Growth Management Policy Board
Thursday, March 1, 2018 • 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
PSRC Board Room • 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104

The meeting will be streamed live over the Internet at www.psrc.org.

1. Call to Order (10:00) - Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair
2. Report of the Chair
3. Communications and Public Comment
4. Extended Public Comment for VISION 2050 Scoping Statement
5. Staff Report
6. Consent Agenda (10:40)
   a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting Held February 1, 2018
7. Action Item (10:45)
   a. Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for Milton -- Michael Hubner, PSRC
8. Action Item (10:50)
   a. Sumner-Pacific Request to Extend Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center Provisional Status -- Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
9. Discussion Item (10:55)
   a. 2050 Forecast of People and Jobs -- Carol Naito and Michael Jensen, PSRC
10. Discussion Item (11:10)
    a. Background for VISION 2050: Trends Shaping the Region -- Michael Hubner and Maggie Moore, PSRC
11. Discussion Item (11:40)
    a. Regional Growth Strategy Update Process -- Michael Hubner, PSRC
12. Information Item
    a. Transportation Technologies
13. Information Item
    a. VISION 2050 Project Principles
14. April 5, 2018, 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m., PSRC Boardroom
   Major Topic for April: VISION 2050
15. Adjourn (12:00)
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
February 1, 2018
PSRC Boardroom

[To watch a video of the meeting and hear the discussion, go to http://psrcwa.iqm2.com/Citizens/Detail_Meeting.aspx?ID=1647]

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Chair Mello.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR
Chair Mello announced the agenda order will be changed to move Item 9 (Regional Centers Framework Update) to before Item 8 (Regional Open Space Conservation Plan Update). There were no concerns about changing the order of the agenda.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS
No public comments.

STAFF REPORT
Senior Program Manager Paul Inghram highlighted the Information Items in the agenda packet including the 2050 forecast of people and jobs and the Draft Supplemental Biennial Budget. Mr. Inghram reminded the board that the VISION 2050 scoping notice is ready to be released on Friday, February 2 to begin the 45-day scoping period. Additionally, there will be four scoping listening sessions around the region during the scoping period.

CONSENT AGENDA
a. Approval of Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting held January 4, 2018

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Margeson/Holman) to adopt the Consent Agenda. The motion passed.

RECOMMEND FULL CERTIFICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR BONNEY LAKE AND ORTING
Associate Planner Laura Benjamin presented on comprehensive plan amendments from Bonney Lake and Orting. Both cities updated their plans to address certification conditions.
**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Gossett/Ryan) 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: Bonney Lake and Orting. The motion passed.

**RECOMMEND PUYALLUP EXTENSION**

Principal Planner Michael Hubner presented on the work the City of Puyallup has done to address certification conditions, and additional work planned for 2018.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Bader/Margeson) to 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. The motion passed.

**REGIONAL CENTERS FRAMEWORK UPDATE**

Senior Planner Liz Underwood-Bultmann reviewed background on the Regional Centers Framework Update project and provided an overview of the proposal under consideration by the board.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Margeson/O’Brien) to recommend the Executive Board approve and initiate implementation of the Regional Centers Framework Update.

After the motion was made, the board considered several amendments provided by members.

**Proposed Amendments:**

GMPB directed amendment 1 – 2020 Plan Timeline

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Margeson/Arnold) to amend on p. 9 the section below "Initial redesignation" as follows:

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 motion passed unanimously.
GMPB directed amendment 2 – Market Study Expectations

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Margeson/Arnold) to amend on p. 10 the Market Study section as follows:

[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 motion passed unanimously.

GMPB directed amendment 3 – Mix of Uses

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Margeson/O'Brien) to amend the table on p. 6 to:

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.

The motion passed unanimously.

SCA Requested Amendment – Name Different Types of MICs

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Margeson/Wheeler) to amend the table on p. 8 to:

Add names to the different manufacturing/industrial center pathways (see table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturing/Industrial Centers</th>
<th>Industrial Employment Center</th>
<th>Industrial Growth Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>

The motion passed unanimously.

Port Amendment 1 – Collaboration with Ports on Subarea Planning

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Felleman/O'Brien) to amend after “Planning” on p. 7 as follows:

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.

Councilmember O’Brien requested changing the word “collaboratively” to “in consultation with,” which Commissioner Felleman agreed to.

The agreed upon new amendment was:

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 in consultation with public ports and other affected governmental entities.

The motion passed unanimously.

