Growth Management Policy Board
Thursday, November 1, 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. Director’s Report
5. Consent Agenda (10:15)
   a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting Held October 4, 2018
6. Action Item (10:20)
   a. Regional Growth Center Plan Certification for Tacoma Mall Subarea Plan -- Andrea Harris-Long, PSRC
7. Action Item (10:30)
   a. VISION 2050: Action to Proceed with Environmental Review for VISION 2050 -- Liz Underwood-Bultmann and Paul Inghram, PSRC
8. Discussion Item (11:15)
   a. VISION 2050 Update - Economy and Public Services Chapters -- Paul Inghram, Jason Thibedeau, & Ben Kahn, PSRC
9. Information Item
   a. 2019 Growth Management Policy Board Schedule
10. Next Meeting: November 29, 2018, 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m., PSRC Boardroom
    Major Topics for November 29: VISION 2050
11. 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
October 4, 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=1658]

CALL TO ORDER

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

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

None

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

The board received public comments from the following:

Alex Tsimerman provided general public comments.

Dan Cardwell with Pierce County provided comments on behalf of Pierce County Councilmember Derek Young regarding the Regional Growth Strategy. Mr. Cardwell’s statement requested the board consider the revised Dispersed Urban Growth scenario staff will present at today’s meeting. He also noted that VISION 2050 isn’t just about the growth of new people, but about the quality of life of the people who already live in the region.

Hester Serebrin with Transportation Choices Coalition (TCC) provided comments on the letter TCC, Washington Environmental Council, The Wilderness Society, Futurewise, and the Housing Development Consortium submitted to the board regarding the Regional Growth Strategy. The organizations urged the board to look at data about access to opportunity as part of the decision-making process on scenarios.
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director of Growth Management Paul Inghram announced a copy of the letter Ms. Serebrin spoke to is available for board members as they entered the boardroom. He noted that environmental justice will be a portion of the SEPA analysis of the alternatives.

This past month, Mr. Inghram met separately with Jeff Clarke with Alderwood Water & Wastewater District and Bainbridge Island Councilmember Ron Peltier to discuss VISION 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategy. Councilmember Peltier has ideas about how to improve environmental aspects of analysis of the alternatives.

Mr. Inghram shared that Director of Transportation Planning Kelly McGourty spoke with the Regional Staff Committee about greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. The board will receive a more in-depth briefing at a future meeting. Mr. Inghram also announced that a report on the space industry was released recently.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting held September 6, 2018

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

VISION 2050: HOUSING

Senior Planner Laura Benjamin joined Mr. Inghram to present on VISION 2050 and housing. The board last discussed housing in VISION 2050 at the extended meeting in July. Ms. Benjamin reviewed policies and actions currently in the housing chapter in VISION 2040 and meetings where housing was discussed that have occurred since the July GMPB meeting. Ms. Benjamin reviewed the staff recommendations for the housing chapter in VISION 2050 based on review of the existing housing chapter and feedback received to date.

The board discussed focusing housing near transit, having housing available to a mix of income levels, and having a mix of types of housing available including condos and townhomes. Members noted that home ownership provides intergenerational wealth and condos and townhomes are an entry point into home ownership. The board expressed that the housing chapter updates are heading in the right direction. There is interest in further discussing accountability related to housing policies at a future meeting.

The board expressed concerns about displacement. PSRC staff is working on a displacement risk analysis and will be presenting the analysis to the board at a future meeting.
VISION 2050: Regional Growth Strategy

Principal Planner Liz Underwood-Bultmann updated the board that work has been done on the Regional Growth Strategy with the Regional Staff Committee, technical committees, and with PSRC's data team. Staff will come back to the November 1 GMPB meeting seeking board action to select alternatives for environmental review, which will then launch the environmental analysis and inform later development of a preferred alternative.

