Growth Management Policy Board

Thursday, November 7, 2019 • 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM – EXTENDED
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. Communications and Public Comment
3. Report of the Chair
4. Director’s Report
5. Consent Agenda (10:15)
   a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting held October 3, 2019
6. Action Item (10:20)
   a. VISION 2050 Comment and Amendment Review -- Paul Inghram and Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
7. Break (12:00)
8. Continue Action Item (12:10)
   a. VISION 2050 Comment and Amendment Review
9. Information Item
   a. 2020 Growth Management Policy Board Calendar
10. Next Meeting: December 5, 2019, 1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m., PSRC Boardroom
    Major Topic for December:
    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 alternative formats, can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling 206-464-7090. Arabic, 中文 | Chinese, Deutsch | German, Français | French, 한국어 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese, Call 206-587-4819.

TTY Relay 711.
MINUTES
Growth Management Policy Board
October 3, 2019
PSRC Boardroom

[To watch a video of the meeting and hear the discussion, go to http://psrcwa.iqm2.com/Citizens/Detail_Meeting.aspx?ID=1768]

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Councilmember Hank Margeson, Vice Chair.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

The following people provided public comment:

Alex Tsimerman provided comment on the non-voting applications process for PSRC’s policy boards.

Maria Batayola with El Centro De La Raza spoke to the letter submitted on the draft VISION 2050 plan. Ms. Batayola talked about the Title VI program and how it applies to environmental justice and the work of PSRC in addition to supporting a budget ask in the state Legislature.

Leah Missik with Climate Solutions spoke to the amount of climate-related public comments PSRC received as part of public comments on the draft VISION 2050 plan.

Andrew Kidde with 350 Seattle quoted Swedish climate activist Greta Thunberg: “our house is on fire” and “unite behind the science” in support of stronger climate policy in VISION 2050.

CHAIR’S REPORT

Vice Chair Margeson welcomed Caia Caldwell, the new representative for the Master Builders Association. The board was reminded that the application deadline for the open non-voting positions on the policy boards is Friday, October 18.
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director of Growth Management Paul Inghram spoke to the media coverage on VISION 2050 in various newspapers and other outlets around the region. Mr. Inghram mentioned the Bringing the Region Together bus rapid transit event happening on Friday, October 4, in the Crossroads area of Bellevue, and an upcoming missing middle housing event in Kenmore on October 15.

Mr. Inghram announced the November 7, 2019, GMPB meeting will be an extended meeting held 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. and that there will be a December meeting on Thursday, December 5, in the afternoon after Executive Board. Also, due to the changes to the board in 2020, there likely will be no meeting on January 2, 2020.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting held September 5, 2019

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

DRAFT VISION 2050 PLAN REVIEW

Mr. Inghram provided an overview of the public comments received on the draft VISION 2050 plan. Principal Planner Liz Underwood-Bultmann presented on the Regional Growth Strategy and the draft Preferred Alternative. The summary of public comments shows support for the Transit Focused Growth alternative and growth near transit. The board discussed the purpose and revision process for the urban growth area under the Growth Management Act.

Ms. Underwood-Bultmann discussed jobs/housing balance, highlighting that several comment letters, including revisions requested by the Pierce County Regional Council, included housing policy changes. Analysis of a scenario to shift 5% of the population to King County from Pierce and Snohomish counties shows that it would result in jobs/housing balance improvements, but also raises other questions about the distribution of growth among counties and regional geographies.

Mr. Inghram reviewed the summary of comments related to the Climate chapter. The board discussed whether targets should be included and the importance of aligning with the regional goals and the state and using the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency’s targets as a starting point.

The board discussed airports and aviation, including the public comments heard regarding environmental justice. The discussion addressed PSRC’s role/responsibility when it comes to airports.
Mr. Inghram asked the board to review the public comment matrix when it is released and reiterated that the board should submit edits by noon on November 4 so they can be distributed prior to the November GMPB meeting.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next Growth Management Policy Board meeting is scheduled for November 7 to review draft VISION 2050 plan comments and discuss edits to the plan.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 11:58 a.m.
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ACTION ITEM

October 31, 2019

To: Growth Management Policy Board
From: Paul Inghram, Director of Growth Management
Subject: VISION 2050 Comment and Amendment Review

IN BRIEF

On October 25, the Growth Management Policy Board was provided with an organized matrix of comments on VISION 2050. At the November meeting, the board will be asked to review the comments, determine whether to make changes to the draft plan, and prepare to make a recommendation to the Executive Board at its subsequent meeting.

