What We’ve Done:
(Spring 2018-April 2019)

- Scoping/Listening Sessions
- Issue Identification
- Research
- VISION 2050 Outcomes
- Regional Growth Strategy Alternatives
- Policy Context
- SEPA/Environmental Analysis

Policy Review

February 2019
- Housing

March 2019
- Environment & Development Patterns

April 2019
- Development Patterns, Transportation & Public Services

May 2019
- Economy, Regional Collaboration & Regional Growth Strategy
Today's Meeting
June 6th & 13th
✓ Review DSEIS comments
✓ Preferred RGS
✓ Outstanding policy issues

July 11th
✓ Outstanding policy issues
✓ Finalize RGS
✓ Release draft plan for public comment

July-Sept. 2019
✓ 60-day public comment period
Outstanding Items

Table of proposed policy and action changes (see desk packet)

• Level 1 – Needs additional board review

• Level 2 – Consent revisions
Do you agree that these warrant additional discussion at 7/11 meeting? Move them to Level 2?

- Funding
- Equity
- Climate Change
- Displacement
Questions and policies related to the Regional Growth Strategy

• Rural growth
• Capacity
• Implementation
• Flexibility
• RGS objectives, draft preferred alternative

• Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap county requests
RGS Objectives

- Maintain stable urban growth areas
- Focus new growth within the UGA
- Variety of community types, densities, and sizes
- Better balance of jobs and housing across the region
- Within UGA, focus growth in cities
- Within cities, create and support centers
- Build TOD around planned infrastructure
- Use existing infrastructure and new investments efficiently
Draft Preferred Alternative would call for:

- **Increased** growth in mid- to large-size cities with regional growth centers and high-capacity transit
- **Decreased** growth in Rural areas
- **Decreased** growth in Urban unincorporated areas and smaller cities, especially at the urban edge
- **Increased** jobs-housing balance in the region
Draft Preferred Alternative would call for:

- **Increased** growth in mid- to large-size cities with regional growth centers and high-capacity transit
- **Decreased** growth in Rural areas
- **Decreased** growth in Urban unincorporated areas and smaller cities, especially at the urban edge
- **Increased** jobs-housing balance in the region
Average Annual Population Change - Snohomish

Population Growth

- Metropolitan Cities: 2,600
- Core Cities: 1,400
- HCT Communities: 7,000
- Cities and Towns: 1,100
- Urban Unincorporated: 350
- Rural: 320

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

Average Annual Population Change - Pierce

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

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

- Request is for fundamental change to geographies or exception for cities in Kitsap County
- Working with Kitsap planning directors to see if there are other options
- Recommend reviewing request with Regional Staff Committee
What are the potential effects of higher levels of rural and urban incorporated growth?
Draft Preferred Alternative

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
Rural Growth Trends

King
- Rural: 4% (2000), 1% (2015)

Pierce

Kitsap
- Urban: 52% (2000), 75% (2015)

Snohomish

Region
- Rural: 14% (2000), 4% (2015)
Rural and UU Growth Effects

Per Capita VMT (average daily)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Cities</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Cities</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT Communities</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities and Towns</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Urban</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Effects of Lower-Density Growth
- Cost of service extension
- Longer commutes, fewer mobility options
- Loss of natural lands, carbon sequestration
- Loss of working lands
Rural and UU Growth

Overall, limited changes across the regional screening factors, but differences in some transportation measures

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>
How could policies address concerns about long-term rural and unincorporated growth?
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.
What should the growth goal be for high capacity transit areas and centers?

What are the implications of a change?
HCT Areas

Includes:

- Regional Growth Centers
- ½ mile walkshed from Light Rail, Commuter Rail, and Ferry
- ¼ mile walkshed from Bus Rapid Transit
- Basis for developing new regional geographies, which also factor in other policy goals
• Development capacity + historical growth trends suggest:
  • 75% goal for employment is ambitious, yet achievable
  • 75% goal for population more challenging

• Peer regions: Centers and TOD areas typically expected to capture more employment growth than housing growth

• Revised high capacity transit growth goal does not change regional geography allocations
Regional High Capacity Transit Goal

• Currently, 51% of residential capacity and 53% of employment capacity in HCT areas

• Relatively more capacity for additional employment growth in HCT areas

• 2000-17: 31% of population growth and 47% of employment growth in HCT areas
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.
High Capacity Transit Goal

Goal more than doubles the number of people in HCT areas in 2050

Compared to the draft preferred, modeling for a 65% goal shows:
  • Slightly less high and moderate density housing
  • Slightly less growth in areas of high displacement risk
  • Lower transit boardings

65% goal is more consistent with peer regions, capacity, and development trends but still represents an ambitious goal for residential growth
How does the Regional Growth Strategy currently factor in flexibility?
Regional Growth Strategy Implementation

How to maintain a clear and functional strategy for local governments while achieving the regional social, environmental, and mobility benefits of the Regional Growth Strategy?

Existing Flexibility in the Regional Growth Strategy
- Time Period
- Regional Geographies
- County variations
- Front/Back Loaded Growth
- Actions and measures (Appendix II-B)

PSRC certifies plans, not growth trends
Follow-up work for July 11

Today
• Discussed Level 1 and Level 2 issue structure for July 11 meeting
• Reviewed RGS objectives and draft preferred alternative
• Reviewed draft policies
• Responded to Board questions
• Set direction for July 11 meeting

July 11 meeting
• Full Board discussion and action to release draft plan 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
Proposed Regional Geographies

**Metropolitan Cities**

Largest cities in each county: Seattle, Bellevue, Everett, Tacoma and Bremerton

**Core Cities**

All other cities with Regional Growth Centers

**High Capacity Transit Communities**

Cities and urban areas planned for annexation with existing/planned high capacity transit
Regional Geographies

Cities and Towns
- Cities and towns with local transit service or without fixed-route transit

Unincorporated Urban
- Urban unincorporated areas without high capacity transit and/or not planned for annexation or incorporation

Rural
- Other areas located outside the Urban Growth Area

Resource Lands
- Designated agricultural, forest, & mineral lands

Major Military Installations
- Installations with more than 5,000 enlisted personnel
## 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>
<th>Ratio relative to 2017 base year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Worsens by .05 to &lt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Worsens by .10 to &lt; .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Worsens by &gt; .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ratios are indexed to the regional average, includes enlisted military personnel.