1. Call to Order (10:00) - Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair
2. Report of the Chair
3. Communications and Public Comment
4. Director’s Report
5. Consent Agenda (10:15)
   a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting Held January 4, 2018
6. Action Item (10:20)
   a. Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Bonney Lake and Orting -- Laura Benjamin, PSRC
7. Action Item (10:25)
   a. Puyallup Conditional Certification Extension -- Liz Underwood-Bultmann and Michael Hubner, PSRC
8. Discussion Item (10:30)
   a. Regional Open Space Conservation Plan Update -- Erika Harris and Maria Sandercock, PSRC
9. Action Item (11:00)
   a. Regional Centers Framework Update -- Liz Underwood-Bultmann and Paul Inghram, PSRC
10. Information Item
    a. VISION 2050 Public Engagement Plan
11. Information Item
    a. 2050 Forecast of People and Jobs
12. Information Item
13. Next Meeting: March 1, 2018, 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m., PSRC Boardroom
    Major Topic for March: VISION 2050
14. Adjourn (1:00)
Board members please submit proposed amendments and materials prior to the meeting for distribution. Organizations/individuals may submit information for distribution. Send to Kristin Mitchell, e-mail kmitchell@psrc.org, fax 206-587-4825; or mail.

Sign language and communication material in alternate formats can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling (206) 464-7090 or TTY Relay 711. 中文 | Chinese, 한국 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese Call 206-587-4819.
MINUTES
Growth Management Policy Board
January 4, 2018
PSRC Boardroom

[To watch a video of the meeting and hear the discussion, go to http://psrcwa.iqm2.com/Citizens/Default.aspx]

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m. by Chair Ryan Mello.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair Mello announced the new and returning non-voting members.

This fall, applications were solicited for non-voting seats to represent community/environment and business/labor interests on the policy board. The board welcomed back reappointed board members:
- Patricia Akiyama, Master Builders Association, representing Business/Labor
- Clayton Graham, Municipal League of King County, representing Business/Labor
- Edna Shim, Seattle Children’s, representing Business/Labor
- Bryce Yadon, Futurewise, representing Community/Environment

The board also welcomed new members:
- Peter Mayer, Metro Parks Tacoma, representing Community/Environment
- Ian Morrison, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Association, representing Business/Labor

Chair Mello thanked outgoing board members for their years of distinguished service:
- Skip Swenson with Forterra
- Mike Flynn and Jeanette McKague with the WA Association of Realtors

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

The board received public comments from the following:

Alex Tsimerman provided general public comments.

Kurt Beckett with the NW Seaport Alliance/Port of Tacoma provided comments about the Regional Centers Framework. Mr. Beckett requested more emphasis on the ports’ role in regional, state, and national economy. The ports provided suggested language. Mr. Beckett also
requested recognition of existing plans as appropriate substitutes ahead of the 2025 plan deadline and requested feedback if those plans are not adequate.

STAFF REPORT

Senior Program Manager Paul Inghram welcomed new members.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting held November 30, 2017

Commissioner Fred Felleman requested the minutes note that the board requested the status of center subarea plans.

**ACTION:** A motion to adopt the consent agenda was made by Vice-Chair Margeson and seconded by Councilmember Paul Winterstein.

Motion passed.

RECOMMEND FULL CERTIFICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR THE CITIES OF: ARLINGTON, DUVALL, GRANITE FALLS, AND PACIFIC

Associate Planner Laura Benjamin presented on how the cities of Arlington, Duvall, Granite Falls, and Pacific made updates to their comprehensive plans.

**ACTION:** A motion was made by Councilmember Holman and seconded by Mayor Wheeler to recommend that the Executive Board certify that the transportation-related provisions of the comprehensive plans, as amended in 2017, are consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and conform to the Growth Management requirements for transportation planning for the cities of: Arlington, Duvall, Granite Falls, and Pacific.

Motion passed.

VISION 2050 SCOPING

Mr. Inghram was joined by Principal Planner Michael Hubner to present on the VISION 2050 scoping process.

In discussing the draft project principles, the board discussed the importance of recognizing the local plans of PSRC members, the diversity of the region, what we’ve learned from VISION 2040, and acknowledging challenges in the region. The importance and benefits of working together regionally should be noted in the draft principles. Staff stated that the draft principles would be refined and brought back to the board.

The board discussed the importance of engaging members of the public, especially with an equity lens, in addition to engaging PSRC’s jurisdictions. Councilmember Paul Winterstein asked the board to engage their constituents and asked PSRC staff to provide content/materials to use at public engagement events, such as a two-page handout about the VISION update.
Mr. Inghram stated the VISION scoping statement is planned to be released for a 45-day public comment period from February 2 to March 19. A scoping statement is a public notice and marks the start of the SEPA process. The scoping statement does not define the scope of the project, which the board will determine in April and May.

The board requested that PSRC staff ensure that the scoping statement is readable by someone unfamiliar with PSRC, and to clearly explain what PSRC and VISION 2040 are.

Board members pointed to the letter from Snohomish County Tomorrow and asked Mr. Inghram to meet with Snohomish County and Everett staff to come to an understanding on what areas VISION 2050 will focus on.

The board discussed the importance of public health being directly addressed in VISION and the need to focus on housing and housing affordability.

**ACTION:** A motion was made by Vice-Chair Margeson and seconded by Mayor Chelminiak to direct staff to prepare the scoping statement and release it for public comment.

Motion passed.

**REGIONAL CENTERS FRAMEWORK UPDATE**

Chair Mello called on Senior Planner Liz Underwood-Bultmann who provided requested follow-up information from the November 30 meeting.

Regarding subarea plan timing, the board discussed having demonstrable progress by 2020 to make sure jurisdictions are moving forward ahead of the 2025 deadline. There was discussion about providing the option to request an extension from the GMPB board if a plan has not been adopted by 2020. Board members also requested additional definition on the minimum expectations for a subarea plan.

For market studies, the current proposal requires a completed market study, but there is no consideration to what the study contains. The board discussed combining the options presented in the memo to address the development goals for the center:

- Require jurisdiction to demonstrate study recommendations have been implemented and show market study is still current
- Require market study to demonstrate ability to meet growth targets

Chair Mello requested that staff provide revised language at the next meeting.

The board reviewed options for the mix of uses in regional growth centers. Members discussed that a minimum mix of uses should be encouraged and supported with goals. The board asked for revised language at the next meeting.

Several members provided text amendments to the draft proposal. Chair Mello requested staff to package all the proposed amendments in an easy to follow document for board to consider at its February meeting.
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for February 1 and will focus on completing the Regional Centers Framework.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.
GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARD Attendance Roster – January 4, 2018

GMPB MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT

(Italicsized = alternate)
Patricia Akiyama, Master Builders Association – Business/Labor
Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold, Kirkland – Other Cities & Towns in King County (via remote)
Councilmember Scott Bader, Metropolitan Center—Everett (via remote)
Mayor John Chelminiak, Metropolitan Center—Bellevue
Jeff Clarke, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
Lorena Eng, Transportation Agency - WSDOT
Mayor Allan Ekberg, Tukwila – Other Cities & Tows in King County
Commissioner Fred Felleman, Port of Seattle – Ports
Commissioner Charlotte Garrido, Kitsap County
Councilmember John Holman, Auburn – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Councilmember Rob Johnson, Metropolitan Center—Seattle
Councilmember Jeanna Kohl-Welles, King County
Jeanna Lee, Municipal League of King County – Business/Labor
Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Peter Mayer, Metro Parks Tacoma – Community/Environment
Mark McCaskill, WA State Department of Commerce (via remote)
Ian Morrison, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Association – Business/Labor
Councilmember Ryan Mello, Metropolitan Center—Tacoma
Councilmember Mike O’Brien, Metropolitan Center—Seattle
Deputy Mayor Cynthia Pratt, Lacey – Thurston Regional Planning Council (via remote)
Councilmember Terry Ryan, Snohomish County
Councilmember Jan Schuette, Arlington – Other Cities & Towns in Snohomish County
Councilmember Michael Scott, Bainbridge Island – Other Cities & Towns in Kitsap County
Deputy Mayor Nancy Tosta, Burien – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Dr. Susan Turner – Kitsap Health Department – Community/Environment (via remote)
Mayor Greg Wheeler, Metropolitan Center—Bremerton
Councilmember Paul Winterstein, Issaquah – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Bryce Yadon, Futurewise – Community/Environment
Councilmember Derek Young, Pierce County (via remote)

GMPB MEMBERS ABSENT (*alternate present)

*Dr. Anthony Chen – Tacoma–Pierce County Health Department – Community/Environment
Councilmember Tim Curtis, Fife – Other Cities & Towns in Pierce County
Councilmember Larry Gossett, King County
*Clayton Graham, Municipal League of King County – Business/Labor
Marty Kooistra, Housing Development Consortium Seattle/King Co. – Community/Environment
*Commissioner Paul McIntyre, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
Rob Purser, Suquamish Tribe
Edna Shim, Seattle Children’s – Business/Labor
Chip Vincent, Regional Staff Committee
*Commissioner Edward Wolfe, Kitsap County
GUESTS AND PSRC/STAFF PRESENT
(As determined by signatures on the attendance sheet and documentation by staff.)

Ben Bakkenta, PSRC
Kurt Beckett, Northwest Seaport Alliance/Port of Tacoma
Laura Benjamin, PSRC
Elizabeth Court, Olympic Workforce Development Area
Carolyn Downs, PSRC
Erika Harris, PSRC
Tom Hauger, City of Seattle
Michael Hubner, PSRC
Paul Inghram, PSRC
Kathryn Johnson, PSRC
Michael Kattermann, City of Bellevue
Kristin Mitchell, PSRC
Maggie Moore, PSRC
Ian Munce, Tacoma
Brian Parry, Sound Cities Association
Marianne Seifert, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department
Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
Karen Wolf, King County
Lindsay Wolpa, Port of Seattle/Northwest Seaport Alliance
ACTION ITEM

January 25, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board

From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager

Subject: Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Bonney Lake and Orting

IN BRIEF

Consistent with PSRC’s adopted plan review process, PSRC staff reviewed the 2017 comprehensive plan amendments for the cities of Bonney Lake and Orting that respond to the conditions for regional certification. Staff recommends full certification of the plans.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board should:

Recommend the Executive Board certify that the transportation-related provisions of the following comprehensive plans, as amended in 2017, are consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and conform to the Growth Management requirements for transportation planning.

1) City of Bonney Lake (certification report)
2) City of Orting (certification report)

DISCUSSION

The 2015 comprehensive plan updates for the cities of Bonney Lake and Orting were conditionally certified in 2015 and 2016 as part of PSRC’s plan review process. Conditional certification allowed the cities to qualify for PSRC-managed federal funding while working to address the conditions.

Bonney Lake

On January 28, 2016, PSRC conditionally certified the City of Bonney Lake’s 2015 periodic update of the comprehensive plan. The December 2015 certification report for the Bonney Lake comprehensive plan update identified inconsistency between the anticipated growth included in the plan and the housing and employment growth targets adopted by Pierce County. The conditional certification called for the city to consider adjustments to the plan’s anticipated population and employment growth to more closely align with adopted countywide targets,
recognize the role of designated Small Cities in accommodating growth, identify strategies to manage growth, and ensure that proposed expansions of the Urban Growth Area (UGA) are consistent with countywide planning policies and do not add capacity for growth that is inconsistent with the city’s role as a Small City.

In March 2017, PSRC reclassified Bonney Lake from a Small City to a Larger City, recognizing the current population and employment size of the city. Under PSRC’s Regional Growth Strategy, Larger Cities are anticipated to accommodate a larger share of the county’s population, housing, and employment growth. In a separate but related process, the city coordinated closely with Pierce County and PSRC during discussions of target adjustments. As part of the 2017 target reconciliation, the city’s housing targets were increased to accommodate growth targets transferred from other communities in Pierce County. Bonney Lake revised the plan’s discussion of growth targets and demonstrated that the revised estimates of the city’s growth are reasonably close to the adopted revised Pierce County targets. The city’s analysis of growth rates leads it to anticipate population growth that is about 38% higher than the adopted growth target. In addition, actions identified in the plan are consistent with the conditions and take steps to better align city growth with the Regional Growth Strategy. These actions include:

- Use of a Residential/Conservation Zoning District
- Redesignating 163 acres to Open Space-Conservation
- Adopting the Bonney Lake Centers Plan and focusing future growth to three designated centers in the city
- Prioritizing transportation and infrastructure spending to support those three centers

Finally, the city has worked with the county’s Growth Management Coordinating Council regarding management of the Urban Growth Area (UGA). The city’s adopted plan amendments modify its discussion of the UGA and remove several areas that were previously identified for potential UGA expansion.

**Orting**

On October 29, 2015, PSRC conditionally certified the City of Orting’s 2015 periodic update of the comprehensive plan. The September 2015 certification report noted that while the plan included notable policies that address pedestrian and bicycle facilities, additional work was needed to complete the GMA-required pedestrian and bicycle component of the transportation element.

In January 2018, the city adopted amendments to the plan that address the condition and resubmitted the plan for further review and full certification. The 2017 plan amendments include new and revised policies supporting the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The city also developed a nonmotorized plan and included it in the updated transportation element.

The amendments for the plans discussed above have been reviewed in accordance with the adopted plan review process. They were found to be consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and to conform to transportation planning requirements in the Growth Management Act. PSRC staff coordinated with city staff in the review of the amendments and the development of the certification reports.
NEXT STEPS

With nearly all cities in the region fully certified, review of comprehensive plans has slowed. However, PSRC will continue to review major comprehensive plan changes, such as new and updated center subarea plans, major amendments to transportation and land use provisions of the plans, amendments that address conditional certification, and plans that have yet to receive certification for the periodic update. These new plans and plans with significant changes will be brought to the GMPB for review and action.

Many jurisdictions complete annual plan amendments, the majority of which are minor land use changes, updates to the capital improvement program, and updates to functional plans. During the next two years, most of board and planning staff capacity will be devoted to VISION 2050. Staff will continue to process all adopted plan amendments and conduct a cursory review to determine if the amendments are minor or if they require board action. Local jurisdictions can assume that minor amendments to previously fully certified plans do not affect the plan’s certification status, unless otherwise notified by PSRC.

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

January 25, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board

From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager

Subject: Puyallup Conditional Certification Extension

IN BRIEF

In April 2016, the Executive Board conditionally certified the City of Puyallup’s comprehensive plan. The city requests an extension to December 31, 2018, to allow additional time to address conditions.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board should recommend that the Executive Board grant an extension of the conditional certification of the transportation-related provisions in the City of Puyallup’s comprehensive plan until December 2018.

DISCUSSION

In April 2016, the Executive Board acted to conditionally certify the transportation-related provisions in the City of Puyallup’s comprehensive plan. Conditional certification is recommended if only a limited set of major issues are identified during review, the jurisdiction has committed to resolve the issue(s), and the jurisdiction and PSRC have established an update schedule. Conditional certification includes regular updates to PSRC by the jurisdiction to ensure progress and satisfactory resolution of the issues.

Review of Puyallup’s plan found that it is consistent with the majority of requirements but did not provide sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated growth and included inconsistencies between plan elements. The city acknowledged these issues, and the certification action in 2016 included a schedule for the plan update to be completed by December 2017.

In a letter dated December 28, 2017 (see Attachment A), the city documents progress to date and requests extension of its conditional certification to the end of 2018. The city has taken several actions to begin resolving issues identified in the certification report. In 2017, the city adopted a subarea plan for the South Hill regional growth center and completed an updated...
capacity analysis. This was an important step in accommodating additional employment and residential growth in the city. The city also adopted plan amendments to resolve internal inconsistencies between plan elements. Puyallup is working on additional planning in 2018 to increase development capacity and support additional infill development.

PSRC staff has been working with the city and supports an extension to the conditional certification deadline. Given the work already completed and planned for 2018, the city expects to resolve any remaining concerns with the plan within the next year.