ACTION

The Growth Management Policy Board is asked to take a series of actions outlined herein to prepare a formal recommendation of the draft VISION 2050 to the Executive Board.

At a subsequent meeting, the board will be asked to act to recommend VISION 2050, as amended, to the Executive Board.

DISCUSSION

At the July 11 meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board acted to release the draft growth strategy, policies, and actions for public review and comment during a 60-day comment period. The public comment period closed September 16.

At the November meeting:

- Staff will provide an overview of the public comment review and response process
• The board will be asked to review the comments and responses as No Action, Minor, or Major changes to the draft plan, and act on individual groups of potential changes.

Staff request that board members identify any major amendments they wish to sponsor and/or provide any new amendments by noon on Monday, November 4. Doing so will allow staff to distribute an organized list of potential amendments to the full board prior to the meeting. The meeting review and discussion will focus on those items identified by board members. If items from Group A or B are not sponsored, it will be assumed that no change will be made in response to these comments. Staff have received some board member amendments already and will distribute them to the full board prior to the meeting.

Public Engagement and Comments

PSRC engaged in a significant public outreach process that was reviewed with the board at the September meeting. In summary, PSRC held draft review work sessions and public open houses, stationed booths or tables at fairs, festivals and farmers markets around the region, held sessions with area youth councils, and conducted a robust online review forum including an online open house. PSRC also provided information and advertised through social media to get the word out about the draft plan and comment period. VISION 2050 materials were translated into nine languages and distributed to community-based organizations around the region to get the word out to non-English speaking residents. The online open house was available for translation in these nine languages as well.

The online open house and VISION 2050 webpages had over 9,000 page views over the course of the public comment period. The draft plan was downloaded nearly 3,000 times. In total, PSRC received letters, emails or comments in other forms from 574 commenters. The comments, which were posted on the PSRC website and provided in full to the board prior to the October meeting, are organized by commenter affiliation:

• Agencies, Organizations, and Businesses
• Cities and Counties
• Individuals
• Tribal Nations

The VISION 2050 Outreach and Comment Summary Report (Attachment 1) provides an overview of the outreach techniques, comment process, and the comments received. The chart below shows the number of comments made by planning topic.
Approach for Board Review of Comments

At the October meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board was provided the set of public comments and an overview of key comment themes and discussed several key topics. A comprehensive matrix of all comments and responses sorted by category was provided to the board on October 25. The matrix has been updated with several additional comments since it was first posted. Please use the linked matrix provided in this memo.

Board members are asked to review the matrix and identify amendments for consideration in advance of the November meeting. Potential amendments may be considered in three categories:

**Regional Growth Strategy**
- These amendments are needed to complete the population and employment allocations to regional geographies in the Preferred Alternative
Response to Public Comments

- Public comments have been sorted into subcategories to aid the board in its process:
  - Major Change for Board Consideration (Group A)
  - Major Change for Board Consideration – Do not recommend (Group B)
  - Minor Text, Policy or Action Changes – Recommended (Group C)
  - Minor Text, Policy or Action Changes – Do not recommend (Group D)
  - No action required (Group E)

Board-Identified Amendments

- Sponsored Major Changes – board members may choose to sponsor Major Change amendments proposed in the matrix of public comments (see Groups A and B)
- Board Member-Initiated – if a topic has not been addressed in the matrix, board members may choose to recommend additional amendments

Minor amendments identified in the comment matrix may be acted on by the board as a group and do not need to be sponsored by board members before the meeting. However, board members may identify minor amendments from Groups C or D for additional discussion or action.

At the November 7 Growth Management Policy Board meeting, staff will ask the board for a recommendation on the potential changes to the draft VISION 2050 plan. The board will be asked to indicate consensus or vote as appropriate. The following sequence is proposed:

- Are there any No Action comments that board members would like to identify for further discussion? (See Group E.) These comments did not propose specific changes, but if board members wish to identify a change related to any of these comments, they could be pulled and included in the discussion of Major Changes. Otherwise, no action is proposed for this set of comments.

