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Scope of Work

[...] 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.

Implements MPP-DP-6, DP-9, DP-12, Action-3, Action-5
Framework Update

119 board, committee, and outreach meetings

Workshops
Joint-board working sessions
Centers workshops in each county

Committees
Technical Advisory Group
Stakeholder Working Group

Reports + Documents
Scope of Work
Background Paper
Peer regions appendix
Military facilities appendix
Market Study
Stakeholder Working Group report
Equity Supplement + Proposal
Committee Outreach

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

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

Community
South Sound Military and Communities Partnership
Transportation Choices Community Partners meeting

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

**September 7**
- Social equity proposal
- Discuss + revise preliminary framework outline

**October 5**
- Reviewed and revised complete draft proposal
- Release for comment

**November 30**
- Reviewed comments & revisions, provided direction to staff

**January 4**
- Review comments & revisions, provided direction to staff
Draft Proposal
GMPB Discussion

- Support implementation & success of VISION 2040
- VISION seeks a “limited” number of regional centers
- Support centers we have & have already invested in
- Want system to be meaningful
- Need to be opportunities in each county
- Include performance standards and accountability
Draft Proposal

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

• Initial board proposal was a **hybrid** based on member interest

• The proposal carries forward and builds on **current centers framework**

• Proposal also addresses several **project objectives** identified by the board
Successful Centers

Current
- Some centers do not meet current standards
- Different expectations based on when designated

Draft Proposal
- Common expectations
- Additional time (2025) to achieve consistency
- Path to redesignate based on planning actions

Retain all existing centers, but make system more consistent

Increase focus on local planning to support regional centers

Market study to support new growth opportunities
Growth Centers

Recognize differences - tailor criteria for different types of centers

Guide future growth planning
Growth Centers

Current
One type
Primary focus on existing and planned density, commitment

Draft Proposal
Two types & consider other criteria:
- Transit
- Market potential
- Regional role
- Distribution & number of centers

Expand criteria beyond existing density
Focus on factors that can make centers successful
Industrial Centers

**Recognize differences - tailor criteria for different types of centers**

**Allow designation of new centers & long-term preservation of industrial land**
Support strategies in Industrial Lands Analysis

Expand criteria beyond minimum employment

Current
One pathway
Primary focus on existing and planned jobs, commitment

Draft Proposal
Two pathways & consider other criteria:
- Industrial zoning
- Job type
- Preservation strategies
Countywide Centers

Recognize role of smaller centers
Create shared understanding between counties
Implement VISION 2040 policy

Current
- No shared definition

Draft Proposal
- Shared criteria
- Recognize places beyond regional centers
Countywide Centers

Criteria for successful centers
Room for flexibility and tailoring at each county
Discretion for how each county organizes approach to centers

Current
No countywide designation two counties
Where present, criteria and designation vary

Draft Proposal
Criteria focus on:
  • Local priority
  • Mixed use, planning for growth
  • Multimodal options
  • Industrial zoning, retention
Military Installations

Based on Pierce County’s proposal, recognize major military installations in VISION 2050

Current
Not in VISION 2040
All installations eligible to be countywide centers

Draft Proposal
Recommend major installations in VISION 2040 update
Countywide designation for smaller installations

- Joint Base Lewis McChord
- Naval Base Everett
- Naval Base Kitsap
  - Bangor
  - Bremerton
**Other Highlights**

**Social Equity:** additional planning and guidance to advance equity

**Procedural Changes:** planning ahead of designation, update eligibility requirements

**Performance Measures:** periodic review of regional centers
Draft Framework

The draft proposal does not:

• Recommend higher or lower funding priority for different types of regional centers

• Recommend de-designating any existing regional centers in the VISION 2040 update

• Limit local governments from designating other types of local centers
## Comment Period

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

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

* Individual councilmember

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

### Individuals (7)
- Members of the public

+ 25 letters submitted before comment period
Proposed Amendments
The Growth Management Policy Board recommends the Executive Board approve and initiate implementation of the Regional Centers Framework Update.
## Proposed Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiated By</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Directed</td>
<td>Planning, Market Study, Mix of Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Manufacturing/Industrial types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>Military, Countywide Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Countywide Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Minor Technical Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Directed Changes

Plan Deadline
  o Clarify plan requirements
  o Plans should be substantially complete

Market Study
  o Clarify market study requirements + findings of study

Mix of Uses
  o Encourage mix of uses as a goal
Proposed Amendments

Sound Cities Amendment
1. Include names for different types of MICs

Pierce County Amendments
1. Funding for military installations
2. Remove standards for countywide centers
3. Add work plan item on identifying funding for base access projects
Proposed Amendments

King County Amendments

1. Countywide Growth – add planned mix of uses
2. Countywide Growth – add planned density threshold
3. Countywide Industrial – add minimum employment and/or acreage
Proposed Amendments

Port Amendments

• Three changes to reflect port input/collaboration on MIC plan updates

Minor Amendments (Considered as a group)

• Minor text/policy changes
• ID amendments for separate discussion
Thank you.