Today’s Meeting

Response to Board Questions

Other Key Issues / Changes

Board Direction or Action
GMPB Working Schedule

October 5
- Review complete draft proposal
- Release for comment

November 2
- Overview of comment themes

November 30
- Review public comments, provide direction to staff

January 4
- Review public comments, provide direction to staff, potential board action
**Framework Update**

117 board, committee, and outreach meetings

**Workshops**
Joint-board working sessions
Centers workshops in each county

**Committees**
Technical Advisory Group
Stakeholder Working Group

**Reports + Documents**
Scope of Work
Background Paper
Peer regions appendix
Military facilities appendix
Market Study
Stakeholder Working Group report
Equity supplement + proposal
[...] Evaluate the regional centers framework and recommend structural changes to recognize both regional and subregional centers using consistent designation criteria and procedures. If adopted, the new centers framework would inform future regional and local planning and investments.
Draft Proposal

- Encourages larger centers to plan for more growth
- Creates new path for designating MICs
- Path to redesignate existing regional centers
- Recognizes Major Military Installations
- Increase planning & performance for all centers
- Guidelines to designate countywide centers
Comment Period

**Multiple Jurisdictions/Joint Letters (6)**
- King County & cities of Seattle, Bellevue, Kirkland, and Tukwila
- Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
- Ports of Bremerton, Everett, Seattle, Tacoma, and NW Seaport Alliance
- Mason County and Rep. Drew MacEwen (35th LD)
- Pierce County Regional Council
- Snohomish County Tomorrow

**Jurisdictions (20)**
- Auburn
- Bainbridge Island*
- Bellevue
- Bremerton
- Federal Way
- Fife
- Kenmore
- Kitsap County
- Lakewood
- Marysville
- Puyallup
- Redmond
- Renton
- Pierce County
- SeaTac
- Seattle
- Snohomish County*
- Steilacoom
- Tacoma
- University Place
  * Individual councilmember

**Other Organizations + Agencies (8)**
- EDB Tacoma Pierce County
- EPA Region 10
- Futurewise, Transportation Choices Coalition, OneAmerica, and Regional Equity Network
- Kitsap Economic Development Alliance
- Master Builders of King and Snohomish Counties
- Sierra Club
- South Sound Military & Communities Partnership
- Tacoma Pierce County Health Department

**Individuals (7)**
- Members of the public
Recommend Revisions

• Redline revisions [Dec 14 version] provided in agenda packet
  o Revised redesignation standards section
  o Incorporated Group C comments – text and policy clarifications

• Summary of comments updated to include page references

• Revisions respond to comments and address key issues
Proposal Versions

October 10 version Released for comment

November 28 version Includes Group C comments

December 14 version Provides source for Nov 28 edits
November 30 edits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A [Green]</th>
<th>Responses to board questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group B [Teal]</td>
<td>Major changes requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C [Orange]</td>
<td>Minor text or policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D [Purple]</td>
<td>Statements, general comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group A Comments: Board Review Questions
Group A – Board Questions

Group A – response to board questions

- Timeline for subarea planning
- Standards for redesignation of existing centers
- Criteria for countywide center designation
- Expected mix of uses in regional growth centers
Group A – Board Questions

Board Discussion

• **2020 planning deadline.** What are the implications of the 2020 deadline for subarea plans?

• **Market study requirements.** Should market study demonstrate ability to meet growth targets?

• **Mix of uses.** What is the current mix of uses in centers?
2020 Planning Timeline

Is the planning timeline reasonable and appropriate?

- Nov 30 mtg: clarify the role of the 2020 interim deadline
- Nearly all centers would have some type of plan completed by 2020; most require changes to be consistent with plan checklist

Option for board consideration:

- Require subarea plans by 2020
  - Conditions or other consequences for non-compliance
- Recommend subarea plans by 2020
- Remove 2020 interim deadline
Market Study

- **Purpose:** Understand market opportunities and barriers, ability to attract new growth

- **Procedures for new centers:** Requires “market analysis demonstrating the center’s development potential to meet targeted levels of growth”

- **Redesignation process:** Calls for completion of a market study for centers below density/employment threshold
Market Study

What should be the expectations for market studies?

- Nov 30 mtg: clarify expectations for market study
- Current proposal requires market study for centers below required density/employment threshold

Option for board consideration:
- Require jurisdiction to demonstrate study recommendations have been implemented, show market study is still current
- Require market study to demonstrate ability to meet growth targets
- Make no additional changes
Mix of Uses

- Jurisdictions develop growth targets for regional centers
- Activity units measure both jobs and residents
- Goal is to support a mix of uses in centers
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What is the current mix of uses in centers?

- Nov 30 meeting: provide info on current mix of uses in centers
- Data provided in agenda packet; shows wide mix of uses in centers
- Range: 100% employment (Issaquah, Tukwila), 38% employment (University Place)

Option for board consideration:
- Clarify text to more clearly support mix of uses
- Include a required mix of uses in centers
- Make no changes
Countywide Density

Board question: Is the proposed countywide density standard appropriate?

- Of comments provided, about half supported higher density standards
- Density map provided in packet
- Comments: support current standards, eliminate all countywide criteria

Option for board consideration:

- Increase minimum density requirements
- Eliminate criteria for countywide centers
- Make no changes [staff recommend]
Group B – Major Requests

Group B – substantive requested changes

Examples:

• Delay project
• Remove planning requirements
• Require transit in MICs
• Develop criteria for countywide military installations

• Staff generally do not recommend major changes to the proposal at this time

• Board members may identify amendments to consider
Group B – Amendments

Pierce County Amendments

1. Funding for military installations
2. Remove standards for countywide centers
3. Add work plan item on identifying funding for base access projects
Group B – Amendments

King County Amendments

A. Revise definition of Core Industrial Zoning
B. Address countywide review of countywide centers
C. Countywide Growth – add planned mix of uses
D. Countywide Growth – add planned density threshold
E. Countywide Industrial – add minimum employment and/or acreage
Group C – Minor Changes

Examples:

• Clarify funding
• Clarify process and potential content of performance measures
• Countywide centers should be in the UGA
• Plan for bicycles, as well as pedestrians

• Strike-thru incorporates potential text changes
• Board members may identify amendments to consider
Group D – Other types of comments

Examples:

- Comments consistent with the current draft
- Other types of statements
- Comments outside of project scope

- Staff recommends no action on these comments
- Board members may identify amendments to consider
Options for the Board

• Recommend approval of the draft proposal, as revised
  – The Growth Management Policy Board recommends the Executive Board approve and initiate implementation of the Regional Centers Framework Update proposal

• Direct staff to prepare additional revisions, future amendments, or seek additional review
Thank you.