Staff heard concerns about the Dispersed Urban Growth scenario from the board and staff-level committees. The initial version of the scenario was putting more growth into Cities & Towns and Urban Unincorporated areas than existing capacity. Staff updated the scenario to set growth allocations using information from Buildable Lands capacity. Staff also heard feedback on the Transit Focused Growth scenario, including concerns about the amount of growth to High Capacity Transit Communities. The growth allocations were increased to that regional geography for the second version of the scenario.

There was discussion with the board about merging the Forward from 2017 and Dispersed Urban Growth scenarios. The board also expressed interest in seeing more details on transportation delay in the analysis of the scenarios and seeing additional analysis in the future of equity considerations. The board also discussed having more job growth dispersed around the region.

Ms. Underwood-Bultmann discussed the goal for transit-oriented development in the Transit Focused Growth Scenario. The Regional Transit-Oriented Development Advisory Committee supported including an ambitious goal and was interested in seeing additional analysis in the future. There was discussion about having housing for all income levels in transit-oriented developments. Based on the board and committee discussion, staff will proceed with the goal of 75% population growth/75% employment growth in the scenario and as part of the package that will be provided to the board to select the alternatives.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for November 1 which will be an extended meeting and will focus on deciding the Regional Growth Strategy alternatives along with reviewing the VISION 2050 Economy and Public Services chapters.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.
GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARD Attendance Roster – October 4, 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 (via remote)
Mayor John Chelminiai, Metropolitan Center—Bellevue (via remote)
Dr. Anthony Chen, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department – Community/Environment
John McClellan, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
Councilmember Larry Gossett, King County
Councilmember Rob Johnson, Metropolitan Center—Seattle
Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Peter Mayer, Metro Parks Tacoma – Community/Environment (via remote)
Councilmember Ryan Mello, Metropolitan Center—Tacoma
Councilmember Mike O’Brien, Metropolitan Center—Seattle
Councilmember Ron Peltier, Bainbridge Island – Other Cities & Towns in Kitsap County
Mayor Rob Putaansuu, Port Orchard – Other Cities & Towns in Kitsap County
Councilmember Terry Ryan, Snohomish County
Councilmember Jan Schuette, Arlington – Other Cities & Towns in Snohomish County
Commissioner Peter Steinbrueck, Port of Seattle – Ports
Councilmember Nancy Tosta, Burien – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Dr. Susan Turner, Kitsap Public Health District – Community/Environment (via remote)
Mayor Greg Wheeler, Metropolitan Center—Bremerton
Chris Wierzbanksi, Futurewise
Commissioner Edward Wolfe, Kitsap County (via remote)

GMPB MEMBERS ABSENT (*alternate present)
Councilmember Tim Curtis, Fife – Other Cities & Towns in Pierce County
Clayton Graham, Municipal League of King County – Business/Labor
*Councilmember John Holman, Auburn – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Councilmember Jeanne Kohl-Welles, King County
Marty Kooistra, Housing Development Consortium – Seattle/King County
Mark McCaskill, WA State Department of Commerce
*Commissioner Paul McIntyre, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
Barb Mock, Regional Staff Committee
Ian Morrison, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Association – Business/Labor
Deputy Mayor Cynthia Pratt, Lacey – Thurston Regional Planning Council
Rob Purser, Suquamish Tribe
Edna Shim, Seattle Children’s – Business/Labor
*Bryce Yadon, Futurewise
Councilmember Derek Young, Pierce County
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
Joseph Gellings, Port of Seattle
Erika Harris, PSRC
Peter Heffernan, King County DOT
Michael Hubner, City of Seattle
Paul Inghram, PSRC
Kathryn Johnson, PSRC
Ikuno Masterson, Snohomish County
Doug McIntyre, City of Bellevue
Kristin Mitchell, PSRC
Maggie Moore, PSRC
Ian Munce, City of Tacoma
Jenny Ngo, King County
Brian Parry, SCA
Marianne Seifert, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department
Hester Serebrin, Transportation Choices Coalition
Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
Claire Woodman, Parametrix
ACTION ITEM

To: Growth Management Policy Board

From: Paul Inghram, Director of Growth Management

Subject: Regional Growth Center Plan Certification for Tacoma Mall Subarea Plan

IN BRIEF

Consistent with PSRC’s adopted plan review process, PSRC staff reviewed and recommends certification of the center subarea plan listed below.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend that the Executive Board certify that the Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan addresses planning expectations for regional growth centers.

