Executive Board  
Thursday, January 23, 2020 • 10:00 – 11:30 AM  
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 Bruce Dammeier, President

2. Communications and Public Comment

3. President's Remarks

4. Executive Director's Report

5. Committee Report  
   a. Operations Committee - Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Vice President

6. Consent Agenda (10:20)  
   a. Approve Minutes of Meeting held December 5, 2019  
   b. Approve Vouchers Dated November 15, 2019 through January 10, 2020 in the Amount of $1,422,039.37  
   c. Approve Membership for City of Carnation  
   d. Approve Associate Membership for Cascade Water Alliance  
   e. Approve PSRC Executive Board Representatives  
   f. Approve Contract Authority for 2020 General Assembly  
   g. Approve Contract Authorization for Replacement of Boardroom Audio/Video System and Ongoing Maintenance Services for Audio/Video Systems  
   h. Adopt Routine Amendment to the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program  
   i. Authorize a Change in the Regional Transportation Plan Project Status for the City of Bellevue's Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail, 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Place SE Project  
   j. Adopt Federal Safety Targets

7. New Business (10:25)  
   a. Approve Project Tracking Recommendation for an Exchange of PSRC and TIB Funds -- Ryan Thompto, PSRC

8. New Business (10:40)  

9. Discussion Item (11:00)
a. GMPB Recommendation for VISION 2050 – *Paul Inghram and Ben Bakkenta, PSRC*

10. Other Business

11. Information Item
   a. 2020 Executive Board and Operations Committee Meeting Schedule

12. Next Meeting: Thursday, February 27, 2020, 10 - 11:30 AM, 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. العربية | Arabic, 中文 | Chinese, Deutsch | German, Français | French, 한국어 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese, Call 206-587-4819.
December 5, 2019

VISION 2050 plan recommendation approved

The Growth Management Policy Board unanimously approved a formal recommendation to the Executive Board to adopt the VISION 2050 plan. This action is an important milestone that culminates two years of intensive work by the board, including recent actions on more than 200 amendments in response to comments.

Leading up to the final recommendation, the board considered a handful of remaining proposed amendments covering specific aspects of the Regional Growth Strategy, military installations and compatibility, Puget Sound recovery, school siting, and climate change.

The board’s recommendation to adopt VISION 2050 will be presented to the Executive Board in early 2020. The Executive Board is anticipated to make a recommendation to the General Assembly for adoption in May.

For more information, contact Liz Underwood-Bultmann at 206-464-6174 or lunderwood-bultmann@psrc.org, or Paul Inghram at 206-464-7549 or pinghram@psrc.org.
Thank you to outgoing board members

The board offered special thanks to Tacoma Councilmember Ryan Mello and Redmond Councilmember Hank Margeson for their outstanding leadership and service to the region as Chair and Vice Chair of the Growth Management Policy Board.

The board also recognized other dedicated members and alternates who were moving on at the end of the year: Mayor John Chelminiak, Councilmember Tim Curtis, Councilmember Larry Gossett, Councilmember John Holman, Councilmember Mike O’Brien, Councilmember Abel Pacheco, Councilmember Bruce Harrell, Councilmember Ron Peltier, Councilmember Brian Sullivan, Dr. Susan Turner, and Councilmember Paul Winterstein.
December 12, 2019

PSRC's Freight Work Program

The Transportation Policy Board was briefed on the status of the regional freight inventory, which is a key step to identifying the region’s freight assets and their unique characteristics and relationship to the transportation system. The overall goal is to expand the understanding of the importance of freight and highlight the critical aspects of the complex multimodal freight system in the region. View the presentation or watch the meeting video.

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

Federal Safety Targets

PSRC is required to update federal safety performance targets on an annual basis. Staff briefed the board on the target setting process, the state and draft regional targets for the performance measures, and the evaluation process for the targets, in addition to the relationship of the targets to current conditions and planning efforts. It is anticipated the board will be asked to recommend adoption of the safety targets in January 2020.
For more information, contact Kelly McGourty at (206) 971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.

In other business, the board:

- Discussed the impacts of implementing Initiative 976. While some projects have been placed on hold awaiting further direction from the courts and Legislature, exact outcomes are not known at this point.
January 9, 2020

2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds

The Transportation Policy Board recommended adoption of the 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds. The document will become the guidance for the distribution of an estimated $270 million in PSRC funding annually during fiscal years 2023 and 2024. It outlines how the process will be conducted, including each individual funding program. The Executive Board is scheduled to take final action on the Policy Framework at its meeting on January 23. View the presentation or watch the meeting video.

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

Funding Exchange

The Transportation Policy Board recommended approval of a project tracking request to exchange PSRC funds with Transportation Investment Board funds between the City of Lake Stevens’ 20th Street SE Phase II, Segment 1 project and the City of Lynnwood’s 196th Street SW Improvements project. The City of Lake Stevens was awarded PSRC funds for 2022 and could accelerate
construction if funding were available earlier. By trading funding sources with the Lynnwood project, both projects can move forward in a timely matter with full funding.

For more information, contact Ryan Thompto, Senior Transportation Analyst, at 206-464-7122 or rthompto@psrc.org.

**Federal Safety Targets**

The Transportation Policy Board recommended adoption of federal safety targets for 2020. Performance measures for these targets include the number of fatalities, serious injuries, and bicycle and pedestrian safety. View the presentation.

For more information, contact Gary Simonson, Senior Planner, at 206-971-3276 or gsimonson@psrc.org.

**In other business, the board:**

- Was briefed on the status of PSRC’s Passenger-only Ferry Study.
- Was briefed on preparation for the 2022 Regional Transportation Plan. View the presentation.
- Recommended a Routine Amendment to the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Recommend authorizing a change in the Regional Transportation Plan Project Status for the City of Bellevue’s Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail, 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Place SE Project.
MINUTES

Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board
Thursday, December 5, 2019
PSRC Board Room

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Executive Board was called to order at 10:08 a.m. by Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Vice President. The signatures on the Attendance Sheet, as well as documentation by staff, determined attendance and that a quorum was present.

[To watch a video of the meeting and hear the full discussion, please go to: https://www.psrc.org/boards/watch-meetings.]

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

Councilmember Claudia Balducci, PSRC Vice President, King County
Commissioner Glen Bachman, Port of Everett
Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, King County Other Cities & Towns
Councilmember Bruce Bassett, Mercer Island, Other Cities & Towns King County
Commissioner Cary Bozeman, Port of Bremerton
Mayor Becky Erickson, Poulsbo, Kitsap County Other Cities & Towns
Commissioner Charlotte Garrido, Kitsap County
Councilmember Kathy Lambert, King County
Councilmember Mike O’Brien, City of Seattle
Mayor Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, King County Other Cities & Towns
Councilmember Ed Prince, City of Renton
Mayor Bill Pugh, Sumner, Pierce County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Dana Ralph, City of Kent
Ms. Patty Rubstello, WSDOT
Councilmember Terry Ryan, Snohomish County
Commissioner Hester Serebrin, Washington State Transportation Commission
Executive Dave Somers, Snohomish County
Mayor Penny Sweet, City of Kirkland
Councilmember Mike Todd, Mill Creek, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns
Mayor Greg Wheeler, City of Bremerton
**Mayor Victoria Woodards, City of Tacoma**  
**Councilmember Stephanie Wright, Snohomish County**  
Councilmember Derek Young, Pierce County

Members absent included:  
(*alternate present)

Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, King County Other Cities & Towns  
Mayor John Chelminiak, City of Bellevue  
Executive Dow Constantine, King County  
Executive Bruce Dammeyer, PSRC President, Pierce County  
Mayor Jenny Durkan, City of Seattle  
Mayor Jim Ferrell, City of Federal Way  
Mayor Cassie Franklin, City of Everett  
Commissioner Courtney Gregoire, Port of Seattle  
*Mayor Denis Law, City of Renton  
Commissioner Dick Marzano, Port of Tacoma  
*Secretary Roger Millar, WSDOT  
Councilmember Teresa Mosqueda, City of Seattle  
*Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, King County Other Cities & Towns  
*Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, King Co. Other Cities & Towns  
Mayor Barbara Tolbert, Arlington, Snohomish County Other Cities & Towns

**COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no public comment or communications received.

**PRESIDENT'S REMARKS**

Vice President Claudia Balducci recognized the following outgoing board members and alternates and thanked them for their service:

- Councilmember Bruce Bassett
- Mayor John Chelminiak
- Commissioner Courtney Gregoire
- Councilmember Bruce Harrell
- Councilmember Dennis Higgins
- Mayor Denis Law
- Councilmember Ryan Mello
- Councilmember Mike O'Brien
- Councilmember Abel Pacheco
- Commissioner Clare Petrich
- Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford
- Commissioner Larry Stokes

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**
Vice President Claudia Balducci, Chair, Operations Committee, reported that at today’s meeting the Operations Committee recommended approve of the vouchers dated October 17 through November 15, 2019 in the amount of $1,039,973.57. The committee also recommended contract authority for unanticipated repairs or replacement of essential equipment and related consultant services.

She reported that in October the committee heard from the Federal Transit Administration that PSRC received zero findings on their latest Triennial Review; and that the State Auditors will be arriving next week to begin their Fiscal Year 2019 audit. After the last state audit, we celebrated seven clean audits in a row. She also reported that the committee discussed the development of the Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program.

Vice President Balducci then called on The Le, PSRC HR Manager, who introduced the following two new employees:

- Grace Young, Data and Planning Intern, Data Department
- Mikayla Svob, Administrative Assistant II, Regional Planning Department

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Garrido/Ockerlander) to: (a) Approve Minutes of Meeting held October 24, 2019, (b) Approve Vouchers Dated October 17, 2019 through November 15, 2019 in the Amount of $1,039,973.57, and (c) Approve Contract Authority for Unanticipated Repairs or Replacement of Essential Equipment and Related Consultant Services. The motion passed unanimously.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Authorize a Change in the Regional Transportation Plan Project Status for the WSDOT SR 509 Extension (with I-5), Phase 1 Project**

WSDOT has submitted a request to change the status of the SR 509 Extension (with I-5), Phase 1 project from “Candidate” to “Approved.”