Port Amendment 2 – Collaboration with Ports on Subarea Planning

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Felleman/O’Brien) to amend under “Initial redesignation” on p. 9 as follows:

Adopted center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) identified by 2020. Different approaches to subarea planning may be appropriate in some instances 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.

The motion passed unanimously.

Port Amendment 3 – Collaboration with Ports on Subarea Planning

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Felleman/O’Brien) to amend after “Planning” on page 10 as follows:

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.

Councilmember O’Brien requested changing the word “collaboratively” to “in consultation with” to match the Port Amendment 1, which Felleman agreed to. Deputy Mayor Arnold asked to include other language from the first line. Commissioner Felleman and Councilmember O’Brien agreed.

The agreed upon new amendment was:

An updated Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) that addresses regional guidance and plans for access to transportation infrastructure, and economic development. Where applicable, the plan should be developed in consultation with public ports and affected governmental entities.

The motion passed unanimously.
Pierce County Amendment 1 – Funding for Military Installations

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Young/Curtis) to amend text on p. 13 under Section 8. Military Installations as follows:

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.”

A roll call vote was taken: 12 No / 7 Yes – amendment failed.

Pierce County Amendment 2 – Countywide Centers Criteria

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Young/Wheeler) to amend on p. 16 under the section titled “6. Countywide Centers”, to delete the table titled “Countywide Centers” in its entirety and modify the second paragraph of the section as follows:

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.

A roll call vote was taken: 12 No / 7 Yes – amendment failed.

Chair Mello called for a break at 11:57 AM. The board reconvened at 12:07 PM.

Pierce County Amendment 3 – Military Installations Work Plan

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Young/Margeson) to amend on p. 16 under the section titled “12. Implementation”, to modify the fourth bullet from the end as follows:

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.

The motion passed unanimously.

King County Amendment 1 – Countywide Centers Mix of Uses

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Gossett/Kohl-Welles) to amend on p. 12 the left column, fourth bullet as follows:

Planning and zoning for a minimum mix of uses, including residential, 20 percent residential and 20 percent employment, unless unique circumstances make these percentages not possible to achieve.

The motion passed with a majority Yes vote. Two No votes were recorded from Councilmember Young and Councilmember Ryan.

King County Amendment 2 – Countywide Centers Planned Density

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Kohl-Welles/O'Brien) to amend on p. 12 the left column, fifth bullet as follows:

Capacity and planning for additional growth: A minimum planned activity unit density of 16 activity units per acre.

A roll call vote was taken: 9 No / 9 Yes / 1 Abstain – amendment failed.

King County Amendment 3 – Minimum Standard Countywide Industrial Centers

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Kohl-Welles/Margeson) to amend on p. 12 the right column, third bullet as follows:

Minimum 1,000 existing jobs and/or 500 acres of industrial land.

A roll call vote was taken: 11 Yes / 8 No – amendment passed.

Minor Technical Amendments

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Margeson/O'Brien) to adopt the following technical amendments:

On p. 6: Under "Manufacturing/industrial centers form a critical...", halfway through that sentence: “... economic diversity, supports national and international trade...”

On 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.”
On p. 7, under “Designation Procedures for New Centers,” after “Local commitment”: Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, strategies and incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and establish partnerships...

On p. 8, Footnote 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 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.”

On p. 10 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...”

On p. 12 add to both columns, a new first bullet:
Identified as a countywide center in the countywide planning policies

On p. 14 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.”

The motion passed unanimously.

Having voted on all proposed amendments, the board returned to the motion on the table as amended.

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Margeson/O'Brien) to recommend the Executive Board approve and initiate implementation of the Regional Centers Framework Update as amended.

The motion passed with one No vote from Councilmember Young.

REGIONAL OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION PLAN UPDATE

Senior Planner Erika Harris and Associate Planner/GIS Analyst Maria Sandercock presented on the released Regional Open Space Conservation Plan currently out for board review.

Ms. Harris and Ms. Sandercock reviewed the plan including nine strategies.

Strategy 1: Incorporate open space conservation into all levels of planning
Strategy 2: Support growth in the right places
Strategy 3: Keep working lands working
Strategy 4: Permanently protect remaining key habitat areas
Strategy 5: Enhance stewardship on privately owned lands
Strategy 6: Restore habitat in high value areas
Strategy 7: Coordinate planning among and within resource agencies and jurisdictions
Strategy 8: Increase connections between people and open space, with equitable access for all groups
Strategy 9: Build multi-benefit green infrastructure
Ms. Harris requested comments by March 8, 2018.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for March 1, 2018, and will focus on VISION 2050.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 1:03 PM.
GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARD Attendance Roster – February 1, 2018