DISCUSSION

A major emphasis of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) is the need to coordinate local, regional, and state planning efforts. Within the central Puget Sound region, local governments and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) have worked together to develop an overall process for reviewing local, countywide, regional, and transit agency policies and plans for compatibility and consistency.

VISION 2040, the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Adopted Policy and Plan Review Process call for PSRC to review and certify subarea planning efforts of jurisdictions with designated regional centers. VISION 2040 includes an action (DP-Action-17, p. 98) for jurisdictions with regional growth centers and/or
manufacturing/industrial centers to develop subarea plans for those centers.¹ This expectation has been in place since the PSRC Executive Board adopted its Plan Review Process in 2003. Review of center subarea plans provides an opportunity to coordinate and share information related to local and regional planning.

The City of Tacoma adopted the Tacoma Mall Regional Growth Center (RGC) Subarea Plan in May 2018. The RGC consists of 575 acres and includes the Madison, Northwest, Lincoln Heights, and Mall districts. Tacoma Mall was designated as a regional growth center in 1995. The city completed the subarea plan to address PSRC regional growth center subarea plan requirements and submitted the plan to PSRC.

PSRC staff reviewed the subarea plan and finds it addresses the planning expectations for regional growth centers. PSRC staff coordinated with city staff in the review of the Plan Review and Certification Report. The newly adopted Regional Centers Framework (2018) calls for review of centers and center planning again in 2025, and PSRC may provide additional comments or guidance for center planning as part of that work.

For more information, please contact Andrea Harris-Long at (206) 464-6179 or aharris-long@psrc.org, or Liz Underwood-Bultmann at (206) 464-6174 or LUnderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org.

¹ The specific requirements for center planning are provided in PSRC’s Plan Review Manual, and the process is also described in VISION 2040, Part IV: Implementation. Certification of the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan for consistency with the regional transportation plan, regionally established guidelines and policies, and Growth Management Act requirements for transportation planning is completed through a separate board action.
ACTION ITEM

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Director of Growth Management
Subject: VISION 2050: Action to Proceed with Environmental Review for VISION 2050

IN BRIEF

The November meeting will continue the board’s review of the Regional Growth Strategy, and the board will be asked for action to proceed on studying alternatives in the VISION 2050 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Direct staff to proceed with preparation of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for VISION 2050, including analysis of the No Action (Stay the Course), Transit Focused, and Reset Urban Growth growth-pattern alternatives.

Environmental analysis will occur over the fall and winter to support the board’s work to develop a preferred growth strategy alternative and draft plan in the spring of 2019.

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. At the September and October meetings, the board reviewed proposed changes to regional geographies, discussed preliminary growth scenarios, and provided feedback on jobs-housing balance and a goal for growth in transit station areas. Both the Land Use Technical Advisory Committee and Regional Staff Committee were engaged this fall in reviewing inputs and modeling results from the preliminary growth scenarios. PSRC has also published a draft [background paper on the Regional Growth Strategy](#) to inform ongoing review and development of the Strategy.

At the November 1 GMPB meeting, staff will:
- Update the board on discussions with staff-level committees
- Seek action on selection of alternatives for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft SEIS)

**Regional Geographies**

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.

At the June and September meetings, the Growth Management Policy Board discussed issues raised by cities and counties related to the current regional geographies and expressed support for proposed changes to Small and Larger cities, the unincorporated urban area, and to add a category for military installations. PSRC staff have been working with staff-level committees to finalize the distribution of cities, towns, and unincorporated areas based on the revised regional geography definitions. A map showing the revised regional geographies is provided in [Attachment A](#).

