Overview

- Overview of Draft Preferred Alternative
- Transit Growth Goal
- Potential Board Action
- Next Steps
Preferred Alternative Schedule

March 2019: Board & committee presentations on DSEIS

April 2019: Begin discussion of priorities

May 2019: Review comments, discuss priorities, develop preferred alternative concepts

June 2019: Refine and finalize draft preferred alternative

July 2019: Release draft VISION 2050 plan for comment
# Growth Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth focused in Metropolitan and Core cities</td>
<td>More compact growth focused in high capacity transit (HCT) areas</td>
<td>Growth more distributed throughout the urban growth area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DSEIS Comments

- Strong support for Transit Focused Growth
- Concerns about displacement, some growth allocations
- Snohomish County Tomorrow and Pierce County numeric recommendations

† Draft Preferred Alternative Approach: Use Transit Focused Growth as starting point, make adjustments
Transit Focused Growth

Employment - Region

- Metropolitan Cities: 44%
- Core Cities: 35%
- HCT Communities: 13%
- Cities and Towns: 4%
- Urban Unincorporated: 2%
- Rural: 1%

Legend:
- 2000-2017 Actual
- 2010-2017 Actual
- Stay the Course
- Reset Urban Growth
- Transit Focused Growth
Population Request:

- Rural at 6% – up from Transit Focused Growth at 2%
  - Draft Preferred: Rural growth levels under half the share in Stay the Course
- Urban Unincorporated at 4% – up from Transit Focused Growth at 3%
  - Draft Preferred: Urban Unincorporated allocation about half as much as Stay the Course
- HCT Communities at 50% – less than Transit Focused Growth at 54%
Population Growth

Snohomish County

2000-2017 Actual  2010-2017 Actual
Stay the Course  Reset Urban Growth  Transit Focused Growth  Preliminary Preferred Alternative v.1
Pierce County

Population Request:

• Increase Rural to 8% – up from Transit Focused Growth at 3%
  ➢ Draft Preferred: Rural at 6%, about twice the levels in Stay the Course

• Increase Urban Unincorporated to 22% – up from Transit Focused Growth at 11%
  ➢ Draft Preferred: Urban Unincorporated at 16%, about twice Stay the Course
  ➢ Draft Preferred reduces Core Cities from 28% to 23% and HCT Communities from 14% to 10%
Modified Transit Focused Growth

Preliminary analysis:

• Modified version provides most benefits of Transit Focused Growth
• Large portion of future growth occurs near transit and in compact, walkable communities
• Some worse outcomes from shifting growth to outlying areas
• Requests reflect trends, capacity, development
### Preliminary Data

#### System Vehicle Miles Traveled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Draft Preliminary Preferred Alternative v. 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transit Ridership (Annual Boardings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Draft Preliminary Preferred Alternative v. 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>508 million</td>
<td>502 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Population-to-Jobs Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>HCT</th>
<th>Cities Towns</th>
<th>UU</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio relative to 2017 base year

- Worsens by .05 to <.10
- Worsens by .10 to <.20
- Worsens by >.20

Note: Ratios are indexed to the regional average
• How much rural growth is appropriate and what steps can be taken to manage rural growth?

• What the relationship between urban unincorporated growth and VISION’s policy focus on annexation/incorporation?

• How much flexibility do local governments have in implementing the Regional Growth Strategy?
Potential Draft Policies

**MPP-RGS-D**  Manage and reduce rural growth over time to maintain rural landscapes and lifestyles and protect the environment, consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.

**MPP-RGS-E**  Avoid increasing zoning capacity in areas inconsistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.

**MPP-RGS-F**  Facilitate annexation and incorporation in urban unincorporated areas by planning for appropriate economic development, infrastructure, and future transit service.
Social Equity in VISION 2050

• **New policies:**
  • Residential and commercial displacement
  • Promote affordable housing near high capacity transit
  • Support middle density housing options

• **New actions with equity focus**

• **Data tools and analysis**
  • Displacement Risk Analysis
  • Opportunity Mapping
Regional High Capacity Transit Goal

• Development capacity + historical growth trends suggest:
  • 75% goal for employment is ambitious, yet achievable
  • 75% goal for population more challenging
• Proposed regional goal for HCT areas:
  MPP-RGS-B Attract 65% of the region’s residential and 75% of the region’s employment growth to high capacity transit station areas to realize the multiple public benefits of compact growth around high-capacity transit investments. As jurisdictions plan for growth targets, focus development near high capacity transit to achieve the regional goal.
• Is the Draft Preliminary Preferred Alternative concept on the right track?

• Are there adjustments that should be considered?
Direct staff to include the Preferred Alternative, with changes as directed by the board, in the draft VISION 2050 document for public review.
Thank you.

Liz Underwood-Bultmann, AICP
Principal Planner
Lunderwood-Bultmann@psrc.org

Paul Inghram, AICP
Director of Growth Management
PInghram@psrc.org
Growth Management Policy Board
Currently on Break

Meeting video planned to resume at approximately 12:10 p.m.

The board will reconvene for continued discussion at that time.
Population Growth

Average Annual Population Change - King County

- Metropolitan Cities
- Core Cities
- HCT Communities
- Cities and Towns
- Urban Unincorporated
- Rural

2000-17 Actual
2010-17 Actual
Stay the Course
Transit Focused Growth
Reset Urban Growth
Prelim Preferred Alternative v.1
Population Growth

Average Annual Population Change - Kitsap County

- Metropolitan Cities
- Core Cities
- HCT Communities
- Cities and Towns
- Urban Unincorporated
- Rural

Options:
- 2000-17 Actual
- 2010-17 Actual
- Stay the Course
- Transit Focused Growth
- Reset Urban Growth
- Prelim Preferred Alternative v.1