For more information, please contact Michael Hubner at (206) 464-6179 or MHubner@psrc.org or Liz Underwood-Bultmann at (206) 971-3289 or LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - Puyallup Certification Extension Request 2018
December 28, 2017

Paul Inghram, AICP
Senior Program Manager
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Ste 500
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Mr. Inghram,

The purpose of this letter is to address the City of Puyallup's Comprehensive Plan conditional certification status. Following the November 2015 adoption of the City's 2015 Comprehensive Plan periodic update, the Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board conditionally certified the City's comprehensive plan with a requirement to amend the plan to demonstrate sufficient capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial development provided for in the plan and align the projections used in the Transportation analysis with the growth assumptions adopted in the Land Use Element.

Our City Council adopted a resolution in June 2016, which committed to working to address the conditions for regional certification by December 31, 2017. To that end, the City completed an updated capacity analysis for the South Hill sub-area following adoption of the South Hill Neighborhood Plan and associated area-wide rezoning. That analysis, which was incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan through the 2017 annual amendment cycle, demonstrated that Puyallup has capacity that exceeds the Pierce County 2030 growth targets. However, additional capacity is needed to meet the extrapolated 2035 growth projections, and the updated capacity analysis is not fully consistent with the projections used for the 2035 Transportation model update.

Following dialogue between City Planning staff and PSRC staff, we are requesting additional time to meet the requirements for full certification, acknowledging the ongoing work the City has been doing to address its conditional certification status and documenting specific additional efforts that will be completed over the next year.

In addition to this recently completed capacity analysis, the City is also moving forward on additional measures that will likely result in increased housing and employment capacity. These include:

- Completion of a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement for the Downtown Regional Growth Center (in process; anticipated completion March 2018);
- Completion of a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement for the South Hill Regional Growth Center (budgeted but not yet started; anticipated completion December 2018);
- Adoption of code amendments related to affordable and infill housing allowances (in process; anticipated completion June 2018).
At this time, based on the work that has been completed and the work anticipated to be completed over the next year, the City of Puyallup respectfully requests an extension of our Comprehensive Plan conditional certification, through December 31, 2018.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Utterback, AICP
Director

Cc: Kevin Yamamoto, City Manager
DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager
Subject: Regional Open Space Conservation Plan Update

IN BRIEF

Staff will provide the board with an update on the draft regional open space conservation plan.

DISCUSSION

The U.S. Endowment for Forestry & Communities awarded PSRC a grant to develop a regional open space conservation plan, which will help implement En-Action-2 and MPP-En-8. These provisions in VISION 2040 direct the region to identify, preserve, and enhance significant regional open space networks and linkages across jurisdictional boundaries. Last winter and spring, the Growth Management Policy Board provided feedback on the work plan, advisory structure, content of the plan, and criteria for identifying the regional open space network.

To date, the plan has been developed through a data-driven, collaborative process that has involved a diverse set of stakeholders. The advisory committee for the plan, made up of representatives from counties, cities, tribes, resource agencies, nonprofits, and working lands businesses, has met three times and recently provided feedback on a preliminary draft plan. PSRC staff has worked closely with county staff to gather information, develop maps, and solicit feedback. PSRC staff also conducted interviews with over 150 people from nonprofits, resource agencies, tribes, and other stakeholder groups.

The regional open space conservation plan is intended to serve as a framework for conservation efforts in the central Puget Sound region. The strength of this plan and the regional open space network is that they integrate and build on conservation and planning efforts across sectors, across agencies, and across jurisdictions. The coordinated vision for open space in this plan serves to elevate the region’s conservation needs and can help attract funders interested in social impact investments.
The regional open space conservation plan:
- Compiles data on open space services from across the region into a geodatabase for planners and conservation groups
- Presents a regional open space network and conservation opportunities within the network that can serve as a guide for open space conservation
- Describes the threats to open space in the region
- Presents strategies, tools, and actions to conserve the region’s key open spaces

The regional open space conservation plan is not a regulatory or policy document. The plan does not require jurisdictions to take specific actions. Rather, it provides a regional context and shares important information and knowledge that can help jurisdictions in their own conservation efforts. It highlights work that jurisdictions are already doing so that different groups can learn from each other. Perhaps most importantly, the plan provides a platform for working together toward collaborative and regional initiatives that are targeted and scaled to meet the region’s most pressing conservation priorities.

NEXT STEPS

By the date of the board meeting, a link to the draft plan will be on the open space webpage. The Growth Management Policy Board, Regional Staff Committee, Open Space Conservation Plan Advisory Committee, and others are encouraged to provide feedback on the draft plan by March 8, 2018.

For more information, please contact Erika Harris, Senior Planner, at (206) 464-6360, eharris@psrc.org, or Maria Sandercock, Associate Planner/GIS Analyst, at (206) 971-3298, msandercock@psrc.org.
ACTION ITEM

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager
Subject: Regional Centers Framework Update

IN BRIEF

At its February board meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board will be asked to review potential amendments to the draft Regional Centers Framework Update proposal and make a recommendation on the draft proposal to the Executive Board.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

*The Growth Management Policy Board recommends the Executive Board approve and initiate implementation of the Regional Centers Framework Update proposal.*

Please note that the board has discretion to recommend the draft to the Executive Board, seek additional research or input on the proposal, and/or extend discussion of the draft proposal to future meetings.

DISCUSSION

The Puget Sound Regional Council is working with its members and other partners to evaluate the regional centers framework to better recognize and support centers throughout the region. This effort carries out a [scope of work](#) adopted by the Growth Management Policy Board (GMPB) in July 2015.

GMPB discussed updates to the centers framework throughout 2017. PSRC solicited comments on the draft framework proposal from October 10 through November 8, 2017, and the board reviewed comments received at its November 30 and January 4 meetings.

Objectives for the February 1 meeting:
- Review material requested at January 4 meeting
- Consider amendments, provide other direction to staff
- [Potential action] Recommend the draft proposal to the Executive Board
This memo presents follow-up from previous board discussions and potential options for the board to consider.

**Draft Framework Proposal**

The Centers Framework Update project has included multiple phases, significant member engagement, and extensive board and committee discussion. At the outset of the project, the board adopted a scope of work with guiding principles. From the scope:

**Project Summary:**

*The Puget Sound Regional Council will work with its members and other partners to 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.*

**Guiding Principles:**

*The project will be guided by the following principles. The new framework and procedures should:*

- 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

The project implements the following multicounty planning policies and actions in VISION 2040:

MPP-DP-6: Provide a regional framework for designating and evaluating regional growth centers.
MPP-DP-12: Establish a common framework among the countywide processes for designating subregional centers to ensure compatibility within the region.

Evaluate Designated Centers: DP-Action-3: The Puget Sound Regional Council will study and evaluate existing regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers to assess their designation, distribution, interrelationships, characteristics, transportation efficiency, and performance.

Other Centers, Including Countywide and Local Centers: DP-Action-5

The Puget Sound Regional Council, together with its member jurisdictions and countywide planning bodies, will develop a common framework for identifying various types of central places beyond regional centers. Address the role of smaller nodes that provide similar characteristics as centers.

The board developed a draft proposal that sought common ground on criteria and expectations for regional growth centers, manufacturing/industrial centers, military installations, and
countywide centers. The board has broad agreement that it is important for the framework to manage the number of regional centers, be meaningful, provide opportunities in each county, establish standards, and maintain accountability.

A revised version of the proposal, dated December 14, 2017, is provided as Attachment A. This version incorporated minor text and policy changes (Group C comments) and a rewrite of the redesignation standards. The version includes changes identified by board members at the November 30 meeting and identifies the source of recommended edits in the document.

The draft proposal responds to the board’s discussion and includes several key components:

- Maintains the designation of all current regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers, including those in Kitsap County
- Increases the overall planning and performance expectations for all regional centers; fully updated plans will be required by 2025
- Encourages larger regional growth centers to plan for higher levels of growth
- Creates a second path for designating manufacturing/industrial centers – designation can occur by meeting minimum employment (4,000 jobs) and acres (2,000 acres)
- Recognizes the region’s Major Military Installations, including Naval Base Kitsap, Naval Station Everett, and Joint Base Lewis McChord, as supported by Pierce County and Kitsap County, and recommends including them in the update of VISION 2040
- Provides new guidelines to designate countywide centers consistent with the project principles and scope of work

Attachment B provides an overview of the project and proposal highlights.

At its November 30 and January 4 meetings, the board reviewed the 41 letters and comments received from individual jurisdictions, multiple jurisdictions, other organizations and agencies, and individuals – summarized in a recommended response table available online. The table was updated following the November 30 meeting to cross-reference page numbers for recommended edits. The complete letters are also available online, along with letters submitted prior to the comment period.

The comments are organized in the response table as follows:

Group A – Responses to the board’s questions on draft proposal
Group B – Major changes requested
Group C – Minor text or policy changes
Group D – Statements, supportive comments, and other no action comments

The board had no additional comments regarding Groups C and D at its November 30 meeting and focused its discussion primarily on Group A comments and requested additional information. Several parties have requested edits and amendments to incorporate in Group B comments. These are discussed in Attachment C.

**Group A Comments – Board Review Questions**
This section provides follow-up information requested by the board at its November 30 meeting.

Options for the board:
• Adopt amendments to the draft proposal
• Direct either PSRC staff or the Regional Staff Committee to complete additional review and bring back a recommendation
• Make no changes to the draft proposal

1. Required Timing for Subarea Planning - Required Timing

At its November 30 and January 4 meetings, the board discussed the role of the 2020 interim deadline for existing regional centers to have a completed plan. The board directed staff to prepare language that clarifies expectations for the 2020 plan deadline, defines minimum expectations for an adopted plan, and allows for an extension if necessary.

Proposed text clarifications (p. 9):

- **Adopted center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) should be completed by 2020. Jurisdictions may request an extension from the Growth Management Policy Board if substantial progress on subarea planning has been made by 2020. Different approaches to subarea planning may be appropriate in some instances but future updates should be equivalent to a subarea plan by 2025. Plans should include goals and policies that specifically address the center and should be adopted by the jurisdiction(s) with local land use authority for the center. Plan adoption should meet public notice and involvement requirements established under the Growth Management Act.**

The board may direct staff to include the proposed language, amend the language, or make no additional changes to the framework proposal.

2. Market Study Expectations for Redesignation

The framework proposal requires completion of a market study for regional centers below the designation thresholds in 2025. The board discussed expectations for market studies at their November and January meetings. The board directed staff to develop revised language to clarify what the market study should include.

Proposed text clarifications (p. 10):

- **Market study. [Regional growth centers or Manufacturing/industrial centers] that have existing employment levels below the level required for new centers at the time of the review must complete a market study to evaluate the potential for and opportunities to best support center growth. The market study must consider a planning horizon reasonably beyond the monitoring period (2025). The market study should show how the center can meet targeted levels of growth within the planning period. The jurisdiction should demonstrate its work to address opportunities identified in the market study.**

The board may direct staff to include the proposed language, amend the language, or make no additional changes to the framework proposal.

3. Mix of Uses in Regional Growth Centers.
The board has been discussing expectations around the mix of activity in regional growth centers. At the November 30 board meeting, members requested additional information about the current mix of uses in centers. The percentage mix of uses varies widely among regional centers, but nearly all centers have more employees than residents. A couple of centers have no or limited residential uses today. About a third, including downtown Seattle and downtown Bellevue, have less than 20% residential population, compared to their combined population and jobs (total activity units). However, all regional growth centers are planning for a future mix of both residential and employment uses.

The current draft proposal supports a mix of uses in centers and calls for updating guidance on growth targets. At the January meeting, board members requested revised language that establishes a goal for mix of uses in the center.

Proposed text clarifications (table, p. 6):

- **Regional growth centers should have a goal for a minimum mix of at least 15% planned residential and employment activity units in the center.**

The board may direct staff to include the proposed language, amend the language, or make no additional changes to the framework proposal.

---

**Group B Comments [teal table] – Major Changes Requested [board review]**

Some comment letters suggest significant policy changes or raise concerns that the board has discussed at length in 2017.

At the January 4 meeting, King and Pierce counties and the ports provided several potential amendments to the proposal. All amendments that have been proposed, including the board-requested amendments, are provided in Attachment C. Attachment D provides a map of regional densities to inform discussion of one of the amendments.

If board members wish to propose additional amendments to the proposal, please contact Liz or Paul (contact info at end of memo), who can work with board members to prepare an amendment. **Please contact staff by Tuesday, January 30, to provide enough time to distribute an amendment prior to the meeting.**

---

**Group C Comments [orange table] – Minor Text or Policy Changes**

Several comment letters identify issues that can be addressed through minor changes. Recommended changes are incorporated into the December 14 version of the draft proposal and were available for board review at the November 30 meeting.

---

**Group D Comments [purple table] – Comments of support, statements, and other changes that do not require action**

Most letters include statements of support for some aspects of the draft proposal. These and other statements are summarized in the Group D table.
SEPA
PSRC has issued an Addendum to the 2008 VISION 2040 FEIS, per Revised Code of Washington 43.21C and Washington Administrative Code 197-11, in January 2018 to support final action on the Regional Centers Framework Update. This document is provided as Attachment E.

Framework Review Schedule
The board’s review has proceeded over several months, with a goal of recommending a proposal to the Executive Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Transmit Stakeholder Working Group report to board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Project purpose and outcomes, committee comments, and board schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Military installation alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended work session</td>
<td>Regional growth center alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Manufacturing/industrial center alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Countywide centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin development of centers framework alternatives; continue previous discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Develop draft Centers Framework – review preliminary framework outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Further develop draft Centers Framework &lt;possible release for comment&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – November</td>
<td>Solicit comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Update on comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 30, 2017</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Discuss comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 2018</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Discuss comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2018</td>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board</td>
<td>Possible action on recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Resources**

The [project website](#) includes many resources that can support board review, including the report from the Stakeholder Working Group, the project scope of work, and the centers background paper and market study summary.

The page also provides a preliminary analysis of the alternatives, comment letters submitted to the board, and a summary of comments from the board and committee process.

For more information, please contact Liz Underwood-Bultmann at 206-464-6174, [LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org](mailto:LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org), or Paul Inghram at 206-464-7549, [PInghram@psrc.org](mailto:PInghram@psrc.org).
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This draft is a redline version of the October 10 Centers Framework Update public review draft. It has been marked up to show potential changes in response to comments provided in the comment period, including Group C comments [minor text/policy changes] and reorganized section on redesignation standards.

The Growth Management Policy Board may continue to edit this draft prior to making a recommendation to the Executive Board.

Changes from November 28 version:
- Edits in document reference specific comments in summary table
- Additional minor changes/corrections identified by board at November 30 meeting
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Attachment: A - DRAFT Regional Centers Framework Proposal Dec 14 version (2171 : Regional Centers Framework Update)
Purpose and Background

Purpose

Centers are the hallmark of VISION 2040 and the Regional Growth Strategy. They guide regional growth allocations, advance local planning, inform transit service planning, and represent priority areas for PSRC’s federal transportation funding.

In 2015, the Growth Management Policy Board adopted a scope of work to review the existing centers framework. The regional centers have been integral to regional planning for over 20 years, and this update represented an opportunity to reassess the system in place today and opportunities to recognize other places that are serving important roles in the region. The Regional Centers Framework outlines a revised structure and criteria for regional and countywide centers and direction to update policies and procedures to update to the regional centers framework.

This update will:

- Clearly define the types of central places—both larger and smaller—within the region that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment.
- Establish criteria and planning expectations that ensure centers are developing as thriving and connected communities with sufficient market potential to accommodate new jobs and residents.
- Provide for consistent designation of centers at the regional and countywide levels across the region.
- Address requirements for new centers and redesignation of existing regional centers.