The regional geographies group jurisdictions by common sets of criteria, though all jurisdictions have different local circumstances. These local circumstances are factored in during development of local growth targets. The revised Regional Growth Strategy could include additional guidance on other issues to inform the development of growth targets and implementation of the strategy, including topics such as the expectations for cities with more than one designated center, different levels of transit investments, the role of manufacturing/industrial centers, and other factors.

**Growth Scenarios**

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 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.

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; local land use and infrastructure
capacity; transportation accessibility; opportunities to leverage regional investments in
high-capacity transit; designated centers; jobs-housing balance; and market conditions.

The scoping report for VISION 2050 is based on the need to plan for the technical
estimate of a population level of 5.8 million people in 2050. Staff discussed several
concepts with the Growth Management Policy Board for the pattern of growth that
allocate shares of population and jobs based on county and geography.

Staff recommend these scenarios as alternatives in the VISION 2050 environmental
analysis:

- **STAY THE COURSE** – This 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 encouraging growth
  within urban areas and within centers.

- **TRANSIT FOCUSED GROWTH** – This growth scenario directs a greater amount
  of population and employment growth to areas with existing or planned high
  capacity transit. This scenario incorporates an ambitious goal of 75 percent
  population and employment growth in areas served by high-capacity transit.

- **RESET URBAN GROWTH** – This scenario assumes that the region would see
  relatively less growth near transit and regional centers compared to the other two
  growth scenarios. This scenario would continue to allocate the largest shares of
  growth to Metropolitan Cities and Core Cities, although comparatively less than
  Stay the Course or Transit Focused Growth. This scenario also allocates growth
  to Cities & Towns and Urban Unincorporated Areas based on land development
  capacity.

In response to board comments, the new Reset Urban Growth scenario combines
aspects of two growth scenarios previously discussed – Forward from 2017 and
Dispersed Urban Growth. There are several benefits of the combined scenario:

- The Reset Urban Growth scenario incorporates comments and interests from
  multiple parties. This blended scenario resets the VISION shares to
  approximately 2017 levels, a sort of “market-check” of VISION 2040 shares
  desired by some board members. The scenario also includes relatively higher
  levels of growth in Urban Unincorporated and Rural regional geographies.
- While the Forward from 2017 scenario has important differences in certain
  geographies from Stay the Course, the changes were showing limited differences
in the regional-scale analysis of the screening factors. It is beneficial for the environmental analysis to look at greater distinction between the alternatives studied.

The Regional Staff Committee and Co-Chairs Working Group reviewed this new Reset Urban Growth scenario and members stated agreement with the rationale and staff recommendation to include this scenario for study in the Draft SEIS.

Charts comparing the recommended alternatives are provided in Attachments B and C. Screening factors are provided for all the recommended scenarios in Attachment D. Based on board and committee feedback, both action scenarios (Transit Focused Growth and Reset Urban Growth) incorporate a 5% shift of forecast employment growth from King County to Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties.

Please note that selecting alternatives for study is not an endorsement of any particular approach to allocating growth through the Regional Growth Strategy. The environmental review process allows consideration of different visions of growth to understand impacts and trade-offs of different growth patterns. The objective of Regional Growth Strategy work this fall is to define distinct alternatives for environmental evaluation, not to select the preferred alternative. Alternatives for study should be reasonable but may represent significantly different futures. 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 one of these three alternatives or develop a preferred alternative by modifying an alternative and/or by combining elements from different alternatives.

Some board members asked about the option of a lower growth scenario. The scoping report, adopted by the board in June, established the intent to evaluate growth of about 1.8 million people, based on a technically derived estimate. This allows direct comparison between alternative growth patterns. The purpose of the Regional Growth Strategy is to understand how the region can best accommodate the growth that will most likely occur. The SEPA analysis can include discussion about how potential impacts may change if the total growth is less or greater than the estimate.