Craig Stone, WSDOT Gateway Program Administrator, provided a brief overview of the project. The SR 509 Extension (with I-5), Phase 1 project will construct a new four lane SR 509 from S. 188th St to its connection with I-5. The project will also construct a two-lane southbound collector-distributor along I-5 to SR 516, reconstruct the SR 516 interchange into a diamond interchange and provide a connection to Veterans Drive.

This project also constructs a northbound auxiliary lane between the SR 516/Veterans Drive on-ramp and the SR 509 off-ramp. The project also constructs a half diamond interchange to the south to connect SR 509 to 28/24th Ave S. The project will also reconstruct the S. 188th St. interchange into a half diamond to the north and construct a southbound auxiliary lane from SR 516 down to S 272nd St.
At its meeting on November 14, the Transportation Policy Board recommended that the Executive Board authorize changing the status of the project as requested.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Erickson/Ockerlander) that the Executive Board authorize a change in project status for the WSDOT SR 509 Extension (with I-5), Phase 1 project from “Candidate” to “Approved.” The motion passed with one abstention (Councilmember O’Brien).

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

**Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission**

Josh Brown, PSRC Executive Director, provided a brief overview of the Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission. The Commercial Aviation Coordinating Commission was created by the Legislature to identify a location for a new primary commercial aviation facility in Washington State.

The legislation directed WSDOT’s Aviation Division to provide staff support for coordinating and administering the commission and technical assistance as requested by commission members.

The Commission is charged with a broad review of potential aviation facility sites, to review existing data, and conduct research as necessary. A shortlist of six sites must be recommended by January 1, 2021, narrowed to two sites by September 1, 2021, and a single preferred location for a new commercial aviation facility must be identified by January 1, 2022. Options for a new primary commercial aviation facility in Washington State may include expansion of an existing airport facility. The Commission must project a timeline for developing an additional commercial aviation facility that is completed and functional by 2040. The Commission must also make recommendations on future Washington State long-range commercial facility needs.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

At 11:16 a.m. Vice President Claudia Balducci announced that the board would adjourn to an Executive Session for 14 minutes to discuss the Executive Director’s annual performance evaluation. Vice President Balducci reconvened the board meeting at 11:35 a.m.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Erickson) to approve a merit increase for the Executive Director at 6% and an increase to the employer annual match from $7,500 to $8,000 to his 401A Deferred Compensation Plan effective January 1, 2020. The motion passed unanimously.

**INFORMATION ITEM**
Included in the agenda packet was the 2020 Executive Board and Operations Committee Meeting Schedule.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business brought before the board.

NEXT MEETING

The Executive Board will next meet on Thursday, January 23, 2020, 10 - 11:30 a.m., PSRC Board Room.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:41 AM.

Adopted this 23rd day of January, 2020.

________________________________________
Executive Bruce Dammeier, President
Puget Sound Regional Council

ATTEST:

Josh Brown, Executive Director
CONSENT AGENDA

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Vouchers Dated November 15, 2019 through January 10, 2020 in the Amount of $1,422,039.37

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</th>
<th>WARRANT DATE</th>
<th>VOUCHER NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/19 - 01/10/20</td>
<td>AP Vouchers</td>
<td>$ 527,765.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/27/19 - 12/31/19</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>$ 894,273.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,422,039.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board
From: Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Chair, Operations Committee
Subject: Approve Membership for City of Carnation

IN BRIEF

The City of Carnation has requested membership in the Puget Sound Regional Council. Please see the attached transmittal letter.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Recommend that the Executive Board recognize the City of Carnation as a member of the Puget Sound Regional Council, effective February 1, 2020.
2. Recommend the Executive Board authorize the Executive Director to assess the City of Carnation membership dues beginning in Fiscal Year 2021 (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021).

BUDGET IMPACT

The estimated annual dues for the City of Carnation will be approximately $705. The addition of the City of Carnation 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 2020 and invoiced in August 2020. The dues are allocated based on the most recent Office of Financial Management population and assessed values of all member jurisdictions. The addition of Carnation 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 Carnation Transmittal Letter
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DATE:
12/16/2019

SENT VIA:
US Postal Service

TO:
Josh Brown, Executive Director
C/O Sheila Rogers, Executive Assistant

FROM:
Mary Madole, City Clerk

COMPANY:
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

RE:
ILA (original x2) for execution

THESE ARE TRANSMITTED AS CHECKED BELOW:

☐ AS REQUESTED ☐ FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT ☐ FOR APPROVAL
☐ FOR YOUR FILE ☐ FOR YOUR INFORMATION ☒ OTHER FOR EXECUTION

REMARKS:
Hello Sheila,

Enclosed herewith, please find two (2) originals of the ILA for Regional Planning in the Central Puget Sound Area which has been approved by the Carnation City Council and signed by the City Manager. Please have both agreements signed where flagged, and return one (1) of the executed originals to my attention at Carnation City Hall. My mailing address is as follows:

ATTN: Mary Madole, City Clerk
City of Carnation
4621 Tolt Avenue
PO Box 1238
Carnation, WA 98014-1238

Thank you!

SIGNED: Mary Madole, City Clerk

4621 TOLT AVENUE | P.O. BOX 1238 | CARNATION, WA 98014-1238
T: 425-333-4192 | F: 425-333-4336 | WWW.CARNATIONWA.COM
CONSENT AGENDA

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Associate Membership for Cascade Water Alliance

IN BRIEF

Cascade Water Alliance has requested associate membership in the Puget Sound Regional Council. Please see the attached letter.

PSRC bylaws Article VI, Section 12, states any jurisdiction of general purpose government not a party to the Interlocal Agreement, and any jurisdiction of special purpose government within the four-county region, may be admitted to associate membership at the direction of the Executive Board.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. Recommend that the Executive Board recognize Cascade Water Alliance as an associate member of the Puget Sound Regional Council, effective February 1, 2020.
2. Recommend the Executive Board authorize the Executive Director to assess the Cascade Water Alliance membership dues beginning in Fiscal Year 2021 (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021).

BUDGET IMPACT

The estimated annual dues for Cascade Water Alliance will be approximately $705. The 2020 dues would be billed in August 2020. The addition of Cascade Water Alliance 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:
Cascade Water Alliance Request for Associate Membership
October 29, 2019

Mr. Josh Brown, Executive Director  
Puget Sound Regional Council  
1111 Western Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

Re: Associate Membership

Dear Mr. Brown:

I am writing on behalf of our Board members to request that the Cascade Water Alliance be admitted into the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) as an Associate Member. PSRC’s work guides critical growth planning for the region, and Cascade is interested in participating in those efforts.

The Cascade Water Alliance is a municipal corporation comprised of seven municipalities (five cities and two water and sewer districts) in the Puget Sound region that joined together to provide safe, clean, reliable water supply to its 380,000 residences and more than 20,000 businesses. Cascade’s mission is to provide water supply to meet current and future needs of our members in a cost-effective and environmentally responsible manner through partnerships, water efficiency programs, acquiring, constructing and managing water supply infrastructure and fostering regional water planning.

Regional growth and its implications for future water supply, infrastructure development and management, and rates are key issues for Cascade members and their customers. Cascade’s membership in PSRC would bring an important water utility perspective to regional planning discussions.

We would appreciate the opportunity to participate as an Associate Member. Please feel free to contact me at 425-453-0930 if you have any questions about our request.

Sincerely,

Chuck Clarke  
Chief Executive Officer
CONSENT AGENDA

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve PSRC Executive Board Representatives

IN BRIEF

Every three years per the Interlocal Agreement (Section 5.C.3.), the Executive Board shall reconsider the distribution of county and city representation on the Executive Board.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend that the Executive Board add seats on the Executive Board roster for the cities of Lakewood, Port Orchard and Redmond effective February 1, 2020 (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION

The Operations Committee reviewed Executive Board representation in fall 2018. In January 2019, the Operations Committee recommended, and the Executive Board agreed, to maintain PSRC Executive Board representatives at 33 and to do another review in fall 2019.

At its meetings in September and October of 2019, the Operations Committee reviewed the city and county board representatives and asked that staff to review the RCW 42.80.60 Executive Board Membership (Attachment 2). In December, staff provided the Operations Committee with an overview of the RCW and pointed out that three Principal Cities would need to be added to the current county and city representatives (Attachment 3). Staff also briefed the PSRC officers and they all agreed that the three Principal Cities should be added to the Executive Board.
In addition to the three new Principal Cities, the population changes within the region have resulted in a shift in the county and city representatives on the Executive Board. The two impacted jurisdictions are the City of Seattle and Pierce County. Staff has been in contact with both jurisdictions and both are not requesting an additional seat on the Executive Board.

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

Attachments:
Attachment 1 - 2019 Exec Board Reps Votes Principal Cities
Attachment 2 - RCW 47.80.60
Attachment 3 - Principal Cities
## Attachment 1

### PSRC Executive Board Weighted Votes and Representatives January 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>King</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2,226,300</td>
<td>53.092%</td>
<td>13,804</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>530.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>747,300</td>
<td>17.821%</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>145,300</td>
<td>3.465%</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>97,840</td>
<td>2.333%</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>129,800</td>
<td>3.095%</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>88,940</td>
<td>2.121%</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>104,700</td>
<td>2.497%</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond**</td>
<td>65,860</td>
<td>1.571%</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn*</td>
<td>71,740</td>
<td>1.711%</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities &amp; Towns</td>
<td>526,545</td>
<td>12.557%</td>
<td>3.265</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>270,100</td>
<td>6.441%</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>177,930</td>
<td>4.243%</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>42,080</td>
<td>1.004%</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Orchard**</td>
<td>14,390</td>
<td>0.343%</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities &amp; Towns</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>0.851%</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>887,155</td>
<td>21.157%</td>
<td>5.501</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>211.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>10.016%</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>211,400</td>
<td>5.041%</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn*</td>
<td>9,980</td>
<td>0.238%</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood**</td>
<td>59,670</td>
<td>1.423%</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities &amp; Towns</td>
<td>186,105</td>
<td>4.438%</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>809,710</td>
<td>19.310%</td>
<td>5.021</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>193.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>365,480</td>
<td>8.716%</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>111,800</td>
<td>2.666%</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities &amp; Towns</td>
<td>332,430</td>
<td>7.928%</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities/Towns/Counties</td>
<td>4,193,265</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statutory Members

- Port of Bremerton: 1
- Port of Seattle: 1
- Port of Tacoma: 1
- Port of Everett: 1
- WA State Dept of Trans: 1
- WA Trans. Commission: 1

### Grand Total

|                | 33 | 36 | 1,153.00 |

**NOTE:**

- Population figures provided by OFM and only include member jurisdictions. (Non-members include Brier, Carbonado, Gold Bar, Index and South Prairie.)
- Weighted votes are updated every September, and representatives for the Executive Board are reviewed every three years, per Interlocal Agreement, Article V.c.3. and as prescribed in RCW 47.80.010 and RCW47.80.60. The Executive Board Representatives was scheduled for the Fall of 2019. The Operations Committee has been asked to do the representatives review in the Fall of 2018.
- *City of Auburn Population is over 80,000 which gave them 1 representative seat on the Executive Board September 2018
- **Principal City Per OMB
Attachment 2
RCW 47.80.060

Executive board membership.