GMPB MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT

Italicized = alternate

Patricia Akiyama, Master Builders Association – Business/Labor
Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold, Kirkland – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Councilmember Scott Bader, Metropolitan Center—Everett
Carson Bowlin, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Association – Business/Labor
Mayor John Chelminiak, Metropolitan Center—Bellevue (via remote)
Jeff Clarke, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
Councilmember Tim Curtis, Fife – Other Cities & Towns in Pierce County
Councilmember Scott Diener, Port Orchard - Other Cities & Towns in Kitsap County (via remote)
Mayor Allan Ekberg, Tukwila – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Lorena Eng, Transportation Agency - WSDOT
Commissioner Fred Felleman, Port of Seattle – Ports
Councilmember Larry Gossett, King County
Clayton Graham, Municipal League of King County – Business/Labor
Councilmember John Holman, Auburn – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Councilmember Rob Johnson, Metropolitan Center—Seattle
Councilmember Jeanne Kohl-Welles, King County
Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Peter Mayer, Metro Parks Tacoma – Community/Environment
Mark McCaskill, WA State Department of Commerce
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
Edna Shim, Seattle Children’s – Business/Labor
Councilmember Nancy Tosta, Burien – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Mayor Greg Wheeler, Metropolitan Center—Bremerton
Commissioner Edward Wolfe, Kitsap County
Bryce Yadon, Futurewise
Councilmember Derek Young, Pierce County (via remote)

GMPB MEMBERS ABSENT (*alternate present)

Dr. Anthony Chen, Pierce County Health – Community/Environment
Marty Kooistra, Housing Development Consortium Seattle/King County – C/E
*Commissioner Paul McIntyre, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
*Ilan Morrison, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Association – Business/Labor
Rob Purser, Suquamish Tribe
*Councilmember Michael Scott, Bainbridge Island – Other Cities & Towns in Kitsap County
*Councilmember Brian Sullivan, Snohomish County
Chip Vincent, Regional Staff Committee
GUESTS AND PSRC/STAFF PRESENT
(As determined by signatures on the attendance sheet and documentation by staff.)
Ben Bakkenta, PSRC
Laura Benjamin, PSRC
Leah Bolotin, WSDOT
Dan Cardwell, Pierce County
Carolyn Downs, PSRC
Erika Harris, PSRC
Michael Hubner, PSRC
Paul Inghram, PSRC
Kathryn Johnson, PSRC
Michael Kattermann, Bellevue
Kristin Mitchell, PSRC
Maggie Moore, PSRC
Ian Munce, Tacoma
Brian Parry, Sound Cities Association
Maria Sandercock, PSRC
Allison Satter, City of Bremerton
Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
Emily Wittman, PSRC
Karen Wolf, King County
Lindsay Wolpa, Port of Seattle/Northwest Seaport Alliance
ACTION ITEM

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager
Subject: Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for Milton

IN BRIEF

Consistent with PSRC’s adopted plan review process, staff recommends full certification of the 2018 comprehensive plan amendments for the City of Milton.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend that the Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board:

Recommend that the Executive Board Certify that the transportation-related provisions of the comprehensive plan for the City of Milton, as amended in 2018, are consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and conform to the Growth Management requirements for transportation planning. (certification report)

DISCUSSION

On January 28, 2016, PSRC conditionally certified the City of Milton’s 2015 periodic update of the comprehensive plan. Conditional certification allowed the city to qualify for PSRC managed federal funding while working to address the conditions. As a condition for full certification, the city was asked to amend the comprehensive plan to address inconsistencies between land use assumptions used in the plan and housing growth targets adopted by Pierce and King counties and make clear that all elements of the plan assume consistent 20-year growth in housing and jobs.

RCW 36.70A.130 requires that local comprehensive plan updates accommodate the growth projected to occur over the subsequent 20-year period. VISION 2040 (MPP-DP-3) calls for countywide adoption of housing and employment growth targets that promote the Regional Growth Strategy. MPP-T-9 calls for coordination of state, regional, and local transportation planning in support of that strategy. RCW 36.70A.070 requires the transportation element of local comprehensive plans to implement and be consistent with the land use element.
Located within two counties, the City of Milton plans for targets set in both King and Pierce counties. For the 20-year planning period in this update, the estimated combined housing target is 300 units and the employment target 1000 jobs.

The 2018 amendments clarify the basis for the land use assumptions and bring the household growth assumption in the land use, housing, and transportation elements into alignment with each other and with the adopted targets.

The amendments 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.

