Growth Management Policy Board
Thursday, September 6, 2018 • 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM – EXTENDED MEETING
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. Staff Report
5. Consent Agenda (10:15)
   a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting Held July 5, 2018
6. Discussion Item (10:20)
   a. VISION 2050 Outcomes and Objectives -- Ben Bakkenta and Paul Inghram, PSRC
7. Discussion Item (10:50)
   a. VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy -- Paul Inghram and Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
8. Breakout Session (11:15)
   *** The board will break into smaller groups to discuss the topic. The breakout discussions are open to the public, but will not be webstreamed because simultaneous discussions will take place. If you would like to observe, please plan to attend in person. ***
9. Break (12:00)
10. Continue VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy Discussion (12:15)
11. Next Meeting: October 4, 2018, 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m., PSRC Boardroom
    Major Topic for October: VISION 2050
12. 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
July 5, 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=1656]

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair Mello welcomed new board members Councilmember Steve Worthington from University Place, the new alternate for Other Cities & Towns – Pierce County, and Sara Wamsley, the new alternate for the Housing Development Consortium of Seattle-King County.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

Alex Tsimerman provided general public comments.

STAFF REPORT

No staff report.

CONSENT AGENDA

  a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting held June 7, 2018

    **ACTION:** It was moved and seconded (Margeson/Putaansuu) to adopt the Consent Agenda. The motion passed.
RECOMMEND FULL CERTIFICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR EATONVILLE

Senior Planner Laura Benjamin presented the staff recommendation to certify the comprehensive plan for the Town of Eatonville.

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Margeson/Schuette) to recommend that the Executive Board certify the comprehensive plan for Eatonville. The motion passed.

RECOMMEND CERTIFICATION OF THE UNIVERSITY PLACE REGIONAL GROWTH CENTER SUBAREA PLAN

Principal Planner Liz Underwood-Bultmann presented the staff recommendation to certify the University Place regional growth center following the city’s adoption of its subarea plan.

ACTION: It was moved and seconded (Worthington/Margeson) to recommend that the Executive Board certify that the City of University Place Regional Growth Center Subarea Plan addresses planning expectations for regional growth centers. The motion passed.

This action removes the center’s provisional status, finalizing the designation of the University Place Regional Growth Center.

HOUSING

Mr. Inghram kicked off the discussion of housing for VISION 2050. Board members highlighted the challenges of people commuting further to find affordable housing, the impact of a jobs/housing imbalance in the region, and the need to work as a region so that cities are not disproportionately impacted. The board expressed concern about the loss of affordable housing as prices increase.

Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold, who serves as Co-Chair for the Regional Transit-Oriented Development Advisory Committee (RTODAC), shared an update from its June 15 meeting. The committee considered whether to have numeric goals and to tie goals to workforce housing and lower income housing.

The board broke into smaller discussion groups to consider the following questions related to housing supply, housing affordability, and maintaining existing affordability:

- What does success look like? What is needed to address the problem statements?
- What is the role of PSRC, counties, cities and towns, and other stakeholders to develop and maintain a system to implement and monitor housing efforts?

Breakout sessions began at 11:13 a.m. The board reconvened at 12:11 p.m.
Discussion comments during the breakout sessions included:

- Maintain housing affordability over the long term with no net loss of existing affordable units and an increase in new affordable units, especially in fast growing areas.
- PSRC’s role can include being an information clearinghouse about how to maintain affordability.
- Recognition that the market will not supply housing affordable to low income households, and public investment is needed to provide housing affordable to lower income households.
- PSRC can provide model ordinances and technical assistance to support local housing work.
- More housing, specifically affordable housing, is needed in transit station areas and along transportation corridors.
- Support housing types for middle density, such as townhomes, duplexes, and backyard cottages. Housing supply should address both the quantity of available housing units as well as the types of units.

Recognizing that changing zoning to increase the potential for more housing takes a lot of time and effort, the board indicated that all communities should plan for more housing through comprehensive and subarea planning. The board indicated that all communities should implement strategies to support development of housing for lower income levels. The board also expressed interest in working with the state to provide planning grants associated with housing affordability and to address condo liability.

