Overview

- Draft Concept for the Preliminary Preferred Alternative
- Committee Discussion
- Transit Growth Goal
- Next Steps
Preferred Alternative Schedule

March 2019: Board & committee presentations on DSEIS

April 2019: Begin discussion of priorities

May 2019: Review comments, discuss priorities, develop preferred alternative concepts

June 2019: Refine and finalize draft preferred alternative

July 2019: Release draft VISION 2050 plan for comment
## Growth Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth focused in Metropolitan and Core cities</td>
<td>More compact growth focused in high capacity transit (HCT) areas</td>
<td>Growth more distributed throughout the urban growth area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DSEIS Comments

• Strong support for Transit Focused Growth

• Concerns about displacement, some growth allocations

• Snohomish County Tomorrow and Pierce County numeric recommendations

Draft Preferred Alternative Approach: Use Transit Focused Growth as starting point, make adjustments
Transit Focused Growth

Average Annual Population Change - Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000-17 Actual</th>
<th>2010-17 Actual</th>
<th>Stay the Course</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth</th>
<th>Reset Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Cities</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Cities</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT Communities</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities and Towns</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Unincorporated</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Focused Growth

Average Annual Employment Change - Region

- Metropolitan Cities: 24,000
- Core Cities: 15,500
- HCT Communities: 12,300
- Cities and Towns: 4,600
- Urban Unincorporated: 1,500
- Rural: 800

2000-17 Actual | 2010-17 Actual | Stay the Course | Transit Focused Growth | Reset Urban Growth
Population Request:

- Rural at 6% (25,000) – up from TFG at 2% (10,000)
- Urban Unincorporated at 4% (18,000) – up from TFG at 3% (12,000)
- HCT Communities at 50% (210,000) – down from TFG at 54% (231,000)

→ Rural growth levels twice as much as Transit Focused Growth, but under half the share in Stay the Course

→ UU allocation ~50% more growth than Transit Focused Growth, but about 1/3 as much as Reset Urban Growth
Average Annual Population Change - Snohomish

- **Metropolitan Cities:**
  - 2000-17 Actual: 2,600
  - 2010-17 Actual: 2,600

- **Core Cities:**
  - 2000-17 Actual: 1,400
  - 2010-17 Actual: 1,400

- **HCT Communities:**
  - 2000-17 Actual: 7,000
  - 2010-17 Actual: 6,400

- **Cities and Towns:**
  - 2000-17 Actual: 1,100
  - 2010-17 Actual: 1,100

- **Urban Unincorporated:**
  - 2000-17 Actual: 350
  - 2010-17 Actual: 550

- **Rural:**
  - 2000-17 Actual: 320
  - 2010-17 Actual: 760
Population Request:

- Rural at 8% (30,000) – up from TFG at 3% (11,000)
- Urban Unincorporated at 22% (80,000) – up from TFG at 11% (41,000)
- Draft PPA: Increase Rural to 6% (22,000) and UU to 16% (60,000).

→ Urban Unincorporated allocation is ~50% increase over Transit Focused Growth and about twice Stay the Course

→ Rural at the Reset Urban Growth share is about twice the levels in Stay the Course

→ Draft PPA reduces Core Cities from 28% to 23% and HCT Communities from 14% to 10%
Population Growth

Average Annual Population Change - Pierce

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

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

- Modified version provides most benefits of Transit Focused Growth
- Large portion of future growth occurs near transit and in compact, walkable communities
- Some worse outcomes from shifting growth to outlying areas
- Requests reflect trends, capacity, development
RSC Co-Chairs Policy Discussion

• How much rural growth is appropriate and what steps can be taken to manage rural growth?

• What the relationship between urban unincorporated growth and VISION’s policy focus on annexation/incorporation?

• How much flexibility do local governments have in implementing the Regional Growth Strategy?
## Preliminary Data

### System Vehicle Miles Traveled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Transit Focused Growth % Growth</th>
<th>Draft Preliminary Preferred Alternative v. 1 % Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminary Data

### Per Capita Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>Growth %</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>Growth %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Cities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Cities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT Communities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities and Towns</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Unincorporated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Equity in VISION 2050

- Displacement Risk Analysis tool
- Equitable development and community engagement
- Implement the Growing Transit Communities strategy
- Promote affordable housing near high capacity transit
- Support middle density housing options
- Identify and mitigate displacement through housing planning
- Advance equitable access to economic benefits and opportunity
Transit Growth Goal

Revisit the 75% goal?

- Differentiate population and job growth: 65/75%?
- Jobs tend to be more concentrated
- Closer look at capacity, growth potential

Differentiate between types of high capacity transit?
Discussion

• Is the Draft Preliminary Preferred Alternative concept on the right track?

• Are there adjustments that should be considered?
Next Steps

- Development of preferred growth alternative through June
- Continue coordinating with RSC, GMPB, and other stakeholders toward development of a draft plan
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