Scope of Vision 2050

The scope of the Vision 2050 needs to provide enough detail to avoid future confusion or misunderstanding as to what issues/topics will be addressed, and the extent potential changes to goals, policies, and the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) will be possible.

Question: Does the “Scoping Report” identify the scope of work for Vision 2050 to a degree that it would be clear to a new board or staff member that were not part of the initial approval process?

The report summarizes the outreach effort, common general/high level comments, topics for environmental review, and identified “Assumptions” for the update. However, it doesn’t provide a clear picture as to the range of possible changes to goals, policies, and the RGS through this update process.

Examples of Needed Clarification:

“What Regional Issues Should the Plan Address” (page 5):

- An “Assumption” (page 14) states that Vision 2050 discussion before the GMPB will focus on a limited set of issues. However, the PSRC SEPA Official recommends the PSRC’s policy board should continue work to prioritize and explore 31 topics/issues (pages 5 – 10).
- The text under various potential topic areas summarizes the range of comments submitted. The full extent of potential changes to goals and policies that may be considered during the update is unclear.
- While the RGS is called out as an issue that should be addressed, the description is written different than other topic areas (pages 9 and 11). More than one page is devoted to summarizing comments received. It is unclear if all of these comments are within the scope of potential changes of the update. It should be clear as to whether PSRC staff is directed to extend the existing growth shares and minor revisions to the existing RGS geographies, or if greater wholesale change(s) to the RGS will be explored/discussed.

Identified Assumptions (page 14):

- Implement the Growth Management Act (GMA). While it is assumed that Vision 2050 will implement the GMA, it is unclear if the update will identify regional policies that are redundant with, or not necessary for, the regional plan to be consistent with GMA.
• Use Vision 2040 as starting point. It states that Vision’s current framework –
goals, policies, and RGS – will be the starting point for Vision 2050. But it
doesn’t state to what extent goals, policies, and the RGS can change.
• Focus on emerging and important issues. It states the plan update will focus on
a limited set of issues. These include the RGS, housing, climate change, and
social equity issues. How are the topics starting on page 5 incorporated?

“Regional” versus “County” issues:

Vision 2050 represents multi-county planning policies for the four-county region.
These policies are intended to provide a common policy approach for issues that
require a unified regional approach. While various topics are important to
jurisdictions within each of the four counties, it isn’t required or necessary for all
to pursue a united strategy. Countywide planning policies are to address
topics/issues unique to individual counties.
• The scoping document should identify if comments came from
jurisdictions/stakeholders located in a single county or from multiple counties.
• The scoping document should distinguish between comments/topics that
would be appropriate to be addressed in countywide planning policies as
opposed to Vision 2050.
• Are existing Vision 2040 policies being reviewed to determine their need
across the entire region, or just within an individual county(ies)?

Question: What comments/requests made through the scoping
process are not within the scope of the update?

As stated on page 2 of the Scoping Report, PSRC staff has delineated over 1,300
comments to inform the plan scope and environmental review. It is unclear how
many of the comments have been incorporated in the scope of Vision 2050. The
way the report is written, it is unclear to a jurisdiction if its comment(s) may be
considered as a potential change to Vision 2050 goals, policies, or the RGS.
Jurisdictions may determine it is not necessary to expend limited resources to
track the progress of Vision 2050 if their specific issue(s) won’t be addressed.
• The GMPB should be provided with the list of issues/topics identified within
the scoping process that will not be considered in Vision 2050 and the reason
why they are not being considered.