Next steps for housing in VISION 2050 include:

- Update the narrative and housing data, including information about need for affordable housing
- Retain most policies with specific changes to reflect board direction
- Explore new housing actions to guide future work on housing

REGIONAL OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION PLAN

Senior Planner Erika Harris and Maria Sandercock, with the Washington State Department of Ecology and formerly with PSRC, presented the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan. The U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities grant supported the plan. The plan covers the eight major watersheds in the region and six categories of open space. Comments received on the plan have been very supportive with a strong interest in urban open space.

Next steps include sharing the plan around the region to encourage its implementation. Emerald Alliance for People, Nature & Community, a multisector group working on open space, just received a grant from the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities to help fund the plan. The plan will be integrated into VISION 2050 where relevant.
NEXT MEETING

The next board meeting is scheduled for September 6 which will be an extended meeting to focus on the Regional Growth Strategy.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 12:53 p.m.
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DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Ben Bakkenta, Senior Program Manager
Subject: VISION 2050 Outcomes and Objectives

IN BRIEF

The September 6 Growth Management Policy Board meeting will continue the board’s June 7 discussion regarding updated objectives for the Regional Growth Strategy.

DISCUSSION

At the heart of VISION 2040 is a shared vision of how and where the region should grow. Organized around the state Growth Management Act’s concepts of urban, rural, and natural resource areas, the Regional Growth Strategy provides a description of an overall development pattern that the central Puget Sound region should strive for over time. The Regional Growth Strategy provides guidance for how counties, cities and towns can work together to establish local growth targets and achieve a desired pattern of growth. The adopted Regional Growth Strategy’s pattern of development was analyzed through an environmental review process and identified as most likely to achieve a balance of desired plan outcomes, including preserving and enhancing the natural environment, making efficient use of existing infrastructure and planned investments, and working to provide opportunity equitably throughout the region.

At its June meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board reviewed the original VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy objectives and confirmed continued general support for the pattern of maintaining the urban growth area and focusing growth in centers that can be well served by transit and infrastructure.

Several board members expressed interest in specific outcomes and how to measure results. As we work towards potential growth scenarios, staff will begin to be able to share several preliminary measures that indicate the general direction the scenarios push different outcomes. More about these measures will be discussed during the following agenda item. Detailed analysis of the growth scenarios will occur once PSRC
chooses two or three specific alternatives to include in the SEPA environmental analysis.

Other board comments tended to reflect back to the overall expectations for VISION 2050. Board members noted that some objectives more accurately described goals or outcomes for the VISION plan as a whole, while others were more descriptive of steps to take to achieve a specific physical growth pattern that will help to achieve those outcomes. For example, healthy communities might be an expectation for the plan, while analysis of the pattern of growth might focus on whether growth is going to locations that are walkable and have access to recreation.

Using the discussion of the board and Regional Staff Committee, staff separated the objectives to distinguish between those that relate specifically to the pattern of growth and those that represent broad goals or policy statements for VISION. These objectives should be considered works in progress that will evolve over the course of the update. They may help inform how the goals for VISION are updated and how the Regional Growth Strategy is framed in the new plan. Of course, objectives for the growth strategy may also be shaped based on the scenario the board finds most suitable for the region.

**Regional Growth Strategy Objectives**

Physical development patterns are associated with particular outcomes. For example, distance between a job location and housing that the employee working in that location can afford affects daily travel, related vehicle emissions, roadway congestion, and transit use. Compact development patterns use less land and can reduce pressure on environmental systems. Proximity of competing and complementary industries and businesses create wealth and support larger pools of talent, increasing regional competitiveness.

When looking at the region’s pattern of physical development, what distribution of activity, mix and intensity of uses will help produce the desired VISION 2050 outcomes?

Direction from the board and input from the Regional Staff Committee in response to the existing VISION 2040 growth strategy objectives led to this updated version to guide the creation of the region’s land use and development pattern.

