Growth Management Policy Board
Thursday, October 3, 2019 • 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
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 Hank Margeson, Vice 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 September 5, 2019
6. Discussion Item (10:20)
   a. VISION 2050 Comment and Draft Review -- Paul Inghram & Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
7. Information Item
   a. PSRC Accepting Applications for Non-Voting Board Members on Policy Boards
8. Information Item
   a. Updated 2019 Growth Management Policy Board Calendar
9. Next Meeting: November 7, 2019, 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m., PSRC Boardroom
   Major Topic for November:
   Draft VISION 2050 Plan Public Comments
10. Adjourn (12:00)
11. Communications

   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 العربية | 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
September 5, 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=1763]

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 10:07 a.m. by Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair

DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Director of Growth Management Paul Inghram highlighted the information item in the agenda packet for the upcoming Transit-Oriented Development/Bus Rapid Transit event in Bellevue on October 4. Mr. Inghram explained the two public comment opportunities at today’s meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT
The following people provided public comment on the September 5, 2019 GMPB agenda:

Alex Tsimerman expressed his frustrations providing public comment at past meetings.

John Niles expressed concerns that light rail will hit capacity at peak time, but that a new generation of buses will be able to take the capacity and a new generation of cars will adapt to conditions better to manage traffic.

DRAFT VISION 2050 PLAN PUBLIC HEARING
Chair Mello opened a public hearing on the Draft VISION 2050 Plan. The following comments were submitted into the record for the draft plan:

Grace Yuan, Legal Counsel for Snohomish County School Districts Group, provided two handouts to PSRC staff requesting amendments to VISION 2050 (specifically MPP-PS-25, MPP-PS-26, MPP-PS-27 and new policy MPP-PS-26-B). Ms. Yuan stated the first amendment would allow urban growth boundaries to be adjusted if a school site is adjacent to the urban growth area. Ms. Yuan briefly described the school districts’ boundary characteristics and challenges with school siting. She stated that
additional requested amendments recognize that each county is diverse in their school siting needs and would allow counties to maintain their current policies regarding siting schools. She briefly described the various ways that counties manage school siting. Ms. Yuan stated that current Snohomish County policies discourage placement of schools in rural areas but do not prohibit their placement in rural areas.

**Maria Batayola, Environmental Justice Coordinator for El Centro de la Raza,** provided a written letter from Centro de la Raza and stated her organization has concerns about air and land transportation pollution, specifically with regards to the flight paths over Beacon Hill. She stated that PSRC came to mind as an opportunity to address these issues in her community. Ms. Batayola stated transportation and growth policies must be sensitive to the environment, climate change, and community impacts. She concluded by suggesting that air transportation should be integrated into the land-based transportation planning process. She stated that she is worried that the environmental analysis done for land transportation will be remiss if air transportation impacts are not considered.

**Leah Missik, Climate Solutions,** stated concerns that VISION does not properly address climate change or address climate change in an equitable manner. Ms. Missik stated VISION 2050 should establish climate targets, and PSRC should lend its expertise to help local jurisdictions take climate action. Ms. Missik stated her support for the Climate Change chapter and committing to do a climate wedge analysis. She stated that Climate Solutions would like VISION 2050 to go further with taking climate action, by amending policies to commit to specific greenhouse gas pollution reduction goals aligned with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, leverage comprehensive plan approval and allocation of transportation funds to enforce emission reductions, commit local jurisdictions to sustainable growth, no new sprawl, and clean transportation. She noted that even though some of these suggestions are out of PSRC’s scope and control, the agency can be a valuable resource. Ms. Missik requested that PSRC create an implementation guide with model climate-related policies that local jurisdictions can adopt and evaluate greenhouse gas emissions every two years instead of every four years. She noted that PSRC’s plan and all decisions should align with climate targets.