- Are there any Minor Changes that board members would like to identify for further discussion? (See Groups C and D.) As needed, items listed as Minor Changes could be pulled and included in the discussion of Major Changes. Once the list of Minor Changes has been reviewed, the board may act to include them in the draft plan:
Move to incorporate the recommended Minor Changes (Group C) into the GMPB recommended draft of VISION 2050.

- Are there any board-identified amendments that board members would like to identify for discussion or action? (The consolidated amendment table will be distributed prior to meeting.) Board members may choose to discuss and act on sponsored amendments in groups or individually.
  - Move to incorporate the _______ change(s) into the GMPB recommended draft of VISION 2050.

- Are there any changes to the Regional Growth Strategy population and employment growth allocations that board members would like to propose for the recommended plan? Once the board has completed its review of the Regional Growth Strategy allocations, it may act to include them in the draft plan:
  - Move to incorporate the recommended Regional Growth Strategy allocations into the GMPB recommended draft of VISION 2050.

- Are there any other amendments a board member would like to offer? Board members may choose to speak to and act on any additional amendments not yet addressed.
  - Move to incorporate the _______ change(s) into the GMPB recommended draft of VISION 2050.

The board may need to continue this review at its December meeting and could schedule a second November meeting if needed.

**Major Topic Review**

Many of the comments and suggested changes in the comment matrix reflect key topics in VISION 2050 that the board has spent much of its time discussing already. Below is a list of comments addressing major changes that are included in Group A of the comment matrix. Typically, these comments seek additional new policies or actions or suggest major changes to the draft policies and actions. Many of the topics raised have already been considered by the board and are addressed in the draft plan. However, the comments may seek changes or additional emphasis that go beyond the draft. By noon on November 4, board members are encouraged to identify which of these potential amendments they would like to discuss further or sponsor at the November board meeting. The meeting will be organized to focus on those amendments identified by board members rather than review each individual comment during the meeting.
Themes of Major Changes (Group A comments):


**Affordable Housing:** A-24-25.
**Annexation and Incorporation:** A-12 and A-75.
**Aviation:** A-84-85.
**Climate Change:** A-1-A-5, A-20, and A-43.
**Concurrency and Level of Service:** A-11 and A-17.
**Costs of Local Services:** A-19.
**Displacement:** A-26-28.
**Employment Shift:** A-18.
**Equity:** A-33-34 and A-76.
**Fiscal:** A-35-37 and A-44-45.
**High Speed Rail:** A-87.
**Implementation:** A-38-39.
**Local Transit Service Areas:** A-13.
**Military Installations:** A-10, A-40 and A-41.
**Monitoring:** A-42.
**Open Space:** A-21 and A-71.
**Resilience:** A6-A-8.
**Schools Siting:** A-14, and A-31-32.
**Sewer Access:** A-29.
**Transportation Technology:** A-82-83.
**Tribes:** A-15-16.
**Water Quality:** A-22-23 and A-89.

As noted above, the complete comment matrix also includes potential major changes that are not recommended (Group B). They included changes that conflict with direction the board has previously provided, although board members could recommend them for additional discussion.

Please contact staff if board members seek to sponsor any of the major changes or suggest new amendments related to any of these comments or if additional materials or information on any of these topics are needed for November.
Modeling Changes for the Final Supplemental EIS

As part of VISION 2050 development, PSRC technical staff model the growth alternatives to help understand their impacts and tradeoffs. An initial set of modeling results was reported in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). PSRC is preparing to conduct a final round of modeling to support analysis of VISION 2050 for the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) scheduled for release in late winter 2020. PSRC modeling staff have identified a set of improvements and refinements to be incorporated into the final series of model runs, as described in Attachment 2.

NEXT STEPS

If board members seek to suggest additional revisions to the draft plan or sponsor Major Change amendments (Groups A or B), please send them no later than noon on Monday, November 4, so that they can be distributed to the full board ahead of the November meeting.

The board is scheduled to transmit its recommended version to the Executive Board by the end of 2019.