**Updated Regional Growth Strategy Objectives**

- Maintain stable urban growth areas
- Focus the great majority of new population and employment within urban growth areas
- Maintain a variety of community types, densities, and sizes
- Achieve a better balance of jobs and housing across the region
- Within urban growth areas, focus growth in cities
- Within cities, create and support centers to serve as concentrations of jobs, housing, services, and other activities
- Build transit-oriented development around planned infrastructure
- Use existing infrastructure and new investments efficiently
The above list of objectives – that relate directly to the pattern of growth - is useful when considering whether different growth strategy scenarios perform to support VISION.

Board and committee comments noted the importance of several other issues, including industrial lands and freight movement to the region. All of the growth scenarios are built off of the underlying land uses that include industrial lands and the established manufacturing/industrial centers. No changes to them would be assumed in the growth scenarios. Comments also noted the importance of supporting a pattern of center-oriented growth that supports pedestrian-oriented places with a mixture of uses and services. The pattern of growth that supports centers is captured above while support for centers is further addressed within VISION’s policy framework.

Broader VISION outcomes that the board and Regional Staff Committee identified are also worth keeping in mind even if the pattern of growth does not directly speak to them. These preliminary outcomes can help provide overall guidance to the growth strategy and connect the growth strategy back to the fundamental goals of VISION. These outcome statements will continue to evolve as the board discusses the goal and policy framework for VISION.

**Preliminary VISION 2050 Outcomes**

- **Climate.** Meaningful steps have been taken to reduce carbon emissions and minimize the region’s contribution to climate change.
- **Community and Culture.** Distinct, unique communities are supported throughout the region, cultural diversity is maintained and increased, and displacement due to development pressure is mitigated.
- **Economy.** Economic opportunities are open to everyone, the region competes globally, and has sustained a high quality of life. Industrial and manufacturing opportunities are maintained.
- **Environment.** The natural environment is restored, protected, and sustained, preserving and enhancing natural functions and wildlife habitats.
- **Health.** Communities promote physical, social, and mental well-being so that all people can live healthier and more active lives.
- **Housing.** Healthy, safe, and affordable housing for all people is available and accessible throughout the region.
- **Innovation.** The region embraces and responds to innovation and change.
- **Mobility and Connectivity.** A safe, clean, integrated, affordable, and highly efficient multimodal transportation system reduces travel times, promotes economic and environmental vitality, connects people, and supports the regional growth strategy.
- **Natural Resources.** Natural resources are permanently protected, supporting the continued viability of resource-based industries, such as forestry, agriculture, and aquaculture.
- **Public Facilities and Services.** Public facilities and services support local and regional growth plans in a coordinated, efficient, and cost-effective manner.
• **Resilience.** The region’s communities plan for and are prepared to respond to potential impacts from natural hazards and other adverse events.

• **Rural Areas.** Rural communities and character are strengthened, enhanced, and sustained.

• **Social Equity.** All people can attain the resources and opportunities to improve their quality of life and enable them to reach their full potential.

**NEXT STEPS**

The growth strategy objectives can be used to guide the development of growth scenarios during the next agenda item. Based on the board’s direction, the scenarios will continue to evolve over the next couple of months. The Growth Management Policy Board will be asked to confirm two or three growth strategy alternatives at its November 1 meeting to include in the analysis of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that will be prepared this winter.

For more information, please contact Ben Bakkenta at 206-971-3286, bbakkenta@psrc.org.
DISCUSSION ITEM

August 30, 2018

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

IN BRIEF

The September meeting will continue the board’s review of the Regional Growth Strategy from its June meeting. Staff will ask if the initial growth scenarios discussed here are an appropriate starting place and will ask for additional guidance on regional geographies, jobs-housing balance, and growth near transit. The board will be asked to confirm two or three growth scenarios to include as alternatives for environmental review at its November 1 meeting.

DISCUSSION

VISION 2040 is the long-term strategy for sustainable growth in the central Puget Sound region. VISION 2040 includes goals, multicounty planning policies (MPPs), and implementation actions. It also sets forth the Regional Growth Strategy, which provides numeric guidance for planning for population, housing, and employment growth in countywide targets and local comprehensive plans. The update of VISION will extend the planning horizon for the growth strategy to 2050.

