Progress on VISION 2050 Draft Plan

June 20, 2019
Regional Staff Committee
**What We’ve Done:**
*(Spring 2018-April 2019)*

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

### Policy Review

- **February 2019**
  - Housing

- **March 2019**
  - Environment & Development Patterns

- **April 2019**
  - Development Patterns, Transportation & Public Services

- **May 2019**
  - Economy, Regional Collaboration & Regional Growth Strategy
June 6th & 13th
- Review DSEIS comments
- Preferred RGS
- Outstanding policy issues

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

July-Sept. 2019
- 60-day public comment period
Policy Review

• Level 1 – additional board review
• Level 2 – consent revisions

Regional Growth Strategy

• Pierce and Snohomish – adjustments to UU and R
• Kitsap – change to definitions and adjustments
• Goals for High Capacity Transit areas
Policy Review

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

- Level 1 – Needs additional board review
- Level 2 – Consent revisions
Questions and policies related to the Regional Growth Strategy

- Rural growth
- Capacity
- Implementation
- Flexibility
Regional Growth Strategy
What is the draft preferred alternative and what were the requested changes from Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties?
RGS Objectives

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

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

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

Average Annual Population Change

[Bar chart showing population changes across different categories: Metropolitan Cities, Core Cities, HCT Communities, Cities and Towns, Urban Unincorporated, Rural. Categories are represented by different colors and years: 2000-17 Actual, 2010-17 Actual, Stay the Course, Reset Urban Growth, Transit Focused Growth, Prelim Preferred Alternative v.1.]
Average Annual Population Change

- **Metropolitan Cities**: 4,100 (2000-17 Actual), 4,100 (2010-17 Actual)
- **Core Cities**: 3,100 (2000-17 Actual), 2,600 (2010-17 Actual)
- **HCT Communities**: 1,600 (2000-17 Actual), 1,100 (2010-17 Actual)
- **Cities and Towns**: 760 (2000-17 Actual), 760 (2010-17 Actual)
- **Urban Unincorporated**: 1,800 (2000-17 Actual), 1,200 (2010-17 Actual)
- **Rural**: 330 (2000-17 Actual), 670 (2010-17 Actual)

**Legend**:
- Black: 2000-17 Actual
- Gray: 2010-17 Actual
- Teal: Stay the Course
- Purple: Reset Urban Growth
- Green: Transit Focused Growth
- Red: Prelim Preferred Alternative v. 1
Kitsap Request

- Include both cities and associated UGAs in geography allocations
- Classify Kingston as a High Capacity Transit Community
- Reduce Bremerton & its associated UGA from about 34% to 32% of population growth
- Increase Central Kitsap unincorporated UGA from about 5% to 7% of population growth
What would be the implications of the Kitsap County request?
Regional Geographies

• Scoping comments: Differentiate urban unincorporated areas by ability to support growth (access to transit & plan for annexation/incorporation)

• DSEIS sorts UU areas into two regional geographies

• Countywide targets frequently identify targets for specific UU areas

High Capacity Transit Communities

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

Unincorporated Urban Areas

Urban unincorporated areas without high capacity transit and/or not planned for annexation or incorporation
Should Kingston be included in HCT Communities?

- HCT Communities defined as served by HCT and planned for incorporation or annexation
- Served by fast ferry
- County indicates intent to plan for incorporation
- VISION 2050 could include Kingston in HCTC with * noting county’s work to plan for incorporation
Should Metro and HCT Communities geographies for Kitsap include both cities & the unincorporated UGA?

• Would acknowledge UGAs as being closely linked to cities
• 40+ cities have UGA areas – how would this change effect them?
• Would redefine geographies either for Kitsap or region
• May shift growth targets from cities to unincorporated areas
How can the RGS limit the potential effects of rural and urban unincorporated growth?

How should policy objectives to manage rural and UU growth be accounted for in allocations?
Draft Preferred Alternative

• Modified draft provides most benefits of Transit Focused Growth
  • Large portion of future growth continues to occur near transit and in compact, walkable communities
• Some worse outcomes from shifting growth to outlying areas
• Requests reflect trends, capacity, development
### Per Capita VMT (average daily)

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

**General Effects of Lower-Density Growth**

- Cost of service extension
- Longer commutes, fewer mobility options
- Loss of natural lands, carbon sequestration
- Loss of working lands
Overall, limited changes across the regional screening factors, but differences in some transportation measures.

### System Vehicle Miles Traveled

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

### Transit Ridership (Annual Boardings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth 508 million</th>
<th>Draft Preliminary Preferred 502 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Rural growth rates are trending downward
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Rural growth rates are trending downward.
What assumptions should go into rural growth allocations?

• Growth trends are downward
• Existing available lots allow continued development
• Market factors and site suitability?
• Vacancy rate is about 10% in rural areas
• How effective might conservation programs be?
What should the growth goal be for high capacity transit areas and centers?

What are the implications of a change?
HCT Areas

Includes:

- Regional Growth Centers
- ½ mile walkshed from Light Rail, Commuter Rail, and Ferry
- ¼ mile walkshed from Bus Rapid Transit
- Basis for developing new regional geographies, which also factor in other policy goals
Regional High Capacity Transit Goal

• Development capacity + historical growth trends suggest:
  • 75% goal for employment is ambitious, yet achievable
  • 75% goal for population more challenging

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

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

65% goal more than doubles the number of people in HCT areas in 2050

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

65% goal is more consistent with peer regions, capacity, and development trends and still represents an ambitious goal for residential growth
Next Steps for GMPB

June 13 meeting
• Discussed Level 1 and Level 2 issue structure for July 11 meeting
• Reviewed RGS objectives and draft preferred alternative
• Reviewed draft policies
• Responded to GMPB questions
• Set direction for July 11 meeting

July 11 meeting
• Full board discussion and action to release draft plan for public review
Thank you.