Growth in centers has significant regional benefits, including supporting multimodal transportation options, compact growth, housing choices near jobs, climate goals, and access to opportunity. As important focal points for investment and development, regional centers represent a crucial opportunity to support equitable access to affordable housing, services, health, quality transit service, and employment, as well as to build on the community assets currently present within centers.

Implementation

This framework establishes key opportunities for the region to support VISION 2040’s objective of encouraging development of compact, livable centers as an opportunity to accommodate a significant portion of the region’s growth. Adoption of the framework in itself does not change regional or local policies, regulations, or funding mechanisms. Implementation of the framework will take several steps that are discussed in Section 12 of the framework:

- Updating new center designation procedures
- Developing new administrative procedures for monitoring of existing centers
- Updating VISION 2040, including guidance on growth expectations for centers
- Updating countywide planning policies with countywide criteria and designations
- Measuring performance and outcomes over time
- Completing additional analysis on social equity strategies for centers
- Completing additional review and consultation with tribes on the role of tribal lands in the centers framework
- Research funding opportunities for centers
- Research the number and distribution of centers
The framework proposal focuses on the criteria and process to designate and evaluate regional and countywide centers. The proposal does not recommend prioritizing funding based on center size or type. The proposal identifies different types and sizes of regional centers to better tailor expectations for future growth and development in centers.

Development of the board proposal has focused on providing opportunities for jurisdictions to designate new centers and flexibility to maintain existing centers, including at least two growth centers and one manufacturing/industrial center in each county. The centers framework should continue to maintain appropriate regional distribution and provide for opportunities to designate new centers.

Guiding Principles & Objectives
In the project scope of work, the Growth Management Policy Board adopted the following guiding principles for the project:

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

PSRC convened a joint board session in 2016 that identified several project Objectives to guide the project were establish at a joint board session in 2016:

Growth: Centers attract robust population and employment growth—a significant and growing share of the region’s overall growth.

Mobility: Centers provide diverse mobility choices so that people who live and work in centers have alternatives to driving alone.

Environment: Centers improve environmental sustainability by diverting growth away from rural and resource lands, habitat, and other critical areas, and towards urban areas with existing infrastructure.

Social Equity and Opportunity: Centers offer high access to opportunity, including affordable housing choices and access to jobs, to a diverse population.

Economic Development: Centers help the region maintain a competitive economic edge by offering employers locations that are well connected to a regional transportation network, and are attractive and accessible to workers.

Public Health: Centers create safe, clean, livable, complete and healthy communities that promote physical, mental, and social well-being.

The Regional Centers Framework Update project included significant outreach and committee and board discussions. The process was informed by staff-level Technical Advisory Group and Stakeholder Working Group, joint board sessions, county-level workshops, and ongoing outreach to local governments. A staff-level Stakeholder Working Group met from June 2016 through January 2017 and identified recommendations and alternatives for PSRC’s boards to consider. Their final report informed deliberation by the Growth Management Policy Board in 2017.
2. Regional Centers Designation Procedures

The Designation Procedures for New Centers contains detailed requirements for designation and review of regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers. The procedures are adopted by the Executive Board.

As part of the implementation of this framework, PSRC will update the Designation Procedures for New Centers to incorporate the following procedural changes:

- When designating new regional centers, the PSRC boards will also consider:
  - Distribution of centers throughout the region, including by county, and whether new center locations would be advantageous for overall regional growth objectives. Centers should be distributed in rational places locations consistent with the regional vision, and in areas that do not place additional development pressure on rural and resource lands.
  - Environmental factors may be considered in designating new centers.
  - The overall number of centers in the region, supported by research on the number and distribution of centers.
  - Application and review of new regional centers will be limited to major regional growth plan updates (VISION 2040 and its successor plans) and approximately every five years, following the results of performance monitoring. As an interim measure, the application period for new centers will remain open through the fall of 2019.
  - Employment and/or activity thresholds for new regional centers will be reviewed and potentially updated when the regional growth plan is updated to account for overall growth in centers over time. Center designations should remain relatively stable over the long term, but will allow centers to change into new types when they have achieved higher levels of activity and other criteria.

3. Regional Growth Centers Eligibility and Criteria

Regional growth centers are locations of more compact, pedestrian-oriented development with a mix of housing, jobs, retail, services, and other destinations. The region’s plans identify centers as areas that should receive a significant share of the region’s population and employment growth compared with other parts of the urban area, while providing improved access and mobility—especially for walking, biking, and transit.

Eligibility Criteria for New Regional Growth Centers

The minimum eligibility requirements for new centers ensure consistency in centers designation and ensure that new regional growth centers meet the intent of VISION 2040 while allowing for flexibility. The
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Designation Procedures for New Centers will be updated to identify additional supporting documentation:

- **Local commitment.** Evidence center is a local priority and sponsor city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in creating a walkable, livable center.
- **Planning.** Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) that meets regional guidance in advance of designation. Environmental review that demonstrates center area is appropriate for dense development.
  - Assessment of housing need, including displacement risk, as well as documentation of tools, programs, or commitment to provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes and strategies to further fair housing
- **Jurisdiction and Location.** New Regional growth centers should be located within a city, with few exceptions. LINK light rail stations in unincorporated urban areas (including those funded through the Sound Transit 3 ballot measure) may be eligible for center designation at any scale, provided they are affiliated for annexation or planned for incorporation. **Joint planning of unincorporated center areas is encouraged.** Other unincorporated urban areas may be eligible for countywide center status, provided they are affiliated for annexation or planned for incorporation.
- **Existing Conditions.** Existing infrastructure and utilities sufficient to support new center growth, a mix of both existing housing and employment, justification of size and shape. Recommend centers to be nodal with a generally round or square shape, avoid linear or gerrymandered shapes that are not readily walkable or connected by transit and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, amenities, and a street pattern that supports walkability

Designation Criteria for New Regional Growth Centers
The Regional Centers Framework Update defines two distinct types of regional growth centers with tailored minimum criteria as described in this section. **The type of regional center does not establish a distinction for the purpose of PSRC’s regional funding process.** The criteria are expanded to include discussion of appropriate size, minimum transit service, market potential, and regional role. **Transit service is an important factor for growth in centers.** Local governments should work with transit providers to plan for appropriate transit service levels in centers. **The center types will be used to inform future growth planning.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Growth Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Growth Center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These centers have an important regional role, with dense existing jobs and housing, high-quality transit service, and planning for significant growth. These centers may represent areas where major investments – such as high-capacity transit – offer new opportunities for growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Growth Center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These centers have a primary regional role – they have dense existing jobs and housing, high-quality transit service, and are planning for significant growth. They will continue to serve as major transit hubs for the region. These centers also provide regional services, and serve as major civic and cultural centers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Urban Growth Center Criteria
Center must meet each the following criteria:
  o **Existing density.** 18 activity units per acre minimum
  o **Planned target density.** 45 activity units per acre minimum
  o **Size.** 200 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)
  o **Transit.** Existing or planned fixed route bus, regional bus, Bus Rapid Transit, or other frequent and all-day bus service. May substitute high-capacity transit mode for fixed route bus. Service quality is defined as either frequent (< 15-minute headways) and all-day (operates at least 16 hours per day on weekdays) – or – high capacity
  o **Market potential.** Evidence of future market potential to support planning target
  o **Role.** Evidence of regional role
    - Clear regional role for center (serves as important destination for the county)
    - Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy

Metro Growth Center Criteria
Center must meet each the following criteria:
  o **Existing density.** 30 activity units per acre minimum
  o **Planned target density.** 85 activity units per acre minimum
  o **Size.** 320 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)
  o **Transit.** Existing or planned light rail, commuter rail, ferry, or other high capacity transit with similar service quality as light rail. Evidence the area serves as major transit hub and has high quality/high capacity existing or planned service.
  o **Market potential.** Evidence of future market potential to support planning target
  o **Role.** Evidence of regional role:
    - Clear regional role for center (for example: city center of metropolitan cities; other large and fast-growing centers; important regional destination)
    - Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy

4. Manufacturing/Industrial Centers Eligibility and Criteria
Manufacturing/industrial centers preserve lands for family-wage jobs in basic industries and trade and provide areas where that employment may grow in the future. Manufacturing/industrial centers form a critical regional resource that provides economic diversity, supports national and in trade, generates substantial revenue for local governments, and offers higher than average wages.

1 “Planned” transit means funded projects or projects identified in the constrained portion of Transportation 2040. The Transportation 2040 constrained project list incorporates projects in transit agency long-range plans where funding is reasonably expected during the 2040 planning horizon.
VISION 2040 calls for the recognition and preservation of existing centers of intensive manufacturing and industrial activity and the provision of infrastructure and services necessary to support these areas. These centers are important employment locations that serve both current and long-term regional economic objectives.

Manufacturing/industrial centers have very different characteristics and mobility needs than regional growth centers. For example, transit may not be viable for all types of manufacturing/industrial centers, but identifying transportation demand management strategies, including carpool and vanpools, can help reduce congestion impacts regardless of transit access. The criteria to designate manufacturing/industrial centers focuses on these and other factors to support the long-term industrial base of the region.

The Industrial Lands Analysis (2015) identified strategies to ensure an adequate supply of industrial land in the region, including protecting priority users of industrial land and limiting commercial and office uses that compete with industrial use. The centers designation criteria provide some flexibility for non-industrial uses in manufacturing/industrial centers, which may include amenities and services for employees, some commercial uses, and other types non-industrial uses.

Eligibility Criteria for New Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers
Minimum eligibility requirements ensure consistency in centers designation and ensure that new regional growth centers meet the intent of VISION 2040 while allowing for flexibility. The Designation Procedures for New Centers should be updated to identify additional supporting documentation:

**Local commitment.** Evidence center is a local priority had city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in infrastructure and transportation. Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and established partnerships with relevant parties to ensure success of manufacturing/industrial center.

**Planning.** Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) that meets regional guidance in advance of designation. Environmental review that the area is appropriate for development.

**Location.** Manufacturing/industrial centers should be located within a city with few exceptions.

**Existing Conditions.** Adequate infrastructure and utilities to support growth, access to relevant transportation infrastructure, documentation of economic impact, and justification of size and shape of manufacturing/industrial center.

**Designation Criteria for New Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers**
The Regional Centers Framework Update identifies two distinct pathways to designate new manufacturing/industrial centers. Minimum eligibility for regional designation is described in this section. The criteria are expanded to include discussion of appropriate employment type, core industrial zoning, industrial preservation strategies, and regional role. The center pathways may be used to inform future growth planning.
### New Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

These centers are highly active industrial areas with significant existing jobs, core industrial activity, evidence of long-term demand, and regional role. They have a legacy of industrial employment and represent important long-term industrial areas, such as deep-water ports and major manufacturing. The intent of this designation is to, at a minimum, preserve existing industrial jobs and land use and to continue to grow industrial employment in these centers where possible.

Center must meet each of the following criteria:

- Existing jobs: 10,000 minimum
- Planned jobs: 20,000 minimum
- Minimum 50% industrial employment
- Access to transit or defined transportation demand management strategies in place
- Presence of irreplaceable industrial infrastructure
- At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses
- Industrial retention strategies in place
- Regional role

---

### Regional Centers

These regional clusters of industrial lands have significant value to the region and potential for future job growth. These large areas of industrial land serve the region with international employers, industrial infrastructure, concentrations of industrial jobs, and evidence of long-term potential. The intent of this designation is to continue growth of industrial employment and preserve the region's industrial land base for long-term growth and retention.

Center must meet each of the following criteria:

- Minimum size of 2,000 acres
- Existing jobs: 4,000 minimum
- Planned jobs: 10,000 minimum
- Minimum 50% industrial employment
- Access to transit or defined transportation demand management strategies in place
- At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses
- Industrial retention strategies in place
- Regional role

---

1. Industrial-related infrastructure that would be irreplaceable elsewhere, such as working maritime port facilities, air and rail freight facilities.

2. Zoning designations dominated by traditional industrial land uses such as manufacturing, transportation, warehousing and freight terminals. Core industrial does not include zoning that permits both industrial and commercial uses together. Core industrial zoning should strictly limit non-industrial uses. Some core industrial zones may allow both industrial and commercial uses together, but the industrial uses are primary and commercial uses are accessory.
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5. Regional Center Redesignation Standards
Regional centers have been a central strategy of the regional plan for decades, although centers have been designated through different procedures depending on when they were first designated. An objective with the regional centers framework update is to establish a more consistent system between new and existing centers. Recognizing both that existing centers were designated through different processes and the objective of working toward greater consistency, PSRC will develop administrative procedures for review of existing centers. The procedures are anticipated to be drafted in the first half of 2018, with a review of existing centers to follow in 2018 and 2019 during the VISION 2050 planning process.

- **Initial redesignation**. The first evaluation of existing centers will occur in 2018-2020 as part of the VISION 2040 update. All designated regional centers as of 2017 are automatically redesignated, provided that they meet the following criteria;
  - Adopted center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) by 2020. Different approaches to subarea planning may be appropriate in some instances but future updates should be equivalent to a subarea plan by 2026.
  - Designation of the regional center in the adopted local comprehensive plan and countywide planning policies.
- **PSRC staff** will work with cities and counties to identify the applicable center types and whether all the criteria are already met or could be met.

- **Monitoring review of regional growth centers**. A first monitoring review period, scheduled for 2025, will follow the next major comprehensive plan periodic update, (due in 2022 and 2024) and will reoccur about every five years thereafter. At the first monitoring review in 2025, existing regional growth centers will be expected to fully meet eligibility and designation criteria similar to new centers.
  - **Local commitment**. Evidence center is a local priority and sponsor city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in creating a walkable, livable center.
  - **Planning**. An updated center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) that provides detailed planning or analysis that addresses regional guidance, and plans for a mix of housing and employment, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, amenities, and a street pattern that supports walkability.
  - **Assessment of housing need, including displacement risk, as well as documentation of tools, programs, or commitment to provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes and strategies to further fair housing.
  - **Location**. Existing regional growth centers not located within a city should be affiliated for annexation or in a location planned for incorporation. Joint planning of the center area is encouraged.
  - **Capital investments**. Capital investments by the local government in the center in the current or prior 5-year capital planning cycle, and commitment to infrastructure and utilities in the jurisdiction’s capital improvement program sufficient to support center growth, pedestrian infrastructure, and public amenities.
  - **Center criteria**. Consistent with designation criteria for sized planning, transit, market potential, and role for new regional growth centers in Section 3. Existing centers will...
remains designated if they do not meet the new center density criteria, provided that the center is consistent with other criteria identified in this section.

• Market study. Regional growth centers that have existing density employment levels below the level required for new regional centers at the time of the review must complete a market study to evaluate the potential for and opportunities to best support center growth.

c. Monitoring review of manufacturing/industrial centers. A first monitoring review period, scheduled for 2025, will follow the next major comprehensive plan periodic update (due in 2023 and 2024) and will recur every five years thereafter. At the first monitoring review in 2025, existing manufacturing/industrial centers will be expected to fully meet eligibility and designation criteria similar to new centers:

• Local commitment. Evidence center is a local priority and sponsor city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in infrastructure and transportation. Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and established partnerships with relevant parties to ensure success or the manufacturing/industrial center.

• Planning. An updated center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) that addresses regional guidance, and plans for access to transportation infrastructure, and economic development.

• Location. If existing manufacturing/industrial centers are not located within a city, joint planning and annexation/incorporation are encouraged as feasible affiliated for annexation or in a location planned for incorporation. Joint planning of the center area is encouraged.

• Capital investments. Capital investments by the local government in the center in the current or prior 5-year capital planning cycle, and commitment to infrastructure and utilities in the jurisdiction's capital improvement program sufficient to support center growth and planned transportation infrastructure.

• Center criteria. Consistent with designation criteria for new manufacturing/industrial centers in Section 4. Existing centers remain designated if they do not meet the new center existing or planned jobs criteria, provided that the center is consistent with other criteria identified in this section.

• Market study. Manufacturing/industrial centers that have existing employment levels below the level required for new centers at the time of the review must complete a market study to evaluate the potential for and opportunities to best support center growth.