**Andrew Kidde, climate activist with 350 Seattle,** stated the need to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) to achieve climate pollution reduction goals. He recognized that VISION 2050 notes the significance in reducing VMT to achieve climate goals and stated the VMT reduction associated with the Transit Focused Growth scenario. Mr. Kidde believes the VMT reduction is not enough and shared suggestions for further reduction of VMT. Mr. Kidde stated VISION 2050 should encourage cities with bus transit centers to dedicate bus lanes in and out of transit centers. He noted that bus lanes should be provided through all regional traffic choke points. Mr. Kidde requested more specific details on how to create compact, walkable places and suggested incorporating policies that address redevelopment of grayfield properties, private-public partnerships, improvements in local connectivity, and coordination with transit agencies. Mr. Kidde requested a more robust definition of “walkability” in VISION 2050.
Dale Bright, Laborers Local 242, thanked PSRC for giving a presentation on VISION 2050 to his group’s members. He discussed apprenticeship utilization and noted that many jurisdictions have adopted these requirements, noting some have created community workforce agreements. He stated that these programs turn public works projects into an extension of the state education system and provide job training for community members. He shared his personal experience working in the trades industry. Mr. Bright requested apprenticeship utilization be added as part of PSRC’s scoring requirements.

Hester Serebin, Policy Director of Transportation Choices Coalition, noted that her organization has been working with a coalition of organizations to collectively suggest recommendations for VISION 2050. She noted that written comments will be provided, but she wanted to share the following changes to VISION 2050 during the public hearing:

- Reduce rural and urban unincorporated growth to reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions
- Have regional geographies be consistent across all counties
- PSRC should develop an anti-displacement toolkit that would support jurisdictions in developing anti-displacement plans, in consultation with affected communities
- Commit to greenhouse gas targets and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in an equitable manner through comprehensive plan certification and transportation funding
- Incorporate air transportation planning into climate change planning
- Review land use plans to account for climate impacts such as sea level rise, flooding, wildfires, etc.
- Develop a dashboard to track progress on regional outcomes
- The use of regional health indicators to target pollution-reducing projects and lower health disparities
- Improve environmental justice analysis
- Create a plan for resourced environmental justice advisory group that can help create a regional equity strategy
- Strengthen commitments to open space

Dave Lange, Kenmore resident, former Shoreline resident, referenced a traffic study from the city of Shoreline and shared his concerns regarding Transit Oriented Development (TOD). He stated that he believes more TOD in the suburbs will lead to greater traffic congestion and personal vehicle trips. He noted a lack of commercial square footage in the regional TOD.

John Niles, resident, stated concerns about the plan’s goal of attracting 65% of population and 75% of job growth to centers and transit station areas. Mr. Niles noted outcomes in 2018 environmental impact statements that indicate transit usage will not increase enough to support the plan’s goal on transit-focus growth. He noted that private vehicle driving will still have a significant share of the transportation mode-split.
Mr. Niles also cited concerns about using VISION 2040 as a basis for VISION 2050 and the ability of VISION 2050 to meet goals. Mr. Niles stated that he has specific requests in his written testimony but that he is requesting PSRC inform the public about the current status of population and employment distribution as well as provide a quantitative, decade-by-decade plan for growth as a part of VISION 2050.

**Brianna Nicolello, Forterra,** described Forterra’s work and intent for providing written comments on the draft plan. She stated concerns that the current growth allocations proposed for rural areas risk creating land use patterns inconsistent with the goals of the Growth Management Act. She stated that rural growth implications include increased traffic congestion, increased infrastructure costs, loss of animal habitat, and environmental degradation. Ms. Nicolello described open spaces as important for economic, social, and environmental integrity. Ms. Nicolello stated PSRC should encourage local jurisdictions to conserve open space and provide equitable access to those preserved spaces. Ms. Nicolello requested for VISION 2050 to require cities and counties to align local comprehensive plans with the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan and measure the impacts of VISION 2050 against that plan.

**Anne Kroeker, resident,** requested that PSRC listen to recommendations from Climate Solutions, 350 Seattle, Beacon Hill community, and Forterra while crafting VISION 2050 with regards to sustainability and equity. Ms. Kroeker requested using 2018 data on emissions instead of 2015 data. Ms. Kroeker requested the creation of an economic-equity balance sheet to document potential and typical “winners and losers” for regional policies and plans. Ms. Kroeker requested specific targets and short- and long-term goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. She noted incentives and rewards should be built into emission reduction planning. Ms. Kroeker stated natural systems have an economic value and requested these values be documented in the VISION 2050, specifically the health benefits of natural systems. Ms. Kroeker also requested that farms are preserved in the region.