In order to qualify for state planning funds available to regional transportation planning organizations, the regional transportation planning organizations containing any county with a population in excess of one million shall provide voting membership on its executive board to the state transportation commission, the state department of transportation, the four largest public port districts within the region as determined by gross operating revenues, any incorporated principal city of a metropolitan statistical area within the region, as designated by the United States census bureau, and any incorporated city within the region with a population in excess of eighty thousand. It shall further assure that at least fifty percent of the county and city local elected officials who serve on the executive board also serve on transit agency boards or on a regional transit authority.

[2007 c 511 § 1; 2005 c 334 § 1; 1992 c 101 § 31.]

The Office of Management and Budget sets Principal Cities (as they also designate Metropolitan Statistical Areas).

Here's the most recent list of principal cities (September 14, 2018).

**Bremerton-Silverdale-Port Orchard, WA Metropolitan Statistical Area**
Principal Cities: Bremerton, Silverdale, Port Orchard

**Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA Metropolitan Statistical Area**
Principal Cities: Seattle, Tacoma, Bellevue, Kent, Everett, Renton, Auburn, Redmond, Lakewood

According to the publication above, the current standards for Principal Cities were published in the June 28, 2010 Federal Register

**Section 5. Identification of Principal Cities**
The Principal City (or Cities) of a CBSA* will include:

(a) The largest incorporated place with a 2010 Census population of at least 10,000 in the CBSA or, if no incorporated place of at least 10,000 population is present in the CBSA, the largest incorporated place or census designated place in the CBSA; and

(b) Any additional incorporated place or census designated place with a 2010 Census population of at least 250,000 or in which 100,000 or more persons work; and
(c) Any additional incorporated place or census designated place with a 2010 Census population of at least 50,000, but less than 250,000, and in which the number of workers working in the place meets or exceeds the number of workers living in the place; and (REDMOND & LAKEWOOD)

(d) Any additional incorporated place or census designated place with a 2010 Census population of at least 10,000, but less than 50,000, and at least one-third the population size of the largest place, and in which the number of workers working in the place meets or exceeds the number of workers living in the place. (PORT ORCHARD)

*Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Micropolitan Statistical Areas are sub-categories of CBSAs (which stands for Core-Based Statistical Areas).*
Attachment 3

Principal City Criteria
A). The largest incorporated place or census designated place in the Core Based Statistical Areas with a 2010 population of at least 10,000.
B). Any additional incorporated place or census designated place with at least 250,000 people of 100,000 jobs.
C). Any incorporated place or census designated place with a population between 50,000 and 250,000 where the number of workers in that place is equal to or
D). Any incorporated place or census designated place with a population between 10,000 and 50,000 with 1/3 of the population of the largest place and where the

** Source: 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS) 5 year estimates, Data Profile 3
*** Source: 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS) 5 year estimates, Table B08604

Table 1: 2018 Principal Cities as designated by the Office of Management and Budget using 2017 Census Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal City</th>
<th>Metropolitan Statistical Area</th>
<th>Population of Largest City in MSA</th>
<th>2017 Total Population*</th>
<th>Population over 16**</th>
<th>Workers over 16 within Place**</th>
<th>Total Workers in City***</th>
<th>% of Population in the Largest City in MSA</th>
<th>Principal City Criteria</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>78,960</td>
<td>59,048</td>
<td>35,617</td>
<td>44,765</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>More than 9000 jobs over the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>140,700</td>
<td>113,552</td>
<td>70,304</td>
<td>126,190</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>More than 26,000 jobs over the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>Bremerton-Silverdale-Port Orchard, WA</td>
<td>40,630</td>
<td>40,630</td>
<td>33,387</td>
<td>19,914</td>
<td>37,393</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Largest city in MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>109,800</td>
<td>86,576</td>
<td>52,911</td>
<td>101,343</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>More than 48,000 jobs over the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>127,100</td>
<td>99,721</td>
<td>61,537</td>
<td>66,606</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>More than 5000 jobs over the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>59,280</td>
<td>47,763</td>
<td>25,645</td>
<td>25,816</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>171 jobs over the criteria and the margin of error is over 1200 for this Census data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Orchard</td>
<td>Bremerton-Silverdale-Port Orchard, WA</td>
<td>40,630</td>
<td>13,990</td>
<td>10,772</td>
<td>5,389</td>
<td>7,580</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>If Bremerton added 2350 people, no longer meets criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>62,110</td>
<td>48,116</td>
<td>32,508</td>
<td>96,426</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>More than 63,000 jobs over the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>102,700</td>
<td>79,665</td>
<td>53,199</td>
<td>58,775</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>More than 5,500 jobs over the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>592,552</td>
<td>402,736</td>
<td>578,869</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Largest city in MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>713,700</td>
<td>208,100</td>
<td>167,611</td>
<td>97,647</td>
<td>116,709</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Fits criteria B by more than 16,000 jobs and more than 19,000 jobs for criteria C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT AGENDA
January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Contract Authority for 2020 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 2020 General Assembly.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend that the Executive Board authorize the Executive Director to enter into one or more contracts for support of the 2020 General Assembly. The total cost for all contracts will not exceed $33,000.

BUDGET IMPACT

The adopted Biennial Budget and Work Program for fiscal years 2020-2021 includes funding for this project. Total budget for the contract is not to exceed $33,000.

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 28, 2020, to establish the FY2020-2021 Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program, elect new officers and adopt VISION 2050.
If you have any questions, please contact Rick Olson at 206-971-3050 or email rolson@psrc.org; or Sheila Rogers at 206-464-5815 or email srogers@psrc.org.
CONSENT AGENDA

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Councilmember Claudia Balducci, Chair, Operations Committee

Subject: Approve Contract Authorization for Replacement of Boardroom Audio/Video System and Ongoing Maintenance Services for Audio/Video Systems

AT ISSUE

Action by the Executive Board is required to amend the Biennial Budget and Work Program

Authorization by the Executive Board is also required for the Executive Director to enter into a contract in excess of $10,000 per year. A request is being made to amend the budget and to authorize contract authority for services to replace and maintain audio and video system equipment and software in the PSRC Boardroom.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Recommend that the Executive Board amend the Fiscal 2020 budget to designate $250,000 from the Fiscal 2019 carryover for replacement and maintenance of Boardroom audio/video systems;

2. Recommend that the Executive Board authorize the Executive Director to enter into one or more contracts for services to replace and maintain audio and video systems not to exceed $250,000.

BUDGET IMPACT

The adopted Biennial Budget and Work Program, amended as recommended above, will include sufficient funds within biennial budget under Encumbered for Future Work (see Table 2)
DISCUSSION

On December 5, 2019 the Executive Board authorized contract authority for emergency replacement of technology systems with particular emphasis on the Boardroom audio, video and web-streaming systems, components of which had failed during two recent board meetings. PSRC staff committed to bring a plan for replacement of the Boardroom systems to the Operations Committee and Executive Board in January 2020.

Meanwhile, at the January 9, 2020 Transportation Policy Board meeting, the system controlling the in-room cameras unexpectedly went offline. A reboot of the system after the meeting restored operation, but this incident highlighted the vulnerability of the aging equipment.

PSRC staff is requesting contract authority to replace the primary Boardroom audio/video systems that manage, control and distribute both in-room and remote audio and video signals in support of meeting administration, audio/video teleconferencing and live web streaming.

Replacement of hardware and software together with the necessary programming is estimated to cost between $150,000 and $190,000.

The current three-year contract for maintenance and on-call repair and programming for the Boardroom and other meeting room audio/video systems will expire on March 31, 2020. These services are estimated to cost $15,000 to $20,000 per year.

Contract authorization is requested for replacement, maintenance and on-call services not to exceed $250,000.

For more information, please contact Jerry Harless at 206-464-5325 or jharless@prsc.org.
CONSENT AGENDA

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Mayor Becky Erickson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board

Subject: Adopt Routine Amendment to the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program

IN BRIEF

Three agencies submitted nine projects this month for routine amendment into the Regional TIP. These projects are summarized in Exhibit A. These projects were awarded local, state, and federal funding through various processes, such as Connecting Washington funds managed by the Washington State Department of Transportation. PSRC staff reviewed the projects for compliance with federal and state requirements, and consistency with VISION 2040 and the Regional Transportation Plan. At its meeting on January 9, the Transportation Policy Board recommended adoption of the amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should adopt an amendment to the 2019-2022 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, the Regional Transportation Plan, 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 the Regional Transportation Plan**

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 the Regional Transportation Plan.

**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 Fund Source Descriptions**

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

- **NHPP** Provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS).
- **Connecting Washington** State Connecting Washington Account.
For more information, please contact Ryan Thompto at (206) 464-7122 or rthompto@psrc.org.