At that time, jurisdictions that do not meet adopted minimum activity requirements must demonstrate progress planning for and investing in the center, including:

• Adopted subarea plan.
• Completed market study.
• Availability of transit service (not required for manufacturing/industrial centers), and
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Recent capital investments by the local government in the center and commitment to appropriate infrastructure in the jurisdiction’s capital improvement program to support planned growth.

- The board will maintain flexibility in evaluating existing centers to consider when centers are very close to the existing conditions criteria, to account from economic recessions, progress and growth, local investments or the lack of investments, and regional importance of a particular area.
- Criteria related to physical improvements should be included in center plans, but may need to be addressed over the long-term, such as developing a complete walkable street network.

6. Countywide Centers

Each county’s countywide planning policies include criteria and processes for countywide centers, though the approach currently varies significantly by county. Through the Centers Framework Update, designation of countywide centers remains delegated to a countywide process, while providing a baseline of consistent regional standards for each county to use. PSRC reviews and certifies countywide planning policies, but PSRC’s role does not include review of countywide centers.

Countywide growth centers serve important roles as places for concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. These are often smaller downtowns, high-capacity transit station areas, or neighborhood centers that are linked by transit, provide a mix of housing and services, and serve as focal points for local and county investment. Countywide industrial centers serve as important local industrial areas. These areas support living wage jobs and serve a key role in the county’s manufacturing/industrial economy. The checklist below represents basic standards expected for countywide centers in each county. Depending on county circumstance and priorities, countywide planning policies may include other numeric or additional criteria (such as planning requirements or mix of uses) or other additional standards within this overall framework. Countywide center designations will be reviewed by an established timeframe and process set by the countywide planning body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide Growth Center</th>
<th>Countywide Industrial Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Located within a city or unincorporated urban area</td>
<td>Located within a city or unincorporated urban area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Countywide Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide Growth Center</th>
<th>Countywide Industrial Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration that the center is a local planning and investment priority:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Demonstration that the center is a local planning and investment priority:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Identified as a countywide center in a local comprehensive plan; subarea plan recommended</td>
<td>o Identified as a countywide center in a local comprehensive plan; subarea plan recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Clear evidence that area is a local priority for investment, such as planning efforts or infrastructure</td>
<td>o Clear evidence that area is a local priority for investment, such as planning efforts, or infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The center is a location for compact, mixed-use development; including:</td>
<td>The center supports industrial sector employment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A minimum existing activity unit density of 10 activity units per acre</td>
<td>o Minimum existing jobs and/or acres of industrial land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Planning and zoning for a mix of uses, including residential</td>
<td>o Defined transportation demand management strategies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Capacity and planning for additional growth</td>
<td>o At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The center supports multi-modal transportation, including:</td>
<td>o Industrial retention strategies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transit service</td>
<td>o Capacity and planning for additional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bicycle infrastructure and amenities</td>
<td>o Important county role and concentration of industrial land or jobs with evidence of long-term demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Street pattern that supports walkability</td>
<td>o Compact, walkable size of one-quarter mile squared (160 acres), up to half-mile transit walkshed (500 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bicycle infrastructure and amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Local Centers and Other Types of Centers

VISION 2040 calls for central places in all jurisdictions to support a centers-based approach to development in the region. These places range from neighborhood centers to active crossroads in communities of all sizes. These centers play an important role in the region and help define our community character, provide local gathering places, serve as community hubs, and are often appropriate places for additional growth and focal points for services.

The Regional Centers Framework recognizes the importance of these places, but does not envision a regional or county designation for all types of local centers. The designation criteria outlined in this document may provide a path to regional or county designation for locations that continue to grow and change over time.
Per program eligibility requirements, rural centers that participate in PSRC’s Rural Town Centers and Corridors funding competition are located in either a freestanding city or town that is outside the region’s contiguous urban growth area or a county’s unincorporated rural area. These centers are designated through a local planning process, not through the Regional Centers Framework process.

6. Military Installations

Military installations are a vital part of the region, home to thousands of personnel and jobs and a major contributor to the region’s economy. While military installations are not subject to local, regional, or state plans and regulations, PSRC recognizes the relationship between regional growth patterns and military installations, and recognizes the importance of military employment and personnel all aspects of regional planning.

Recognition of military installations in the update to VISION 2040 can better acknowledge the role these installations play in the regional economy and in regional growth patterns. Designation criteria for installations can also help establish common expectations for how the region works with and supports military installations. Stakeholders throughout the process have emphasized the need to address base transportation access to benefit surrounding communities, as well as the installations. Per federal statutes, PSRC transportation funds cannot be spent on military installations, but surrounding communities may be eligible to receive funds for projects that connect to installations.

Designation Criteria for Types of Military Installations

PSRC’s Executive Board will identify Major Military Installations in the update to VISION 2040, subject to adoption of the plan by the General Assembly. Major installations are defined as installations with more than 5,000 enlisted and service personnel. As of 2017, four installations met the minimum size criteria: Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Pierce County, Naval Base Kitsap–Bangor and Naval Base Kitsap–Bremerton in Kitsap County, and Naval Station Everett in Snohomish County.

This recognition in the regional plan advances active collaboration between military installations, neighboring jurisdictions, and the region. The region recognizes military installations are major employers, associated with congestion, and that regional designation can help work to alleviate impacts.

Through this recognition, regional expectations include:

- Ongoing coordination between the military installation, countywide planning forum, and neighboring jurisdictions regarding planned growth, regional impacts, and implementation of multimodal transportation options
- Support for multimodal commute planning and mode split goals for installation
- Completed Joint Land Use Study or similar coordinated planning effort

Smaller military installations may continue to be recognized by countywide planning forums as a type of countywide center or equivalent. The minimum size criteria for countywide center designation will be as specified by RCW 36.70a.530 and identify “federal military installation[s], other than a reserve center,” for the purpose of regional centers designation, jurisdictions may count military activity towards center thresholds when the installation is directly adjacent or surrounded by the center (such as Naval Base Kitsap-Bremerton and the downtown Bremerton regional growth center).
that employs one hundred or more full-time personnel.” As of 2017, five installations met the minimum criteria: Naval Base Kitsap Keyport, Seattle Coast Guard Station, Naval Base Kitsap Jackson Park, Camp Murray, and Naval Base Everett – Smokey Point Support Complex.

9. Planning Requirements
PSRC’s Plan Review Manual contains guidance and requirements for comprehensive plan certification, including center subarea plans. The Regional Center Plans Checklist in the PSRC’s Plan Review Manual addresses planning expectations for center subarea plans. PSRC will work with the Regional Staff Committee to update the Plan Review Manual to amend requirements and provide best practices, with consideration for local variability.

The Regional Growth Center Plan Checklist will be updated to address the following topics:
- Affordable housing, including housing targets, needs assessment, affordable housing goals, and strategies to encourage new housing production with long-term affordability
- Displacement risk analysis and strategies to prevent or mitigate displacement
- Transit access, including transit service, transit-dependent populations, and safe and connected pedestrian and bicycle networks
- Equitable community engagement
- Access to opportunity, including employment and education opportunities and neighborhood quality of life
- Environmental justice impacts
- Specific transportation planning investments, programs, and resources identified.
- Availability of public services, like K-12 education, to meet needs of households with children.

The Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center Plan checklist will be updated to address the following topics:
- Equitable community engagement
- Access to opportunity, including employment and education opportunities
- Environmental justice impacts
- Expectations around core industrial uses, residential encroachment, and commercial and office uses that do not support manufacturing/industrial function
- Clearly articulated long-term commitment to protect and preserve manufacturing/industrial land uses and businesses in the center
- Specific transportation planning investments, programs, and resources identified.

10. Regional Support
Funding to Support Centers
Staff will research and identify other potential funding sources or programs to support development in centers. This may include housing in regional growth centers, economic development, other capital funds, additional state resources, marketing, and other strategies. PSRC should collaborate with other agencies and funders to identify additional funding sources for designated centers. PSRC will also explore funding for centers planning and technical assistance.

Regional Center Types
The Regional Centers Framework does not establish a distinction between different types of regional centers for the purpose of PSRC’s funding framework.

11. Performance Measures
In the VISION 2040 update, PSRC will work with local governments and other stakeholders to develop performance measures for centers as a whole to evaluate success of the overall framework. Like previous monitoring studies, PSRC will lead the effort, with support and review from local governments. Performance measures should focus on a limited number of centers and consider the project outcome statements to support growth, mobility, environment, social equity and opportunity, economic development, and public health. Metrics may include overall growth goals or mode split goals for centers, level of local or regional investment, greenhouse gas emissions reductions, or other measures as appropriate, such as housing affordability, mix of uses, and health and equity.

PSRC will continue to conduct ongoing monitoring of performance measures for individual centers. This may include progress towards growth targets and mode split goals, tracking implementation actions, or tracking other measures consistent with the designation requirements.

- PSRC will publish a centers performance monitoring summary every five years in order to stay on top of regional trends in centers development.
- PSRC will review centers for performance as part of the monitoring review and prior to regional plan update years, and consider possible changes or reclassification if the local jurisdiction is not taking steps to plan and support growth in center to meet targets or goals.

12. Implementation
Procedures and Planning Expectations. The board directs staff to prepare updates to the Designation Procedures for New Centers, Regional Center Plans Checklist, and develop administrative procedures for existing centers.

Plan Updates. The board directs staff to identify issues for VISION 2040 update:
- Identification of military installations a regional geography
- Preservation of industrial land, both within designated manufacturing/industrial centers and in other industrial areas in the region
- Growth goals for regional centers

Countywide Planning Policies. The board requests updates to the countywide planning policies in each county during the next GMA update cycle (by 2023/2024) to implement countywide centers and achieve consistency with the regional framework. PSRC staff should work collaboratively with countywide groups on technical assistance and implementation of updated criteria.

The framework may inform an update to the Regional Growth Strategy but does not commit the region to any particular distribution of growth or definition of regional geographies.
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PSRC Work Plan. The board directs staff to develop an implementation work plan and schedule to engage with PSRC membership and other stakeholders as appropriate on additional analysis, research, and guidance. The work plan should incorporate the following tasks to support ongoing work on regional and countywide centers:

- **Performance measures.** Develop in consultation with jurisdictions and other stakeholders, develop framework to track performance and outcomes over time and identify challenges or barriers over time. Performance measures should consider project outcome statements to support growth, mobility, environment, social equity and opportunity, economic development, and public health. Measures may include assessment of demographic characteristics, housing affordability, employment, amenities, and access to opportunity.

- **Update growth planning guidance.** Update the guidance paper on center targets to discuss changes to growth expectations for centers and the mix of employment and residential activity envisioned in regional growth centers.

- **Market studies.** Provide additional guidance on recommended components of market studies for centers.

- **Social equity.** Complete additional analysis and research on displacement and displacement risk in centers.
  - Provide additional resources and best practices addressing equitable community engagement, including opportunities for local planning staff and policy-makers to learn about tools that have been successfully used by cities and counties in the region.
  - Research and recommend a best practice approach to a comprehensive equity impact review tool to address social equity through policies and implementation decisions for centers throughout the region.

- **Tribal land & centers.** Complete additional review and consultation with tribes on the role of tribal lands in the centers framework.

- **Funding opportunities.** To achieve the vision of growth in centers, research other funding opportunities and opportunities to leverage existing designations. Collaborate with other agencies and funders to identify additional funding sources to designated centers. Explore funding, including a set-aside, for centers planning and technical assistance.

- **Military installations.** PSRC, countywide groups, and local jurisdictions should continue to work with state and federal partners to secure infrastructure resources, provide support for military installations, and address impacts on surrounding jurisdictions.

- **Economic measures.** Given their important role in the regional economy, PSRC should consider additional research on economic impact measures for manufacturing/industrial centers (e.g., revenue generators, export value).

- **Projects supporting centers.** Review and develop policy guidance on types of projects that support development in centers and corridors connecting centers.

- **Number and distribution of centers.** During the VISION 2040 update, research guidelines to manage the number and distribution of centers, factoring in minimum density standards, projected growth, jurisdictional size, location within the county, competition for market share, and allocation of limited regional resources.
Regional and local centers are the cornerstone of the region’s long-term plan for growth in VISION 2040. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has identified regional-scale mixed use and industrial centers that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment. These centers include metropolitan downtowns like Seattle, Tacoma and Bremerton; growing areas supported by regional transit investments like Lynnwood and Redmond; and major industrial areas, such as Paine Field and the Port of Tacoma.

Working with its members, PSRC initiated the first comprehensive review of the system since most centers were designated in 1995.

The project had several goals:

- **Identify shared expectations.** The standards for centers have varied by county and over time – this project provides an opportunity to review the expectations for new centers and existing centers. Establishing common designation criteria and procedures would improve overall consistency and coordination for centers planning.
- **Define the role of places.** The current centers framework only formally identifies regional centers. This project has allowed the region to consider the role of other types of places, such as countywide centers, transit stations, and military installations.
- **Implement regional policy and recommendations.** The project implements VISION 2040 policies, along with recommendations from Growing Transit Communities Strategy and the Regional Industrial Lands Analysis.

**Features from the Draft Centers Framework Proposal**

- Encourage larger centers to plan for greater growth by establishing different types of regional growth centers
- Create a new path to designate manufacturing/industrial centers to preserve industrial lands for the future
- Retain existing centers, with option to meet minimum criteria through market study and planning actions
- Recommend recognizing the role of major military installations in the VISION 2040 update
- Create minimum standards to designate countywide centers in each county
- Add new planning expectations to advance social equity
- Better reflect existing policy and goals, including a focus on transit service, regional role, market potential, and core industrial zoning, in the designation process.
What Would These Changes Mean?

Implementation over time. The centers framework proposal provides direction on how the plans, policies, and procedures should be updated to reflect our vision for regional centers. Upcoming updates to PSRC plans, policies, and procedures will implement the revised framework.

New regional centers. The draft proposal changes the regional criteria, which may allow some new regional centers to be designated. In particular, the criteria propose a lower employment threshold for manufacturing/industrial centers, which may lead to designation of new manufacturing/industrial centers.

New types of growth centers. By establishing different types of regional growth centers, larger centers would be encouraged to plan for greater levels of growth, and VISION 2040 could better address the different characteristics and growth trajectories of centers.

New countywide centers. The draft proposal establishes basic standards for countywide centers, which would create a more consistent system of places planning for growth and prioritized for countywide transportation funds. This may lead to designation of new countywide centers.

Military installations. The draft proposal recommends identifying major military installations in the update to VISION 2040 to recognize the influence these installations have on regional growth patterns, the economy, and transportation system. This may provide new opportunities for collaboration. Smaller military installations may be designated as a type of countywide center to recognize their role.

A more consistent system. The draft proposal does not recommend removing regional designation for any existing regional centers in the VISION 2040 update. The proposal establishes a time period and expectations for existing regional centers to meet the revised criteria.

Track progress over time. The draft proposal focuses on evaluating progress for individual centers over time.

Many existing policies won’t change. The framework incorporates procedural changes, but the basic structure of designating new centers doesn’t change. Local governments will be responsible for seeking designation, with the concurrence of the countywide organization in each county. PSRC’s Executive Board will continue to be responsible for designating new regional centers.

