusing the majority of growth in (towards) urban areas with existing infrastructure. | Revised language clarifies environmental objectives for Centers Framework Update |
| Amendment 2 (City of Kent - Mayor Ralph) | p. 8 | In Footnote 3, describing core industrial zoning, make the following changes:  
- 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 to accessory uses. | This footnote, attached to the criterion for 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses, states commercial uses within core industrial zones shall be strictly limited. Some believe commercial as an accessory use is implied in the footnote, but Kent would like the framework to be explicit so there is no need for interpretation or implication. The original verbiage stated that “commercial uses are accessory,” but that verbiage was removed at the February 1 GMPB meeting as a “minor technical amendment.” Kent would like the language regarding commercial accessory uses to be reinstated and believes this change has a substantive effect on the city. Adding limited flexibility to uses in the industrial area attracts high-quality businesses and employees as a better fit for industrial uses in the modern age. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment 3 (SCA – Councilmember Roberts) | p. 8 | In the table on Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, amend the narrative description for both Industrial Employment Centers and Industrial Growth Centers to include:  
- Jurisdictions and transit agencies should aim to serve all MICs with transit.  
Under “Center must meet each of the following criteria,” make the following changes for both Industrial Employment Centers and Industrial Growth Centers:  
- Access to transit or defined transportation demand management strategies in place. If MIC is within a transit service district, availability of existing or planned frequent, local, express, or flexible transit service. If MIC is outside a transit service district, documented strategies to reduce commute impacts through transportation demand management strategies consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan Appendix F ([Regional TDM Action Plan](#)). | Amendment strengthens the transit requirements for manufacturing/industrial centers and establishes criteria more consistent with regional growth centers when the MIC is within a regional transit system. When the MIC is not within a transit agency district, clarifies expectations to develop alternative strategies to reduce the impacts of traffic. |
ACTION ITEM

To: Executive Board

From: Executive Bruce Dammeier, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Recommend Adoption of Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program FY2018-2019

IN BRIEF

Last May, PSRC’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 an option to make an adjustment with a supplemental budget after the first year.

Information on the proposed Supplemental Budget and Work Program was given to the Executive Board, Transportation Policy Board, Growth Management Policy Board, Regional Staff Committee, and the Economic Development Board during the month of February 2018 and members were invited to forward any comments to the Operations Committee.

On Thursday, March 22, 2018, the Executive Board will be asked to recommend the Fiscal Years 2018-2019 Supplemental Budget and Work Program for adoption by the General Assembly on May 31, 2018. The Proposed Supplemental Budget and Work Program, which can be viewed at https://www.psrc.org/about/budget, provides an overview of the agency’s major work elements and describes the changes that are proposed since the last amendment to the budget.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS


2. Recommend that the General Assembly adopt Resolution PSRC-A-2018-01 authorizing the submittal of the adopted Supplemental Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Biennial Budget and Work Program to the appropriate federal and state funding agencies.
BUDGET IMPACT

The Proposed Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program FY 2018-2019 of $27.5 million is a steady-state budget with no overall changes in revenues and expenditures since the last amendment in October 2017.

BACKGROUND

The Puget Sound Regional Council is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization and state designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization for the four-county area and has specific responsibilities under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), Clean Air Act (CAA), the state Growth Management Act (GMA), and the Interlocal Agreement approved by PSRC members.

PSRC is funded through a combination of federal and state grants and local funds. The federal grants traditionally make up nearly 68 percent of the funding, while state grants contribute about 4 percent. Local funds provide 28 percent and are used to match the state and federal grants, and also fund work not covered by federal and state grants.

If you have questions, please call Diana Lauderbach, PSRC Chief Financial Officer, at (206) 464-5416 or email dlauberbach@psrc.org.

Attachments:
Resolution PSRC-A-2018-01
RESOLUTION NO. PSRC-A-2018-01

A RESOLUTION of the Puget Sound Regional Council
Authorizing Submittal of the Supplemental Fiscal Years 2018-2019 Biennial Budget and Work Program

WHEREAS, the General Assembly of the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), at its meeting on May 31, 2017, adopted the Biennial Budget and Work Program for Fiscal Years 2018-2019;

WHEREAS, that the Executive Director of the Puget Sound Regional Council is authorized to submit to the federal and state agencies the grant application to carry out the Biennial Budget and Work Program, and all supporting information, including procedures to ensure compliance with the requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Economic Development Administration; the Environmental Protection Agency; the Federal Aviation Administration; the United States Geological Survey; and the Washington State Department of Transportation.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Executive Director is designated as the authorized official to execute grant contracts on behalf of the Puget Sound Regional Council with the United States Department of Transportation, the Economic Development Administration; the Environmental Protection Agency; the Federal Aviation Administration; the United States Geological Survey; and the Washington State Department of Transportation in support of the adopted budget and work program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director of PSRC is authorized to incur costs beginning on July 1, 2018, and receive planning monies from the federal and state agencies and local jurisdictions pursuant to the adopted Biennial Budget and Work Program for Fiscal Years 2018-2019 for the Puget Sound Regional Council.