Attachments:
Exhibit A
### Project(s) Proposed for Routine Amendment to 2019-2022 TIP

**Month:** January  
**Year:** 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title and Work Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>PSRC Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. King County Department of Transportation (Road Services)</td>
<td><strong>2020 High Friction Surface Treatment</strong>&lt;br&gt;New project adding preliminary engineering and construction funds to install high friction surface treatments.</td>
<td>$2,908,800 Federal HSIP&lt;br&gt;$323,200 Local&lt;br&gt;$3,232,000 Total</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seattle</td>
<td><strong>NE 117th St Intersection Redesign and Sidewalk</strong>&lt;br&gt;New project adding preliminary engineering, right of way, and construction funds for traffic signal, pedestrian countdown, audible pedestrian signal, signal back-plates, retro-reflective signal boarders, protective turn restrictions, curb ramps, crosswalk, median island, protected bicycle crossing, sidewalk, and bicycle pavement markings.</td>
<td>$950,000 Federal Safe Routes To School&lt;br&gt;$2,632,781 Local&lt;br&gt;$3,582,781 Total</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WSDOT Northwest Region</td>
<td><strong>I-405/NE 132nd Street Interchange Improvements</strong>&lt;br&gt;New construction phase adding funds to construct half-diamond interchange ramps at NE 132nd Street.</td>
<td>$47,666,054 Connecting Washington&lt;br&gt;$47,666,054 Total</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title and Work Description</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>PSRC Action Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WSDOT Northwest Region</td>
<td>I-5/Northgate Way &amp; Maple Rd Bridges - Seismic Retrofit New project adding preliminary engineering and construction funds to seismically retrofit the bridges to bring them up to current seismic design standards and reduce the risk of catastrophic failure during an earthquake.</td>
<td>$2,128,589 Federal NHPP $79,841 Local $2,208,430 Total</td>
<td>□ ☑ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WSDOT Northwest Region</td>
<td>I-5/Southbound Stillaguamish River Bridge - Painting New project adding preliminary engineering and construction funds to remove paint, clean, and paint the bridge to preserve structural integrity. Additionally, a previous contract used the I-5 median for a detour, this project will restore the median by reinstalling barrier and removing the detour pavement.</td>
<td>$10,443,461 Federal NHPP $286,512 Local $10,729,973 Total</td>
<td>□ ☑ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WSDOT Olympic Region</td>
<td>SR 305/Murden Creek - Remove Fish Barrier New project adding right of way funds to replace the existing structure with a fish passable structure. Remove fish passage barrier (994325).</td>
<td>$185,781 Federal NHPP $3,792 State $189,573 Total</td>
<td>□ ☑ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WSDOT Olympic Region</td>
<td>SR 305/Sam Snyder Creek - Remove Fish Barrier New project adding right of way funds to replace the existing structure with a fish passable structure. Remove fish passage barrier (994327).</td>
<td>$211,829 Federal NHPP $4,323 State $216,152 Total</td>
<td>□ ☑ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title and Work Description</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>PSRC Action Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 305/Klebeal Creek - Remove Fish Barrier, New project adding right of way funds to replace the existing structure with a fish passable structure. Remove fish passage barrier (991958).</td>
<td>$137,058 Federal NHPP, $2,797 State, $139,855 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WSDOT</td>
<td>SR 162/SR 410 Interchange - Construct Roundabouts, New project with preliminary engineering funds for the SR 162/SR 410 intersection project.</td>
<td>$771,434 Federal NHPP, $1,067,081 State, $1,838,515 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT AGENDA January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Mayor Becky Erickson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board

Subject: Authorize a Change in the Regional Transportation Plan Project Status for the City of Bellevue’s Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail, 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Place SE Project

IN BRIEF

The City of Bellevue has submitted a request to change the status of the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail, 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Avenue SE project from “Candidate” to “Approved.” Per PSRC’s adopted procedures, requests to change a project status require Board action. At its meeting on January 9, the Transportation Policy Board recommended that the Executive Board authorize changing the status of the project as requested.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should authorize a change in project status for the City of Bellevue’s Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail, 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Avenue SE project from “Candidate” to “Approved.”

DISCUSSION

The Regional Transportation Plan contains policies requiring PSRC’s Executive Board to approve regionally significant transportation capacity projects before those projects begin implementation phases. Projects in the Regional Transportation Plan are designated as Candidate, Approved, or Conditionally Approved. A Candidate designation means a project has gone through a comprehensive planning process, but that one or more of the following has not yet been completed: environmental documentation and approvals, financial plan, and/or other planning requirements. A project’s status is changed to Approved once these requirements have been met.
Conditional Approval may be granted if a project has fulfilled most of the approval criteria but lacks only certain details. For example, if a project awaits only final signatures on its environmental documentation but has completed all other requirements, the Executive Board may grant Conditional Approval. Once the final details have been completed, staff has the authority to grant a project full Approval status administratively, thereby saving the project sponsor several weeks of delay.

The Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail, 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Avenue SE project will design and construct two sections of a separated multi-use trail along the south side of I-90 from 132nd Ave. SE to the I-90 overcrossing of 142nd Place SE. In general, the trail will include a 12-foot-wide, hard surface facility, trailhead treatments, wayfinding, landscaped buffer in some areas, lighting, and storm drainage improvements. This project will also provide a signal modification at 136th Place SE and a mid-block pedestrian crossing with a Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon and median island within the 13400 block of SE 36th Street.

Table 1 below provides additional details of the project, including the criteria used to review the project for the requested status change. This project is a segment of the larger Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail project as identified in the Regional Transportation Plan as project number 5501, between 132nd Avenue SE and Lakemont Boulevard. Approval is requested only for this segment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail: 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Avenue SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$6,773,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Transportation 2040 Policies</td>
<td>The project is consistent with regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-Cost Analysis</td>
<td>This project is exempt from benefit-cost analysis requirements because the investment is less than $100 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td>The NEPA was signed January 26th, 2016 and was re-evaluated and approved in November of 2018. SEPA was concluded in February of 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Planning Requirements</td>
<td>The City will finalize a trail lease extension with the Washington State Department of Transportation prior to construction authorization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Criteria</td>
<td>Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail: 132nd Avenue SE to 142nd Avenue SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Feasibility</td>
<td>The project is fully funded with $2,882,030 in federal funding and $3,890,970 in local funding for a total project cost of $6,773,000 in 2017 year of expenditure dollars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Conformity</td>
<td>Approving this project will not change the region’s air quality conformity determination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Mayor Becky Erickson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board

Subject: Adopt Federal Safety Targets

IN BRIEF

The Executive Board adopted safety targets in January 2018 as part of the required process laid out under federal legislation. Staff provided a briefing to the Transportation Policy Board at their December 12 meeting, in anticipation of a recommendation to adopt the targets as required before the February 2020 deadline. At its meeting on January 9, the Transportation Policy Board recommended the adoption of the targets.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should adopt the 2020 Regional Safety Performance Management targets identified in Table 1.

DISCUSSION

Per the provisions established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published the Safety Performance Management Measures (Safety PM) Final Rules in March 2016. The rule established five performance measures based on the five-year rolling averages of the following data, on all public roads:

- Number of fatalities
- Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
- Number of serious injuries
- Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries
States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to work together to establish annual performance targets for each of the above measures.

For the initial target-setting process, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) established targets based on the State’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Target Zero, using a straight-line projection beginning in 2016 that achieves zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2030. PSRC’s regional targets (based on the regional share of statewide totals) were developed applying a similar methodology to ensure alignment with the statewide targets. WSDOT’s initial statewide safety performance targets were established in 2017 with PSRC adopting the regional targets in January 2018.

The safety performance targets are required to be updated on an annual basis. In 2019, the PSRC targets were assumed to remain on the straight-line projection to 2030, as established with the adopted 2018 targets. However, for 2020 this projection has been updated to reflect the most current data and has been rebased with a new trend line to 2030. WSDOT recently established the 2020 statewide safety targets for each of the five measures identified above, and MPOs (including PSRC) have until February 28, 2020 to adopt regional safety targets.

The Transportation Policy Board was provided a briefing at its December 2019 meeting on the target setting process, the state and draft regional targets for the above performance measures, the evaluation process for the targets, as well as contextual information on the relationship of the targets to current conditions and planning efforts. The regional targets, per the rebased trend line towards zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2030, are provided in Table 1 below. The board is asked to recommend adoption of the targets to achieve the federally required February 2020 deadline.

**Table 1: 2020 PSRC Regional Safety Performance Management Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2020 Target (5-Year Rolling Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>187.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate Per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>917.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate Per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bicycle/Pedestrian Fatalities &amp; Serious Injuries</td>
<td>290.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact Gary Simonson, Senior Planner, at 206-971-3276 or gsimonson@psrc.org.
ACTION ITEM

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board

From: Mayor Becky Erickson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board

Subject: Approve Project Tracking Recommendation for an Exchange of PSRC and TIB Funds

IN BRIEF

The Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) has requested PSRC allow an exchange of PSRC’s federal funds with TIB funds between two projects jointly funded with both sources. The two projects are the 20th Street SE Phase II, Segment 1 project in the City of Lake Stevens, and the 196th Street SW (SR-524) Improvements project in the City of Lynnwood.

The purpose of the request is to allow Lake Stevens to accelerate its project earlier than the federal funds become available. This request, which falls outside of PSRC’s currently adopted Project Tracking Policies, is being recommended by the Regional Project Evaluation Committee for consideration by the board. At its meeting on January 9, the Transportation Policy Board recommended that the Executive Board approve the exchange of funds between projects.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should approve of an exchange of PSRC’s federal funds and TIB funds between the City of Lake Stevens’ 20th Street SE Phase II, Segment 1 project and the City of Lynnwood’s 196th Street SW Improvements project.

DISCUSSION

The City of Lake Stevens’ 20th Street SE Phase II project will widen 20th Street SE between 83rd Avenue SE and 91st Avenue SE from two lanes to four lanes with left turn pockets. The project also includes sidewalks along both sides of the roadway, bicycle
accommodations, storm drainage, water quality facilities, surface water detention, street lighting, a modification to the traffic signal system at 83rd and 20th Streets SE and installation of a new traffic interconnect system. This project is part of a corridor project started under Snohomish County that extends along 20th Street SE from South Lake Stevens Road to US 2.

The project was awarded $1,055,800 in 2015 PSRC funds for the preliminary engineering and right-of-way phases. The project was awarded an additional $2.5 million in 2022 PSRC funds for the construction phase.

