Today’s Meeting

Project Schedule + Board Review Process

Outreach and Comments to Date

Centers Framework Purpose and Objectives
  o VISION 2040 + Centers
  o Previous Board Direction
  o Project Outcomes
Process
## Process

| Stakeholder Working Group | • Develop alternatives for the Growth Management Policy Board  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>• Develop other recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Growth Management Policy Board** | • Discuss alternatives and recommendations  
<p>|                          | • Recommend Centers Policy Framework document |
| <strong>Regional Staff Committee</strong> | • Provide technical assistance to board, other assistance as requested |
| <strong>Comment Period</strong>       | • Solicit comments on framework prior to GMPB recommendation |
| <strong>Executive Board</strong>      | • Action on Centers Policy Framework |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMPB</td>
<td>Purpose + Objectives</td>
<td>Growth Centers Military Facilities</td>
<td>Industrial Centers Countywide Centers</td>
<td>Framework Development</td>
<td>Framework Development Release for comment</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Final recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Staff Committee</td>
<td>Technical Assistance – Comments</td>
<td>Technical Assistance as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board</td>
<td>Project Briefing</td>
<td>Project Briefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the schedule seem reasonable?</td>
<td></td>
<td>GMPB Transmittal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the schedule seem reasonable?
Committee Outreach

PSRC Regional Committees (Staff)
- Regional Staff Committee
- FAST Freight Advisory Committee
- Regional TOD Advisory Committee
- Regional Project Evaluation Committee
- Transportation Operators Committee
- Transportation Demand Management Steering Committee

Countywide Groups (Staff)
- King County Planning Directors
- King County Interjurisdictional Team
- King County Project Evaluation Committee*
- Kitsap Land Use Technical Advisory Committee
- Kitsap TransTAC
- Pierce County Growth Management Coordinating Council
- Pierce County Transportation Coordinating Committee*
- Snohomish County Tomorrow Planning Advisory Committee
- Snohomish County Tomorrow Infrastructure Coordination Committee*

Countywide Groups (Elected)
- King County Growth Management Planning Council
- Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council – Land Use Policy Work Session
- Pierce County Regional Council
- Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee
- Sound Cities Association Pre-PIC

Community
- Transportation Choices Community Partners meeting*

* scheduled
Committee Feedback

- Equity and Regional Distribution
- Implications for Funding
- Regional Growth Center alternatives
- Manufacturing/Industrial Center alternatives
- Countywide Centers
- Military Installations
- Tribal Lands, Additional Research, and Other Comments
Technical Comments

Suggestions to clarify or amend the alternatives:

- Consider revised terminology for tiers
- Clarify transit measure
- Review criteria in RGC Alternative B
- Consider economic measures for manufacturing/industrial centers

Recommendation: RSC review technical comments
What are centers and how do we use them?

The Regional Centers Framework is how we focus and support our region’s growth.

- VISION 2040 and regional growth allocations
- Local planning
- Funding framework to support growth
- Transit service planning
- Data collection and research
Why are we doing this project?

• Regional objectives. Implement VISION 2040 policy, prepare for update

• Recent initiatives. Growing Transit Communities and the Industrial Lands Analysis

• Role of other places. Questions about how to address military lands, countywide centers, other growing places

• Change over time. Reassess growth trajectories, alignment with transit investments, and how we plan for centers
What are the big policy questions?

How well do these recommendations and alternatives help the region achieve VISION?

What should the centers framework look like over the next 20 years?
The region is growing...

- **917,000** additional people
- **818,000** additional jobs
- **546,000** additional households
VISION 2040

Why Centers?

**Land Use** — Compact growth, reduce sprawl, provide housing choices

**Transportation** — Multimodal transportation, leverage investments

**Environment** — Reduce emissions, preserve land

**Equity** — Improve mobility and access to opportunity

**Economy** — Economic development and competitiveness
Metro and Core Cities have an important role in accommodating growth:

From 2000 – 2040, these cities are expected to accommodate:

- **54%** of region’s population growth, or nearly 900,000 residents
- **71%** of employment growth, or nearly 867,000 jobs
VISION 2040

**MPP-DP-5:** Focus a significant share of population and employment growth in designated regional growth centers.

**MPP-DP-8:** Focus a significant share of employment growth in designated regional manufacturing/industrial centers.

**MPP-DP-12:** Establish a common framework among the countywide processes for designating subregional centers to ensure compatibility within the region.
Questions about role of centers in VISION 2040?
**Project Outcomes**

**Growth:** Centers should attract a significant share of the region’s growth

**Mobility:** Centers should provide access to frequent transit and multimodal choices

**Environment:** Centers should divert growth away from rural and resource lands, habitat, and other critical areas
Project Outcomes

**Social Equity and Opportunity:** Centers should offer access to opportunity, including affordable housing and employment, to a diverse population.