Social Equity

At the October meeting, board members asked for additional information and discussion of social equity in the Regional Growth Strategy. The Draft SEIS will include more information on how the alternatives affect low-income and minority populations. Per requests, staff will provide additional information in November regarding access to jobs under the growth scenarios, particularly for census tracts with higher concentrations of low-income or minority communities.

An extended board meeting in February 2019 will focus on social equity and VISION 2050. PSRC staff is working on an updated version of Opportunity Mapping and a regional displacement risk analysis, which will support additional discussion on social
equity and understanding of the alternatives. This can support development of a preferred alternative and/or potential policies or actions to address social equity, access to opportunity and displacement.

NEXT STEPS

Once alternatives are confirmed, staff will proceed with modeling and development of the Draft SEIS with PSRC’s SEPA consultants. Staff anticipate release of the Draft SEIS in February/March 2019, which will include significantly more data and analysis of the selected alternatives.

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.

Attachments:
A - VISION 2050 Regional Geography Map
B - Growth Scenario Charts
C - Growth Scenario Tables
D - Screening Factors - October 2018
VISION 2050 Growth Scenarios - Population 2017-50

Stay the Course
- Metropolitan Cities: 35% (607,661)
- Core Cities: 28% (487,766)
- HCT Communities: 18% (308,326)
- Cities & Towns: 9% (161,833)
- Urban Unicorp: 5% (95,695)
- Rural: 5% (95,084)

Transit Focused Growth
- Metropolitan Cities: 36% (632,292)
- Core Cities: 29% (509,346)
- HCT Communities: 23% (403,964)
- Cities & Towns: 6% (105,382)
- Urban Unicorp: 4% (70,255)
- Rural: 2% (35,127)

Reset Urban Growth
- Metropolitan Cities: 31% (551,308)
- Core Cities: 25% (438,145)
- HCT Communities: 18% (318,329)
- Cities & Towns: 8% (138,988)
- Urban Unicorp: 12% (205,241)
- Rural: 6% (104,355)

Total
- Metropolitan Cities: 44%
- Core Cities: 36%
- HCT Communities: 32%
- Cities & Towns: 12%
- Urban Unicorp: 12%
- Rural: 6%

VISION 2050 Growth Scenarios - Employment 2017-50

Stay the Course
- Metropolitan Cities: 44% (509,361)
- Core Cities: 36% (413,297)
- HCT Communities: 12% (133,338)
- Cities & Towns: 5% (54,990)
- Urban Unicorp: 3% (33,035)
- Rural: 1% (14,383)

Transit Focused Growth
- Metropolitan Cities: 44% (512,550)
- Core Cities: 35% (407,191)
- HCT Communities: 13% (150,538)
- Cities & Towns: 4% (48,642)
- Urban Unicorp: 2% (26,596)
- Rural: 1% (12,888)

Reset Urban Growth
- Metropolitan Cities: 41% (473,361)
- Core Cities: 32% (373,999)
- HCT Communities: 12% (140,911)
- Cities & Towns: 6% (74,336)
- Urban Unicorp: 6% (70,859)
- Rural: 2% (24,938)
## Population Growth - Stay the Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Metropolitan Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>High Capacity Transit Communities</th>
<th>Cities &amp; Towns</th>
<th>Urban Unincorporated</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>608,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>488,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>308,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>162,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Employment Growth - Stay the Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Metropolitan Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>High Capacity Transit Communities</th>
<th>Cities &amp; Towns</th>
<th>Urban Unincorporated</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>509,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>413,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>133,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some columns and rows may not sum accurately due to rounding.
### Population Growth - Transit Focused Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Metropolitan Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>High Capacity Transit Communities</th>
<th>Cities &amp; Towns</th>
<th>Urban Unincorporated</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>381,000</td>
<td>346,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>632,000</td>
<td>509,000</td>
<td>404,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Growth - Transit Focused Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Metropolitan Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>High Capacity Transit Communities</th>
<th>Cities &amp; Towns</th>
<th>Urban Unincorporated</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>311,000</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>513,000</td>
<td>407,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some columns and rows may not sum accurately due to rounding.
### Population Growth - Reset Urban Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Metropolitan Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>High Capacity Transit Communities</th>
<th>Cities &amp; Towns</th>
<th>Urban Unincorporated</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>354,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>551,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>438,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>318,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>139,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>205,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>104,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Growth - Reset Urban Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Metropolitan Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>High Capacity Transit Communities</th>
<th>Cities &amp; Towns</th>
<th>Urban Unincorporated</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>473,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>374,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>141,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some columns and rows may not sum accurately due to rounding.
Screening Factors for VISION 2050 Growth Scenarios – October 25, 2018