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

February 22, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board

From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager

Subject: Sumner-Pacific Request to Extend Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center Provisional Status

IN BRIEF

In February 2018, the cities of Sumner and Pacific submitted a request to extend their provisional center designation to April 2019 to allow one additional year to complete their joint center subarea plan. At its March 1 meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board will be asked to take action on the request.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Growth Management Policy Board should grant the requested one-year extension to the Sumner-Pacific center subarea plan requirement.

DISCUSSION

The Designation Procedures for New Regional Centers were updated and adopted by the PSRC Executive Board in September 2011. Per the procedures, new centers receive "provisional" status when designated until the city has adopted a center subarea plan into its comprehensive plan and the subarea plan has been certified by the Executive Board.

In December 2015, PSRC received an application from the cities of Sumner and Pacific to designate a new manufacturing/industrial center. In April 2016, the Executive Board acted to provisionally designate the Sumner-Pacific Manufacturing/Industrial Center. The designation letter to the cities specified the deadline for completing and submitting a subarea plan for certification as April 2018.

The cities describe their request in Attachment A. The cities have a consultant under contract to complete the plan and has completed background research, engaged with stakeholders and the business community, and convened a joint city council meeting and advisory committee. The cities have continued to work on floodplain management and salmon recovery along the White River. The joint planning process between the two cities and work on floodplain have added
complexity to the planning effort, and the cities have requested an additional year to complete the plan, extending the deadline to April 2019.

The Board has three options:

(1) Grant the extension per the deadline requested by the cities.
(2) Grant the extension based on an alternative timeline or with other conditions.
(3) Deny the request for extension.

The designation procedures state that a “provisional” center will lose its status as a regional center if the center subarea plan has not been adopted and submitted for review and certification after two years. Per the procedures, the Growth Management Policy Board has discretion to grant additional time for the cities to work with PSRC staff to address outstanding issues and meet the planning expectations. The cities appear to be making good progress towards completing the subarea planning requirement. Staff expect that the cities will be able to complete the remaining planning work within the additional time period requested and support the cities’ request.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Liz Underwood-Bultmann at LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org or 206-464-6174 or Paul Inghram at pinghram@psrc.org or 206-464-7549.

Attachments:
A - Sumner-Pacific MIC Subarea Plan Ext Letter 2-2-18
February 2, 2018

Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager, AICP
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue #500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

RE: Deadline Extension for Sumner-Pacific MIC Subarea Plan Submittal

Dear Paul:

In April 2016 the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) granted a “provisional” approval for the Sumner-Pacific Manufacturing/Industrial Center (SPMIC). The PSRC conditioned the approval on the completion of a subarea plan for the SPMIC that needed to address land use, environmental impacts and constraints particularly the development in the floodplain, and transportation and traffic impacts.

The cities of Sumner and Pacific, along with BERK Consulting and Community Attributes, Inc. have been working diligently and in good faith on the subarea plan. The work so far has included the following:

1. **Consultant Selection**
2. **Background Research.**
   - Completed a market analysis and buildable lands study to establish that the SPMIC has capacity for 20,000 employees
   - Prepared a draft existing conditions report
3. **Stakeholder and Business Outreach.** Held a community visioning workshop on October 5 and completed interviews, surveys and outreach to the business and residential community to gather input on the future needs and issues related to the MIC area
4. **City Councils.** Presentation and Visioning session at a Joint Council Meeting
5. **Advisory Committee.** Organized and convened an Advisory Committee made up of business and community members who will meet on a regular basis

Finally, we have been meeting monthly with the “White River Dialogue Group” which includes representatives from the tribes, Pierce County, City of Pacific and Department of Ecology. This group is tasked with working through the details of floodplain management and salmon recovery efforts along this stretch of the White River. The effort is funded by the state and was slow to start, but has been meeting regularly and making great progress. We anticipate having 30% designs by second quarter of 2018.
Given the need to continue meeting and working through the White River Dialogue Group effort, and to allow time for the Advisory Committee to meet regularly we are requesting additional time to complete the work. In addition, the subarea plan will require joint meetings and with both city councils and a parallel adoption process through both creating additional potential complexities and delays.

We are requesting that the deadline for completion of the subarea plan be extended to April 2019.

Please give me a call if you have further questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Ryan Windish, AICP
Community Development Director

Jack Dodge, AICP
Community Development Manager

Cc:
Radhika Nair, BERK Consulting, Inc.
DISCUSSION ITEM

February 22, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager
Subject: 2050 Forecast of People and Jobs

IN BRIEF

At its March meeting, staff will brief the Growth Management Policy Board on PSRC’s draft regional macroeconomic forecast that has been extended out to the year 2050 and establishes the long-range growth assumptions for VISION 2050.