**Economic Development:** Centers should help the region maintain a competitive economic edge.

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

Are there other things the board would like to consider?
The stakeholder working group should recommend alternative frameworks that recognize different tiers or scales of centers.

Response options

- Strongly agree: 21 (78%)
- Agree: 2 (7%)
- Neutral: 1 (4%)
- Disagree: 2 (7%)
- Strongly disagree: 1 (4%)

Engagement: 93% of responses are strongly in agreement.
Board Direction to SWG

Location as Selection Criteria

- Strongly agree: 60%
- Agree: 12%
- Neutral: 16%
- Disagree: 4%
- Strongly disagree: 8%

Alternative Center Types or Functions

- Strongly agree: 55%
- Agree: 19%
- Neutral: 4%
- Disagree: 11%
- Strongly disagree: 11%

Transit and Transportation Access

- Strongly agree: 62%
- Agree: 15%
- Neutral: 12%
- Disagree: 12%
- Strongly disagree: 12%

Market Characteristics

- Strongly Agree: 19%
- Agree: 50%
- Neutral: 15%
- Disagree: 8%
- Strongly disagree: 8%
Background Paper Findings

Regional Growth Centers + Growing, Mixed-Use Places
Manufacturing/Industrial Centers + Emerging Job Centers
Regional + Local Support for Centers
Designation Processes
Lessons from Peer Regions
Priority Findings

County Designation Procedures

Should the framework establish consistent criteria and procedures across the region for nominating and designating centers?
County Designation Procedures

Should the framework establish consistent criteria and procedures across the region for nominating and designating centers?

Stakeholder Report:
Recommend updating the countywide planning policies with consistent procedures and criteria by county.
Transit Access
How should the framework incorporate transit access, especially high-capacity transit?
Transit Access

How should the framework incorporate transit access, especially high-capacity transit?

Stakeholder Report:
Establish minimum transit service requirements (varies by alternative)

Establish walkable center size and shape
The Big Picture

How should the framework create opportunities for the PSRC board to discuss broad issues regarding the entire set of centers?
The Big Picture

How should the framework create opportunities for the PSRC board to discuss broad issues regarding the entire set of centers?

Stakeholder Report:
Consider regional planning goals in designation
Incorporate center “role” in designation
Develop performance metrics to evaluate centers
Motivation for Center Selection

What expectations should the region establish and what incentives should the region offer to ensure centers help meet regional vision?
Motivation for Center Selection

What expectations should the region establish and what incentives should the region offer to ensure centers help meet regional vision?

Stakeholder Report:
Update criteria to clarify expectations
Encourage planning in different scales of centers
Identify other funding opportunities for centers
Priority Findings

Expectations for New versus Existing Centers

Should the framework establish consistent expectations for all designated centers?

Should the framework establish alternative ways to recognize important centers that do not meet the regional thresholds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation Procedures</th>
<th>Pre-2011 Center Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary changes submitted for review</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum existing activity levels (18 AU/acre)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum target activity levels (45 AU/acre)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expectations for New versus Existing Centers

Should the framework establish consistent expectations for all designated centers?

Should the framework establish alternative ways to recognize important centers that do not meet the regional thresholds?

Stakeholder Report:
Develop consistent criteria and procedures

Develop alternatives with different scales of criteria
How should a centers framework inform VISION 2040?

• Right-size growth and planning expectations for different kinds of places
• Identify smaller-scale locations that support the regional growth strategy
• Inform growth assumptions about manufacturing/industrial centers

Does this sound right? Are there other objectives?
Upcoming Meetings

May GMPB Meeting – 9:30 start!
Discuss:
• Regional Growth Center recommendations + alternatives
• Military Facility options

June GMPB Meeting
Discuss:
• Manufacturing/Industrial Center recommendations + alternatives
• Countywide Center recommendations
Project Resources

Project Scope of Work

Background and Findings Report
  • Military Appendix
  • Peer Regions Appendix

Stakeholder Working Group Report and Appendices
  • Equity + Opportunity in the Centers Framework
  • Comments to the Working Group

Regional Centers Market Study Summary Report

Regional Centers Monitoring Report (2013) + Center Profiles
Thank you.

Liz Underwood-Bultmann
Senior Planner
LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org

Paul Inghram
Program Manager
Pinghram@psrc.org
Purpose

Scope of Work - Guiding Principles

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