**Gena Estep, Director of Community Development for the City of Covington,** stated the City of Covington supports the draft VISION 2050 plan and transit-focused growth. However, she stated that the city has concerns regarding the implementation of growth targets. Ms. Estep requested more clarity in the plan on how the regional growth strategy will affect the local target-setting process.

**Tom Laufmann, Executive Director of Business Services for the Snohomish School District,** described challenges facing the Snohomish School District and placement of schools in rural areas. Mr. Laufmann requested that PSRC allow the Snohomish School District to site schools according to current Snohomish County policies.

**Milenko Matanović, Pomegranate Center,** shared his concern about the disconnect between planning and members of the public. Mr. Matanović suggested PSRC engage the public more creatively to ensure plans are carried out smoothly.
CHAIR’S REPORT
Chair Mello shared it was the last board meeting for Patricia Akiyama, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties, as Ms. Akiyama will be moving out of state. Chair Mello thanked her for her participation on the board. Chair Mello announced that two non-voting positions are open for reappointment this fall. The application deadline is October 18, 2019.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. Approve Minutes of Growth Management Policy Board Meeting held July 11, 2019

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

DRAFT VISION 2050 PLAN REVIEW
Mr. Inghram reviewed the work the board accomplished at the July 11 GMPB meeting. Senior Planner Andrea Harris-Long joined to share the outreach that was conducted on VISION 2050 over the summer. This included youth events, open houses, and participation at community events such as the Pierce County Fair, Evergreen State Fair, Burien’s B-Town Fiesta, and an upcoming Bremerton farmers market. PSRC has also been using more social media and online resources such as Google ads in addition to a blog post series. The agency also shared an outreach toolkit and translated materials in nine different languages. The board thanked staff for the outreach and for releasing a plan that is accessible to the general public.

Director of Transportation Kelly McGourty presented the climate analysis that shows the emissions by sector. Next steps include working with partners to address decreasing the greenhouse gas emissions in areas that are beyond PSRC’s influence.

Mr. Inghram presented information on fiscal sustainability related to the impacts of when incorporation takes away the tax bases from counties. There are policies and an action addressing funding sources in the Draft VISION 2050 Plan.

Principal Planner Liz Underwood-Bultmann presented information on jobs/housing balance including reviewing the work done so far. The board may continue to discuss and propose amendments to these topic areas at future meetings.

NEXT MEETING
The next Growth Management Policy Board meeting is scheduled for October 3 to review Draft VISION 2050 Plan public comments.

ADJOURN
The meeting adjourned at 11:58 a.m.
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GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARD Attendance Roster – September 5, 2019

**GMPB MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT**
*(Italicized = alternate)*
Patricia Akiyama, Master Builders Association – Business/Labor
Dave Andersen, WA State Department of Commerce (via remote)
Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold, Kirkland – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Councilmember Scott Bader, Metropolitan Center—Everett
*Councilmember Traci Buxton, Des Moines – Other Cities & Towns in King County*
Mayor John Chelminski, Metropolitan Center—Bellevue (via remote)
Dr. Anthony Chen, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department – Community/Environment
*Jeff Clarke, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District*
Commissioner Charlotte Garrido, Kitsap County (via remote)
Councilmember John Holman, Auburn – Other Cities & Towns in King County
Marty Kooistra, Housing Development Consortium – Seattle/King County
Councilmember Kathy Lambert, King County
Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond – Other Cities & Towns in King County (via remote)
Robin Mayhew, Transportation Agency – WSDOT
Councilmember Ryan Mello, Metropolitan Center—Tacoma
Barb Mock, Regional Staff Committee
*Councilmember Ron Peltier, Bainbridge Island – Other Cities & Towns in Kitsap County*
Deputy Mayor Cynthia Pratt, Thurston Regional Planning Council (via remote)
Mayor Rob Putaansuu, Port Orchard – Other Cities & Towns in Kitsap County
Councilmember Jan Schuette, Arlington – Other Cities & Towns in Snohomish County
Edna Shim, Seattle Children’s – Business/Labor
Commissioner Peter Steinbreuck, Port of Seattle – Ports
*Councilmember Nancy Tosta, Burien – Other Cities & Towns in King County*
Mayor Greg Wheeler, Metropolitan Center—Bremerton
*Councilmember Paul Winterstein, Issaquah – Other Cities & Towns in King County*
Bryce Yadon, Futurewise
Councilmember Derek Young, Pierce County