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 population, employment, and household 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 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 draft forecast is expected to be finalized in late spring 2018, and will establish the growth assumptions that will inform VISION 2050 planning work moving forward.

For more information, please contact Carol Naito at (206) 464-7535, CNaito@psrc.org or Michael Jensen at (206) 464-7538, MJensen@psrc.org.
DISCUSSION ITEM

February 22, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager
Subject: Background for VISION 2050: Trends Shaping the Region

IN BRIEF

PSRC staff will present data on trends shaping the region as background to the VISION 2050 planning process.

DISCUSSION

A variety of information will help inform the scope for the VISION 2050 planning process, such as how the region has changed since the adoption of VISION 2040, major indicators of progress toward achieving the region’s stated goals, and data that highlight major issues facing the region that may benefit from additional regional planning and coordinated actions.

To support the scoping process, PSRC staff has identified major trends that have shaped the region in recent years. This background information for VISION 2050 addresses a range of policy areas, including trends related to people, the economy, housing, transportation, and the environment. PSRC staff will present data points as they relate to these topics, along with observations on how they may inform planning for 2050.

Specifically, the background information will address ten major trend topics:

1. **Population growth.** The region has welcomed a surge of new residents since 2010, reaching over 80,000 annually for the past two years.

2. **Racial diversity.** Minority residents comprise a growing share of the region’s population, a trend that has spread from central cities to many suburban communities.

3. **Aging population.** By the year 2030, 1 in 5 residents of the region will be 65 or over, double the share in the year 2000.

4. **Employment surge.** The region has added nearly 350,000 jobs since 2010, 86% of them in King and Snohomish counties.
5. **Changing economy.** Against a backdrop of broad job growth across sectors and counties since 2000, the mix of jobs gained and lost within each county is unique.

6. **Housing prices.** Regionally, home prices and rents have increased by 60% since 2012.

7. **Cost burden.** While rising housing costs affect many households across the region, low income renters bear the brunt of the impact, paying more than a third or even half of household income on housing.

8. **Freeway congestion.** Vehicle delay has surged across major freeway corridors in the region, especially I-5.

9. **Transit ridership.** For the 7th year in a row, more people are riding transit, including a recent jump in light rail riders with new Link stations opening, but also strong growth in bus and ferry boardings.

10. **Health of Puget Sound.** While the region has successfully implemented many actions to reduce impacts on the Sound, the population of orcas and other species are in decline, and several indicators of water and habitat quality show mixed or little improvement.

**NEXT STEPS**

PSRC will make these data available broadly through blog posts and on the VISION 2050 project website and will provide the board with additional data to support specific issue discussions.

For more information on this topic, please contact Michael Hubner, AICP, Principal Planner, (206) 971-3289, mhubner@psrc.org.
DISCUSSION ITEM

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

IN BRIEF

PSRC staff will provide an overview of a proposed approach to updating and extending the Regional Growth Strategy for VISION 2050. The board will be asked to provide direction on schedule, phases of work, and a process for the board to develop plan alternatives with support from the Regional Staff Committee.

DISCUSSION

VISION 2050 will extend the Regional Growth Strategy out another decade beyond the current plan horizon of 2040 to 2050. Development of this extended and updated strategy will incorporate lessons learned from efforts to implement the existing strategy along with future opportunities to focus growth within urban areas.

VISION 2040 promotes a desired pattern of population and employment growth throughout the central Puget Sound region. Specifically, the Regional Growth Strategy provides numeric guidance for each of the counties to establish 20-year growth targets, in coordination with their cities, for the purposes of comprehensive planning by each jurisdiction under the Growth Management Act (GMA).

The strategy reflects several principles in VISION 2040, including:
- Protecting the natural environment and resource lands
- Minimizing growth in the Rural area
- Focusing growth within Urban Growth Areas, cities, and centers
- Improving the balance of jobs and housing across the region
- Recognizing differences in each county
- Achieving a growth pattern that is efficient to serve with infrastructure
- Minimizing greenhouse gas emissions that affect the climate

During the scoping period for VISION 2050, the Growth Management Policy Board will initiate a collaborative process for considering the extension of the current strategy and any potential
modifications to it for environmental review in an anticipated Supplemental EIS. This process will begin in spring 2018 and extend through early 2019. At the March 1 meeting, PSRC staff will outline a proposed schedule for the work on the Regional Growth Strategy. This work is expected to occur in several phases, as follows:

**Spring 2018.** Review background on the Regional Growth Strategy. Review stakeholder input, relevant data, and analytic tools. Develop guiding principles and evaluation criteria. Develop a draft no action alternative. Support a potential extended board work session.