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

Attachments:
A - Draft Plan Comment Summary
B - VISION 2050 Modeling Changes
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Introduction

VISION 2050 is the long-range plan for the central Puget Sound region and builds on PSRC’s VISION 2040 plan to keep the region healthy and vibrant as it grows. The Growth Management Policy Board began work on VISION 2050 in 2017. An integral part of updating the long-range plan is hearing from the region’s cities and counties, tribes, ports, military installations, residents, business owners, and other agencies and organizations. PSRC has engaged the public throughout the plan update, with increased efforts at key milestones in the planning process.

Most recently, the Growth Management Policy Board has been updating the draft goals, policies, and actions and Regional Growth Strategy for VISION 2050. This work culminated in a July 11 board action to direct staff to prepare the draft VISION 2050 plan. On July 19, 2019, the draft plan was released for a 60-day public comment period. This report summarizes the outreach efforts for the draft plan and comments received. All comments submitted on the draft plan are available on the VISION 2050 webpage and organized by commenter type (Agencies, Organizations, and Businesses, Cities and Counties, Individuals, and Tribal Nations).

Goals for Engaging the Public

When conducting outreach for VISION 2050, PSRC used the following goals to guide engagement efforts:

- Provide a variety of ways for people to engage with PSRC and provide comments
- Use innovative outreach techniques
- Equitably engage a range of diverse communities
- Leverage and strengthen relationships with cities, counties, and other partners throughout the region to reach more people
- Increase the overall awareness of PSRC and VISION 2050
Releasing the Draft Plan

The draft VISION 2050 plan reflects months of policy discussions by the Growth Management Policy Board and PSRC advisory committees and incorporates feedback received throughout the planning process. The document is comprised of an introduction, multicounty planning policies for nine functional areas, and an implementation section. Online resources include a glossary and reference materials and supporting documents. The draft plan is available at www.psrc.org/vision.

On July 19, the draft plan was released for a 60-day public comment. Figure 1 summarizes the variety and reach of initial notice activities completed, consistent with PSRC’s Public Participation Plan. PSRC also sent letters with copies of the draft plan to all nine federally recognized tribes in the region to encourage their participation in the planning process.

Connecting with Residents, PSRC Members and Others

PSRC organized several different engagement activities and opportunities for people to share their thoughts on the draft plan. Comments could be submitted through an online comment portal, in-person at events and a public hearing, or by sending an email, mail, or fax directly to PSRC.

Workshops and Open Houses

PSRC held back-to-back in-person events at five different locations around the region to provide information and engage with people. The first half of each workshop featured a brief presentation and small-group discussions focused on policy areas. The workshops were geared towards jurisdictional and agency staff, elected and appointed officials, and other stakeholders and provided time for a deeper dive into the subject matter. Oriented towards members of the public, drop-in style open houses were held in the evening.
following the workshops. A brief presentation about VISION 2050 was given, and attendees could browse stations organized by policy area. PSRC staff was available to talk to people and answer questions throughout both events. Nearly 200 people attended these events, and paper comment forms were completed by some attendees.

**Tabling at local events**

An important objective of this outreach period was to meet people in their communities and take advantage of summer events. PSRC maximized the timing of the public comment period and tabled at four community events:

- Pierce County Fair in Graham, WA on August 9
- Burien’s B-Town Fiesta on August 25
- Evergreen State Fair in Monroe, WA on August 27
- Bremerton Farmers Market on September 12

PSRC staff talked to hundreds of residents and shared information about PSRC’s mission and the draft plan, including how to view and comment on the draft plan.
Online Open House
PSRC developed an online open house that mirrored the in-person open houses to reach residents and PSRC members who were not able to attend in-person events. The online open house was available for the entire 60-day public comment period and available for translation into nine different languages (Vietnamese, Tagalog, Chinese, Korean, German, French, Spanish, Russian, and Arabic). The online open house and VISION 2050 webpages had over 9,000 page views over the course of the public comment period. The draft plan was downloaded nearly 3,000 times.

Growth Management Public Hearing
The Growth Management Policy Board held a special public hearing on September 5, 2019 to hear comments on the draft plan. Thirteen people addressed the board.