The draft proposal does not recommend higher or lower funding priority for different types of regional centers and encourages local governments to designate other types of local centers.
## Overview of Draft Centers Framework Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Standards</th>
<th>Draft Proposal (Dec 2017 version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Growth Centers</strong></td>
<td>Two types of regional growth centers -- metro growth center and urban growth center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One type of regional center</td>
<td>Include additional criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary focus on existing and planned density, commitment when reviewing new centers</td>
<td>• Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Market potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distribution &amp; number of centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing/Industrial Centers</strong></td>
<td>Two pathways to designate either large industrial areas or major employment centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One pathway</td>
<td>Include additional criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary focus on existing and planned jobs, commitment when reviewing new centers</td>
<td>• Core industrial zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preservation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Installations</strong></td>
<td>Recommend to recognize major installations in the VISION 2040 update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major installations like Joint Base Lewis McChord and the Bremerton Shipyard are not fully addressed in VISION 2040</td>
<td>Guidance on countywide designation for smaller installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All installations are eligible to be countywide centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redesignation</strong></td>
<td>Common expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some centers do not meet current standards</td>
<td>2025 performance check-in, with option to meet minimum criteria through market study and planning actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different expectations based on when designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong></td>
<td>Additional housing planning prior to designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea planning required</td>
<td>Update center plan checklist to address topics like displacement, access to opportunity, and environmental justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provisions for affordable housing and special housing needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan for amenities like parks and civic places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Standards

Social Equity (cont.)
- Encourage walkability and transit-supportive planning

Draft Proposal (Dec 2017 version)
- New regional analysis and guidance on equitable community engagement + displacement
- Develop framework to measure progress

Process
- Rolling application window
- Ad hoc review of thresholds
- Review based on checklist alone
- Application window every five years
- Revisit thresholds during updates to VISION
- Consider distribution, location, and number of centers in designation process

Countywide Centers
- No shared definition of countywide centers
- Only regional centers have common definition and recognition
- Criteria and designation vary by county
- Establish shared criteria for countywide centers; recognize places beyond regional centers
- Criteria focus on:
  - Local priority
  - Mixed use, planning for growth
  - Multimodal options
  - Industrial zoning, retention

Performance Measures
- Performance monitoring reports on ad hoc schedule
- Five-year monitoring report
- Set performance measures
- Additional review if not meeting performance expectations
This document compiles potential amendments submitted for consideration for the February 2018 Growth Management Policy Board meeting. Amendments have been standardized since the January meeting, and some amendments have been updated by the sponsor.

Please note that some potential amendments are mutually exclusive and should not be adopted together. King County Amendments 1, 2, and 3 propose changing or adding standards for countywide centers, while Pierce County Amendment 2 proposes removing the standards related to countywide centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMPB directed amendment 1</td>
<td>p. 9</td>
<td>Under “Initial redesignation”&lt;br&gt;• Adopted center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) should be completed by 2020. Jurisdictions may request an extension from the Growth Management Policy Board if substantial progress on subarea planning has been made by 2020. Different approaches to subarea planning may be appropriate in some instances but future updates should be equivalent to a subarea plan by 2025. Plans should include goals and policies that specifically address the center and should be adopted by the jurisdiction(s) with local land use authority for the center. Plan adoption should meet public notice and involvement requirements established under the Growth Management Act.</td>
<td>At the January meeting, GMPB directed staff to prepare language that clarifies that substantial progress should be made on subarea planning by 2020, permits extensions under some circumstances, and defines what a subarea plan should be. This amendment provides suggested language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMPB directed amendment 2</td>
<td>p. 10</td>
<td><strong>Market study.</strong> [Regional growth centers or Manufacturing/industrial centers] that have existing employment levels below the level required for new centers at the time of the review must complete a market study to evaluate the potential for and opportunities to best support center growth. The market study must consider a planning horizon reasonably beyond the monitoring period (2025). The market study should show how the center can meet targeted levels of growth within the planning period. The jurisdiction should demonstrate its work to address opportunities identified in the market study.</td>
<td>At the January meeting, GMPB directed staff to develop revised language to clarify the market study scope, content, and subsequent actions by local governments. This amendment provides suggested language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GMPB directed amendment 3**<br>Mix of uses | p. 6 | Add to the Regional Growth Center table:  
- Regional growth centers should have a goal for a minimum mix of at least 15% planned residential and employment activity in the center. | At the January meeting, GMPB directed staff to develop language reflecting a goal for a planned mix of uses in regional growth centers. This amendment provides suggested language. |
| **SCA Requested Amendment**<br>Name different types of MICs | p. 8 | Add names to the different manufacturing/industrial center pathways (see table) | Clarifies that, like the types of regional growth centers in the proposal, the MIC criteria represents different types of regional manufacturing/industrial centers. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Manufacturing/Industrial Centers</strong>&lt;br&gt;Industrial Employment Center</th>
<th>Industrial Growth Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These centers are highly active industrial areas with significant existing jobs...</td>
<td>These regional clusters of industrial lands have significant value to the region...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Pierce County Amendment 1 | p. 13 | Amend text on p. 13 under Section 8. Military Installations: Recognition of military installations in the update to VISION 2040 can better acknowledge the role these installations play in the regional economy and in regional growth patterns. Designation criteria for installations can also help establish common expectations for how the region works with and supports military installations. Stakeholders throughout the process have emphasized the need to address base transportation access to benefit surrounding communities, as well as the installations. Per federal statutes, PSRC transportation funds cannot be spent on military installations, but surrounding communities may be eligible to receive funds for projects that connect to installations. For purposes of funding eligibility, these projects will be treated similarly to projects which connect regional growth centers.” | Major military installations, such as Joint Base Lewis McChord (JBLM), generate similar benefits (focused residential/employment/services) as the regionally designated growth centers. Citizens from across central Puget Sound travel to these major military installations to work, shop, and receive necessary services, such as health care. Applying the same funding eligibility as regional centers reinforces the regional recognition of the significant role that these installations play in the central Puget Sound. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Amendment 2</td>
<td>p. 16</td>
<td>Under the section titled “6. Countywide Centers”, delete the table titled “Countywide Centers” in its entirety and modify the second paragraph of the section as follows:</td>
<td>Countywide Centers, as opposed to Regional Centers, identify areas that serve a more local role. Adopting minimum thresholds that are applied across the region 1) takes away local control in determining the importance of areas and funding priorities, and 2) fails to recognize local differences that may exist among the counties and cities. Jurisdictions within each county should be given total flexibility in criteria that it adopts so it can place a value on its unique characteristics. Note: Neither GMA or Vision 2040 requires consistency across the region in the designation of countywide centers. Nothing requires Countywide Center criteria to be adopted in the Regional Center Framework. The Pierce County Countywide Planning Policies have had designation criteria for a number of years. Why haven’t other counties (and cities) amended their CPPs to incorporate countywide center criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide centers criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Countywide growth centers serve important roles as places for concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. These are often smaller downtowns, high-capacity transit station areas, or neighborhood centers that are linked by transit, provide a mix of housing and services, and serve as focal points for local and county investment. Countywide industrial centers serve as important local industrial areas. These areas support living wage jobs and serve a key role in the county’s manufacturing/industrial economy. The checklist below represents basic standards expected for countywide centers in each county. Depending on county circumstance and priorities, countywide planning policies may include additional criteria (such as planning requirements or mix of uses) or other additional standards within this overall framework. Countywide center designations will be reviewed by an established timeframe and process set by the countywide planning body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Amendment 3</td>
<td>p. 16</td>
<td>Under the section titled “12. Implementation”, modify the fourth bullet from the end as follows:</td>
<td>The proposal currently has language that directs PSRC to research and identify other potential funding sources to support development in designated Regional Centers. At the outset, Pierce County has requested that PSRC recognize the importance of JBLM in the central Puget Sound. While it is beneficial to establish a new Major Military Installations geography via Vision 2050, additional steps should be taken to validate the regional importance of these military installations. Researching and identifying other potential funding sources is a minor activity, yet may be a significant step in PSRC’s acknowledgement of the role these areas play in the region’s growth and economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Military installations work plan |      | Military Installations  
Staff will research other potential funding sources or programs to support improvement of transportation corridors serving recognized military installations. PSRC, countywide groups, and local jurisdictions should continue to work with state and federal partners to secure infrastructure resources, provide support for military installations, and address impacts on surrounding jurisdictions. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King County Amendment 1</td>
<td>p. 12</td>
<td>Amend left column, fourth bullet: Planning and zoning for a minimum mix of uses, including residential of 20 percent residential and 20 percent employment, unless unique circumstances make these percentages not possible to achieve.</td>
<td>VISION 2040 states on page 49 that &quot;VISION 2040 expects each city in the region to take steps to further evolve one or more central places as mixed use areas of residences, employment, shops, cultural facilities, and entertainment. Each such center — no matter how large or small — should serve as a focal point of community, be walkable, and have easy access to transit.&quot; To ensure that countywide growth centers develop as mixed-use areas, a threshold for the mix should be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide centers mix of uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Amendment 2</td>
<td>p. 12</td>
<td>Amend left column, fifth bullet: Capacity and planning for additional growth. A minimum planned activity unit density of 16 activity units per acre</td>
<td>VISION 2040 states on page 49 that &quot;VISION 2040 expects each city in the region to take steps to further evolve one or more central places as mixed use areas of residences, employment, shops, cultural facilities, and entertainment. Each such center — no matter how large or small — should serve as a focal point of community, be walkable, and have easy access to transit.&quot; To ensure that countywide growth centers have densities to support easy access to transit, a transit-supportive density threshold should be established. Based on PSRC’s research, the optimal minimum transit supportive density for bus rapid transit is 17 activity units per acre (Stakeholder Working Group Report, Appendix B, Page 40). Given that the current and proposed minimum existing activity unit density for Regional Growth Centers, the 16 AU planning threshold for Countywide Centers is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Proposed Amendment</td>
<td>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| King County Amendment 3 | p. 12 | Amend right column, third bullet  
Minimum **1,000** existing jobs and/or **500** acres of industrial land | The Centers Framework focuses on areas where the market has already created a critical mass, rather than focus on speculating about new greenfield areas. Without clear standards, the current proposal for Countywide Industrial Centers would allow them to be proposed at almost any acreage, regardless of whether there are existing jobs. In short, the lack of a number of jobs and lack of a number of acres open the process to abuse. Based on PSRC’s Industrial Lands Study, and Centers Working Group Materials and supplemental research, a threshold is needed for a minimum level of industrial employment and/or acreage to avoid speculatively designating areas where no market exists. |
| Port Amendment 1 | p. 7 | After “Planning”  
- Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) that meets addresses regional guidance in advance of designation. **Where applicable, the plan should be developed collaboratively with public ports and other affected governmental entities.** | Without specifically acknowledging other government entities impacted by center plans, we think that does not allow ports an appropriate seat at the table for a say in our own futures. While we recognize that cities are the ones with land use authority under GMA, we think GMA also allows us a level of influence under the Container Port Elements and Essential Public Facilities clauses. Of note, each of the four PSRC ports currently operates Essential Public Facilities within their respective current MICs. |
| Port Amendment 2 | p. 9 | Under “Initial redesignation” on packet page 9:  
- Adopted center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) identified by 2020. Different approaches to subarea planning may be appropriate and input from other affect government entities, such as public ports, **will be considered**, but future updates should be equivalent to a subarea plan by 2025. | Since PSRC’s Center Subarea Plans list was shared via email with the board on December 21, port staff identified two planning studies about the tideflats (Port of Tacoma MIC) that might be an accessible different approach in advance of the 2020 deadline. This information was shared via email with PSRC staff on December 27. With respect to this section, unless further clarity is added into the Framework, the language should not be so prescriptive. Further, if adopted as is, this could present a significant problem for the redesignation of the Port of Tacoma MIC and access to important grant funds. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Port Amendment** 3  
Collaboration with ports on subarea planning | p. 10 | After “Planning”  
- An updated center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) that addresses regional guidance and plans for access to transportation infrastructure, and economic development. Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent). Where applicable, the plan should be developed collaboratively by public ports and affected governmental entities. | As with the recommendation from page 7, without specifically acknowledging other government entities impacted by center plans, we think that does not allow ports an appropriate seat at the table for a say in our own futures. While we recognize that cities are the ones with land use authority under GMA, we think GMA also allows us a level of influence under the Container Port Elements and Essential Public Facilities clauses. Of note, each of the four PSRC ports currently operates Essential Public Facilities within their respective current MICs. |

**Minor Technical Amendments (To be considered as a group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Port Amendment**  
Typo | p. 6 | Under “Manufacturing/industrial centers form a critical...,” halfway through that sentence:  
“... economic diversity, supports national and international trade...” | Corrects typo |
| **Port Amendment**  
Freight + goods | p. 7 | At the end paragraph that starts with “Manufacturing/industrial centers...”:
- Add final sentence to that paragraph that reads “Moving freight and goods to and through MICs is critical, on trucks, as well as other modes, such as marine, air and rail.” | Port staff believes the current paragraph’s focus on transit is somewhat misguided, thus the additional language emphasizes critical elements that should be acknowledged. |
| **Port Amendment**  
- Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, strategies and incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and establish partnerships... | Ads additional importance on the fact that encouragement is needed to sustain and ideally enhance the economic benefits for the region from a prospering industrial sector. |
| **Amendment in consultation with King County, City of Seattle, and Ports** | p. 8 | Footnote 3:
3 Zoning designations dominated by traditional industrial land uses such as manufacturing, transportation, warehousing and freight terminals. Commercial uses within core industrial zones shall be | The proposed framework is for 75% Core Industrial Land, with the remaining land eligible for other zoning and uses. This means the 75% Core Industrial Land should be tightly constrained for manufacturing industrial uses, and should strictly limit non-industrial |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale (Provided by sponsor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core industrial zoning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>strictly limited. Core industrial does not include zoning that permits both industrial and commercial uses together. Some core industrial zones may allow both industrial and commercial uses together, but the industrial uses are primary and commercial uses are accessory.</td>
<td>uses given that they can locate on the other 25% of the land. To make this change, the fourth sentence of the footnote should be removed as is directly conflicts with the existing second sentence and would allow non-industrial in 100% of the zones. The purpose of the statement gets somewhat lost in its length, thus a more succinct version is recommend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Amendment</td>
<td>p. 10</td>
<td>Under “Monitoring review of manufacturing...Planning,” after “Local commitment”: • Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, strategies and incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and establish partnerships...</td>
<td>As with the recommendation from page 36, adds additional importance on the fact that encouragement is needed to sustain and ideally enhance the economic benefits for the region from a prospering industrial sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Amendment</td>
<td>p. 12</td>
<td>Add to both columns, add a new first bullet in each column: • Identified as a countywide center in the countywide planning policies</td>
<td>The Countywide bodies must have a role in reviewing and approving countywide centers. The language at the bottom page 11 infers this, however, the amendment makes the language in the table more explicit on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Amendment</td>
<td>p. 14</td>
<td>Under “Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center Plan checklist,” the fourth bullet: • Expectations around core industrial uses, residential encroachment, transitional buffers and commercial and office uses that do not support manufacturing/industrial function.</td>
<td>While “residential encroachment” does cover some of the issues with respect to transitional buffers, adding that specific reference broaden land use planning considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Centers Framework

2018 SEPA Addendum to the VISION 2040 Final Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared pursuant to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (Chapter 43.21C RCW) and WAC 197-11-625.

January 25, 2018
January 25, 2018

Dear Member of the Puget Sound Regional Council or Interested Parties:

The Puget Sound Regional Council has prepared this State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) addendum for the Regional Centers Framework project. This addendum updates the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) issued in April 2008 and provides information about the Regional Centers Framework project.

The Regional Centers Framework project considers changes to the regional council’s procedures, criteria and support for regional centers to implement the policy direction of VISION 2040.

Copies of this addendum and project documents are all available online at psrc.org or from the Puget Sound Regional Council’s Information Center at (206) 464-7532.

Sincerely,

Erika Harris, AICP
SEPA Responsible Official
2018 SEPA Addendum to the VISION 2040 Final Environmental Impact Statement

January 25, 2018

Description of Proposal
This document is an addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for VISION 2040. The purpose of this addendum is to assess and document the environmental impacts of an update to the Regional Centers Framework. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) is proposing the update of the framework to include new and modified criteria and procedures to guide the designation of regional centers, including regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers. This project implements policy stated in VISION 2040 and its environmental scope falls within the range of environmental review considered in the original Environmental Impact Statement for VISION 2040. This addendum complies with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) rules under Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 43.21C and Chapter 197-11 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

Lead Agency and Source of Proposal
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104
206-464-7090
psrc.org

Contact: Puget Sound Regional Council Information Center • 206-464-7532 • info@psrc.org SEPA

Responsible Official: Erika Harris, AICP, Senior Planner, Growth Management Planning

Prepared by:
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104

Licenses Required: No licenses are required.