At its March and June 2018 meetings, the Growth Management Policy Board reviewed growth trends and the performance of the adopted Regional Growth Strategy. The board also provided initial direction for updating the strategy, including review of the growth strategy objectives. Following the prior agenda item’s continued discussion on the Regional Growth Strategy objectives, September’s board meeting will seek to:

- Confirm approach to draft revisions to the regional geographies
- Provide direction on how the preliminary growth concepts for 2050 should be refined or adjusted, particularly regarding jobs-housing balance and growth near transit
Regional Geographies in the VISION Regional Growth Strategy

The Regional Growth Strategy implements the goals and policies of VISION 2040 by distributing planned growth using “regional geographies” that classify cities and unincorporated area by roles and types. Grouping cities into geographies provides flexibility to counties and cities to identify appropriate growth targets for different cities in each category.

Within counties, the geographies are a starting point for countywide processes to allocate Growth Management Act (GMA) growth targets in a more detailed way to individual jurisdictions. Cities within each regional geography have different growth targets based on local conditions and negotiations with other cities during the target setting process.

At the June meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board reviewed the issues raised in scoping comments and expressed interest in the following concepts to explore modifications to the regional geography classification:

- Continue a focus on jurisdictions with designated regional centers
- Differentiate current Small and Larger cities by existing and planned high-capacity transit
  - Includes light rail, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, ferry & streetcar
- Identify unincorporated urban areas with high-quality transit service
- Recognize Major Military Installations

The board discussion noted that the changes would clarify different types of places, particularly for urban unincorporated areas and areas identified for transit-oriented development. Board members also noted that development of regional geographies may consider availability of other types of infrastructure and that the overall growth strategy should consider displacement.

Based on these concepts, staff developed the following proposal for modifications to the regional geography classifications:
Through the scoping comments, the most common comments about regional geographies were about the distinction between Larger and Small cities and the treatment of the unincorporated urban areas. The proposed *High Capacity Transit Communities* and *Cities and Towns* geographies would replace the current Larger and Small cities categories. This addresses concerns regarding the use of population and employment as a threshold between Small and Larger cities and help organize planning around current and future transit access.

The current Urban Unincorporated geography would be split between *High Capacity Transit Communities* and *Urban Unincorporated Areas*. Areas that are affiliated for annexation and planned for significant transit investments would be categorized with cities as *High Capacity Transit Communities*. This would add nuance to understanding of the unincorporated urban areas, reflecting both transit access and future planning for annexation or incorporation.
Unlike the regional geography system in VISION 2040, future reclassifications under this system would be informed by mobility options, rather than simply reflecting recent growth trends. The Regional Staff Committee discussed the proposal and staff made adjustments based on committee feedback. In discussions so far, these new geographies have received positive feedback from member staff and representatives.

Other Guidance
Discussion with the board and the Regional Staff Committee raised several additional factors to inform regional geographies, including the level of transit investments, the role of manufacturing/industrial centers, existing plans for growth, and other criteria commonly considered when setting targets at the countywide level. Without making the system of regional geographies overly complex, the revised Regional Growth Strategy could include additional guidance to address these factors as they relate to targets. This approach would be more efficient than providing separate geographies and growth assumptions for the variety of unique local circumstances. The guidance could address topics such as the expectations related to centers, level of transit investments, availability of other infrastructure, and existing land use capacity. Staff will continue to work with the Regional Staff Committee to develop potential guidance.

GMPB discussion question: Based on the board’s prior review, does the board have any additional comments on the proposed regional geographies? Should these draft changes to the regional geographies be used as PSRC develops new growth alternatives for VISION 2050?

Growth Scenarios for the Regional Growth Strategy
VISION 2040’s Regional Growth Strategy was developed from several alternatives that were studied through an extensive environmental analysis. These alternatives ranged from highly concentrated growth in metropolitan cities to more dispersed growth patterns. The preferred hybrid alternative that emerged from that process represented a deliberate move away from historical trends and toward a more sustainable pattern of development that could be achieved within the long-range planning period to 2040.