**Summer to Fall 2018.** Develop one or more growth scenarios for early evaluation. Consider modifications to the regional geography definitions.

**Fall 2018 to Winter 2019.** Evaluate growth scenarios as a basis for recommending a no action alternative along with one or more alternatives for environmental review. Consider potential actions to implement the growth strategy to be included in VISION 2050.

Extending the strategy to 2050 will involve important decisions about how and where the region will accommodate continued robust growth in population, housing, and employment. PSRC staff has been working to identify ingredients for the extension of the Regional Growth Strategy. These include relevant policies in VISION 2040, GMA goals and requirements, and recently updated local comprehensive plans. The VISION 2050 scoping process is gathering input from the public and stakeholders on the growth strategy and related issues, which will supplement information gleaned from regional plan certification and the assessment report of the last planning round, Taking Stock 2016. Finally, a variety of data and analytic steps will inform and shape the growth strategy, encompassing regional forecasts, development trends, land use capacity, transportation investments, environmental factors, social equity, and market conditions related to economic development and housing affordability.

One requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) is to define a limited range of alternatives for environmental analysis. The wide range of alternatives studied for the VISION 2040 Environmental Impact Statement provide a robust starting point.

- **No Action Alternative** – A “no action alternative” must be evaluated in accordance with SEPA. This alternative will maintain the current Regional Growth Strategy allocation of shares of growth extended to 2050. This also provides a starting point and point of comparison for any potential modifications to the Regional Growth Strategy that may be considered.

- **2050 Modified Regional Growth Strategy Alternative(s)** – A modified growth strategy(ies) may be defined and evaluated to consider changes to the regional geographies, growth allocations, and/or actions to promote the desired pattern of growth.

One of the first steps in the process is defining the “no action” alternative. The Regional Staff Committee and Land Use Technical Advisory Committee recently reviewed and provided feedback on a proposed approach that would extend the existing growth strategy shares to 2050. As the name suggests, the no action alternative would maintain currently adopted regional policy, with no changes to guidance for patterns of future growth, other than technical adjustments, such as to account for annexation.
After defining a no action alternative, staff will work to establish a framework for developing one or more alternatives to the no action alternative. The Regional Staff Committee and Land Use Technical Advisory Committee provided suggestions for information that could be used to support the development of new alternatives.

For more information on this topic, please contact Michael Hubner, AICP, Principal Planner, (206) 971-3289, mhubner@psrc.org.
IN BRIEF

Appendix N of the draft Regional Transportation Plan and the attached presentation provide a summary of emerging transportation technologies.

DISCUSSION

Board members have expressed interest in how VISION 2050 can address technological changes that are shaping society. Since VISION 2040 was adopted ten years ago, the impacts of technology have accelerated. Mobile smartphones have become ubiquitous, leading to new forms of transportation, like ride hailing, car sharing, and bike sharing, that we couldn’t have predicted. Now, we hear more and more about how autonomous vehicles may transform society.

What are the potential implications for VISION 2050 and future growth patterns? The impacts of technological changes are difficult to predict, but we are starting to see how current technologies are being used and we can adjust our plans to avoid being caught off guard by technological shifts.

The Transportation Policy Board looked at transportation technologies during the recent plan update process, which is documented in Appendix N of the draft Regional Transportation Plan.

The attached presentation provides a short summary of information about emerging transportation technologies. The Economic Development District Board engaged in a robust discussion of autonomous vehicles with Daniel Malarky on February 7. You may want to review the presentation or video from that meeting.

Staff will provide additional information at a future board meeting.
Please let Senior Program Manager Paul Inghram, AICP, know if you have any specific questions or information requests related to this topic; pingram@psrc.org or 206-464-7549.