Adopted SEPA Documents
VISION 2040 Draft, supplemental, and Final EIS
https://www.psrc.org/environmental-review-vision-2040
Potential Date of Adoption of the Regional Centers Framework by the Executive Board:
March 22, 2018

Location of Documents

Available online at: www.psrc.org/VISION

Copies available from:
Puget Sound Regional Council Information Center
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104
206-464-7532

No cost for individual copies
Need for the Addendum

VISION 2040, the long-range plan for the central Puget Sound region, was adopted in May 2008 following the preparation and review of a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) is updating the criteria and procedures, known as the Regional Centers Framework, used to designate regional centers consistent with the adopted direction of VISION 2040. Related VISION 2040 policies include:

- MPP-DP-5: Focus a significant share of population and employment growth in designated regional growth centers.
- MPP-DP-6: Provide a regional framework for designating and evaluating 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.

VISION 2040 also includes the following actions on centers:

- Evaluate Designated Centers: DP-Action-3: The Puget Sound Regional Council will study and evaluate existing regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers to assess their designation, distribution, interrelationships, characteristics, transportation efficiency, and performance.

- Other Centers, Including Countywide and Local Centers: DP-Action-5
  The Puget Sound Regional Council, together with its member jurisdictions and countywide planning bodies, will develop a common framework for identifying various types of central places beyond regional centers. Address the role of smaller nodes that provide similar characteristics as centers.

Consistent with VISION 2040, the update to the Regional Centers Framework includes amended criteria and procedures to implement VISION 2040’s regional objectives for growth patterns and center-oriented development.

Currently, the region has 29 designated regional growth centers and nine designated manufacturing/industrial centers. When the Draft and Final VISION 2040 Environmental Impact Statements were completed, 27 of these same regional growth centers and eight manufacturing/industrial centers were designated and evaluated as part of the environmental review. Under the proposed updates to the framework, all existing centers continue to be regionally designated.
and play an important role in attracting future growth. VISION 2040 anticipated the designation of additional regional centers over time, as has occurred. With changes to the criteria some new centers and other places are likely to become regionally designated or recognized. The following may occur with the changes to the framework:

- Subject to periodic performance monitoring, existing regional centers remain designated and are expected to accommodate a significant share of regional growth
- New regional growth centers will be required to demonstrate consistency with revised designation criteria, including evidence of planning and environmental review, existing or planned transit service, and existing housing.
- Existing large regional growth centers will be required to plan for a higher level of growth (a minimum of 30 activity units per acre)
- Additional manufacturing/industrial centers may be designated under a new designation path with a lower jobs threshold
- New guidance for countywide centers provides a base level of consistency between counties
- Four large military facilitates are recommended to be recognized in the next update of VISION 2040 for their regional significance
- Planning expectations for existing and new regional centers will increase to address factors such as transit, housing, equity and environmental conditions
- Long-term performance monitoring may improve overall implementation of VISION 2040

With these changes, the region may expect a modest number of new places seeking regional designation, plus regional recognition of major military installations. An exact number of new eligible places cannot be determined due to factors such as community interest and local plans. The region can also expect enhanced planning for regional centers that better addresses planning for growth, transit access, housing, social equity, and environmental suitability compared to the current framework.

Overall, the framework update is consistent with the policies and actions identified in VISION 2040 and the review of environmental impacts considered in the VISION 2040 Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The updated Regional Centers Framework is expected to have similar environmental impacts as those identified in the Draft and Final EIS.

**Subsequent Environmental Review and Project Review Process:** Updating the Regional Centers Framework does not commit the region or individual counties or cities to designate new centers. Designation of new centers begins as a local process and will be subject to planning and environmental review during local plan adoption.

The centers framework establishes a policy guide to update additional implementing actions, including updating designation procedures for new centers, planning checklists, regional plans, and countywide planning policies.
Subsequent updates to VISION 2040 policies that may address aspects of the centers framework will be considered in the next update to the regional VISION plan, VISION 2050, which will include additional review pursuant to SEPA.

Project Information
VISION 2040's Regional Growth Strategy is structured around accommodating significant new residential and employment growth in dense urban centers that are well served by transit and other services. VISION 2040 also calls for preserving industrial land into the long term and accommodating new employment growth in designated manufacturing/industrial centers. The Regional Centers Framework is a set of criteria and procedures that aim to focus and support growth while creating vibrant, livable communities. This proposal

- Defines the types of central places—both larger and smaller—within the region that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment.
- Provides for designation of centers at the regional and countywide levels in a way that improves consistency across the region.
- Establishes planning expectations that ensure centers are developing as thriving, equitable, and connected communities.

The framework incorporates procedural changes, but retains the basic structure of designating new centers. Local governments are responsible for seeking designation, with the concurrence of the countywide organization in each county. PSRC’s Executive Board is responsible for designating new regional centers. The draft proposal encourages local governments to designate other types of centers locally.

The following supporting documents are incorporated by reference into this addendum:
- Regional Centers Framework Update Board Proposal (Dec 2017 version)
- Regional Centers Framework Update Project Scope of Work
- 2016 Regional Centers Framework Update Project Background & Findings Report
- The full background & findings report and other project resources are available online at: https://www.psrc.org/our-work/centers-framework-update

Additional Environmental Information
The 2006 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and 2008 Final Environmental Impact Statement addressed a wide variety of environmental impacts and mitigation for each alternative, considering impacts to transportation, air quality, climate change, land use (population, employment, and housing), noise, visual and aesthetic resources, water quality and hydrology, ecosystems and Endangered Species Act issues, energy, earth, environmental health, public services and utilities, parks and recreation, historic and cultural resources, and environmental justice. The updated Regional Centers Framework would not create significantly different environmental impacts.
Impact of more centers: The draft proposal changes the regional criteria, which may allow some new regional centers to be designated. In particular, the criteria propose a lower employment threshold for manufacturing/industrial centers, which may lead to designation of new manufacturing/industrial centers. However, these are areas that have long been designated for manufacturing/industrial uses. The draft proposal also establishes basic standards for countywide centers, which would create a more consistent system of places planning for growth and prioritized for countywide transportation funds. This may lead to designation of new countywide centers. The VISION 2040 EIS found that:

- General, alternatives with a more focused growth pattern (such as Metropolitan Cities, Preferred Growth, and Larger Cities) have potentially lower overall environmental impacts, but high growth areas could have higher localized impacts with higher development impacts on people and/or services. Because less land would likely be required to meet growth needs, growth in rural or natural resource areas could be reduced or avoided. Compact growth also reduces the regional levels of automobile use and congestion, and improves transit use, carpooling, walking and bicycling, which in turn lowers air pollution, water pollution, and energy use. Redevelopment of older properties to today's standards could also improve localized conditions and environmental performance in a wide array of areas, ranging from transportation to energy, hazardous materials, and stormwater. Regionally, governments could provide public services more efficiently and public services and other cultural and educational amenities could be closer to more people. However, the localized costs for providing services and facilities in the highest growth areas would be concentrated, with some governments bearing higher costs than others. (ES-14)

The FEIS contemplated adding additional regional growth centers or subregional centers, particularly in Larger Cities (FEIS p. 5.2-18). Designation of new centers may lead to potential city reclassification, increased density, and infill development in areas supported by transit and other services.

Greater growth for larger centers. By establishing a different type of regional growth center, larger centers would be encouraged to plan for greater levels of growth, and VISION 2040 could better address the different characteristics and growth trajectories of centers.

Military installations. The draft proposal recommends identifying major military installations in the update to VISION 2040 to recognize the influence these installations have on regional growth patterns, the economy, and the transportation system. This may provide new opportunities for collaboration and coordinated infrastructure investment to support future growth and improved mobility. Smaller military installations may be designated as a type of countywide center to recognize their role as employment centers within each county. This provides a more consistent system across the region.

Planning expectations. The draft proposal does not recommend removing regional designation for any existing regional centers in the VISION 2040 update. The proposal does establish a time period and expectations for existing regional centers to meet the revised criteria and planning expectations. This may result in enhanced local planning efforts to attract development in centers, address needs for transportation, housing, equity, and services, and help create vibrant neighborhoods in the region.
**Conclusion**

Environmental impacts for the updated centers framework are similar to those documented for the 2008 Final Environmental Impact Statement. The Final EIS found that, in general, center-oriented growth would result in fewer environmental impacts compared to more distributed growth patterns. The updated centers framework continues to support VISION 2040’s policies that support center-based development patterns at multiple scales throughout the region, where centers develop as thriving, equitable, connected communities. While the updated framework may ultimately support the designation or recognition of some new center places, those places will continue to be within the designated urban area, and due to the updated criteria, will largely be locations within cities, supported by transit, and that have greater access to housing, employment, and public services.

The change the Regional Centers Framework does not change VISION 2040’s Regional Growth Strategy or require amendments to the types and locations of regional geographies, although changes could be contemplated in the update to VISION 2040.

The SEPA Responsible Official concludes that the updated Regional Centers Framework is consistent with VISION 2040 and would not create new significant adverse environmental impacts beyond those addressed in the 2006 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and 2008 Final Environmental Impact Statement. For proposed new centers, further environmental review is required as part of the designation process.
INFORMATION ITEM

January 25, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board

From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager

Subject: VISION 2050 Public Engagement Plan

IN BRIEF

PSRC is developing a public engagement plan for VISION 2050. While this is provided as an information item, comments on the attached draft plan are welcome at the meeting if time permits.

BACKGROUND

PSRC is developing a public engagement plan to guide engagement efforts during the VISION 2050 planning process. In developing the draft public engagement plan, PSRC staff reviewed the engagement efforts undertaken during the development of VISION 2040 and more recent PSRC plan updates, and tools and best practices that have emerged since VISION 2040 was adopted in 2008, including social media and a greater focus on equitable engagement.

The plan includes goals and strategies for reaching a wide range of stakeholders to solicit substantive input throughout the VISION 2050 process. To meet these goals, PSRC plans to use a variety of tools and techniques, including direct engagement, digital and electronic materials, printed materials, and meetings and interagency coordination. The plan must also comply with PSRC’s Public Participation Plan, and federal and state requirements.

PSRC plans to reach diverse audiences through ongoing engagement work and efforts specific to VISION 2050. Many of PSRC’s ongoing outreach efforts will feed into the VISION 2050 engagement work, including board and committee meetings, the agency website, email communications, and PSRC participation at countywide and regional forums. Direct engagement, such as public meetings and workshops, present opportunities to work more closely with the public, including historically underrepresented communities. PSRC plans to host a variety of events throughout the planning process and staff are also reaching out to community based organizations, advocacy groups, and service providers to identify opportunities for PSRC to present at established community meetings. Direct engagement opportunities will begin with the release of the draft scoping statement in early February 2018.
The public engagement plan is a living document that will be updated as new and enhanced opportunities or resources for engagement are identified. As engagement occurs, this document will be updated into a final version available at the completion of VISION 2050. PSRC staff are also available to periodically brief the Board on engagement efforts.

For more information, please contact Laura Benjamin at lbenjamin@psrc.org or (206) 464-7134 or Maggie Moore at mmoore@psrc.org or (206) 464-6171.

Attachments:
A - DRAFT VISION 2050 Engagement Plan
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Overview
This document provides an overview of public engagement and outreach efforts by the Puget Sound Regional Council for the 2020 update of VISION 2050. Since it was adopted in 2008, VISION 2040 has helped the region coordinate planning and prepare communities for growth. 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. The update provides an opportunity to understand growth and demographic change in the region, to learn from successes and challenges in implementing VISION 2040, and to consider emerging regional issues.

PSRC will extend VISION 2040 to VISION 2050 to accomplish these objectives:

• Build on VISION 2040’s current framework – goals, policies, and regional growth strategy – as the starting point for developing VISION 2050.
• Be bold. VISION 2050 will continue to be an ambitious strategy for a more sustainable region.
• Focus the update on select items that will advance the region toward VISION.
• Put in motion a set of actions and roles to realize the goals of VISION 2050.
• Reflect the diversity of the region – demographic, culture, income, geography, and economy.
• Look for opportunities to make VISION more accessible and usable.

This update to VISION 2050 will continue to ask and answer this central question:

*How should the region accommodate the anticipated growth of people and jobs while enhancing the environment and overall quality of life?*

Goals and Strategies
The following goals and objectives will guide the outreach process. They are subject to revision as appropriate.

**Goal 1:** Engage a wide range of stakeholders, including: the general public, elected officials, local jurisdiction staff, other public agencies, and interest groups.

**Strategies:**

• Ensure the public and the media have access to available information
• Involve appropriate groups in data collection, policy and technical analysis, recommendations, plan preparation, and plan adoption throughout the update process
• Provide information to PSRC committees and boards for review and feedback
• Keep the public informed about the schedule, tasks, and opportunities for input
• Use a variety of methods to obtain input
• Document how outreach efforts meet SEPA and PSRC Public Participation Plan requirements

**Goal 2:** Carry out a robust equitable engagement strategy that reaches a range of diverse communities, including: low income, minorities, persons with disabilities, persons with limited English proficiency, persons with limited literacy, rural populations, seniors, and veterans.

*Draft VISION 2050 Engagement Plan*
January 5, 2018
Strategies:

- Make connecting and engaging with PSRC simple and easy to understand
- Provide opportunities for targeted populations to engage in a variety of ways throughout the plan update process
- Help build long-term relationships, particularly with newly engaged community groups
- Educate about the role PSRC plays in regional growth, transportation, environmental, and economic planning
- Leverage existing relationships to aid outreach efforts
- Tailor outreach opportunities to fit the varying needs and abilities of stakeholders

Goal 3: Solicit substantive input on the VISION update. Build on public engagement carried out for other recent PSRC planning efforts, reducing redundancy, and focusing on obtaining new information.

Strategies:

- Coordinate with PSRC staff who led the Regional Transportation Plan outreach work to build on their efforts, and continue best practices
- Review past outreach materials and events to remove and/or revise unnecessary and ineffective past outreach practices
- Partner with community groups to develop and review outreach and informational materials to ensure questions are appropriate

Goal 4: Use new and innovative techniques such as a greater online/social media presence – go beyond traditional in-person workshops and open houses.

Strategies:

- Provide new and enhanced opportunities for stakeholders to engage remotely through online open houses and other web-based platforms
- Use social media platforms to showcase the central Puget Sound region and engage stakeholders in “fun” activities
- Use online analytics to assess the effectiveness of digital outreach opportunities and continually refine efforts to be as effective at reaching targeted populations as possible

Goal 5: Effectively communicate public input to the boards and incorporate that input into aspects of the plan update considered by the boards.

Strategies:

- Show how stakeholders can help inform the process
- Document public input in an easy to understand format that takes into consideration language and literacy needs
- Provide periodic summaries of input that represent the issues and considerations
- Include a feedback loop for those commenting to know how their comments will be addressed
Summary of Methods and Techniques

To meet these goals and strategies, PSRC will employ a range of tools and techniques which are standard procedure for regional outreach and are consistent with the PSRC Public Participation Plan. Communication and outreach activities are organized under four headings: 1) Direct Engagement, 2) Presentations and Meetings / Interagency Consultation, 3) Written and Printed Materials, 4) Digital and Electronic Materials, and 5) Other. Techniques to be employed throughout the plan update process are described below. An evaluation of the effectiveness of techniques will be included at the completion of the update process.

Direct Engagement

Public Opinion Survey
PSRC will work with a consultant to conduct a statistically valid survey to gather feedback from residents living in the central Puget Sound region regarding their opinions toward growth and growth-related topics including housing, environmental stewardship, access to services, and regional growth management planning and coordination. Survey results will help to inform the VISION 2040 update.