The city is under pressure to deliver this project quickly as the corridor is experiencing rapid growth, including the planned development of a new Costco at the southwest corner of SR 9 and 20th Street SE. The expedited delivery of the project is also driven by other transportation improvements happening along the corridor including the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of SR 9/24th Street SE/South Lake Stevens Road in 2021.

In an effort to coordinate with the adjacent construction projects and to avoid the need to review/renew permits, the City of Lake Stevens has been pursuing opportunities to advance its PSRC funding currently programmed in 2022. Due to the timing of the project, the city was unable to advance the funds as part of the process conducted in 2019 to rebalance PSRC’s federal funds and achieve the annual delivery target. To remain fair to the projects programmed with earlier PSRC funds, there are no other current advancement opportunities open to the city.

To assist the city, staff from TIB reached out to PSRC with a proposal to swap the PSRC federal funds awarded to the Lake Stevens project for TIB funds from another jointly funded project. TIB researched potential donor projects that had the necessary combination of active PSRC, TIB, and local funding. The City of Lynnwood’s 196th Street SW (SR-524) Improvements project was identified as the best potential match.

The Lynnwood project will improve 196th Street SW by providing Business Access and Transit (BAT) lanes in each direction, a planted center median/left-turn/U-turn, new curb, gutter, 12-foot sidewalks, landscaping, undergrounding of overhead utilities, street lighting and new traffic signals beginning at 48th Avenue W. and extending east to 36th Avenue W. The project was awarded $1.73 million in 2013 PSRC funds for preliminary engineering and was subsequently awarded $4.76 million in 2021 PSRC funds for construction. The proposed solution would exchange Lake Steven’s 2022 PSRC funds for the equivalent amount of TIB funds in the Lynnwood project. TIB will then allow Lake Stevens to access the funds early, allowing for construction in 2020. Both projects will remain whole, with no changes to the total amount of funding programmed, and no change to the amount of PSRC funding programmed by year.

The Regional Project Evaluation Committee reviewed this proposal at its December meeting. While PSRC’s adopted project tracking policies do not explicitly allow for these types of exchanges, the committee unanimously recommended this proposal to
the board for consideration due to the following specific conditions that are in place that are consistent with the overall goals of the project tracking policies:

- The existence of a matching project that has the necessary funding to make the exchange feasible
- The exchange is enabling the expedited delivery of a project and remedying what otherwise would be the delay of a project
- Specific, emergent needs are identified as to why expedited delivery is necessary
- The proposal does not have a negative impact on PSRC’s fiscal constraint by year
- Both the receiving and donor projects went through PSRC’s competitive project selection process

For more information, please contact Ryan Thompto, Senior Transportation Analyst, at 206-464-7122 or rthompto@psrc.org.
ACTION ITEM

To: Executive Board
From: Mayor Becky Erickson, Chair, Transportation Policy Board
Subject: Approve 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds

IN BRIEF

PSRC is required under federal legislation to have a documented process that provides the policies and guidance for how PSRC will approve, manage and administer projects to be selected to receive PSRC’s federal funds. PSRC has project selection authority for several sources of funds from both the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Prior to each funding cycle, the policies and procedures for the project selection process are reviewed and updated to reflect current regional priorities and requirements and are documented in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds. At its meeting January 9, the Transportation Policy Board recommended approval of the policy framework.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Executive Board should approve of the policies and procedures for the 2020 project selection process (Attachment A). These policies and procedures will be documented in the 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds.

DISCUSSION

A competitive project selection process is conducted every two to three years for the distribution of PSRC’s federal funds. The next process will be conducted in 2020 for PSRC’s 2023-2024 FHWA and FTA funds. Prior to each process a Policy Framework is adopted, outlining the policy guidance for the distribution of funds and other details on how the process will be conducted. Volunteers were solicited from PSRC’s four boards – Transportation Policy, Growth Management Policy, Economic Development, and Executive – to serve on a Project Selection Task Force charged with reviewing the
policies and procedures for the 2020 project selection process. The Task Force, composed of 31 volunteer board members and alternates, met a total of four times between September and December 2019 and prepared the recommendations for the 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds contained in Attachment A.

These recommendations encompass the policies and procedures for conducting the competitive processes for both PSRC’s FHWA and FTA funding sources, and include the following:

- appropriate estimates to be used to program federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023-2024 funds
- policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them
- set-asides for bicycle and pedestrian investments, preservation, the Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program, and PSRC’s work program
- the split of funds between the regional and countywide processes for PSRC’s FHWA funds
- the split of funds between the regional and earned share processes for PSRC’s FTA funds
- other details of each competitive process, including refinements to the project evaluation criteria and information on the four countywide processes

Once the Executive Board approves the policies and procedures for the 2020 project selection process, which will be documented in the 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, a Call for Projects will be released. A draft schedule for the 2020 process is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 2020</th>
<th>Policy Framework adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>Call for Projects issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2020</td>
<td>Staff committee project recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>Board review of recommended projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>Air quality conformity analysis and preparation of the new 2021-2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>Public comment period on new TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2020</td>
<td>Board adoption of new TIP; submittal to WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>State and Federal approval of new TIP; funds available to projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty at 206-971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - 2020 Policies and Procedures
B - Draft 2020 FHWA Funding Chart
C - Draft 2020 FTA Funding Chart
D - 2020 Project Selection CW Summaries
Attachment A
2020 Project Selection Task Force Recommendations

The Project Selection Task Force recommendations on the policies and procedures for the 2020 project selection process for PSRC’s federal funds are summarized below, encompassing both PSRC’s Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding processes. Full details on the 2020 project selection process will be documented in the final 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, which is anticipated to be released as part of the Call for Projects in February of 2020.

Administrative Details

1. Funding years to program = FFY 2023 and 2024
2. Funding estimates will be based on an assumption of a modest growth rate of 2% per year applied to the average annual allocations from the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. Refer to Attachments B and C for further details on the funding breakdown.
3. A four-part selection process will be conducted:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. The Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program is retained and converted to 10% of the regional competitive portion of funds, funded with STP funds. This program was created in 2003 to assist rural communities in implementing town center and corridor improvements, in coordination with state highway corridor interests. This program is above and beyond the minimum amount of STP funds required to be spent in the federally designated rural area, and the regional competition for this program will be held in 2020.

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

5. The minimum floor set-aside, which provides an adjustment for those transit operators earning less than 1% of the total earned share FTA funding within the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett Urbanized Area, is retained, and remains capped at FFY2015 levels.

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

Policy Details

1. The policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them is retained, as directed by the policies in VISION 2040. Since VISION 2050 is not scheduled to be adopted until May 2020, after the project selection process has begun, VISION 2040 is retained as the policy basis. For the regional FHWA competition centers are defined as regionally designated growth and manufacturing/industrial centers; for all other competitions centers are broadened to include locally identified centers. The provision to include military bases as locally defined centers for the countywide processes is retained.

---

1 In 2016, the preservation set-aside for FHWA funds was reduced from 25% to 20%, with the 5% delta distributed to the countywide processes.
2. The project evaluation criteria address elements such as supporting centers, safety, mobility, equity, accessibility, emissions, project readiness and other elements. No substantive changes to the criteria are recommended by the Task Force for the 2020 project selection process. However, it is recommended that consideration of focus areas identified in VISION 2050 be addressed as part of the next Regional Transportation Plan, which in turn may influence the 2022 project selection process.

**Project Tracking Policies**

1. To address ongoing delivery challenges, the project tracking policies for PSRC’s FHWA funds are recommended to be updated with the following revisions:

   a) **Enhance education and monitoring** by 1) continuing to improve PSRC materials and resources related to delivery; b) partnering with WSDOT and FHWA to provide a project delivery summit (occurred on December 4); c) improving coordination of PSRC and WSDOT progress reporting to the extent possible; and d) coordinating with countywide forums to conduct in-person project monitoring discussions throughout the fiscal year.

   b) **Adjust the current policies related to extensions.** The current policies allow for a one-time extension to the end of the calendar year, from an original June 1st obligation deadline. The reasons for the delay are not currently considered, only the feasibility of the sponsor to meet the December 31st deadline. Under the revised policies, extensions will no longer be automatically granted regardless of the reason for delay. Instead, reasons when extensions would not be granted are identified, rather than determining on a case by case basis what reasons for delay are justified. These ineligible reasons include shifting priorities within the agency, insufficient funding, lack of certification acceptance status, or that work was not begun in a reasonable time to meet the deadline.

   In addition, PSRC’s extension deadlines will be moved to earlier in the year to better align with the federal fiscal year, and potentially reduce the impact on annual delivery. The extended obligation deadline will also be moved up, and will include two pathways:

   - The first, “standard” extension will set an extension deadline of July 15th, which will provide a two-week buffer for the August 1st state delivery deadline and allow for those projects that need a bit more time past June 1st but do not need until the end of the calendar year to deliver. These extensions would remain within the current fiscal year and minimize any impact to the delivery target.

   - The second pathway will allow more time for those projects that are facing a greater delay, outside of the reasons noted above for which an extension would not be granted. These projects may request a longer extension, not to exceed a year, but would require approval by PSRC’s boards.

2. At their meeting in June 2019, the board requested staff develop a “hardship policy” to set clear parameters around when deviations to policy may be allowed. Staff
reviewed background data and current policy with the Task Force, with the following resulting recommendation:

- The “Exceptions” parameters in the current version of the project tracking policies appear to be working, and requests have been limited. Along with the proposed revisions to the extensions policy above, no further changes to this section of the policies are recommended.

As a reminder, the exceptions parameters state that evaluations will occur on a case by case basis, to allow short-term extensions or the movement of funds between phases. Any time extension or movement of funds above $50,000 requires board approval, and must meet the following parameters:
  - The phase remains fully funded,
  - The phase can be implemented within six months of board approval, and
  - There is a compelling need

Exceptions not considered include:
  - Scope changes
  - Transferring funds between projects
  - Cost overruns
  - Defederalizing

- When the exceptions request is for additional funding, the recommendation is to include language tying these requests to current contingency or supplemental funding actions in any given year, and limiting them in the same manner as the current exceptions policy – i.e., the phase remains fully funded, can be implemented within six months of board approval, and there is a compelling need. The definition of “compelling need” would be the same as currently described.