ADOPTED by the Assembly this 31st day of May, 2018.

______________________________
Dave Somers, Executive
Snohomish County
President, Puget Sound Regional Council

ATTEST:______________________________
Josh Brown, Executive Director
IN BRIEF

The Regional Transportation Plan was released for public comment on December 14, 2017, with the formal comment period concluding on January 31, 2018. At the March 22 meeting, staff will present a comprehensive briefing on the comments received, including proposed staff responses to comments and issues for board review and further discussion.

DISCUSSION

The formal public comment period for the draft Regional Transportation Plan was conducted from December 14, 2017 to January 31, 2018. As of February 14, a total of 152 respondents submitted comments, including PSRC member jurisdictions, members of the public, and other organizations. Per standard practice, each of these communications was parsed into individual topic area comments. From the 152 communications, 842 individual comments are noted. The topic areas under which the comments are categorized are as follows:

- Analysis results and tools
- Aviation
- Bicycle / pedestrian
- Climate change / air quality
- Congestion / roadway capacity
- Equity
- Ferries
- Financial strategy
- Freight
- General plan support
- Health
- Maintenance and preservation
- Miscellaneous / other
- Multimodal system
• Parking
• Performance measures
• Project specific
• Public engagement
• Safety
• Special needs transportation
• TDM and CTR
• Transit
• Water quality

At the March 22 board meeting, staff will review the comments in detail and provide information on three categories of comment type – those that are considered technical corrections; those that are general comments; and those that will be presented for further board review and discussion.

All of the comments received have been posted on PSRC’s website at https://www.psrc.org/our-work/rtp. Communications from organizations are posted separately, and one combined report of all individual citizen comments is also provided. A full report, including the detailed accounting by topic area and the proposed staff responses, is also available on this webpage.

This information is provided as a discussion item to the board in March, with time for further review and discussion prior to the scheduled recommendation of the plan in April. As a reminder, approval by the General Assembly is scheduled for May 31, 2018.

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

March 15, 2018

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

IN BRIEF

Following Executive Board direction at its February meeting, PSRC released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for consultant support on March 1st to complete a Regional Aviation Baseline Study. PSRC has also received resolutions adopted by the Cities of Burien and Des Moines related to the need for coordination and planning for the region’s airport system. PSRC staff has met with communities surrounding the region’s airports to ensure their involvement in the upcoming study.

DISCUSSION

At its February 22, 2008 meeting, the Executive Board received a briefing on the proposed Regional Aviation Baseline Study and reviewed the draft scope of work developed in coordination with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). At that meeting, the Board directed staff to proceed with releasing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for consultant support and pursuing grant funding for the study. The RFQ was released on March 1st and PSRC anticipates receiving responses back on March 30th, after which it will work to select a consultant and finalize the grant with FAA.

PSRC staff has also met with communities surrounding airports in the region to receive input on the study and ensure their involvement. In addition to these meetings, the City of Burien and the City of Des Moines recently adopted resolutions that relate to the work that will be completed as part of the Regional Aviation Baseline Study. For your information, those resolutions are included Attachment A and Attachment B.

PSRC staff will continue to provide updates to the Executive Board as this work proceeds.

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:

Doc ID 2235
Attachment A - Burien Resolution
Attachment B - Des Moines Resolution
CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON

RESOLUTION NO. 396

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON, REQUESTING THE KING COUNTY COUNCIL, THE PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL, THE STATE LEGISLATURE, AND THE GOVERNOR’S OFFICE TO TAKE ACTION TO ADDRESS LONG-TERM AVIATION CAPACITY NEEDS IN WESTERN WASHINGTON.

WHEREAS, the City of Burien (“City”) is a community adjacent to Sea-Tac Airport; and

WHEREAS, the City has experienced considerable and disproportionate health and environmental impacts due to proximity to Sea-Tac Airport (“Sea-Tac”); and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that Sea-Tac is an engine for economic growth for the region; and

WHEREAS, the City has formed the Burien Airport Committee (“BAC”) to examine potential opportunities and impacts associated with Sea-Tac; and

WHEREAS, the BAC has examined Sea-Tac growth (average 9% annual rate from 2013-2016) and believes that the expected timeframe for Sea-Tac to exceed capacity is likely to be by 2025 and not 2034 as outlined in the Sea-Tac Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP); and