Attachments:
A - Technology Briefing
Background

- Emerging transportation technologies are expected to have far reaching implications on society.
- These technologies present tremendous opportunities, huge uncertainty as well as immense challenges.
- This briefing provides a high-level overview of selected emerging technologies likely to affect the region.
- Understanding the actual impacts on land use and transportation is critical. To this end, PSRC is launching a work program to get ahead of these planning implications.
Autonomous Vehicles (AVs)

- Vehicles that navigate the roadway with limited or no driver interaction
- Also known as self-driving or driverless vehicles
- AVs use sensing technologies (e.g., radar, lidar, GPS, odometry, computer vision) & advanced control systems to take appropriate navigation actions

Waymo Chrysler Pacifica Hybrid undergoing testing
See test drive video: https://youtu.be/aaOB-ErYq6Y
Source: Wikimedia Commons, 2018
AVs: 6 levels of automation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Automation</td>
<td>Zero autonomy, the driver performs all driving tasks. Most vehicles in use today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Driver Assistance</td>
<td>Vehicle is controlled by the driver, but some driving assist features may be included in the vehicle design. e.g., adaptive cruise control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partial Automation</td>
<td>Vehicle has combined automated functions, like acceleration and steering, but the driver must remain engaged with the driving task and monitor the environment at all times. e.g., Tesla autopilot, Volvo pilot assist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conditional Automation</td>
<td>Driver is a necessity, but is not required to monitor the environment. The driver must be ready to take control of the vehicle at all times with notice. e.g., 2019 Audi traffic jam pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Automation</td>
<td>The vehicle is capable of performing all driving functions under certain conditions. The driver may have the option to control the vehicle. e.g., GM Cruise AV, Waymo, Zoox (all in testing phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Full Automation</td>
<td>The vehicle is capable of performing all driving functions under all conditions. The driver may have the option to control the vehicle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHTSA, 2017
Connected Vehicles (CVs)

Vehicles with technologies that can connect them to their surroundings

- **V2V**: Vehicle to Vehicle
- **V2I**: Traffic lights & other stationary infrastructure
- **V2P**: Pedestrians & bicyclists
- **V2X**: Any entity that may interact with the vehicle

Examples of CV technologies
Source: US DOT, 2015
CVs: Examples

King County METRO’s RapidRide
• Equipped with V2I technology
• Allows passengers to obtain real-time travel information (e.g., estimated time of arrival)

2017 Cadillac CTS Sedans
• Equipped with V2V technology
• Communicates with other V2V vehicles to share information & alert other drivers of traffic conditions & potential hazards

Source: King County METRO, 2018
Electric Vehicles (EVs)

- Vehicles with electric motors for propulsion
- Primary electric source may be off-vehicle (e.g., trolley buses, Link light-rail) or self-contained in rechargeable batteries (e.g., electric car, e-bikes)
- Key challenges for battery powered vehicles:
  - Upgrades of electric grid required for most areas to meet increasing charging needs
  - Public charging stations involve siting, management, & operation issues

BMW i3 is an EV with an optional gasoline-powered range extender engine
Source: Wikimedia Commons, 2017

EV charging station in Tacoma
Source: City of Tacoma, 2018
Shared Mobility

- Transportation services that use mobile technologies & are shared among users
- Related terms: Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS), Mobility on Demand (MOD), Transportation-as-a-Service (TaaS)
- Key challenges seen so far:
  - Policy issues (e.g., curb side management, service regulation)
  - Equity concerns (e.g., geographic distribution of services, exclusion of those without smartphones)

Source: Mark Warner, 2015
Source: PSRC, 2017
Source: Aaron Rogosin, 2012

Attachment: A - Technology Briefing [Revision 1] (2207 : 12.a.a)
## Shared Mobility: Service Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridehailing</strong></td>
<td>Use of mobile technologies to connect passengers with drivers, &amp; automate reservations &amp; payments. Service classes include drivers who use personal vehicles (e.g., Lyft, Uber); traditional taxis dispatched via the providers’ apps; &amp; premium services with professional livery drivers &amp; vehicles. Alternative terms: transportation network company (TNC), ridesourcing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carsharing</strong></td>
<td>Members pay for access to vehicles per day or for intervals of less than a day. Business models include traditional or round-trip (users take &amp; return vehicles at the same location, e.g., Zipcar); one-way or free-floating (users pick up &amp; drop off vehicles at different locations, e.g., Car2go, ReachNow); &amp; peer-to-peer (car owners make their vehicles available for rental when they are not in use, e.g., Turo, Getaround).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bikesharing</strong></td>
<td>Short-term bike rental, usually for individual periods of an hour or less over the course of a membership (periods can range from a single ride, to several days, to an annual membership). Information technology-enabled bikesharing (e.g., Limebike, Ofo, Spin) provides real-time information for locations of bikes available for pick up &amp; options for drop off if docking stations are used as part of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro-Transit</strong></td>
<td>Private multi-passenger transportation services that serve passengers using dynamically generated routes, &amp; may expect passengers to make their way to &amp; from common pick-up or drop-off points (e.g., Chariot, MOIA, Via). Vehicles can range from large SUVs to vans to shuttle buses. These information technology-enabled rides provide transit-like services but on a smaller, on-demand, &amp; more flexible scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridesharing</strong></td>
<td>Refers to passengers added to a private trip in which driver &amp; passengers share a destination or route. Traditional ridesharing includes carpool services facilitated by private companies &amp; transit agencies (e.g., King County METRO VanPool). Information technology-enabled ridesharing can match drivers with riders on daily commutes (e.g., Scoop) &amp; provide on-demand carpool options for ridehailing services (e.g., Lyft Line, UberPool).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traveler Information Tools