The screening factors are a short list of measures to help evaluate the growth scenarios, providing preliminary information on the type and scale of difference between the scenarios. More complete analysis will be provided for alternatives included in the Draft Supplemental Impact Statement.

The screening factors include:

- Mobility. Delay, transit ridership, mode share
- Environment. Greenhouse gas emissions
- Growth Near Transit. New people and jobs near transit
- Housing Choice. Growth at high, medium & low densities
- Access to Opportunity. Growth in moderate to high opportunity areas
- Jobs-Housing Balance. Ratio by county and subarea

Modeling results are provided for the most recent versions of each scenario. Percentages and directional arrows show percent difference from Stay the Course (the No Action Alternative). Both Transit Focused Growth and Reset Urban Growth scenarios reflect a 5% shift of employment from King County to Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties.

### Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOV Mode Share – All Trips</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Transit Boardings</td>
<td>481,000,000</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay per Person</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay per Truck</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth Near Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Share of Population Growth</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>+31%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Share of Job Growth</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Lower Density (single family)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Medium (duplex, triplex, low-rise)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High Density (larger apt, condo bldgs)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Access to Opportunity - Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Very Low and Low Opportunity</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Moderate, High and Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Access to Opportunity - Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Very Low and Low Opportunity</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Moderate, High and Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Jobs-Housing Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>+23%</td>
<td>+23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION ITEM

October 25, 2018

To: Growth Management Policy Board

From: Paul Inghram, Director of Growth Management

Subject: VISION 2050 Update - Economy and Public Services Chapters

IN BRIEF

Staff will brief the Growth Management Policy Board on anticipated changes to the Economy and Public Services chapters.

DISCUSSION

As the review of growth alternatives moves into a more technical phase of environmental analysis, the board will review the individual policy chapters of VISION 2040 to identify potential changes, much like it has started to do for housing. A draft schedule showing the board’s review process is included as Attachment A.

Attachment B provides a review of potential changes to the Economy chapter.

Attachment C provides a review of potential changes to the Public Services chapter, including school siting.

NEXT STEPS

The November 29 and January 3 board meetings will likely focus on planned changes to chapters on the Environment, including climate change, Transportation, and a portion of Development Patterns. An extended board meeting is planned for February 7 to review and discuss how social equity may be addressed in the plan. That meeting may also provide time to follow up on housing policies.

The timing of these items may change as needed to provide flexibility for board discussion. The intent is to have opportunity to review the core issues for VISION 2050...
and develop a revised draft Regional Growth Strategy for a draft plan to be publicly released in summer 2019.

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

Attachments:
A - VISION 2050 Calendar
B - Economy Chapter Review
C - Public Services Review
### VISION 2050 Working Calendar