**GMPB MEMBERS ABSENT** *(alternate present)*
Councilmember Tim Curtis, Fife – Other Cities & Towns in Pierce County
Councilmember Larry Gossett, King County
Clayton Graham, Municipal League of King County – Business/Labor
Peter Mayer, Metro Parks Tacoma – Community/Environment
*Commissioner Paul McIntyre, Alderwood Water & Wastewater District*
Ian Morrison, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Association – Business/Labor
Councilmember Mike O’Brien, Metropolitan Center—Seattle
Councilmember Abel Pacheco, Metropolitan Center—Seattle
Rob Purser, Suquamish Tribe
Councilmember Terry Ryan, Snohomish County
*Commissioner Edward Wolfe, Kitsap County*
GUESTS AND PSRC/STAFF PRESENT
(As determined by signatures on the attendance sheet and documentation by staff.)

Bruce Agnew, Beaux Arts Village/Cascadia Center (via remote)
Maria Batayola, El Centro de la Raza
Laura Benjamin, PSRC
Dale Bright, Laborers Local 242
Carolyn Downs, PSRC
Gina Estep, City of Covington
Erika Harris, PSRC
Andrea Harris-Long, PSRC
Michael Hubner, City of Seattle
Kathryn Johnson, PSRC
Ben Kahn, PSRC
Andrew Kidde, 350 Seattle
Anne Kroeker
Tom Laufmann, Snohomish School District
Dave Lange
Milenko Matanović, Pomegranate Center
Kelly McGourty, PSRC
Leah Missik, Climate Solutions
Kristin Mitchell, PSRC
Maggie Moore, PSRC
Brianna Nicolello, Forterra
John Niles
Brian Parry, SCA
Marianne Seifert, Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department
Hester Serebrin, Transportation Choices Coalition
David Toyer, Toyer Consulting
Alex Tsimerman
Liz Underwood-Bultmann, PSRC
Grace Yuan, Snohomish County School Districts Group
Karen Wolf, King County
IN BRIEF

PSRC solicited comments on the draft VISION 2050 plan from July 19 through September 16. Staff will provide the Growth Management Policy Board with an overview of the comments received and continue to review the draft plan. An organized list of comments will be provided for the November board meeting. Staff recommends holding an extended meeting in November to provide time to review comments and to schedule a December meeting to take action on a recommendation to the Executive Board.

DISCUSSION

At the July 11 meeting, the board acted to release the draft growth strategy, policies, and actions for public review and comment during a 60-day comment period that runs through September 16. Following board action, staff assembled a complete plan document that combines each of the policy chapters and includes several sections of narrative discussion.

At the October meeting staff will:

- Provide an overview of public comment themes on the draft plan
- Seek additional board direction on key areas that the board previously identified for additional consideration:
  - Regional Growth Strategy
  - Climate change
  - Jobs/housing balance
Public Engagement and Comments

PSRC engaged in a significant public outreach process that was reviewed at the September meeting. In summary, PSRC held draft review work sessions and public open houses in five locations, stationed booths or tables at four fairs, festivals and farmers markets around the region, held sessions with six 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 (Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Russian, Korean, Arabic, German, French, and Tagalog) 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.

Through internet sites and social media, notice of the draft plan reached about 300,000 people. Over 9,000 unique users visited the online open house and the draft plan was downloaded over 1,300 times. In total, PSRC received 590 letters, emails or comments in other forms. The comments are organized by:

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

Comments addressed a wide range of topics. Some appreciated the work of PSRC and the board and noted their support of VISION 2050. Others made general comments about the region and the need to plan for growth. PSRC will provide an organized table of comments that are specific to the draft plan for the board’s review at the November meeting.

Some common themes generally and from countywide letters include:

- **Climate Change:** There were comments from more than 300 individuals, local governments, the ports, and other stakeholders that supported stronger action on climate change. This is discussed below.
- **Equity/environmental justice:** Several letters express support for the expanded discussion of social equity in the plan and the action to develop a regional equity strategy. Several comments call for consideration of disadvantaged groups and a need for greater attention to environmental justice. Some communities called for additional guidance from PSRC on expectations and expressed concern about
how equity would be used in plan certification and what it would mean for local plans.

