Overview

- Draft VISION 2050 comments
- Technical work
- Board follow-up items
  - Regional Growth Strategy
  - Jobs/housing balance
  - Climate change
  - Fiscal sustainability
  - Countywide issues
Schedule

• **Sept 26** – Compilation of comments provided with meeting packet

• **Today** – Seek general Board guidance

• **Oct 24** – Distribution of policy/comment matrix

• **Nov 4** – Board members to identify amendments

• **Nov 7** – Extended GMPB meeting
VISION 2050

July-Sept. 2019
✓ 60-day public comment period
✓ Public hearing

Oct. 2019
✓ Review key board and countywide issues

Nov. 2019
✓ Review comment matrix and package of amendments

Dec. 2019
✓ Finalize draft plan
✓ Recommend to Executive Board
Comment Overview

• About 590 commenters*
  • 464 individuals, 3 tribes, 38 jurisdictions and 47 orgs/agencies
  • About 1,600 individual comments

• Common themes & countywide comments:
  • Climate change,
  • Equity/environmental justice
  • Regional Growth Strategy / protection of rural areas
  • Housing access & affordability
  • Aviation impacts & airport planning
  • Tribes
  • Military
  • Fiscal challenges / implementation
Response to Public Comments

• Major changes requested, seeking board direction
• Minor recommended text or policy changes revisions
• Statements, other no action comments

Board-Identified Amendments

• Board-initiated
• Sponsored by board members

Regional Growth Strategy

• Finalize preferred alternative
Technical Work

- Continued modeling work to refine product and consider scenarios
Model Refinements

• Adjust ‘developer lever’ – improvement to measures of land development and impervious surfaces
• Growth in regional growth centers – improve consistency between alternatives

Light Rail Attraction

• Within Transit Focused alternative, distribution of growth near light rail vs other types of transit
• Hold counties constant
• Increased growth near light rail reduces delay, increases boardings

Will document model refinements in Final SEIS
Issue Review

- Regional Growth Strategy
- Jobs/housing balance
- Climate change
- Countywide comments
Most growth in Metro, Core, and High Capacity Transit Communities

65% of region’s population growth and 75% of employment growth in regional growth centers & near HCT

Lower growth allocations in urban unincorporated and rural compared with long-term trends

Better jobs-housing balance by shifting employment allocation from King County
Draft Preferred Alternative would call for:

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

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

Summary of comments:

• Support for Transit Focused Growth and growth near transit infrastructure

• Support for encouraging growth in urban areas & protection of rural lands
  • Questions/concerns regarding growth allocation to rural Snohomish County
  • Concerns about growth in Black Diamond
Regional Staff Committee review of growth target guidance

- Recognition that targets may not perfectly align
- Flexibility built in: different horizon, geographies
- Recommend that PSRC be active in target setting process
- Provide clearer information early to local jurisdictions
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?
Jobs/Housing Balance

• Importance of where people live and work for mobility, quality of life, environmental outcomes
• Relationship to income, housing needs, and affordability

Draft VISION 2050:
• 5% shift of employment allocation from King County
• Achieves improved balance over 2017 or Stay the Course
• Policies on jobs-housing balance, actions to provide guidance on growth targets
## Jobs/Housing Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San mushroom</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East King</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South King</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jobs/Housing Balance

Several comment letters, including revisions requested by the Pierce County Regional Council:

- 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).
Jobs/Housing Balance

Additional options to expand focus:

• Shift additional population growth to King County
• Guidance for setting growth targets to achieve housing supply or subarea jobs/housing balance
• Minimums for housing development in high-capacity transit stations
Scenario: 5% Housing Shift

What happens if additional population growth shifted to King County? (5% = 90,000 people)

• Improves jobs/housing ratios – especially for East King and Sea/Shore subareas
• Delay measure improves for Snohomish and Pierce counties
• Reduces vehicle hours
• Improves alignment with current capacity near transit stations
• Challenge of how to shift growth from other counties
Jobs/Housing Balance