#### Policy Board Review Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov/Dec</th>
<th>January 2019</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GMPB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29:</td>
<td>• Development Patterns chapter review – Centers and TOD</td>
<td>2/7 – Extended</td>
<td>3/7:</td>
<td>4/4:</td>
<td>5/2:</td>
<td>6/6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment chapter review &amp; climate change</td>
<td>• Social equity work session</td>
<td>• DSEIS overview</td>
<td>• DSEIS public comments</td>
<td>• Regional Growth Strategy – select preferred alternative</td>
<td>• Review document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Online survey results</td>
<td>• Housing follow up &amp; policies</td>
<td>• Environment policies review</td>
<td>• Public Services policies review</td>
<td>• Review document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development Patterns chapter review – Annex/UGA</td>
<td>• Development Policies review</td>
<td>• Economy policies review</td>
<td>• Review document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transportation chapter review</td>
<td>• Development Policies review</td>
<td>• Transportation policies review</td>
<td>• Review document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Health overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan narrative, implementation sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcommittee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3:</td>
<td>3/7:</td>
<td>4/4:</td>
<td>5/2:</td>
<td>6/6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5:</td>
<td>• Check in on board direction re: chapters</td>
<td>2/7:</td>
<td>3/7:</td>
<td>4/4:</td>
<td>5/2:</td>
<td>6/6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outline of full plan</td>
<td>• Check in on board direction on policy changes</td>
<td>5/2:</td>
<td>6/6:</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13:</td>
<td>• Economic Board briefing</td>
<td>3/7:</td>
<td>4/4:</td>
<td>5/2:</td>
<td>TPB/EDDB June/July briefings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TPB V2050 review</td>
<td>4/4:</td>
<td>5/2:</td>
<td>6/6:</td>
<td>on draft plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7:</td>
<td>• Peer Networking review</td>
<td>5/2:</td>
<td>6/6:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer Networking work session on social equity</td>
<td>6/6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TPB/EDDB June/July briefings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on draft plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Regional Staff Committee meets monthly, typically discussing topics in development prior to review with GMPB
Attachment B
Economy Chapter Review

VISION 2040’s Economic chapter includes goals and polices that support the health of the region’s economy through investment in people, place and business.

A new regional economic strategy, Amazing Place, was adopted in September 2017. The strategy relied on the input of employers, civic groups, government leaders, educators, chambers of commerce, and a broad array of economic development interests throughout King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties. From this input and lessons learned from prior strategies, three main goals were established:

- Open economic opportunities to everyone
- Compete globally
- Sustain a high quality of life

These three goals are supported by twenty-two strategies, with supporting initiatives identified to sustain growth in key sectors and the overall economy. The goals and strategies in Amazing Place work to implement the goals and policies established in VISION 2040 and are well aligned to this guiding planning document. The MPPs in the Economy chapter address a comprehensive set of topics including business climate and competitiveness, education and widely shared prosperity, as well as foundational areas such as housing, the environment, growth and transportation. Each MPP in the Economy chapter in VISION 2040 is implemented by one or more strategies established in Amazing Place.

The VISION 2040 Economy chapter includes an overview of the regional economy that needs to be updated to provide current information and reflect the themes of the new regional economic strategy.

Amazing Place has a strong focus on ensuring that the prospering economy benefits all areas of the region. The region has seen strong economic growth, but this growth is not equally distributed. Sub-regions have distinct opportunities and challenges requiring different investments and economic development efforts. Various hubs of economic activity provide different opportunities for parts of the region, including communities connected to the region’s military bases, or small towns leveraging tourism and recreation activities.

The Economy section of VISION 2040 has policies related to the location of jobs that support the region’s vision, including employment growth in centers. In addition, there are strategies that look to target job growth to areas that are either underperforming or have unique needs or opportunities. These include:

- MPP-Ec-12: Foster appropriate and targeted economic growth in distressed areas to create economic opportunity for residents of these areas.
- MPP-Ec-21: Recognize the need for employment in cities in the rural areas and promote compatible occupations (such as, but not limited to, tourism, cottage and home based businesses, and local services) that do not conflict with rural character and resource-based land uses.
- MPP-Ec-22: Support economic activity in rural and natural resource areas at a size and scale that is compatible with the long-term integrity and productivity of these lands.
Staff recommend developing a new policy or adjusting existing policies to fully capture the concepts reflected in *Amazing Place* strategy “Encourage economic growth across all parts of the region.”