WHEREAS, since 1989, various governmental agencies tasked by state statute with planning and decision-making related to ensuring future aviation and airspace capacity have failed to identify or promote any alternatives;¹ and

WHEREAS, the financial costs and environmental impacts of continued expansion at Sea-Tac are not sustainable; and

WHEREAS, the SeaTac footprint, transportation infrastructure, and air space capacity will constrain future growth and compromise safety; and

WHEREAS, various other airports exist within the greater Puget Sound and Western Washington region that could potentially accommodate some aviation growth, and that coordination among these facilities is limited; and

WHEREAS, the BAC believes that immediate action is needed to coordinate plans for long-term aviation capacity for the greater Puget Sound and Western Washington region to ensure the ability to accommodate anticipated growth and to minimize further impacts on Burien and adjacent communities.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON, DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Action Requested. The City Council of the City of Burien herein requests that the King County Council, the Puget Sound Regional Council, the State Legislature, and the Governor’s Office take deliberate action to fund and implement the means to cooperatively update an existing or, as needed, develop a new plan that will address the region’s long-term aviation capacity needs. This effort will serve the purposes of both future economic development and reduction of health-related impacts for communities proximate to airport facilities. To address capacity needs, this effort must be launched as soon as possible.

Section 2. Burien’s Cooperation. The Burien City Council is willing to assist or participate with the effort outlined in Section 1 as necessary.

Section 3: Responses Requested. The Burien City Council requests that the entities named in Section 1 respond to the Council of their intended actions no later than sixty days from receipt of this resolution.

Section 4. Effective Date. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage by the Burien City Council.


CITY OF BURIEN
/s/ Lucy Krakowiak, Mayor

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:
/s/ Monica Lusk, City Clerk

Approved as to form:
/s/ Lisa Marshall, City Attorney
Copies to be distributed to:
- The Honorable Joe McDermott, Chair, King County Council
- Josh Brown, Executive Director, Puget Sound Regional Council
- The Honorable Joe Fitzgibbon, Washington State Legislature
- The Honorable Tina Orwell, Washington State Legislature
- The Honorable Mia Gregerson, Washington State Legislature
- The Honorable Karen Keiser, Washington State Legislature
- The Honorable Jay Inslee, Washington Governor
RESOLUTION NO. 1378

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DES MOINES, WASHINGTON, requesting the King County Council, the Puget Sound Regional Council, the State Legislature, and the Governor’s Office to take action to address long-term aviation capacity needs in Western Washington.

WHEREAS, the City of Des Moines ("City") is a community adjacent to Sea-Tac Airport, and

WHEREAS, the City has experienced considerable and disproportionate health and environmental impacts due to proximity to Sea-Tac Airport ("Sea-Tac"), and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that Sea-Tac is an engine for economic growth for the region, and

WHEREAS, the City has formed an Aviation Advisory Committee ("Committee") to examine potential opportunities and impacts associated with Sea-Tac, and

WHEREAS, since 1989, various governmental agencies tasked by state statute with planning and decision-making related to ensuring future aviation and airspace capacity have failed to identify or promote any alternatives, and

WHEREAS, the financial costs and environmental impacts of continued expansion of Sea-Tac are not sustainable, and

WHEREAS, the Sea-Tac footprint, transportation infrastructure, and airspace capacity will constrain future growth and compromise safety, and

WHEREAS, various other airports exist within the Greater Puget Sound and Western Washington region that could potentially accommodate some aviation growth, and coordination among these facilities is limited, and

WHEREAS, the City Council and the Aviation Advisory Committee believe that immediate action is needed to coordinate plans for long-term aviation capacity for the Greater Puget Sound and Western Washington region to ensure the ability to accommodate anticipated growth and to minimize further impacts on Des Moines and adjacent communities; now therefore,
THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DES MOINES RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Sec. 1. Action requested. The Des Moines City Council herein requests that the King County Council, the Puget Sound Regional Council, the State Legislature, and the Governor’s Office take deliberate action to fund and implement the means to cooperatively update an existing or, as needed, develop a new plan that will address the region’s long-term aviation capacity needs. This effort will serve the purposes of both future economic development and reduction of health-related impacts for communities proximate to airport facilities. To address capacity needs, this effort must be launched as soon as possible.

Sec. 2. Des Moines’ cooperation. The Des Moines City Council is willing to assist or participate with the effort outlined in section 1 as necessary.

Sec. 3. Responses requested. The Des Moines City Council requests that the entities named in section 1 respond to the Council of their intended actions no later than sixty (60) days from receipt of this Resolution.

Sec. 4. Effective date. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage by the Des Moines City Council.

ADOPTED BY the City Council of the City of Des Moines, Washington this 15th day of February, 2018 and signed in authentication thereof this 15th day of February, 2018.

MAYOR

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

ATTEST:

City Clerk