- The existing procedures would remain, which require PSRC staff review, committee review through the Regional Project Evaluation Committee and/or the countywide committees, and subsequent board review and approval.
## FHWA Funding Estimates for PSRC’s 2020 Project Selection Process

### 2023-2024 FHWA Funding Estimates (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STP (40%)</th>
<th>CMAQ (60%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding</td>
<td>$106.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding</td>
<td>$54.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160.80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Off the Top Funds

- 10% for bicycle/pedestrian set-aside (STP & CMAQ) | $16.08
- 6.4% for Kitsap County adjustment (per 2019 OFM population estimate) (STP) | $6.83
- 20% of STP for preservation set-aside | $21.24
- 5% from previous preservation set-aside to countywide forums | $5.31
- PSRC Work Program (STP) - $1m per year | $2.00

**Total** | $51.46

### Amount Remaining for Regional and Countywide Competitions

- $109.34

### Regional/Countywide 50-50% Split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Competition</th>
<th>Countywide Competitions</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
<td>$54.67</td>
<td>$54.67</td>
<td>$109.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Competition Amounts by Source & Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CMAQ (60%)</th>
<th>STP (40%)</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>2024</strong></td>
<td><strong>2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>2024</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
<td>$14.76</td>
<td>$9.84</td>
<td>$9.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Countywide Competitions

- 50% to Countywides | $54.67
- 6.4% for Kitsap County adjustment (per 2019 OFM population estimate) (STP) | $6.83
- 5% from previous preservation set-aside to countywide forums | $5.31
- 10% for bicycle/pedestrian set-aside (STP & CMAQ) | $16.08
- 20% of STP for preservation set-aside | $21.24

**Total** | $104.13

### Countywide Amounts by Source & Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>2024</strong></td>
<td><strong>2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>2024</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>$33.76</td>
<td>$8.52</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>$7.17</td>
<td>$1.03</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>$13.47</td>
<td>$3.40</td>
<td>$4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>$12.41</td>
<td>$3.13</td>
<td>$4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | $66.80 | $16.08 | $21.24 | $104.12

( figures may be different due to rounding)

### Minimum Amounts of STP Funds to be Spent in the Rural Area per Year

- King County $0.32m
- Kitsap County $0.17m
- Pierce County $0.28m
- Snohomish County $0.36m

### 2023-2024 FHWA Funding Chart (2753 : Recommendation of 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds)
## FTA Funding Estimates for PSRC's 2020 Project Selection Process

### Estimated 2023-24 FTA Funds (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UZA</th>
<th>Estimated Funds by UZA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton UZA</td>
<td>$8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville UZA</td>
<td>$4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Everett UZA</td>
<td>$369.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$382.34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funds Taken Off the Top

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Work Program - Bremerton UZA</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Work Program - Marysville UZA</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Work Program - STE UZA</td>
<td>$2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remaining Estimated Funds by UZA Available for Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UZA</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton UZA</td>
<td>$8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville UZA</td>
<td>$4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Everett UZA</td>
<td>$367.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$379.84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STE UZA Estimated Earned Share and Regional Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86% Earned Share Process</td>
<td>$315.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% Regional Process</td>
<td>$51.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$367.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STE UZA Estimated Earned Share Amounts by Transit Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Transit</td>
<td>$18.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Transit</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Metro</td>
<td>$148.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Ferry System</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Transit</td>
<td>$11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>$102.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Ferries</td>
<td>$24.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Transit*</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Transit*</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Transit*</td>
<td>$4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$315.81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STE UZA Regional Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14% Regional Process</td>
<td>$51.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount for Minimum Floor Adjustment** $3.32

### Remaining for Regional Competition $24.96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Agency</th>
<th>State of Good Repair</th>
<th>Earned Share</th>
<th>Minimum Floor</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Transit</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td>$18.90</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$20.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Transit</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
<td>$1.03</td>
<td>$2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Metro</td>
<td>$11.06</td>
<td>$148.32</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$159.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>$1.17</td>
<td>$2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Ferry System</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>$2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Transit</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>$11.78</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$12.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>$7.62</td>
<td>$102.21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$109.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Ferries</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$24.14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$25.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Transit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Transit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Transit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4.05</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>$315.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>$342.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These agencies are "external" transit agencies that earn FTA funds by providing service to this UZA. Per adopted policy, these agencies will receive what they earn from this service, but are not eligible to participate in the regional competition, the minimum floor adjustment or vote on Committee actions.

** Per the adopted 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC's Federal Funds, the minimum floor adjustment is capped at 2015 levels.
The overarching parameters for PSRC’s funding project selection process include the following:

- Transparency – conduct an open and transparent process and clearly communicate to prospective sponsors, elected officials and the public;
- Fairness – conduct a process that is fair to all eligible sponsors;
- Meet regional policy – ensure that regional policies are being followed, such as project tracking and the adopted policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them;
- Meet federal requirements – ensure all federal requirements are met, including project delivery, full funding of a phase, and that projects are competitively awarded.

The following are brief summaries of the countywide processes for the 2020 project selection process. Each countywide process is based on the policies and procedures as adopted in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, with additions and tailoring as necessary to meet their local needs. Please note that the countywide forums are still finalizing their procedures, and there may be revisions to some of the items below; the final processes will be incorporated into the 2020 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds prior to the Call for Projects being released.

**King Countywide Process**

The King Countywide forum conducts competitions for six separate categories of projects, due to the large number of eligible jurisdictions. The King Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and application process, with some customization for a few of the project categories. Volunteer subcommittees of the King County Project Evaluation Committee (KCPEC) score and rank projects within each of the six categories, and the full committee then prepares a funding recommendation. Additional considerations beyond the scores are taken into account when making the recommendation, particularly geographic equity between the three King County subareas. Prioritized lists of contingency projects within each funding category are prepared. The final KCPEC recommendation is then forwarded to the King County members of PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board for their final recommendation to PSRC.

The funding distributions and procedures for each are described below:

- Bicycle/Pedestrian set-aside: The amount to be distributed is pre-determined in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds at 10% of the total estimated FHWA funds available and distributed per each county’s population share. The evaluation criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan.
- Preservation set-aside: The amount to be distributed is pre-determined in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds at 20% of the total estimated Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funds available and distributed per each county’s population share. There is a limit of three applications per agency and a maximum request of $1.5 million per project is allowed. The evaluation criteria is based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012.
- Rural program: PSRC is required to program a minimum amount of STP funds within the rural area, and per policy distributes this amount among the four counties based on the average between rural population and rural center lane miles.
• All others program: Eligible sponsors include transit, the port, tribes and other non-local jurisdiction agencies. Funding for this program is set at 15% of the total FHWA funds available for the core King Countywide process, with the remaining funds distributed by population share to the small and large jurisdiction funding program.

• Small jurisdiction program: Eligible sponsors are agencies less than 15,000 in population, and the funding amount is described above. In addition, these agencies may also submit projects to the Large jurisdiction program, to address larger project needs than may be funded in the Small jurisdiction program.

• Large jurisdiction program: Eligible sponsors are agencies over 15,000 in population, and the funding amount is described above.

Kitsap Countywide Process

The Kitsap Countywide forum conducts competitions for three categories of projects: the bicycle/pedestrian and preservation set-asides as identified in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, and a general competition for the core countywide funding program that encompasses capacity, safety and environmental projects. The distribution of the required minimum rural amount is also distributed, and eligible projects may be identified within each of the three categories.

The Kitsap Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and required elements but is customized to reflect the local context and priorities. High, Medium and Low rankings are applied for each criterion. Similar to the KCPEC process, the bicycle/pedestrian criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan, and the preservation criteria are based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012. Prioritized lists of contingency projects within each funding category are prepared.

The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee evaluates and ranks project submittals and makes recommendations to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council’s (KRCC) Transportation Policy Committee; the Policy Committee makes recommendations to the full KRCC Board, who in turn makes final recommendations to PSRC.

Pierce Countywide Process

The Pierce Countywide forum conducts competitions for six categories of projects: the bicycle/pedestrian and preservation set-asides as identified in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, and the required minimum rural amount, as well as specific categories for roadway, transit, and all other projects. The Pierce Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and required elements but is customized to reflect the local context and priorities. Similar to the other counties, the bicycle/pedestrian criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan, and the preservation criteria are based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012.

Each agency may submit a maximum of six applications. A target is established for small cities at 10% of the total available amount, and a cap is established for transit projects at 18% of the total amount available.

A subcommittee of the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) scores and ranks projects from each category, and the full committee then prepares a funding recommendation. A prioritized contingency list of projects is also recommended. Additional considerations beyond the scores are taken into account when making
the recommendation, particularly geographic equity. The TCC makes recommendations to the Pierce County Regional Council, who in turn makes recommendations to PSRC.

**Snohomish Countywide Process**

The Snohomish Countywide forum conducts their competitive project selection process by having sponsors select one of three project categories: projects located within a center, projects connecting to a center (both of which are similar to the regional competition) and preservation projects either within or connecting to a center. Similar to the other counties, the Snohomish Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and required elements but is customized to reflect the local context and priorities. The preservation category is based on the preservation set-aside as identified in the *Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds*, and the criteria is based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012. The distribution of the required minimum rural amount and the bicycle/pedestrian set-aside occurs through eligible projects identified within each of the three categories. As described for the other counties, the bicycle/pedestrian criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan.

A subcommittee of the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee (ICC) reviews and scores all projects and makes recommendations to the full committee. Additional considerations beyond the scores are taken into account when making the recommendation, particularly geographic equity. A prioritized contingency list of projects is also recommended. ICC makes funding recommendations to Snohomish County Tomorrow, who in turn makes final recommendations to PSRC.
DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Executive Board

From: Josh Brown, Executive Director

Subject: GMPB Recommendation for VISION 2050

IN BRIEF

On December 5, 2019, the Growth Management Policy Board acted to unanimously recommend VISION 2050 for adoption. Staff will present the GMPB recommended draft plan at the Executive Board’s January meeting. No action by the board is requested at this time, but board members will be asked to identify any topics they wish to discuss in more detail at the February meeting.