- **Urban growth / protection of rural areas:** Several comments advocate for growth in urban areas, near transit and in designated centers and express general support for the Transit Focused Growth alternative discussed in the DSEIS. Several also voice concern about growth in or impacts to rural areas, with some specifically questioning the potential growth numbers for rural Snohomish County and concern about the potential of urban growth area expansion. Some voiced concern about growth in and near Black Diamond and general concerns about growth away from transit and employment centers.

- **Housing affordability:** Comments asked for more work to provide affordable housing and to address housing choice affordability broadly.

- **Aviation:** A number of comments express concern about community impacts from aviation, including environmental justice and disproportionate impacts on lower income communities. Several asked for better integration of air transportation planning in regional planning.

- **Tribes:** The Suquamish Tribe, Tulalip Tribes, and the Puyallup Tribe provided comment letters that support recognition of tribal lands, tribal rights, and the need to coordinate planning efforts. Other letters support native people, the need to consider environmental impacts on tribes, and suggested changes to how tribal lands are discussed in the Regional Growth Strategy.

- **Military Communities:** The Pierce County Regional Council and other jurisdictions voiced support for the region’s military installations and the need to support communities near installations.

- **Fiscal Challenges:** Sound Cities, King County, and several cities commented asking for more work to address the financial constraints of counties and cities.

- **Implementation:** Several letters discuss questions, concerns and ideas regarding implementation of the policies and the Regional Growth Strategy through regional and local actions, plan certification, and funding.

**Approach for Board Review of Comments**

At its October meeting, staff will provide a review of common themes in the comments and topics of interest previously identified by the board. With board direction at this meeting, staff can develop additional information or amendments on major issues for the board’s consideration in November.

PSRC staff are reviewing and organizing comments for more detailed board review at its November meeting. Staff are identifying minor recommended goal, policy, and action changes that are consistent with previous board direction. Staff are also identifying major changes requested by public comments that would require additional
board direction. Staff are working to make minor text changes and will provide the board with documentation of them prior to the board’s action.

Staff will distribute the organized comment matrix for board review in advance of the November meeting, which will assist board members in understanding major issues. Board members are asked to review the matrix and identify amendments for consideration in advance of the November meeting. **Staff request that any amendments from board members be submitted by noon on Monday, November 4, to allow time to distribute to the full board.**

**Topic Review**

At the time of the release of the draft plan, the Growth Management Policy Board identified fiscal sustainability, climate change, jobs/housing balance, and aspects of the Regional Growth Strategy as items to continue to review and potentially adjust, along with issues that may be raised through the public comment process. Earlier in the year, the board discussed the importance of implementation of the plan, accountability, and communicating the plan’s objectives. The Regional Staff Committee held a work session at its September meeting focusing on the relationship of the Regional Growth Strategy and countywide growth targets and how PSRC could best support countywide and local planning efforts.

**Regional Growth Strategy**

At its September meeting, the Regional Staff Committee discussed the relationship between the Regional Growth Strategy and countywide targets. Planning for growth that is consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy is an important part of how the region plans for transportation and infrastructure and works to meet other objectives of VISION 2050.

The Regional Growth Strategy chapter includes guidance on aligning growth targets to the strategy. The draft plan describes that individual areas may not be perfectly aligned with the Regional Growth Strategy and that flexibility in implementing it is built in, even as communities plan for consistency with VISION 2050 (see page 43 of the draft plan). PSRC received several public comments on how language in this section could be clarified or changed.

During the 2015-2016 plan certification process, there was confusion about the differences between planned growth and actual growth, and between capacity and targets. At their September 19, 2019 meeting, members of the Regional Staff Committee discussed options to improve the language in the draft plan to be clearer and more precise. With the board’s direction, staff will continue to work with the
Regional Staff Committee to update the growth strategy guidance included in VISION 2050 and will plan to provide support to the target setting and comprehensive plan update processes this winter and next year.

In addition to the work of the Regional Staff Committee, several public comments on the draft plan encouraged maintaining urban growth in urban areas and to protect rural areas. Comments questioned the amount of growth planned for rural Snohomish Council and were opposed to expansion of the Snohomish County urban growth boundary. Comments also expressed concern about growth in and around Black Diamond in King County. Some comment letters also raised concerns about consistency of the regional geographies throughout the region.

