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Overview

• Regional Growth Strategy
• VISION 2040 vs. recent trends
• Schedule and work plan
• No action alternative
Regional Growth Strategy

- Growth from 2000 to 2040
- Pop/job shares to counties and Regional Geographies
  - Metropolitan Cities
  - Core Cities
  - Larger Cities
  - Small Cities
  - Urban Unincorporated Areas
  - Rural Areas
- Growth focused in Urban Growth Areas, cities, and centers
- Preserves rural and resource lands
- Multiple environmental, economic, transportation benefits
RGS Performance Trends

• How are we doing, so far?
• Distribution of actual population and employment growth since 2000
• Long-range and short term trends
• Region as whole
• County by county
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**County - Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County - Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Reg. Growth Strategy</th>
<th>2000-2016 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(time series)
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Distribution of Growth
Kitsap County – Regional Geographies

**Kitsap - Population**

- Metro: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2017 Change
- Core: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2017 Change
- Larger: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2017 Change
- Small: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2017 Change
- UUGA: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2017 Change
- Rural: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2017 Change

**Kitsap - Employment**

- Metro: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2016 Change
- Core: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2016 Change
- Larger: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2016 Change
- Small: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2016 Change
- UUGA: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2016 Change
- Rural: Green bar, orange bar for 2000-2016 Change
Distribution of Growth
Pierce County – Regional Geographies

**Pierce - Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Larger</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>UUGA</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Share of Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pierce - Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Larger</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>UUGA</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Share of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reg. Growth Strategy
- 2000-2017 Change
Distribution of Growth
Snohomish County – Regional Geographies

### Snohomish - Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUGA</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Snohomish - Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUGA</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does this mean for VISION 2050?

• What’s going well?
• Where are the gaps?
• Factors and actions shaping growth
• Impacts on transportation, housing, economy, etc.
• Additional data and analysis
RGS Work Plan

2018
- Data analysis
  Winter-spring 2018
- Possible board work session
  Late spring 2018
- Scenarios and geographies
  Summer-fall 2018

2019
- Select Alternatives
  Winter-spring 2019
- Draft/SEPA release
  Summer 2019
- Growth Board recommd’n
  Nov 2019
Path to a Preferred Alternative

Current Regional Growth Strategy

- Scoping
- Data analysis

VISION 2040

No Action

- Continues current RGS to year 2050
- SEPA requirement

Alternative(s)

- Guided by principles and outcomes
- Proposed for analysis in draft SEIS

VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy

- Final SEIS
- Supported by MPPs and actions
Regional Growth Strategy “No Action” Alternative

Population shares in VISION 2040 RGS
Data that informs RGS update

Development Trends

Regional Open Space

High-capacity transit

Local plans and land use capacity

Urban Services and Utilities

Displacement Risk

Regional Open Space

Development Trends

Urban Services and Utilities

Market Demand

PSRC Regional Centers Market Study Summary Report
RGS Work Plan

Next Steps

- Board work session (provisional) in June
  - Background and issues from scoping
  - Guiding principles and outcomes
  - Framework for developing alternatives
- Continue technical prep with Regional Staff Committee
thank you