The GMPB Recommended Draft Plan, along with a detailed table of policy and action revisions and all project materials are available on the VISION 2050 webpage.

The Executive Board is currently scheduled to act in March to make a recommendation to the General Assembly. The General Assembly is scheduled for May 28th and will include final action on VISION 2050.

DISCUSSION

By the year 2050, the central Puget Sound region is expected to grow to nearly 6 million people. Accommodating this growth while working to enhance our communities will require our cities, counties, tribes, ports, agencies, businesses and others to work together to achieve a shared vision for a stronger region. VISION 2050 captures this vision and lays out the policies and actions for a sustainable, healthy, and prosperous region.

VISION 2040 is the region’s adopted plan for managing growth forecasted through the year 2040, and this update extends the plan through 2050. VISION 2050 includes overarching goals, a numeric strategy to sustainably guide growth in the region, and
multicounty planning policies as required by the state Growth Management Act (GMA) (RCW 36A.70.210). The plan also includes implementation actions at the regional, county, and local levels. VISION 2050 policy chapters address regional collaboration, the regional growth strategy, the environment, climate change, development patterns, housing, the economy, transportation, and public services.

Over the last two years, the Growth Management Policy Board worked intensely to review growth issues in the region and identify how to improve upon VISION 2040. Since it was adopted in 2008, VISION 2040 has provided a framework for other PSRC plans and helped the region coordinate planning and prepare communities for growth. Actions listed in VISION 2040 set in motion a number of work program items, including review of industrial lands, an open space strategy, and an update of the regional centers framework. When the Growth Management Policy Board started this update, it directed building on the framework established by VISION 2040 and to put in place a strong strategy to guide the region for the next thirty years.

When cities and counties next update their plans, they will begin to look beyond 2040. Extending VISION another decade provides an umbrella for the next round of local growth targets and comprehensive plan updates. VISION 2050 is also necessary to provide a foundation for the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan as well as other future regional planning efforts.

VISION 2050 Development

In its work, the Growth Management Policy Board identified desired outcomes for the region, evaluated the performance of VISION 2040 and the current Regional Growth Strategy, and reviewed eleven background reports, briefing papers, technical documents on:

- Annexation
- Equity
- Health
- Housing
- Regional Growth Strategy and VISION 2050 Growth Alternatives
- Climate Change
- Technology
- Freight
- Displacement Risk Mapping
- Opportunity Mapping

Public engagement has been a critical part of the process since PSRC began updating the plan. When conducting outreach for VISION 2050, PSRC used goals to guide engagement efforts, including providing multiple ways for people to engage, trying out innovative outreach techniques, and considering how to equitably reach diverse communities. PSRC held a project scoping outreach and comment period in February.
and March 2018 and conducted a public opinion survey to understand residents’ attitudes about growth-related issues and help inform VISION 2050.

Using feedback from the scoping process, the Growth Management Policy Board addressed several fundamental issues, including extending the plan horizon year, statutory changes, major changes to the region since 2008, and recent regional plans and initiatives. High priority policy issues for the Growth Management Policy Board were to take a fresh look at the Regional Growth Strategy and find ways to further support greater housing affordability throughout the region. There was also strong interest among the policy board and in public comments to address climate change and resiliency, social equity and displacement, the impact of transportation technology, community health, annexation, environment and open space, and better recognition of Native American tribes.

The policy board used the input from members and the public, including more than 1,200 scoping comments, to prepare three growth scenarios for environmental analysis. These alternatives were:

- **Stay the Course**, a continuation of the growth pattern in VISION 2040 for another ten years
- **Reset Urban Growth**, an alternative that combined key VISION 2040 growth objectives and recent growth trends, resulting in a generally more dispersed growth pattern
- **Transit Focused Growth**, that specifically aims to locate a large share of population and employment growth near high capacity transit, including ferries, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail

PSRC released a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement in February 2019 that reviewed the environmental impacts and benefits of the three alternatives and identified measures to mitigate impacts, generally implemented in the form of multicounty planning policies. PSRC held a 60-day comment period on the document and gathered over 650 comments.

Considering both the analysis from the environmental review process and the input from public comments, the Growth Management Policy Board systematically updated each chapter of VISION 2040.

**Draft Plan Review**

In July 2019, PSRC released a complete VISION 2050 draft plan document for public review that combined all of the updated policies and actions, new sections of narrative discussion, a preferred Regional Growth Strategy, and other components. This draft was based on months of board review of key topics and the multicounty planning policies and included a draft preferred growth alternative, generally based on the Transit Focused Growth alternative.
PSRC organized several different engagement activities and opportunities for people to share their thoughts on the draft plan. PSRC held public meetings and workshops in each county, informal tabling events at locations such as county fairs, and a formal public hearing with the Growth Management Policy Board. PSRC reached 300,000 using online ads, 10,000 people through email, and made more than 200 media contacts. VISION 2050 was featured or discussed in more than 30 media articles in local print and online newspapers.

An online open house on VISION 2050 was available for the entire 60-day public comment period and available for translation into nine different languages (Vietnamese, Tagalog, Chinese, Korean, German, French, Spanish, Russian, and Arabic). PSRC also sent letters with copies of the draft plan to all nine federally recognized tribes in the region and directly worked with several tribes on plan language regarding Native Americans.

The online open house and VISION 2050 webpages had over 9,000 page views over the course of the public comment period for the draft plan and the draft plan was downloaded nearly 3,000 times.

Through a set of extra and extended meetings from September through December, the Growth Management Policy Board considered more than 1,600 individual comments received on the draft plan from over 600 commenters. The board ultimately acted to include more than 200 amendments to text, policy, and actions addressing a wide range of topics, including:

- Regional growth allocations
- The relationship of jobs and housing
- Housing affordability, displacement and the “missing middle”
- The impacts to salmon and orcas and the recovery of Puget Sound
- Climate change and resilience
- Transportation technology
- Ports and industrial lands
- Infrastructure funding needs and priorities
- Military installations and community compatibility
- School siting
- Social equity
- Open space preservation
- Aviation impacts
- Tribal recognition and coordination
- Healthy communities

In the draft plan, the policy board directed inclusion of a Regional Growth Strategy that is largely based on the Transit Focused Growth alternative studied in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. The Regional Growth Strategy reflects
public comments and requests from members by supporting continued growth in central places, preservation of rural areas and open space, and a significant share of job and population growth in proximity to the region’s investments in transit, including ferries, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and light rail.

To develop the preferred growth alternative, the board adjusted the Transit Focused Growth alternative to incorporate revisions related to Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties, including adjustments to the areas included as High Capacity Transit Communities. The board also adjusted the goal for residential growth near transit from 75% to 65%, based on additional research on peer regions, capacity, and growth trends. The goal for job growth was retained at 75% near transit stations.

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement demonstrated that a more transit-oriented growth alternative will result in less congestion, pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and conversion of undeveloped lands compared to other more dispersed alternatives. The preferred growth alternative developed for the draft plan performs nearly as well as the Transit Focused Growth alternative, while incorporating changes that respond to unique conditions in each county. A Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement will be issued in March.

Attachment A summarizes the key policy changes between VISION 2040 and VISION 2050. Attachment B provides information on the Regional Growth Strategy preferred alternative. PSRC has also received additional public comment on VISION 2050 since the Growth Management Policy Board completed its recommendation. These comments are compiled in Attachment C.

NEXT STEPS

Review of the recommended draft of VISION 2050 will continue at the Executive Board’s meeting in February. If board members have detailed questions, staff would welcome responding to them at the February meeting. The Executive Board will be asked to proceed with action at its March meeting to recommend adoption to the General Assembly.

In addition to the materials included here, the full recommended plan, project information, environmental review documents, background papers, and other materials, are available on the VISION 2050 website.

For more information, please contact Paul Inghram at 206-464-7549 or pingram@psrc.org or Ben Bakkenta at 206-971-3286 or BBakkenta@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - VISION 2040 to 2050 Overview
B - Regional Growth Strategy Background
C - VISION 2050 Additional Public Comments
VISION 2040 to 2050
January 2020

VISION 2040 served as a basic building block for VISION 2050. This document summarizes the differences between VISION 2040 and the Growth Management Policy Board’s recommendation for VISION 2050. Full detail about changes to the multicounty planning policies and actions are provided in a summary table with strike-through edits.

**Overall, VISION 2050:**
- Retains the same core emphasis on a strong economy, healthy environment, preserving farms and forests, and supporting growth within the urban growth area and centers
- Retains the same plan structure as VISION 2040, with a numeric Regional Growth Strategy, multicounty planning policies, and actions
- Identifies new regional outcomes and a vision statement for the region
- Addresses equity and health in policies and actions throughout the plan
- Supports implementation of recent plans and initiatives, like the Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Economic Strategy, the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan, the Regional Centers Framework, and Growing Transit Communities

**Regional Collaboration (formerly the General chapter)**
- Recognizes the need to work collaboratively across jurisdictions
- Retains focus on outreach, engagement, and funding to support VISION implementation
- Consolidates regional funding policies in the Regional Collaboration chapter
- Includes new policies on coordination with tribes and military installations and a new action to develop a Regional Equity Strategy
- Includes a new action for future work to incorporate funding criteria related to communities near military installations

**Regional Growth Strategy**

*Regional geographies*
- Retains concept of growth allocations by regional geography (groups cities and unincorporated areas by characteristics; not by individual city)
- Changes some regional geography categories based on transit and annexation:
  - Differentiates urban unincorporated areas by whether they are or will be served by high-capacity transit and if they are planned for annexation or incorporation
  - Adds regional geographies to acknowledge role of tribes and military installations

*Growth allocations*
- Similar to VISION 2040, accommodates most growth in Metropolitan and Core cities
• Modified version of the Transit Focused Growth alternative studied in Draft SEIS
• Allocates more growth to cities with existing and planned high capacity transit and less to rural areas compared to VISION 2040
• Adds a goal for 65% of region’s population growth and 75% of employment growth in regional growth centers and near high-capacity transit
• Similar to VISION 2040, shifts 5% of expected employment growth from King County to encourage planning for employment growth and improved job-housing balance in other counties