The draft plan includes a range of growth numbers for Pierce County geographies as a placeholder for a specific allocation. Pierce County and Tacoma indicate that there are ongoing discussions about the growth strategy for the county. The City of Lakewoood’s comment letter recommends a third option of growth numbers for the Pierce County geographies.

**Does the board have additional guidance on allocations in the Regional Growth Strategy? Should staff prepare additional options or analysis for the Regional Growth Strategy and the November board meeting?**

**Climate Change**

PSRC received over 300 comments seeking stronger action to address climate change and many asking for explicit inclusion of greenhouse gas reduction targets in VISION 2050 goals or policies. A large portion of these letters are very similar to each other and state VISION must guide the region toward cutting emissions by half by 2030, if not to cut emissions altogether by 2030. Other individual comments include support for variations of emission reduction targets. For example, the 350 Seattle organization’s letter states that VISION 2050 should be built around the goal of reducing climate pollution by 45% by 2030 and eliminating it by 2050. Several jurisdictional letters also express support for addressing climate change and more explicitly incorporating emission targets. Kenmore asks how regional climate policies will change expectations for local plan updates and Mill Creek encourages adoption of realistic standards.

The draft of VISION 2050 includes a new Climate Change chapter and policy amendments that strengthen the regional plan’s direction on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. With the state and other regional and local agencies already having adopted greenhouse gas targets, the draft policies support them rather than create yet another separate target. Following last month’s board meeting, staff updated information about how transportation-related emissions relate to total regional emissions (see attached).
Considering that greenhouse gases are tied to transportation and the built environment, but also stem from other sources such as power generation, it’s important for VISION 2050 to recognize the need to work collaboratively across several fronts to address climate change. The actions listed in VISION 2050 direct PSRC to continue to implement the Four-Part Strategy and to work with other agencies to reduce greenhouse gases.

Comments provide a range of suggestions on how to further amend the draft plan. For example, the City of Burien recommends modifying the Climate Change chapter goal to read:

\[ \text{Goal: The region substantially reduces emissions of greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change in accordance with the goals of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (50\% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80\% below 1990 levels by 2050) and prepares for climate change impacts.} \]

This general approach is supported by the comment letter from King County and several cities. Many commenters also support VISION 2050’s narrative and policies on climate change and recommend additional implementation actions, such as a climate action plan.

**Should staff prepare amendments to the draft Climate Change chapter consistent with the provided comments for review in November? Does the board need additional information to support this discussion?**

**Jobs/Housing Balance**

Board members raised questions about how the growth strategy and housing policy could work together to better connect housing, jobs, and transportation. Effectively reducing and shortening commute trips can occur by providing enough housing in high-job-growth areas, supporting the development of a full range of housing types and densities, supporting a development pattern that best maximizes the transportation system, and providing greater housing affordability, especially to support lower wage jobs. Lack of balance can be mitigated by providing alternative and reliable transportation choices that connect people to job centers. Additional jobs in communities that lack transit or nonmotorized connections may not result in improved commutes or regional mobility.

While VISION 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategy would make significant improvement to jobs/housing balance compared to VISION 2040, some board members express concern that the strategy may not be fully realized. At the September meeting, the board briefly discussed a range of potential strategies that could be expanded in VISION 2050:
• Shift additional 5% of regional population growth to King County from Pierce and Snohomish counties
• Prepare guidance for establishing growth targets that includes working towards jobs/housing balance in each subregion
• Set minimums for housing development in HCT stations, potentially through county-level target setting

These additional steps could be in addition to the policies and strategies already included in the draft VISION 2050 to improved jobs/housing balance:

• The Regional Growth Strategy shifts 5% of regional employment growth from King County to Pierce, Snohomish and Kitsap counties. This will result in planning for 24,000 additional jobs, each, in Pierce and Snohomish counties, and 12,000 more in Kitsap County.

• Housing policy in VISION 2050 encourages planning for more housing, more types and greater affordability in all urban areas. Doing so will create more opportunity for people to find housing that meets their needs closer to where they work. The Housing chapter includes actions to prepare a Regional Housing Strategy, provide Regional Housing Assistance, and to seek state support to better address housing issues.