Ongoing Engagement Efforts
Throughout the public comment period, PSRC staff attended meetings of cities, countywide and regional forums and provided presentations by request about the draft plan:

- 4Culture - Local Arts Agencies Network
- City of Burien
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
- Environmental Resources Agencies Coordination
- Four-County Health Districts (King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish)
- Island Regional Transportation Planning Organization (IRTPV)
- King County Planning Directors
- King County Interjurisdictional Team (IJT)
- Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
- Laborers Local 242
- Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC)
- Salmon Safe
- Snohomish County Special Needs Transportation Committee (SNOTRAC)
- Snohomish County Tomorrow
- Sound Cities Association Public Issues Committee (PIC)
- Transportation Choices Coalition Community Partners
- City of Tukwila
- Washington Association of Land Trusts
Getting the Word Out

Organizing engagement events are only effective if people know about them. PSRC worked diligently to get the word out about the different ways people could view and comment on the plan.

Outreach Toolkit

PSRC developed a new resource for the 60-day public comment period – an Outreach Toolkit – to make it easy for jurisdictions and partner agencies to share information about VISION 2050 with their networks. The toolkit included:

- A short recorded webinar, available on YouTube, that could be played at community meetings
- An annotated presentation for staff to give to boards and councils
- Short blurbs that could be inserted into newsletters, social media posts or email blasts
- Links to social media content and blog posts
- Links to promotional materials and fact sheets for quick reference

The toolkit leveraged the expansive networks of our partners and made it easier for local staff to share information about VISION 2050 with their communities. Jurisdictions and organizations used the outreach toolkit, which helped raise awareness and generate more feedback on the plan. The recorded webinar was viewed nearly 200 times.

Maximizing Social Media and Internet Ads

PSRC is active on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter. These platforms were used to keep the public comment period on the forefront over the 60-day timeframe. PSRC boosted posts and paid for Facebook and Google ads to increase visibility. PSRC identified areas with higher percentages of people of color and/or people with low incomes. These communities have been historically underrepresented in regional planning processes and PSRC targeted ads to these areas to increase engagement and awareness of regional planning. By the end of the public comment period, over 300,000 people were reached with Google ads alone.

Additional Communication Tools

PSRC considers accessibility in all work. To ensure visually impaired residents could access the draft plan, PSRC made all materials accessible for e-readers.

To reach non-English speaking residents, PSRC translated a postcard-style handout into nine different languages (Vietnamese, Tagalog, Chinese, Korean, German, French, Spanish, Russian, and Arabic) and distributed them to about 50 community-
based organizations around the region. These cards encouraged residents to visit the online open house and engage in the process.

During the public comment period, PSRC published a series of VISION 2050 posts on the agency’s blog highlighting key policy areas and topics from the draft plan. These blog posts were shared on PSRC’s social media accounts and generated likes, shares and retweets.

Tracking coverage in traditional local media such as newspapers and news sites revealed that PSRC or VISION 2050 was mentioned 150 times between January and September 2019. VISION 2050 was specifically mentioned 39 times, largely in regional publications. PSRC board members also wrote opinion editorials promoting the importance of regional planning. Editorials were published in the Daily Herald (Everett), Kitsap Sun, Puget Sound Business Journal, The Seattle Times, and The News Tribune (Tacoma). This coverage increased awareness of the public comment period.
Engagement Results: A Summary of Comments

PSRC heard from 619 commenters and received about 1,600 unique comment communications.

Comments were submitted in a variety of ways, from handwritten comments submitted at events to online comment form submittals. Comment submissions were split into individual comments and categorized by the primary policy topic addressed. Some comments recommended specific edits to plan text or goals, policies, or actions. Other comments suggested clarifications, additions and deletions throughout the draft plan or provided general sentiments about regional planning issues. All comments are sorted by major changes, minor changes, and comments that don’t require specific amendments to VISION 2050.

Comment Themes

The highest number of comments were on the topic of climate change. Commenters supported the addition of the new Climate Change chapter but thought more work could be done to strengthen climate policies and actions. Likewise, several comments supported the inclusion of equity throughout all policies. Commenters expressed strong support for the Regional Growth Strategy’s emphasis on transit-oriented development, with commenters emphasizing the need for growth in urban areas and centers to protect rural and outlying areas. Commenters also strongly support compact development patterns, reduction in environmental impacts, and increased access to transit. Concern over higher displacement risk was also present in many comments, with many emphasizing the need for equitable development as growth occurs. Underlying many comments was a concern about housing affordability and the need to provide more affordable housing options as the region grows. Cities and counties were concerned about the implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy and called for clarification of its role in the local target setting process.
Comments by Category
The chart below shows the number of comments made by planning topic.