Equity engagement opportunity: Partner with community-based organizations to translate and distribute the survey to LEP residents and historically underrepresented communities. While the results of the second wave of the survey would not be statistically significant, they may highlight differences and similarities among different racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups across the region, and will provide an opportunity for equity communities and CBOs to engage in the plan update early in the process.

Location: NA/The survey will be fielded via phone and/or online, dependent on cost.
Timeframe: The survey will be fielded in early 2018, with results shared with PSRC staff by April 2018.
Audience: General public – central Puget Sound residents

Countywide Forums
PSRC staff will present at the countywide forums (staff groups and elected officials) to provide information on the plan update schedule, and specifically the scoping comment period. These presentations will provide an opportunity for feedback on the draft scope and provide stakeholders with
more information on future opportunities to provide feedback on the scope and throughout the plan update process. PSRC staff regularly attend countywide forums and these briefings are a part of ongoing engagement with the staff groups and elected officials. See Presentations and Meetings below for more information.

Location: Regular meetings places for countywide forums
Timeframe: February 2018
Audience: Local planning staff, local elected officials

**Countywide Scoping Listening Sessions**
Four listening sessions to provide in-person opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback on the draft scope. The sessions will also provide an opportunity to inform stakeholders on the update process, including schedule, timing, and resources available.

*Equity engagement opportunity: Leverage contacts at community-based organizations and work done for the Regional Transportation Plan to encourage participation by community members. Higher community member participation could be facilitated by hosting afternoon sessions and providing food, childcare, travel subsidies, and translation services.*

Location: One session per county (elaborate/clarify when available)
Timeframe: Four listening sessions will be held around the region during the 45-day scoping comment period.
Audience: Local planning staff, Tribes*, staff from CBOs and NGOs, community members.
*Tribal leaders and staff will be sent a letter with more information on the plan update and future engagement opportunities.

**2018 General Assembly**
Project launch. Share high level results of public opinion survey, and potentially photos from social media campaign.

Location: TBD
Timeframe: May 2018
Audience: PSRC members

**PSRC Board Event**
Members and alternates of the Growth Management Policy Board, Transportation Policy Board, Economic Development Board, and Executive Board will hold a special joint board meeting to review and discuss the Regional Growth Strategy. This will include an overview of the performance of the RGS since its adoption in 2008, alternatives, and the potential outcomes and costs and benefits of the proposed alternatives.

Location: PSRC
Timeframe: June 2018 Executive Board meeting
Audience: GMPB, TPB, EDB, EB members and alternates
Peer Networking Series Work Sessions
In lieu of the regular monthly 90-minute panel and group discussions, the Peer Networking Series will host quarterly three-hour work sessions on topics identified during scoping. These work sessions will provide local planning staff with information, tools, and resources on the identified topics, and an opportunity for participants to share their thoughts on actions and strategies to address these issues regionally. The feedback received at the Peer Networking sessions will help to inform the extended work sessions the Growth Management Policy Board will hold on these same topics.

Location: PSRC and webinar
Timeframe: May 17, September 20, and November 15, 2018
Audience: Local planning staff, key stakeholders for each work session topic

GMPB Work Sessions
Multiple work sessions will be held to engage the board on specific topics related to the plan. These topics will be determined as the plan develops and as identified during scoping. The work sessions will provide opportunities for “deep dives” for board members to discuss topics and potentials ways to address them in the plan update.

Location: PSRC
Timeframe: July 5, September 6, and November 1, 2018
Audience: GMPB members and alternates

Regional Engagement Events
PSRC will host two half-day events at off-site locations to provide an opportunity for a diverse group of stakeholders to discuss key issues identified in the scope. These roundtable discussions will allow stakeholders from various sectors to talk to directly with one another and to develop and refine potential actions and strategies to address regional issues. This feedback will be shared with the GMPB and may help to inform the draft updates to the policies and actions in the plan.

*Equity engagement opportunity:* Leverage contacts at community-based organizations and work done for the Regional Transportation Plan to encourage participation by community members. Higher community member participation could be facilitated by hosting afternoon events and providing food, childcare, travel subsidies, and translation services.

Location: TBD, preferably one event in south Snohomish County and a second event in the Tacoma area.
Timeframe: Fall 2018
Audience: Elected officials, CBOs, NGOs, resource agencies, Tribes, community members, business and trade representatives

2019 General Assembly
Provide a general update on the status of the plan. Share relevant data and findings, and success stories as appropriate.

Location: TBD
Timeframe: Spring 2019
Audience: PSRC members

Draft Plan Feedback Sessions
Four sub-regional events will take place around the region to present the draft plan and solicit feedback from local stakeholders. The feedback sessions will also provide an opportunity to inform stakeholders on the update process, including schedule, timing, and upcoming hearings and additional opportunities to provide formal comment and feedback.

Equity engagement opportunity: Leverage contacts at community-based organizations and work done for the Regional Transportation Plan to encourage participation by community members. Higher community member participation could be facilitated by hosting afternoon sessions and providing food, childcare, travel subsidies, and translation services.

Location: One session per county (elaborate/clarify when available)
Timeframe: Summer 2019 (elaborate/clarify when available)
Audience: local planning staff, Tribes, staff from CBOs and NGOs

Online Open House
PSRC will develop and host an online open house to showcase the draft plan. The open house will be live during the 45-day comment period and will provide stakeholders and the general public an opportunity to review the draft plan materials on their own time and at their own pace and to provide feedback via comment boxes. The online open house will provide the same information as the draft plan feedback sessions.

Equity engagement opportunity: Leverage contacts at community-based organizations and work done for the Regional Transportation Plan to encourage participation by community members. This may include translating the website and including information on the website in various community newsletters.

Location: NA/ Open house will be hosted online
Timeframe: Summer 2019, during 45-day draft comment period
Audience: General public

Public Hearing
Hold a public hearing pursuant to SEPA and agency requirements.

Location: TBD
Timeframe: Summer 2019, at conclusion of 45-day draft comment period
Audience: General public

Presentations & Meetings / Interagency Consultation
Board and Committee Meetings
PSRC will provide regular briefings and presentations to boards and standing committees throughout the planning process.
The Regional Staff Committee will play a key role in the planning process. The committee is composed of the region’s lead planning, public works, and transportation professionals and provides valuable insight and recommendations to PSRC staff, as well as providing direct input to the Growth Management Policy Board. In addition, PSRC will engage a subgroup of RSC members and other technical and subject matter experts during summer 2018 to help define and refine alternatives to the Regional Growth Strategy.

A list of key PSRC boards, committees, and groups is included in Table 1.

Table 1. PSRC Boards, Committees, and Advisory Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSRC BOARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board (EB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Committee (OC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Policy Board (TPB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management Policy Board (GMPB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development District Board (EDD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSRC ADVISORY GROUPS AND COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Staff Committee (RSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional TOD Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Technical Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Committees as needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Forums

In addition to consulting with the agency’s organizational and advisory committee structure, PSRC staff regularly attends other regional policy and advisory group meetings.

King County

Growth Management Planning Committee
Interjurisdictional Team
King County Panning Directors
Project Evaluation Committee
Sound Cities Association

Kitsap County

Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
Land Use Technical Advisory Committee
Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
Pierce County
Pierce County Regional Council
Growth Management Coordinating Committee
Transportation Coordinating Committee

Snohomish County
Snohomish County Tomorrow
Planning Advisory Committee
Infrastructure Coordinating Committee

Each of these forums may also have technical and policy subcommittees or advisory groups that inform their work. PSRC staff regularly present to and meet with both the formal forum groups and their subgroups.

Tribal Outreach
PSRC continues to seek ways to improve engagement with Tribal Nations consistent with the Tribal Consultation Best Practices Guide for Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations in Washington State. Engagement efforts will be documented here.

Environmental Resource Agencies
Engagement with state and federal environmental and resource agencies will be documented here.

Engagement with Community Partners
The Community Partners are a group of local stakeholders established during the update to the Regional Transportation Plan to provide guidance on outreach to equity communities and to identify opportunities for collaboration with community groups. PSRC will continue to work with the Community Partners and leverage CBOs identified and relationships developed during the Regional Transportation Plan.

An Ad Hoc group consisting of a subgroup of the Community Partners and other interested parties may be assembled to assist with the development of a screening tool to analyze equity in proposed policies.

Written and Printed Materials
Environmental Documents
Documents will be distributed in accordance with SEPA. This process will be documented here.

Public Comment
Public comment will be encouraged throughout the entire planning process, with two 45-day public comment periods during Scoping and the release of the Draft Plan/SEIS. Comments will be accepted by email, mail, fax, and in person. Comments will be available on the PSRC website.

Media Relations
PSRC uses media relations to get the word out to a broad and diverse audience of readers throughout the four counties. News releases are distributed to area media.

Periodic Mailings and Postings
When the Draft Plan and Supplemental EIS are released, PSRC will distribute the documents in hard copy and electronic form as needed. Electronic copies of the draft documents will be emailed to Executive
Board, Transportation Policy Board, and Growth Management Policy Board members. Regional Staff Committee members will be emailed the draft plan in electronic format. All documents will be made readily available on the PSRC website. The five major area libraries will receive hard copies of Draft and Final Plan and SEPA documents.

**Digital and Electronic Materials**

**PowerPoint Presentations**

PowerPoint presentations are the primary visual medium for communicating information about the VISON 2050 Update to boards, committees, and outside stakeholder groups. Throughout the planning process, PowerPoint slide presentations featuring bullet points, diagrams, tables, and charts will be used to illustrate information about the process, schedule, analyses, and decisions. These presentations will be posted on the PSRC website.

**Blog and Social Media**

PSRC maintains a blog and social media accounts to provide up-to-date information to the public:

- Blog: [https://www.psrc.org/whats-happening](https://www.psrc.org/whats-happening)
- Facebook: [https://www.facebook.com/PugetSoundRegionalCouncil](https://www.facebook.com/PugetSoundRegionalCouncil)
- Twitter: [https://twitter.com/SoundRegion](https://twitter.com/SoundRegion)
- Instagram: [http://www.instagram.com/soundregion](http://www.instagram.com/soundregion)

**Email**

PSRC maintains an email list of members and interested parties, including environmental justice populations, resource agencies and community based organizations. This list of nearly 7,000 receives updates on PSRC’s work nearly every week.

Email is widely used as the primary communication tool to inform and remind members of meeting times, distribute agendas and documents, announce the release of important documents and request their review and comment during comment periods, direct members to the website, and provide additional information related to the process.

**At Work**

PSRC summarizes what occurred at the meetings of the Executive Board, Transportation Policy Board, Growth Management Policy Board, and Economic Development Board. These summaries are available on the PSRC website.

**Website**

The PSRC website at [psrc.org](http://psrc.org) offers a variety of resources to inform the public and invite participation in the outreach effort. The website is used to announce meetings, events and publicize key junctures in the planning process schedule. In addition, the website offers links to related background materials, and draft and final reports and plans.

**Web Streaming of Meetings**

Other

Systematic Documentation of Public Comments
Public comment will be solicited and documented throughout the planning process.

Public participation framework for PSRC
The PSRC Public Participation Plan for the Puget Sound Regional Council (adopted in 1994 and most recently updated in 2017) specifically outlines the public review process the agency must conduct to prepare regional plans pursuant to state and federal laws including the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

According to the agency’s public participation plan, PSRC may employ a variety of notification and participation procedures to encourage "early and continuous" involvement of individuals, jurisdictions, communities, and other interests in the planning and decision-making processes of the Regional Council. The agency’s public participation plan also allows PSRC to conduct additional outreach efforts as appropriate to provide opportunities for involvement including workshops, open houses, forums, and other events.

Public involvement is essential for ensuring that the adopted policies and strategies in VISION 2050 are consistently represented and addressed throughout the region and in all PSRC planning and project funding. This commitment relies on a variety of methods and techniques to reach out to the wide range of people, groups, organizations, partner agencies, stakeholders, and member agencies with an interest in this update.

Overview of Requirements

PSRC’s Desired Outcomes for its Public Participation – Public Participation Plan
- Receive public input on PSRC’s activities and decisions
- Share information with a broad cross-section of the public
- Ensure notification and participation of all populations, including people of color, low-income and special needs groups
- Increase overall awareness of regional planning activities
- Ensure planning decisions incorporate the concerns, needs, and visions of the region

PSRC Title VI Plan – January 2016
- Title VI and Executive Order 12898 addressing environmental justice populations
- The 1994 USDOT Order to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- The 1998 FHWA Actions to address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- The 1999 FHWA and FTA Memorandum Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan Planning

SEPA – Environmental Review - SAFETEA-LU Section 6001 (2005)
• **WAC 197-11-620** Supplemental EIS Procedures

• **Additional documentation** for SEPA public involvement – scoping period, comment period, public hearing

**FTA C 4703.1 – Environmental Justice Policy Guidance**

**FTA C 9070.1G - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities**

Must include participation by stakeholders identified in the law: seniors; individuals with disabilities; representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human service providers; and other members of the public.

**Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) (2015)**

Section 1201 addressing resource agencies and tribes.  
USC Title 23, Section 134(5)(A)

**Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)**

Individuals requiring reasonable accommodations may request written materials in alternate formats, sign language interpreters, physical accessibility accommodations, or other reasonable accommodations by contacting the ADA Coordinator.

**Detailed Requirements**

**Washington State SEPA Requirements** – WAC 197-11-620 Supplemental EIS Procedures

(1) An SEIS shall be prepared in the same way as a draft and final EIS (WAC 197-11-400 to 197-11-600), except that scoping is optional. The SEIS should not include analysis of actions, alternatives, or impacts that is in the previously prepared EIS.

(2) The fact sheet and cover letter or memo for the SEIS shall indicate the EIS that is being supplemented.

(3) Unless the SEPA lead agency wants to prepare the SEIS, an agency with jurisdiction which needs the SEIS for its action shall be responsible for SEIS preparation.

**Environmental / Resource Agency Outreach - SAFTEA-LU Section 6001 (2005)**

• Continuing, Cooperative, and Comprehensive planning process

• Consultation with federal, state, tribal, and local agencies
  - Land use management
  - Natural resources
  - Environmental protection
  - Conservation
  - Historic preservation

• Review and comparison of the evolving transportation plan with:
  - State and tribal conservation plans and maps
  - Inventories of natural and historic resources
• Discuss potential mitigation activities in consultation with federal, state, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies
• Include equity as one of the criteria for evaluating plan alternatives.

**PSRC Title VI Plan**
• Title VI and Executive Order 12898 addressing environmental justice populations
• The 1994 USDOT Order to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
• The 1998 FHWA Actions to address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
• The 1999 FHWA and FTA Memorandum Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan Planning

**FTA C 4703.1 – Environmental Justice Policy Guidance**
FTA/ FHWA joint planning regulations for public engagement require seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income, minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services. This includes requirements for where to hold public meetings and the methods of engagement to use:
  o Hold public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times
  o Employ visualization techniques to describe plans
  o Make public information available in electronically accessible formats

**Fixing America’s Surface Transportation System (FAST Act) (2015)**
Section 1201 addressing resource agencies and tribes. The fundamental principles of Section 1201 are:
• Planning process shall be continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive
• Develop plan in consultation with federal, state, tribal, and local agencies in charge of:
  • Land use management
  • Natural resources
  • Environmental protection
  • Conservation
  • Historic preservation
• Review and comparison of the evolving transportation plan with:
  • State and tribal conservation plans and maps
  • Inventories of natural and historic resources
• Discuss potential mitigation activities in consultation with federal, state, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies
• Include equity as one of the criteria for evaluating plan alternatives
Compliance

Consistency with PSRC’s Public Participation Plan

1. Ensure notification and participation of all populations, including people of color, low-income and special needs groups. Examine and refine the agency’s public involvement process to ensure full and fair participation in decision-making.