• Information technology (smartphone) based tools that allow travelers to make more informed travel decisions
• Use of these tools driven by increasingly sophisticated mobile apps & greater availability of data
• Key challenges so far:
  • Access limited by users of technology
  • Increased traffic on residential streets due to navigation apps (e.g., Google Maps, Waze)
Intersections of Technologies

• Technologies for AVs, CVs, EVs, & shared mobility may be mixed together

• Common terms include:
  • ACES: automated, connected, electric, & shared
  • AEVs: autonomous electric vehicles
  • CAVs: connected & autonomous vehicles

Shareable electric bikes became available in February 2018
Source: LimeBike, 2018
INFORMATION ITEM

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Senior Program Manager
Subject: VISION 2050 Project Principles

IN BRIEF

Revised VISION 2050 project principles are attached that will help guide staff during the project and support development of the scope of work.

DISCUSSION

At the November and January meetings, the Board reviewed draft project principles and provided recommendations for changes. A decade ago, VISION 2040 aimed to provide a coordinated approach to regional investments, development patterns, and economic strategies. The assumption going into the start of VISION 2050 is that it will build off of VISION 2040 and work to tackle new challenges facing the region. This continues to preserve flexibility for the Board to adapt to the changing needs of the region, while not starting over from scratch.

At the January meeting, the Board talked about the importance of the diversity of the region and asked to move that related principle up the list. The Board also noted the value of planning collaboratively and regionally. Staff worked with the Board Chair to revise the principles per the Board's direction. These principles will help guide staff throughout the VISION update and will be a starting point for conversations about the project scope in April and May.

For more information about VISION 2050, please contact Paul Inghram, AICP, at 206-464-7549 or pinghram@psrc.org.

Attachments:
V2050 Project Principles
Project Principles for VISION 2050

VISION 2050 is an opportunity for our cities and counties, tribes and businesses, and ports and stakeholders to work together to continue towards a more sustainable future of vibrant urban communities, opportunities for economic prosperity, healthy environments, preserved farms and forests, and a robust transportation system. Our region benefits from working across boundaries to solve the region’s most pressing challenges.

These project principles will help guide the project to best build on the framework established by VISION 2040 and other regional planning work and to put in place a strong strategy to guide the region for the next thirty years.

- **Build on VISION 2040’s current framework and Regional Growth Strategy as the starting point for developing VISION 2050.** In adopting VISION 2040, PSRC committed to an integrated approach to regional planning, built upon an environmental framework and implemented through a regional growth strategy. VISION 2040 aimed to reduce impacts related to growth and transportation, enhance opportunities for economic prosperity, reduce sprawl, preserve environmental and resource lands, and leverage regional investments by encouraging the growth of livable urban centers. VISION 2050 is an opportunity to continue these approaches while extending the planning horizon to 2050 and recognizing the region’s investments in infrastructure.

- **Reflect the unique character and diversity of the region – demographic, culture, income, geography, and economy.** As a diverse region spanning a wide geography and 4 million people, it is important that VISION 2050 encompass the individual character of communities across the region and reflect the strength of the region’s cultures and diversity.

- **Continue an ambitious strategy for a more sustainable region.** VISION 2050 is an opportunity to continue to shape growth patterns to more closely align transportation, economic, and development plans, while actively seeking to reduce sprawl and environmental impacts, preserve the region’s working lands, address inequities, and focus growth within centers.

- **Focus the update on those select items that will best advance the region toward VISION.** To making meaningful progress on the region’s most import planning issues, updating VISION will involve making strategic decisions about how to best advance regional objectives.

- **Put in motion a set of actions and roles to realize the goals of VISION 2050.** VISION 2050 will put in place a set of expectations for future work that will drive PSRC’s work program for years to come and will identify how other regional and local planning efforts can help support VISION objectives.

- **Look for opportunities to make VISION more accessible and usable.** VISION 2050 will be designed to be an accessible, usable document that provides overarching guidance to countywide planning policies, the setting of local targets, and to support successful local planning. Aim to be more readable and compelling, including by using new technology.