In addition to review of the policies, staff will review and update the economy Actions that identify steps to implement the policies at the regional and local level. Because of the connection between the region’s quality of life and continued economy growth, members of the Regional Staff Committee recommended that staff work to ensure that the Economy chapter is well connected to other planning areas of VISION.
Attachment C
Public Services Chapter Review

VISION 2040 includes a discussion of the various public services in the region, three sets of related policies, and several actions that serve the goals of the Public Services chapter. The introduction discusses the importance of conservation, reliability, and efficiency of the provision of public services. The discussion and policies are organized into the following subsections:

- Services in General
- Services by Type
- Siting Facilities

Few developments since VISION 2040 have significantly impacted public services in the central Puget Sound region, with the notable exception of school siting, which needs to be addressed in VISION 2050. See below for review of potential changes to school siting policies.

Staff recommend updates to the chapter narrative to refine the scope, remove content unrelated to the policies, and create a better organizational flow. Changes recommended include updating subsection headers, editing content that does not relate directly to policies, and move discussion of stormwater management to Environment chapter. These changes will narrow the scope of the chapter and limit content with less connection to the policies and actions.

School Siting Policy

In recent years, questions have arisen over the siting of schools in rural areas by districts that predominantly serve students from urban areas. Many school districts in the region have owned properties outside the urban growth area, some since prior to the adoption of Growth Management Act. However, this conflicts with the provisions of Growth Management Act and VISION 2040 policies that seek to provide urban facilities within urban areas and limit their development in rural areas. As a response, two bills were passed in the Washington state Legislature to amend the Growth Management Act in 2018 to permit Pierce County to “authorize the siting in a rural area of a school that serves students from an urban area, even where otherwise prohibited by a multicounty planning policy,” so long as the following conditions are met:¹

- a) The county must have adopted in its comprehensive plan a policy concerning the siting of schools in rural areas.
- b) Any impacts associated with the siting of such a school are mitigated as required by the state environmental policy act.
- c) The county must be a participant in a multicounty planning policy, and this policy must be amended, at its next regularly scheduled update, to include a policy that addresses the siting of schools in rural areas of all counties subject to the multicounty planning policy.

The current school siting policy in VISION 2040 states:

*MPP-PS-21 - Site schools, institutions and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans.*

¹ RCW 36.70A.211(1)
Staff suggest an update to MPP-PS-21 to incorporate the Growth Management Act amendment. In addition, feedback from the Regional Staff Committee included a suggestion that PSRC add a new policy to address the intent of school siting by encouraging cities and counties to work with school districts to help locate new schools in optimal locations to serve school-aged children and the community at large.

The suggested language shown here may evolve through discussions with the staff committee prior to returning to the board with the full set of Public Services policies. No action is needed at this time. Staff welcomes all feedback and suggestions at this stage.

**Amend existing policy** – Amend the existing siting policy on siting urban services to include language addressing new GMA policy.

MPP-PS-21 – Site schools, institutions and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans, except as provided for by RCW 36.70A.211.

**New policy on collaboration** –

MPP-PS-SS – Work cooperatively with school districts to plan for school facilities to meet the existing and future community needs consistent with adopted comprehensive plans and growth forecasts, including siting and designing schools to support safe, walkable access and best serve their communities.
Meetings are held at the Puget Sound Regional Council, 1011 Western Avenue, 5th Fl. Boardroom, 10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Meetings held at regular time from 10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Extended meetings held from 10:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Time for July 11 meeting to be determined - Board will be updated when time is determined

As the need arises, the Transportation Policy Board and the Growth Management Policy Board meet in joint session to coordinate activities and make decisions/recommendations.

Meeting dates & times are subject to change. If a meeting is changed or cancelled, members & alternates will be notified.

Updated meeting dates are also listed on PSRC’s website at https://www.psrc.org/board/growth-management-policy-board

Communication: 2019 Growth Management Policy Board Schedule (Information Item)