2. Plan review allows for 45-day public comment period.

Compliance with Addressing Resource Agencies and Tribes
Section 1201 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) for addressing resource agencies and tribes was carried forward into the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The following identifies the fundamental principles of Section 1201:

- Planning process shall be continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive
- Develop plan in consultation with federal, state, tribal, and local agencies in charge of:
  - Land use management
  - Natural resources
  - Environmental protection
  - Conservation
  - Historic preservation
- Review and compare the evolving plan with:
  - State and tribal conservation plans and maps
  - Inventories of natural and historic resources
- Discuss potential mitigation activities in consultation with Federal, State, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies

Compliance with Environmental Justice Requirements
FTA/ FHWA joint planning regulations for public engagement require seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income, minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services. This includes requirements for where to hold public meetings and the methods of engagement to use:

- Hold public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times
- Employ visualization techniques to describe plans
- Make public information available in electronically accessible formats

Compliance with Special Needs
FTA C 9070.1G - Enhanced Mobility Of Seniors And Individuals With Disabilities must include participation by stakeholders identified in the law: seniors; individuals with disabilities; representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation and human service providers; and other members of the public.

Compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)
PSRC uses SEPA to guide its environmental review for key decision-making. A supplemental EIS [WAC 197-11-620] adds information and analysis to supplement the information in a previous EIS. It may address new alternatives, new areas of likely significant adverse impact, or add additional analysis to
areas not adequately addressed in the original document. VISION 2040 will provide the foundation for VISION 2050; therefore, the EIS for VISION 2040 will provide the foundation for the SEPA analysis of VISION 2050 and a supplemental EIS will be prepared. A supplemental EIS includes a draft (with comment period) and a final document, which essentially follows the same requirements as a draft EIS and final EIS. Although scoping for a supplemental EIS [WAC 197-11-400 to 600] is optional, there will be a scoping period for VISION 2050.

SEPA procedures adopted by PSRC require that whenever PSRC issues a determination of nonsignificance (DNS) under WAC 197-11-340(2) or a determination of significance (DS) under WAC 197-11-360(3), PSRC shall give public notice of the availability of those documents on PSRC’s website, give notice to the entities listed in WAC 197-11-340(2)(b), and give notice to anyone who has specifically requested in writing to be notified about the particular proposal. Those notification steps will also be followed whenever PSRC issues a DEIS under WAC 197-11-455 or a SEIS under WAC 197-11-620, or whenever PSRC proposes to change its adopted SEPA procedures. In the case of a DEIS, PSRC will also give notice to anyone who submitted comments during the scoping process. In the case of an SEIS, PSRC will also give notice to anyone who submitted comments on the EIS being supplemented. Whenever PSRC issues an FEIS under WAC 197-11-460, notice of the availability of the FEIS shall be given on PSRC’s website and provided to all agencies with jurisdiction, to anyone who commented on the DEIS, to anyone requesting a copy of the FEIS, and to those who received but did not comment on the DEIS. Whenever PSRC issues an Addendum under WAC 197-11-625, notice of the availability of the Addendum shall be given on PSRC’s website and provided to recipients of the initial DEIS or FEIS being addended.

The PSRC SEPA notification procedures listed above may be supplemented by issuing a news release to major newspapers and news outlets and other notification techniques, such as sending a postcard, newsletter, publication, or email. When undergoing a SEPA process, PSRC often works with an environmental planning group to gain an understanding of the environmental issues and implications of the planning process. This group includes representatives from federal, state, local and tribal environmental and resource agencies.
IN BRIEF

In January 2018, staff presented the PSRC’s latest regional macroeconomic forecast to the Executive Board. The updated forecast has been extended out to the year 2050 and establishes the long-range growth assumptions for VISION 2050.

This memo provides the Growth Management Policy Board with an overview of key highlights from the provisional (final draft) forecast. A link to the Executive Board presentation is provided here.

DISCUSSION

PSRC’s macroeconomic forecast is a long-range forecast of projected jobs, population, households, and other economic and demographic variables at the regional scale. PSRC refreshes this forecast every 2-4 years and has been working with the economic consulting firm ECONorthwest (Portland, OR) to update and refine our model and extend the forecast out to the year 2050 for the first time.

The macroeconomic forecast provides big-picture regional “control total” inputs to PSRC’s land use, travel demand, and other downstream models and tools. It also establishes the future growth assumptions that will be used to support the development of the VISION 2050 plan, including extension of the regional growth strategy out to 2050 as well as environmental analysis of the VISION plan alternatives.

2050 Population and Employment

The region is projected to reach a total of 5.8 million people and 3.4 million jobs by the year 2050. This translates into an additional 1.8 million people and 1.2 million jobs being added to the region between now and 2050.
The jobs forecast reflects a slight upward increase from our previous series, attributable to the strength of the regional economy relative to the broader U.S. economy in the recovery period from the Great Recession. The population forecast reflects a more substantial upward adjustment from the previous series, in part due to the higher jobs forecast but primarily due to model adjustments that better account for the relationship between job growth, the workforce population, and the aging of the boomer generation in the forthcoming decades.

Seniors as a share of the region’s total population nearly doubles from 2000 to 2030, when the last baby boomer crosses the threshold into retirement age. The revised forecast better reflects the resulting bump in the 65+ age cohort as well as an increase in the 20-64 age cohort due to in-migration by working age adults to meet the labor force demands of the growing regional economy.

2050 Households and Household Size

The region is projected to add 830,000 households to reach a total of 2.4 million households by the year 2050. Average household size (or persons-per-household ratio), which has been relatively stable over the last two and a half decades, is anticipated to begin declining again as boomers age and the number of empty-nester and one-person households increases. Decreasing fertility rates also contribute to this trend. A smaller persons-per-household ratio translates into a greater demand for housing to meet the needs of a growing population.

NEXT STEPS

The Regional Staff Committee will be briefed on the updated regional macroeconomic forecast at their meeting in February 2018. The forecast is expected to be finalized in spring 2018, and will establish the growth assumptions that will inform VISION 2050 planning work moving forward.

For more information, please contact Craig Helmann at (206) 389-2889, CHelmann@psrc.org or Michael Jensen at (206) 464-7538, MJensen@psrc.org.
INFORMATION ITEM

January 25, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Diana Lauderbach, Chief Financial Officer
Subject: Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget and Work Program FY2018-FY2019

IN BRIEF


BACKGROUND

Last May, the Puget Sound Regional Council’s General Assembly adopted a two-year budget and work program which runs from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2019. The adopted biennial budget includes the option for adjustment after the first year with a supplemental budget. The Operations Committee has primary responsibility for developing the supplemental budget and work program.

The draft supplemental budget is a steady-state budget with no overall changes in revenues and expenditures as shown in Tables 1-8. A full draft budget is available online: https://www.psrc.org/about/budget.

According to the schedule on page 28 of the published Biennial Budget and Work Program, beginning February through March 2018, information on the draft supplemental budget will be made available to the Executive Board, Transportation Policy Board, Growth Management Policy Board, Economic Development Board and Regional Staff Committee.

The Operations Committee will prepare a recommended Supplemental Budget and Work Program for final consideration and recommendation by the Executive Board in March or April 2018, and adoption by the General Assembly in May 2018.

If you have any questions, please contact Diana Lauderbach at 206-464-5416 or dlauderbach@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - Draft Supplemental Budget Tables 1-8
### Table 1 - Revenue Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Funding</th>
<th>Proposed Supplemental FY2018-2019</th>
<th>October-17 Amended FY2018-2019</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$15,733,000</td>
<td>$15,733,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds, EDD and Service Income</td>
<td>$4,404,000</td>
<td>$4,441,000</td>
<td>($37,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover (a)</td>
<td>$5,672,000</td>
<td>$5,635,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement Reimbursement Carryover</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Federal/Local Anticipated</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 - Expenditure Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Funding</th>
<th>Proposed Supplemental FY2018-2019</th>
<th>October-17 Amended FY2018-2019</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries (b)</td>
<td>$11,493,000</td>
<td>$11,505,000</td>
<td>($12,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (c)</td>
<td>$7,107,000</td>
<td>$7,108,000</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$3,854,000</td>
<td>$3,854,000</td>
<td>($0,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>s+b+oh</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,454,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,467,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>($13,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>$874,000</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$1,399,000</td>
<td>$1,424,000</td>
<td>($25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>($0,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encumbered for Future Work</td>
<td>$596,000</td>
<td>$587,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Reserve PSRC</td>
<td>$1,583,000</td>
<td>$1,583,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 - Staffing Comparison by Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Growth Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Range Transportation Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Range Transportation/PSRC Funding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development District (d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Relations and Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services (e)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(a) Carryover are available funds that remain unspent in the previous budget cycle and can be used in the next budget cycle.
(b) Includes all agency staff salaries for the two year period. Assume 3% merit pool first year and 3% merit pool second year.
(c) Benefits include vacation, sick leave, holiday, retirement medical, dental, short and long term disability, life, a deferred compensation plan, etc.
(d) Staffing reduced due to restructuring of roles.
(e) Administrative Services include: Finance, HR, IT, Information Center, and Graphics.
Any and all lobbying will be paid with local funds.
### Table 4 - Revenue Comparison by Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant and Local Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Planning Org (c)</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$1,226,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (MPO) and</td>
<td>$3,094,000</td>
<td>$3,094,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (MPO)</td>
<td>$8,479,000</td>
<td>$8,479,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Planning funds</strong></td>
<td>$12,799,000</td>
<td>$12,799,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA/5307 (a)</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated STP (a)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA/5310</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Project Funds</strong></td>
<td>$3,950,000</td>
<td>$3,950,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Membership Dues</td>
<td>$3,113,000</td>
<td>$3,113,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD Membership Dues</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Membership Dues</strong></td>
<td>$3,386,000</td>
<td>$3,386,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Agency Dues</td>
<td>$998,000</td>
<td>$998,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Local Funding (b)</strong></td>
<td>$4,384,000</td>
<td>$4,384,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant and Local Revenue Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$21,133,000</td>
<td>$21,133,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Specific Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiDAR</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle - Household Survey</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redmond - Household Survey</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Endowment for Forestry</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Integration Grant - WSDOT</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Project Specific Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPSEDD Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSEDD - EDA Planning Grant</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSEDD - IMCP Carryover</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$57,000 ($37,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD/OEA Match Carryover</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal CPSEDD Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$257,000 ($37,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover PSRC</td>
<td>$5,672,000</td>
<td>$5,635,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement Allowance Carryforward</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Funding Total</strong></td>
<td>$27,090,000</td>
<td>$27,090,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA Anticipated</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated MPO</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Funding Total</strong></td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$27,521,000</td>
<td>$27,521,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) FTA5307 and Estimated STP funding increase beginning FY2019
(b) Dues Increase in 2018 and 2019
(c) RTPO based on December 2017 WSDOT funding estimate
Table 5 - Distribution of Matching funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Funding Match</th>
<th>Proposed Supplemental FY2018-2019</th>
<th>October-17 Amended FY2018-2019</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration combined</td>
<td>$1,806,000</td>
<td>$1,806,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal - FTA 5307</td>
<td>$563,000</td>
<td>$563,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal STP</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD - Matched with EDD Dues</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Endowment for Forestry</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Integration Grant - WSDOT</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Funding Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA Anticipated</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Federal</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated MPO</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Local Dues</td>
<td>$1,048,000</td>
<td>$924,000</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,111,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,111,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 - FY2018-2019 Expenditure Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>SALARIES BENEFITS</th>
<th>OVERHEAD*</th>
<th>DIRECT COST</th>
<th>CONSULTANTS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Budget FY2018-2019 TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>$762,000</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>$1,304,000</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>- $2,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259</td>
<td>LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>$2,915,000</td>
<td>$1,560,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>- $4,964,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>$1,418,000</td>
<td>$759,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>- $2,213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>- $518,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>$5,003,000</td>
<td>$2,679,000</td>
<td>$256,000</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>50,000 $8,503,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>$1,411,000</td>
<td>$755,000</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
<td>$50,000 $2,592,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>$1,169,000</td>
<td>$626,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>16,000 $2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>$542,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $1,085,000</td>
<td>$1,627,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $1,583,000</td>
<td>$1,583,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,814,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,640,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$874,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,399,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,784,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overhead includes Administrative Staff, Direct Costs, and Consultants associated with Finance, Human Resources, Information Technology, Graphics, and Information Center
# TABLE

## FY2018 & FY2019 Revenue Allocation (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>RTPO</th>
<th>FHWA Match 13.5%</th>
<th>FHWA Carryover</th>
<th>FHWA Carryover match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>819,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>663,000</td>
<td>359,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259</td>
<td>LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>663,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>298,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,409,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,432,000</td>
<td>224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,148,000</td>
<td>179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>FTPO</th>
<th>FTA 5310</th>
<th>STP 2018 Match 13.5%</th>
<th>EPA Watershed Carryover</th>
<th>EPA Watershed Carryover match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259</td>
<td>LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>EDD EDA grant Match (EDD Dues)</th>
<th>EDD Dues</th>
<th>IMCP Carryover</th>
<th>Tenant Improvement Carryover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-259</td>
<td>LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>SHORT RANGE TRANSPORTATION/PSRC FUNDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>COUNCIL SUPPORT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT RELATIONS &amp; COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>ENCUMBRANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>CONTINGENCY/RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**
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## REVENUE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTA5303 Local Match 13.5%</th>
<th>FTA5307 Match 20.0%</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover Match</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover Match</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover Match</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover Match</th>
<th>FTA 5307 Carryover Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>1,345,000</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,046,000</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,367,000</td>
<td>213,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>905,000</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,094,000</td>
<td>483,000</td>
<td>327,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>563,000</td>
<td>182,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSTC Carryover</th>
<th>PSTC PSRC Carryover Match</th>
<th>PSTC Transit Carryover Match</th>
<th>Seattle HH Carryover Match</th>
<th>Redmond HH Carryover Match</th>
<th>LiDAR Carryover Match</th>
<th>SHRP 2 Carryover Match</th>
<th>SHRP 2 Carryover Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carryover Local</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Basic Funding Subtotal</th>
<th>Federal Anticipated</th>
<th>Federal Match Anticipated</th>
<th>Anticipated and match Subtotal</th>
<th>FY2018-19 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,187,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>4,964,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,964,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,213,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,213,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>8,453,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>8,503,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td>2,542,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,592,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>1,984,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>1,192,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>444,000</td>
<td>1,636,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,252,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>1,583,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,583,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,770,000</td>
<td>1,379,000</td>
<td>26,961,000</td>
<td>431,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>27,321,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 3,094,000

**Notes:**
- The table presents revenue allocation for FY2018 & FY2019.
- Local Match funding is allocated for various projects and matched by the federal government.
- Budget allocations are spread across different categories such as PSTC, PSRC, Transit, Seattle HH, Redmond HH, LiDAR, and SHRP 2.
- The table includes columns for basic funding, federal anticipated, federal match, anticipated and match subtotal, and FY2018-19 budget.
- Additional notes on budgeting and allocation strategies are included in the document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Grant Funds Remaining</th>
<th>Contractual Remaining</th>
<th>Other Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>2,305,739</td>
<td>247,660</td>
<td>2,058,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5303*</td>
<td>326,963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>326,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>182,443</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>182,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA Healthy Watershed Consortium</td>
<td>141,624</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>141,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Transit Coordination (PSTC)</td>
<td>247,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTC - Transit Agency Match</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle Household Survey</td>
<td>131,899</td>
<td>116,260</td>
<td>15,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redmond Household Survey</td>
<td>29,736</td>
<td>25,065</td>
<td>4,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDA IMCP</td>
<td>19,020</td>
<td>19,455</td>
<td>(435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement</td>
<td>55,193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRP2</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,456,692</strong></td>
<td><strong>408,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,048,252</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover local match</td>
<td>520,278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover local funds</td>
<td>517,646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Reserve Carryover</td>
<td>1,252,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Carryover from FY2017</strong></td>
<td>$5,746,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less EDD Carryover</td>
<td>19,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSRC Carryforward</strong></td>
<td>$5,727,596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>