![Chart showing number of comments by topic]

The table below summarizes key comment themes by topic. All comments submitted are available through the VISION 2050 webpage and organized by commenter type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic and Summary</th>
<th># of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The region should be more ambitious in addressing climate change. The region should set bold targets in accordance with the state of the science. Equity and climate justice should be used as a lens in mitigating impacts. PSRC should provide technical assistance and guidance to local jurisdictions. Climate should be addressed in comprehensive plans and in PSRC’s transportation planning. Regular monitoring of progress should occur. Aviation emissions should be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Growth Strategy</strong></td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many comments expressed support for the draft Regional Growth Strategy and the focus on transit-oriented development. Rural growth and growth in cities further from major job centers presents challenges for environmental outcomes and regional mobility. Cities should have opportunities to plan for growth they are expecting. The plan should be clearer about implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy through policies and guidance on the local target setting process. The plan review manual and future guidance from PSRC should be revised to be clear about Regional Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft VISION 2050 Plan Public Outreach & Comment Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic and Summary</th>
<th># of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy implementation. Jobs-housing balance is an important consideration for many and should be clearly described in the plan. Inclusion of tribes and military installations in the Regional Growth Strategy is important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Patterns</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact development patterns in centers and high-capacity transit station areas is important and should be promoted. As development occurs, concurrency with local and state facilities should be evaluated. Limiting incompatible uses around manufacturing/industrial centers and military installations is vital to supporting these economic assets. Updating the region’s Industrial Lands Analysis is necessary to address changing trends in industrial and manufacturing industries. Focusing growth in urbanized areas will save rural and natural resources. Support for maintaining stable urban growth areas and limiting expansions. Inclusion and promotion of open space, parks, and trails are critical as development occurs. Equitable development with meaningful community engagement is important as the region grows. Annexation and incorporation of urban areas is important and must be done in coordination with service providers. Rural growth should be managed, and tools, such as Transfer of Development Rights programs, are supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Collaboration</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the inclusion of equity and Regional Equity Strategy action, noting that it should address engagement, equity impact tools, and data monitoring. Implementation of regional goals and local planning priorities will require new funding sources for local government services. The board should consider funding priorities for certain areas and communities. It is difficult to distinguish between high-level regional policies and policies that need to be considered as local plans are updated. Recognition and collaboration with the region’s tribes is important. Clarification on the relationship with military installations is helpful and welcomed. The plan should highlight regional coordination between ports and other special districts and service providers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The region needs to assess transportation needs to accommodate additional growth anticipated through 2050. With the transit-focused nature of the regional growth strategy, improvements to public transportation and ensuring those improvements are in place in a timely fashion are important. In addition, safe access to transit and other destinations via many different modes, including walking, bicycling, other forms of transit, and automobile are important. The region should develop a safe and efficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transportation system that accounts for changes in technology and that helps address the challenges associated with climate change. This applies not just to the movement of people, but to the movement of freight and goods. It is also important to incorporate air travel needs into the region’s multimodal transportation system analysis.

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th># of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The region needs to expand its housing stock to include a greater diversity of housing types affordable to a wider range of incomes. New housing should be focused in livable communities with access to jobs, services, and amenities. Greater attention is needed on jobs-housing balance to ensure job-rich communities are providing adequate housing for workers. Support for the strengthened draft policy language, specifically the emphasis on affordable housing near transit and the public intervention needed to provide housing affordable to low and very-low income households. PSRC needs to provide data and technical assistance, including a Regional Housing Strategy, to support local jurisdictions to better address housing affordability.

Increased housing costs and the resulting displacement often have a domino effect across the region. Development and increased access to transit, jobs, and services can result in increased housing prices and force long-time residents from their homes and communities. Additional work is needed to address unintended and inequitable consequences of growth and to help residents stay in their communities.

### Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th># of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General concern for the environment and support of the draft policies and actions to protect and enhance tree canopy, habitat, air quality, water quality, farmland, and forests. The implementation of the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan should be accelerated. Support policies and actions that encourage environmental stewardship and green stormwater infrastructure (low-impact development). Concern regarding water resources and planning for stormwater and water supply, conservation, hydrology, and quality, particularly in the face of climate change. More aggressive action to reduce greenhouse gases and increase resilience is desired. Improving wastewater treatment is desired to improve water quality. Concern regarding air pollution and noise from aircraft and vehicles. Concern over the need for policies that might already be addressed by environmental regulations. Regional resilience and hazard mitigation planning was suggested. Incorporation of equity and performance measures into environmental work is desired, and some support for reviewing local plans with an equity lens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic and Summary</th>
<th># of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC should help coordinate and facilitate better consolidation and integration of services from multiple service providers. Reducing waste and providing public services in greener, more sustainable ways is important. Flexibility in school siting policies is desired from school districts that include both urban and rural areas. Considering impacts to public services when developments are reviewed and approved is critical. Focusing growth in centers and urban areas minimizes infrastructure and service costs, while also mitigating environmental impacts. Emergency management should be addressed in addition to the existing public services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The region needs a skilled, trained workforce and apprenticeship programs are valuable for this purpose. Transportation funding criteria should consider projects that include strong labor standards that include apprenticeships and community workforce agreements. Living-wage job opportunities should be available in all four counties. Ensuring economic development opportunities for smaller cities is an important component of the region’s economic strategy. Jobs need to be located closer to where workers live to help improve the region’s job-housing balance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the draft plan and for other commenter’s comments. Agencies and jurisdictions collaborated on their comment letters. Document needs a more accessible glossary and updated document elements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is important in accomplishing the region’s vision for the future, and equity and climate change are urgent issues. Identifying metrics to track progress and inform needed adjustments in strategies is recommended. Regional goals and needs should be communicated to the state Legislature and state agencies, particularly the need for funding. Specific goals should be prioritized for transportation funding. More clarity in the plan review process and growth targets is desired. Recommendations from the Taking Stock 2016 report should be incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong support for the identified policy focus areas and inclusion of more diverse photos. General support for the vision statement. Minor text clarifications were suggested to clarify the narrative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for offering a variety of ways to view and comment on the draft plan and engaging a variety of stakeholders. The amount of content available for commenting was overwhelming for some.

Next Steps
Gathering public comments on the Draft VISION 2050 Plan is an important step in developing VISION 2050. PSRC has developed responses and staff recommendations to comments for the board’s consideration. At the November 7 Growth Management Policy Board meeting, the board will review what was heard and propose amendments to the draft plan, in advance of their recommendation to the Executive Board. Public comments will also be available for the Executive Board to consider as they review the Growth Management Policy Board recommendation.

VISION 2050 Adoption
The Growth Management Policy Board, after considering all public comments, will recommend the revised draft VISION 2050 plan to the Executive Board for adoption. In early 2020, a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) will be issued with updates to the environmental analysis on the multicounty planning policies, preferred growth alternative, and the three alternatives presented in the Draft SEIS. PSRC’s Executive Board is expected to recommend adoption of VISION 2050 in the spring of 2020. Adoption of VISION 2050 is scheduled to occur by PSRC’s General Assembly later that spring. Members of the public can continue providing comments to the Growth Management Policy Board and Executive Board during the public comment portion of board meetings or by submitting written comments via email, mail, or fax to PSRC.
ATTACHMENT B

VISION 2050: Modeling Changes for Final Supplemental EIS Analysis

IN BRIEF

PSRC is preparing to conduct a final round of modeling to support analysis of the VISION 2050 growth alternatives – Stay the Course, Transit Focused Growth, Reset Urban Growth, and the Preferred Alternative – for the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) scheduled for release in late winter 2020.

PSRC modeling staff have identified a set of improvements and refinements to be incorporated into the final series of model runs, as described in this memo.

DISCUSSION

PSRC uses a suite of in-house forecasting tools – the UrbanSim land use model, SoundCast travel demand model, and Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES) mobile source emissions model – to produce a set of performance indicators for evaluating different environmental impacts of the VISION 2050 growth alternatives. The indicators cover a range of impacts to population, employment and housing patterns, land use, transportation, air quality, water quality and hydrology, parks and recreation, and social equity and environmental justice.