VISION 2050 will include an extension of the Regional Growth Strategy out another decade beyond 2040 to 2050. This extension is an opportunity to incorporate lessons learned from efforts to implement the existing strategy and may result in changes to the growth strategy and development of a new alternative(s).

Comments from the VISION 2050 scoping process encouraged consideration of a range of factors in distributing planned 2050 growth throughout the region, including:

- Recent historical growth and development trends, including trends that have supported the Regional Growth Strategy and trends that are divergent from the Regional Growth Strategy
- Local land use and infrastructure capacity to accommodate growth
• Levels of transportation accessibility, with a focus on current and future transit connections
• Transit-oriented development, with a focus on opportunities to leverage regional investments in high-capacity transit
• Designated centers, particularly regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers, but also other types of centers in the regional framework
• Jobs-housing balance within counties, other sub-regions, and localities, with a focus on impacts on transportation, economic development, and housing affordability
• Market conditions that indicate current and potential growth potential and challenges

As discussed in Agenda Item 6 (VISION 2050 Outcomes and Objectives), the board previously confirmed VISION 2040’s objectives for the Regional Growth Strategy, including focusing the vast majority of growth in the urban growth area and then within centers, while seeking to maintain rural and resource lands and protect the environment. The board may wish to reference those objectives during the breakout session review of the growth strategy scenarios to ask how each scenario might support the implementation of VISION.

Staff discussed several preliminary growth concepts with the Regional Staff Committee. These scenarios will help identify two or three alternatives for study.

• **STAY THE COURSE** – This growth scenario represents a “no action” alternative as required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and would continue the VISION 2040 shares of growth in a straight line to 2050. This option would continue to encourage jobs-housing balance between the counties and focus growth in centers, with a significant share being directed to the regionally designated centers.

• **FORWARD FROM 2017** – With local comprehensive plan updates that are built on VISION 2040 now in place, this option could factor in the growth and market conditions that occurred from 2000 through the present but recommit to the shares of growth for each geography in VISION 2040 from now through 2050. Like the Stay the Course growth scenario above, this scenario could continue to encourage jobs-housing balance between the counties and focus growth in centers, with a significant share being directed to regionally designated centers.

• **TRANSIT FOCUSED GROWTH** – This growth scenario would direct significant population and employment growth to areas with existing or planned high capacity transit. This scenario could incorporate an explicit goal for growth in areas served by high-capacity transit. The remaining share of population and employment growth not identified for transit station areas could be distributed.
based on the objectives for the Regional Growth Strategy discussed in the previous agenda topic.

- **DISPERSED URBAN GROWTH** – To provide a counterpoint to Transit Focused Growth, this growth scenario would distribute growth more evenly across regional geographies, with more emphasis on cities currently defined as Larger and Small cities and unincorporated urban areas. This scenario would assume that the region could see significantly less growth near transit and regional centers compared to the other three growth scenarios, and that the region as a whole could return to historical patterns of development in more outlying urban areas.

It is important to note that the objective of Regional Growth Strategy work this fall is to define two or three distinct alternatives for environmental evaluation, not to select the preferred alternative. Alternatives for study this fall should be reasonable but may represent significantly different futures to illustrate tradeoffs between them. The board will discuss the evaluation of alternatives more in early 2019 and will have several opportunities to define a preferred alternative that builds from this process. Following the environmental analysis, the board could select an existing alternative or seek to develop a preferred alternative by modifying any of these initial alternatives and/or by combining elements from different alternatives.

**GMPB discussion question:** The board will be asked to confirm two or three growth alternatives for analysis at its November 1 meeting. Should staff continue to develop these concepts as potential environmental analysis alternatives, including any adjustments directed by the board? Should any of the scenarios be removed from consideration at this time?