• Policies in VISION 2050 directly address jobs/housing balance. Housing policy H-6 states:

  Develop and provide a range of housing choices for workers at all income levels throughout the region in a manner that promotes accessibility to jobs and provides opportunities to live in proximity to work.

• The Economy chapter includes a parallel policy (EC-18) regarding jobs development.

Several comment letters discuss jobs-housing balance, including the Pierce County Regional Council letter, which suggests revisions to VISION 2050.

Housing Policy MPP-H-1:
Plan for housing supply, forms, and densities to meet the region’s current and projected needs consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and to advance job-housing balance to the maximum extent feasible.

Housing Policy MPP-H-6:
Develop and provide a range of housing choices for workers at all income levels throughout the region in a manner that promotes accessibility to jobs and provides opportunities to live in proximity to work. High concentrations of jobs are located in manufacturing/industrial centers; careful consideration for
protection of industrial land must be given when considering housing in proximity to a Manufacturing Industrial Center (MIC).

These potential amendments will be included in the matrix of comments provided in November.

*Should staff prepare additional changes to the Regional Growth Strategy or policies on jobs-housing balance for review in November?*

**Other Comments**
The countywide letters identify several requested amendments the board may want to review in advance of the November Growth Management Policy Board meeting.

**Military Installations.** The Pierce County Regional Council requests several additional policies and actions regarding military installations. These include:

- **MML-1:** Recognize that military installations can have beneficial economic impacts but can also result in land use, housing, and transportation challenges for adjacent and nearby communities.

- **MML-2:** While the region does not fund infrastructure improvements within Major Military Installations (MMI’s), it should assist proximate communities to address the challenges associated with MMI’s through planning and infrastructure development.

- **MML-Action-1:** PSRC will support and assist communities proximate to MMI’s to meet their GMA obligations to plan for impacts associated with military installations.

- **MML-Action-2:** PSRC will incorporate information, based on a completed local transportation study, how a project benefits transportation to and from a military installation into decision criteria for infrastructure funding allocations.

- **MML-Action-2:** PSRC will coordinate with other agencies and NGOs regarding state level advocacy efforts for state and federal funding and policy support for military-community compatibility.

**UGA Flexibility.** The Snohomish County Tomorrow letter requests that VISION 2050 “include UGA boundary flexibility to allow for changing population distribution, taking into consideration logical service and natural boundaries.”
Airports
PSRC received a group of letters addressing the noise, community and pollution impacts related to airports and requests that regional planning better integrate air transportation planning and environmental health considerations.

Should staff prepare additional materials or policy amendments on any of these topics for November? These potential amendments will be included in the matrix of comments provided in November.

NEXT STEPS

Staff and the outreach consultant are working to sort and tabulate the comments on the draft plan for the board’s consideration at its November meeting.

Are there parts of the plan, policies, actions, or other components that the board would like to consider at the November meeting? If board members seek to suggest additional revisions to the draft plan, 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.

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 - Climate Analysis
PSRC's Climate Change Analysis

As illustrated in the table below, the sources of greenhouse gas emissions in the Puget Sound region encompass a variety of sectors, including the built environment, transportation and other mobile sources, solid waste, water and wastewater, agriculture and other sectors. The draft VISION 2050 plan contains policies addressing climate change across many of these areas - e.g. transportation, energy supply, conservation, etc. In addition, there are numerous actions and regulations at the state and local level addressing these sources, including the recently adopted Clean Energy Transformation and Clean Buildings Acts by the State Legislature.

PSRC is working with partner agencies to estimate the emissions reductions possible from the full spectrum of sectors identified below, based on current programs and legislation. However, PSRC's analysis capabilities address the on-road transportation system only, as influenced by land use patterns and population and employment. As such, the climate change analysis for the draft VISION 2050 plan reflects the total estimated greenhouse gas emissions (carbon dioxide equivalent) produced from on-road vehicles, based on the investments and assumptions in the current Regional Transportation Plan, the expected growth in population and employment by 2050, and the draft regional growth strategy.