Policies and actions
• Incorporates the Regional Growth Strategy in the multicounty planning policies to provide a better nexus between the policy and growth strategy
• Incorporates guidance from VISION 2040 appendix on aligning growth targets with the Regional Growth Strategy
• Supports the upcoming round of countywide growth target setting (2021) and local plan updates (2023-24)

Environment
• Continues focus on environmental stewardship, protection of farms and forests, and improving air quality
• Incorporates new policies and actions to more strongly support the recovery of Puget Sound, conservation of the regional open space network and access to open space

Climate Change
• Creates new Climate Change chapter
• Supports the various state, regional and local goals, targets and activities
• Seeks to advance the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency’s targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions
• Includes a new action directing a Greenhouse Gas Strategy that build’s off of PSRC’s existing Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy
• Seeks local plans to includes policies and actions to address climate change

Development Patterns
• Continues support for urban design and connectivity, maintaining the rural area, and using land use tools to conserve farms and forests
• Incorporates new policies and actions on displacement risk, opportunity mapping, health disparities, and transit-oriented development to address equitable development
• Directs implementation of the Regional Centers Framework

Housing
• Continues focus on providing housing choices and addressing housing affordability
• Incorporates new policies to promote affordable housing in all development, expand moderate density housing, and identify and work to mitigate displacement
• New policy and action call out the need for high-job growth communities to plan for additional housing capacity
• Identifies new actions to develop a regional housing strategy, including a regional housing needs assessment
• Adds new action to develop anti-displacement strategies
• Directs support for local housing efforts

Economy
• Continues emphasis on supporting industry clusters and workforce development
• Incorporates new and revised policies and actions to support economic development throughout the region, encourage jobs in proximity to housing, and work to mitigate commercial displacement

Transportation
• Updates information about the regional transportation system, including investments made to roads, transit and ferries since 2008
• Continues focus on providing a safe and connected multimodal transportation system, linking centers, and supporting the Regional Growth Strategy
• Incorporates new policies and actions addressing stormwater, electrification and emissions reductions, changing transportation technology, and aviation capacity needs in the region
• Supports the upcoming update of the Regional Transportation Plan

Public Services
• Continues focus on demand management, conservation, and sustainable utilities and public services
• Incorporates new policies on climate change, resilience, and water supply management
• Addresses change to state law regarding school siting and adds policy on working collaboratively to site and design urban schools

Implementation
• Continues use of PSRC implementation tools of regional planning, plan review, funding, providing local guidance, communicating with the Legislature, and the PSRC work program
• Incorporates a new action to create new monitoring program to track implementation

For additional information about VISION 2050, please visit https://www.psrc.org/vision
Regional Growth Strategy – Background

The Regional Growth Strategy in VISION 2050 describes how the region should distribute growth to cities and unincorporated areas. The strategy in the draft plan focuses job and housing growth in centers and near transit. The goal is to sustain and create thriving urban communities of all kinds while preserving the region’s working resource lands and open spaces.

What are regional geographies?
The Regional Growth Strategy groups different types of cities and unincorporated areas by common characteristics. These are referred to as regional geographies. These geographies provide flexibility for cities and counties to make local decisions about where growth should go among each group of places. The geographies also include reservation lands and major military installations, which plan outside the Growth Management Act framework.

- **Metropolitan Cities** and **Core Cities** include cities that have designated regional growth centers. These groups of cities are and will be the most intensely urban places in the region.
- **High Capacity Transit Communities** are cities and unincorporated areas that are connected to the regional high-capacity transit system. These urban unincorporated areas are also planned for annexation or incorporation.
- **Cities and Towns** are cities and towns with smaller downtown and local centers, which may be served by local transit.
- **Urban Unincorporated Areas** capture a wide variety of urban lands, both lightly and heavily developed. These areas may be served by local transit and may include areas identified as potential annexation or incorporation areas.
- **Rural Areas** and **Natural Resources Lands** describe the different types of unincorporated areas outside the urban growth area and include very low-density housing, working landscapes, and open space.
- **Major Military Installations** serve as hubs for both military and civilian employment and population.
- **Indian Reservation Lands** are permanent homelands of sovereign tribal nations designated through treaty, Executive, or Congressional Acts and are the home of the region’s native cultures and traditions. Tribes also retain interests in and ownership of off-reservation land.

How is growth distributed within the region and within each county?
The Regional Growth Strategy outlines the shares of growth to regional geographies within individual counties. One of the goals of VISION 2050 is to have cities, towns, and neighborhoods of various sizes and character in the future, so different levels of growth are provided for different types of places. The charts on the following pages show how growth is distributed by county.

Growth is also distributed differently within each county to reflect local characteristics. For example, in King County, the Metropolitan cities of Seattle and Bellevue represent a large share of the county population, while Snohomish County has more smaller cities and urban unincorporated areas with planned high-capacity transit. These differences are reflected in the county growth shares.
How is jobs-housing balance addressed?
Where people live and work impacts regional mobility, quality of life, and the environment. The new Regional Growth Strategy plans for an improved jobs-housing balance and improvements to growth distributions compared to both VISION 2040 and today. The strategy shifts 5% of planned regional employment growth from King County to Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties, and plans for more housing growth in King County than VISION 2040. The draft plan also includes new policies and actions to address housing capacity near major job centers and consider jobs-housing balance when establishing local growth targets. Jobs-housing balance is strongly related to income, housing needs, and affordability. The Housing chapter also addresses housing affordability in the region, and the Economy chapter addresses employment opportunities.

How much growth is planned around high-capacity transit?
The Regional Growth Strategy aims for 65% of the region’s population growth and 75% of the region’s employment growth to be in regional growth centers and near high-capacity transit. This means that cities and counties with major centers or transit investments will be encouraged to plan for growth in those areas.

How is rural growth addressed?
The Regional Growth Strategy supports the long-term trends, which have been showing declining growth in rural areas far from major employment centers. The Growth Management Policy Board developed a Regional Growth Strategy that closely reflects the Transit Focused Growth alternative and allocates less growth in rural areas than VISION 2040. The draft plan also includes policies and actions supporting conservation techniques to maintain rural character over the long term.

How is the Regional Growth Strategy implemented?
Under the Growth Management Act, counties and cities work together to adopt population and employment growth targets for each jurisdiction. These growth targets are used in local comprehensive plans and planning throughout the region for land use, transportation, and services. While the allocations shape local targets, the strategy also supports flexibility by grouping places into regional geographies, extending the planning horizon beyond local plans, and including guidance and policies that recognize that flexibility and adjustments over time may be needed. Beyond just the numbers, the Regional Growth Strategy also includes policies, actions, and guidance on how cities and counties can achieve the strategy over time.

What resources are available for the Regional Growth Strategy?
The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement provides more information about alternatives studied and the environmental effects of each. Background papers on the Regional Growth Strategy and VISION 2050 Alternatives also have more information on growth trends, capacity, and policy considerations.
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

I'm writing to urge you to adopt a regional policy of no net Urban Growth Area expansions through 2050. Instead, we must densify our existing urban areas, looking to cities like Paris, France, for inspiration on how to shift away from our harmful sprawl. By capping or even shrinking our Urban Growth Areas, we will put pressure on leadership to use more and better tools to improve quality of life for everyone who's already here as well as those who will soon move here as our population growth continues. We must reject restrictive zoning that prioritizes only single-family housing in favor of denser, more affordable housing with more walkability and transit accessibility. This will also help us to reject our decades of toxic car-centric design, thereby combatting climate change and preserving our natural resources and environments.

Please help lead the Puget Sound region into a bold, bright future.

Thank you,
Adam H. Callaghan
Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

I'm writing to urge you to adopt a regional policy of no net Urban Growth Area expansions through 2050. Instead, we must densify our existing urban areas, looking to cities like Paris, France, for inspiration on how to shift away from our harmful sprawl. By capping or even shrinking our Urban Growth Areas, we will put pressure on leadership to use more and better tools to improve quality of life for everyone who's already here as well as those who will soon move here as our population growth continues. We must reject restrictive zoning that prioritizes only single-family housing in favor of denser, more affordable housing with more walkability and transit accessibility. This will also help us to reject our decades of toxic car-centric design, thereby combatting climate change and preserving our natural resources and environments.

Please help lead the Puget Sound region into a bold, bright future.

Thank you,
Stasia Brewczynski

--
Stasia Brewczynski she/her
Hello PSRC,

We have plenty of space inside our current urban growth area to house more homes, people, and jobs while preserving green area and wild/agricultural area outside of the urban growth area. Please do not plan of expanding the urban growth area.

Alternatively, I hope that the PSRC would look at how to connect urban growth areas with sustainable, zero carbon, no congestion mass transit. Additionally, consider what it would require to begin to reclaim the unsustainable areas of our current urban growth area for farms and forests.

The urban growth boundary touches on many issues that we must grapple with immediately: climate - living closer together reduces the energy and emissions of travel, and provides more efficient homes.

environmental - More forests, more wetlands, cleaner rivers.

resilience - food production closer to populations, water absorption and cleaning for heavier rains in the future.

equity - allow everyone closer to jobs, friends, family, and community. Stop excluding people with less money from urban opportunity. Break the cycle of gentrification and displacement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,
Greg
INFORMATION ITEM

January 16, 2020

To: Executive Board
From: Josh Brown, Executive Director
Subject: 2020 Executive Board and Operations Committee Meeting Schedule

The Executive Board and Operations Committee meet on the fourth Thursday of the month. Unless noted, the Operations Committee meetings are from 9:00-9:50 a.m. in the Central Meeting Room and the Executive Board from 10:00-11:30 a.m. in the Board Room. Meeting dates and times are subject to change. Members will be notified if a meeting is changed or cancelled.

January 23
February 27
March 26
April 23
May 28 – General Assembly, 11:00 AM - 1:00 PM, Embassy Suites Seattle Downtown Pioneer Square
June 25
July 23
August – No Meeting
September 24
October 22
November – No Meeting
December 3 – Early Meeting Date