**County-Level Distribution of Jobs and Housing**

VISION is focused on accommodating another 1.8 million residents and 1.2 million jobs by 2050. The Regional Growth Strategy includes shares of growth to each county, as well as shares for each regional geography. In developing VISION 2040, the Growth Management Policy Board made several policy-based shifts at the county level to encourage additional employment growth in Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties, and additional population growth in King County and, to a lesser extent, in Kitsap County.

To support development of VISION 2050, PSRC staff has developed revised baseline assumptions for the share of population and employment growth for each county through 2050. These revised numbers are based on the state Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) 2050 projections and the expected distribution of 2050 employment by county given OFM’s projected population distribution.

Compared to the shares in VISION 2040, the expected share of regional population has increased for King County compared to Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish counties. While Kitsap County’s share of the overall population is smaller than the other counties, the baseline shares reflect a notably smaller share of overall population growth than called for in VISION 2040. Estimates of employment growth also anticipate higher employment
in King County than called for in VISION 2040 and slightly smaller shares in the other three counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population Shares in VISION 2040</th>
<th>Baseline 2017-50 County Population Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Employment Shares in VISION 2040</th>
<th>Baseline 2017-50 County Employment Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the Stay the Course scenario reflects a straight-line continuation of VISION 2040, it would continue to use the county shares expressed in VISION 2040 and shown above.

However, when VISION 2040 was adopted it was still assumed that general trends would push toward more dispersed growth. The policy shift incorporated in VISION 2040 to encourage more housing in King County was not only met, but actual trends far exceeded that expectation. To better align with today’s context, staff recommends using the OFM/PSRC baseline shares (shown above on the right) as a starting point for development of other growth scenarios. The board could consider additional adjustments to promote shifts of growth from one county to another to seek VISION objectives.

**GMPB discussion question:** Does the board want to consider policy-oriented adjustments to the county shares to promote a different balance of population and employment?

If the board is interested in pursuing adjustments to the county shares, PSRC staff would work with staff-level committees on developing those assumptions.

**Transit-Oriented Development Goal**

The [Growing Transit Communities Strategy](#) includes goals to attract more of the region’s residential and employment growth to high capacity transit communities. The
Growing Transit Communities Strategy calls for 25% of housing and 35% of employment growth to be accommodated in high-capacity transit station areas in the three-county Sound Transit region, namely future light rail station locations. As of 2017, including some updated station locations, the region was exceeding the goal for employment growth, and nearly achieving the housing growth goal. Meanwhile, the region has seen continued work developing transit, including long-range transit plans by each of the major transit providers that include BRT service, Sound Transit’s ST3 routes, and voter approval of new high-speed ferry routes. VISION 2050 is an opportunity to consider these additional transit communities beyond the light rail corridors studied in Growing Transit Communities and consider broader growth goals around transit-served areas.

The Growing Transit Communities Strategy also calls for VISION to establish transit communities as a key element of the regional growth strategy:

6.1. Amend plans and policies to establish transit communities as a key element of the regional growth strategy to concentrate new population and employment within urban areas in centers linked by a high capacity transit network.

GMPB discussion question: If a transit-focused growth scenario is pursued, would the board like to consider a specific goal for growth in transit station areas? How ambitious should that goal be?

If the board is interested in pursuing a specific goal for growth in transit stations, PSRC staff would work with staff-level committees on continuing to develop those assumptions.

NEXT STEPS

With the board’s guidance, PSRC staff will work with staff committees to further refine the growth scenarios and prepare them as potential Regional Growth Strategy alternatives. The draft alternatives will be reviewed in November, when the board will be asked to confirm their use for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

The draft schedule for GMPB review of VISION 2050 includes:

- October 4 GMPB – review housing strategies, other plan components, and follow-up on Regional Growth Strategy development
- November 1 GMPB – extended meeting to confirm Regional Growth Strategy alternatives and provide direction to conduct environmental analysis
- November 29 GMPB – policy discussion on transit-oriented development in VISION and other topics

For more information, please contact Liz Underwood-Bultmann at 206-464-6174, LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org, or Paul Inghram at 206-464-7549, PInghram@psrc.org.