In addition to this analysis, PSRC has adopted a Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy that identifies opportunities for further emission reductions that may be possible within each of the following areas – land use, transportation choices, pricing and technology. These strategies go above and beyond what is captured in the core analysis as described above, reflecting additional levers that are consistent with the draft VISION 2050 policies – e.g., increased pricing mechanisms and cleaner vehicles.

As illustrated below, the draft VISION 2050 plan – based on the core analysis assumptions mentioned above – has the potential to reduce emissions from on-road vehicles 16% from 2015 (the base year of the regional inventory), by the year 2050. With the additional levers analyzed in the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, there is the potential to reduce emissions even further, to between 37% and 58% below 2015 levels. These potential reductions from the on-road transportation sector will be combined with the estimated reductions from the other sectors of the inventory to produce a more comprehensive assessment in the coming months.

The draft Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy Scenarios referenced in the table include the following assumptions:

- Land Use – draft Regional Growth Strategy
- Pricing – increase in the user fee assumptions as adopted in the Regional Transportation Plan up to an additional $.025 to $.05 per mile
- Choices – suggests an additional 1-2% reduction in emissions can be generated with off-model improvements such as greater share of telework and enhanced pedestrian networks
- Technology – analysis of increased share of electric vehicles (25%-50% of the entire fleet by 2050) and increased medium and heavy-duty truck fuel economy (5-10% improvement)
### PSCAA REGIONAL GHG EMISSIONS INVENTORY - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Regional Emissions (metric tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>19,782,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>7,351,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>4,035,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (heating)</td>
<td>2,708,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (non-road equipment)</td>
<td>408,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td>6,527,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>3,848,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas (heat and other)</td>
<td>1,789,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas (equipment)</td>
<td>40,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (heat and other)</td>
<td>428,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (equipment)</td>
<td>273,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>148,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong></td>
<td>5,903,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>851,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process emissions</td>
<td>452,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary combustion</td>
<td>2,574,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive gas</td>
<td>2,024,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and other Mobile Sources</strong></td>
<td>13,246,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road vehicles</td>
<td>11,884,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger vehicles</td>
<td>9,838,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight and service vehicles</td>
<td>1,824,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit vehicles</td>
<td>221,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight and passenger rail</td>
<td>158,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine vessels</td>
<td>519,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road vehicles and other mobile equipment</td>
<td>29,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air travel</td>
<td>654,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid Waste</strong></td>
<td>622,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation and disposal of solid waste</td>
<td>622,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water and Wastewater</strong></td>
<td>295,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable water process emissions</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater process emissions</td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>376,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domesticated animal production</td>
<td>176,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure decomposition and treatment</td>
<td>199,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary Emission Sectors</strong></td>
<td>122,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil management</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>92,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>34,445,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PSRC Analysis - Draft VISION 2050 and Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy Scenarios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Draft VISION 2050</th>
<th>Four-Part GHG Strategy Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft VISION 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Part GHG Strategy Scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td>-58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Attachment: A - Climate Analysis (2676 : VISION 2050)
INFORMATION ITEM

September 26, 2019

To: Growth Management Policy Board

From: Josh Brown, Executive Director

Subject: PSRC Accepting Applications for Non-Voting Board Members on Policy Boards

IN BRIEF

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) is currently accepting applications for non-voting board members for the Growth Management Policy Board and the Transportation Policy Board.

DISCUSSION

Interested in regional planning? PSRC is offering an opportunity to participate in long-range policy making.

The Transportation Policy Board and Growth Management Policy Board are looking for interested group representatives to serve as non-voting members.

Each board has openings in the categories of business/labor and community/environment. The seats are for three-year terms.

Interested groups that would like to apply should do so by 5 p.m. on Friday, October 18, 2019.

Organizations that apply are asked to name a lead and alternative representative in the application. The application can also be found at: https://www.psrc.org/whats-happening/blog/join-one-psrcs-policy-boards

The decision will be made in December for new members to be seated in January 2020.

PSRC seeks and encourages diversity in its boards.

For questions, contact Sheila Rogers at srogers@psrc.org or 206-464-5815.
# 2019 GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARD MEETINGS

*(updated September 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</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.

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

*December 5 Meeting Time - TBD*

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](https://www.psrc.org/board/growth-management-policy-board)

---

Communication: Updated 2019 Growth Management Policy Board Calendar (Information Item)