Since completing the VISION 2050 Draft Supplemental EIS (released in February 2019), staff have engaged in continued efforts to test and refine the tools and assumptions used for the initial analysis based on public comments. Through the testing process, staff identified the following refinements to be incorporated into the final series of model runs and associated performance indicators for the Final Supplemental EIS:

UrbanSim Developer Sub-Model. The UrbanSim model uses a setting in its developer sub-model to determine whether land development is or is not constrained by jurisdiction-level control totals. This setting can affect whether the model results in more compact versus distributed development throughout the region.

Subsequent testing to investigate the impact of adjusting the setting found most of the resulting performance indicators were affected by only a minor to moderate degree, but that a few indicators directly associated with land development patterns (Housing Choice, Developed Land, Impervious Surface, and Transit Boardings) showed more substantive changes. Changes to this setting resulted in more infill development in already urbanized areas and less development of vacant parcels.

The adjustments generally did not change the relative performance of the three alternatives evaluated in the draft supplemental EIS analysis, although they did serve to accentuate distinctions between the Transit Focused Growth and other alternatives in the expected direction. The adjustments also resulted in decreasing the gap between Stay the Course and Reset Urban Growth results for some performance indicators. As such, staff determined this was a correction that should be incorporated into the final series of model runs.

Regional Growth Center Capacity Boost – Transit Focused Growth Alternative. In the Stay the Course and Reset Urban Growth alternatives studied in the Draft Supplemental EIS, the
modeling methodology applied a development capacity boost to parcels within designated regional growth centers to approximate the attraction of higher-density projects to regional growth centers, thus directing a greater share of each Metropolitan and Core city’s growth to its center or centers per VISION policy.

In the Transit Focused Growth alternative, an alternate methodology was used that explicitly directs 75% of the region’s population and employment growth to regional growth centers and high capacity transit (HCT) station areas. The centers capacity boost was not applied because it was thought the alternate methodology would essentially mimic the effect of the boost.

Subsequent testing and analysis identified that without the capacity boost, the model assigns a greater share of Metropolitan and Core cities’ growth to other HCT areas like bus rapid transit stations at the expense of regional growth centers in the Transit Focused Growth alternative compared to Stay the Course and Reset Urban Growth. Adding the centers capacity boost was found to address the discrepancy and also resulted in modest improved outcomes for selected performance indicators (e.g. System Vehicle Time Traveled, System Vehicle Delay, and Job Accessibility by Walk/Bike/Transit).

To promote consistency across the VISION 2050 alternatives, staff will be refining the Transit Focused Growth as well as Preferred Alternative modeling methodologies to include the regional growth center capacity boost for the final model runs.

**Kitsap County Jurisdiction Reclassifications – Preferred Alternative.** At the Growth Management Policy Board’s direction, the following jurisdictions will be reclassified to new regional geographies in the VISION 2050 preferred growth alternative as follows:

- Bremerton UGA reclassified from Urban Unincorporated to Metropolitan City
- Kingston UGA reclassified from Urban Unincorporated to HCT Community
- Port Orchard UGA reclassified from Urban Unincorporated to HCT Community
- Poulsbo PUTA reclassified from Urban Unincorporated to HCT Community

These reclassifications will be incorporated into the methodology used to generate the jurisdiction-level control total modeling inputs as well as performance indicators for the VISION 2050 Preferred Alternative. This change to the regional geographies in Kitsap means that some growth in Kitsap County is shifted from cities to the urban unincorporated area using the population and job allocation methodology in the modeling. Testing has shown the reclassifications generally result in modestly worse outcomes for a subset of indicators for Kitsap County; outcomes in other counties and the region at large are not impacted.

The reclassifications are applicable only to the Preferred Alternative and will not be reflected in the three alternatives – Stay the Course, Transit Focused Growth, and Reset Urban Growth – studied in the Draft Supplemental EIS. The changes will affect comparability of the Preferred Alternative against the other three alternatives for a small subset of performance indicators reported at the regional geography level.

**NEXT STEPS**

PSRC staff will proceed to incorporate these selected modeling changes into the final series of model runs for the four VISION 2050 growth alternatives. The modeling results will be evaluated as part of the final supplemental environmental analysis of the four alternatives, which is scheduled to be released for public comment in late winter 2020.
# 2020 GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARD MEETINGS

(updated October 2019)

### JANUARY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEBRUARY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MARCH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APRIL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUNE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JULY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUGUST
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEPTEMBER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OCTOBER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOVEMBER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DECEMBER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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