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

- Received over 300 comments that support strong action on climate change.
- Supportive of the Climate chapter and Four-Part Strategy.
- Many seek setting goal for eliminating GHG emissions by 2030 or 2050.
- Comments provide a range of suggestions; e.g., the City of Burien recommends goal to read:
  
  **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.
Draft VISION 2050:

- Includes new Climate Change chapter
- Policies strengthened, e.g.:
  - MPP-CC-1 – Advance state, regional, and local actions that substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions in support of state, regional, and local emission reduction goals, including targets adopted by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
- Regional Growth Strategy allocates majority of growth to locations near transit
- Actions support ongoing work and coordination:
  - Continued implementation of Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy
  - Review with 4-year updates of Regional Transportation Plan
  - Engage in regional resilience planning
## Chalmont Analysis

### PSCAA REGIONAL GHG EMISSIONS INVENTORY - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Regional Emissions (MgCO2e)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Draft VISION 2050</th>
<th>Four-Part GHG Strategy Scenario</th>
<th>Four-Part GHG Strategy Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>19,782,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>4,035,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>2,708,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (heating)</td>
<td>198,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (non-road equipment)</td>
<td>408,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td>6,527,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>3,848,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas (heat and other)</td>
<td>1,789,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas (equipment)</td>
<td>40,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (heat and other)</td>
<td>428,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum (equipment)</td>
<td>273,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>148,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong></td>
<td>5,903,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>851,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process emissions</td>
<td>452,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary combustion</td>
<td>2,574,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive gas</td>
<td>2,024,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and other Mobile Sources</strong></td>
<td>13,246,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road vehicles</td>
<td>11,884,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger vehicles</td>
<td>9,838,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight and service vehicles</td>
<td>1,824,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit vehicles</td>
<td>221,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight and passenger rail</td>
<td>158,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine vessels</td>
<td>619,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road vehicles and other mobile equipment</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid Waste</strong></td>
<td>622,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation and disposal of solid waste</strong></td>
<td>622,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water and Wastewater</strong></td>
<td>296,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable water process emissions</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater process emissions</td>
<td>289,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>376,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domesticated animal production</td>
<td>176,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure decomposition and treatment</td>
<td>199,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary Emission Sectors</strong></td>
<td>122,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil management</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>92,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>34,445,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?
Several members express concern about the fiscal challenge of responding to growth and maintaining current infrastructure

- E.g., Kenmore: “Consideration should be given to a new policy calling for support for local and regional efforts to develop state legislation to provide new fiscal tools…”

Draft VISION 2050 includes policy MPP-RC-10 and RC-Action-5 to explore funding for services and infrastructure
Countywide/Other Issues

- Military installations
- UGA flexibility
- Airports

Should staff prepare additional materials or policy amendments on any of these topics for November?
Military Installations

Pierce County Regional Council requests additional policies and actions regarding military installations:

- Policy 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.

- Policy 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-3: 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.
Snohomish County Tomorrow requests “UGA boundary flexibility to allow for changing population distribution...”

Existing requirements on UGA changes: Growth Management Act, CPPs, and county plans include requirements on urban growth area expansions.

Draft VISION 2050 policy provides flexibility, while supporting stability of urban growth area:

- MPP-RGS-5 Ensure the long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth area consistent with the regional vision.
Airports/Aviation

Many comments received from members and individuals about aviation impacts

- Ask for integrating airport planning into VISION 2050
- Seek to address environmental justice of disproportionate impacts to some communities
Today's Meeting
July 11th July-Sept. 2019

- Outstanding policy issues
- Finalized draft growth strategy
- 60-day public comment period
- Fall 2019
  - Review comments
  - Finalize draft plan
  - Recommend to Executive Board
- Adoption of VISION 2050 in Spring 2020
  - Recommendation to General Assembly
  - Release Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
  - Recommendation to Executive Board
  - Adoption of VISION 2050 in Spring 2020

Next Steps

Should staff prepare additional materials or policy amendments for November?

- Oct 28 – Distribution of policy/comment matrix
- Nov 4 – Board members to identify amendments ahead of Nov 7 meeting
Thank you.

Paul Inghram, AICP
Director of Growth Management
Plingham@psrc.org

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