Comment Letters on Draft VISION 2050 Plan

The Puget Sound Regional Council sought public input on the Draft VISION 2050 Plan from July 19 through September 16, 2019. Background information on the project and public comment period is available on the project webpage.

The comment letters are organized by commenter affiliation: Agencies and Organizations, Cities and Counties, Individuals, and Tribal Nations.
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<td>I - 19</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Brunson</td>
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<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Druschba</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Dubicki</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Edelson</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Ferbrache</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Fields</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristan Fields</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxx Follis-Goodkind</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Forsythe</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Foster</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Fry</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Gangl</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Gardner</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Glenn</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Goodfellow</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gustafson and David Levitan</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brie Gyncild</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Hall</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Hannah</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Hay</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Hays</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrell Hedlund</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Hetherington</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Hollaway</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Holter</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Jauregui</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Jehle</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Jennings</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Johnson</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Johnston</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Keim</td>
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<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Shifley</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preeti Shridhar</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Sills</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Smith</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ellen Smith</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Sparr</td>
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**VISION 2050 Email and Comment Forms**

<table>
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<th>Page</th>
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<tbody>
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<td>I - 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Susan Dodson</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Friedman</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Goulding</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Graham</td>
<td>I - 107</td>
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<tr>
<td>Linda Gray</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Eric Heiligh</td>
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<tr>
<td>Susan Helf</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verne Hoffman</td>
<td>I - 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
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<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kaptanoglu</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Keller</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>172</td>
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<td>173</td>
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<tr>
<td>Megan Slade</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Stevens</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Stinson</td>
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<tr>
<td>Kara Sweidel</td>
<td>178</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Tanya Twitchell</td>
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<tr>
<td>Peter Tynan</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan von Lehe</td>
<td>183</td>
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<tr>
<td>Phil VonWalter</td>
<td>184</td>
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<tr>
<td>Debi Wagner</td>
<td>185</td>
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<td>Katie Weber</td>
<td>216</td>
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</tbody>
</table>
Letter from 279 commenters - full compilation available here
Anne Kroeker, resident, provided verbal comments at the September 5 Growth Management Policy Board Public Hearing. Ms. Kroeker 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.
Dave Lange, Kenmore resident, former Shoreline resident, provided verbal comments at the September 5 Growth Management Policy Board Public Hearing. Mr. Lange 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.
Hello my name is Dave Lange formerly of Shoreline where I participated actively in TOD and Transit issues. I now live in Kenmore.

Here’s my take on Vision 2050:

Vision 2050 advocates putting as many new regional residents as possible within walking distance of light rail stations. There needs to be more evidence that this works better than what was found in a traffic study I have used. The TOD strategy in the City of Shoreline was summarized in its Traffic study as 10 daily commute round trips on transit per 100 new TOD households, as well as 55 car trips out of the zone of the station also in the Afternoon Peak Hour. Generalizing this result across the region means Vision 2050 is going to be held responsible for disastrous traffic impacts in the suburbs.

I will say the TOD traffic study is valid for Sound Transit’s Lynnwood segment. For 5 stations we expect about 100 thousand households and 55,000 car trips during the peak PM hour from the Lynnwood ST segment. Not a nice trick to dump 300,000 new daily trips on the freeway serving through travelers and commerce that was 98% full according to a Sound Transit EIS north corridor study in 2015. Community Transit is probably right to get buses off the freeway and repurpose buses used for Seattle and UW when Lynnwood station opens. TOD.org says: “... walkable communities that greatly reduce the
need for driving and energy consumption. While our regional TOD expects each new transit rider to also create more than 5 car trips.

I would like to use Shoreline 145th TOD as an example of how TOD is being implemented in the ST Lynnwood segment. The 145th station area will get 7,000 cars per hour, primarily using 5th Ave in front of the station into the new density every afternoon stressing traffic management for the 20-25 buses per hour entering and leaving the light rail station. I’m not sure there is a solution to the long queues that will develop. Someone with more models than I have may want to look at the pedestrian traffic from 15,000 housing units crossing 6 lanes of traffic to get to the station and the car and crosswalk delays for ST’s BRT from the Northshore and other Metro buses feeding the station. There is a similar situation at Shoreline 185th TOD with 20,000 units without highway ramps and a single 185th street running to Aurora or Meridian South. What is more important between TOD around the station or getting CT Swift to the station? Does the answer change when TOD means 12 thousand cars also trying to get to the station area also during the Peak PM Hour? This isn’t a case of either/or. South Lake Union was supposed to be a similar pedestrian walkway.

When I Compare our regional TOD against the more optimistic national expectation I believe we are paying for a lack of
commercial square footage in our regional TOD by boosting our car trips. Also our density is large enough to expose the car problem which would be negligible in smaller TOD densities. Can we conclude that too much density will block the buses feeding the stations and foul our freeways? Which brings into question the main thrust of Vision 2050 to motivate/attract many new residents into housing that's walking distance from high capacity transportation.

The elephant in the room and marginally included in existing plans including Vision 2040 is a motor vehicle travel mode share greater than half of trips and road gridlock delays rising by 44% between now and 2040. Yes, transit use and walking/cycling rise a lot from a small initial base, but the automobile dominated mobility numbers remains the dominant feature of the PSRC forecasts through 2040, a fact not mentioned in the Executive Summaries of either PSRC Vision 2050 or PSRC Destination 2040. If our regional TOD implementation fouls I5, will grade separated rail have capacity if a third of the new drivers suddenly become enthusiastic transit riders?

I have heard PSRC hasn't actually done a traffic study for TOD. It has fallen into the same trap with Sound Transit. We care about filling an unlimited train resource, while we have no way to predict how many riders and cars will come out of TOD. Even if
that information is critical to evaluating Vision 2040 and Vision 2050 results. On this basis are all the Growth Plan adjustments made for Vision 2050 to extend another decade to the planning horizon adding to the mobility in the additional ten years of runway from 2040 to 2050? The numbers are hinting the plan has problems. Personally I feel while transit programs can assist growth they shouldn’t be the primary focus of adding growth to our communities.
John Niles, resident, provided verbal comments at the September 5 Growth Management Policy Board Public Hearing. Mr. Niles 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.
Statement by John Niles, Seattle citizen and co-founder of the Center for Advanced Transportation and Energy Solutions, made for the record of the Public Hearing held September 5, 2019 by the PSRC Growth Management Policy Board on the VISION 2050 Plan

Good morning, I'm John Niles. I live in Seattle, and my work these days is designing and doing innovative research projects funded by USDOT about getting better performance out of transportation infrastructure and operations, such as park-and-ride facilities and from carpooling. I am co-author of a university text book on autonomous vehicle deployment strategy, *The End of Driving: Transportation Systems and Public Policy Planning for Autonomous Vehicles* (Elsevier, 2018), creating new forms of public transit. These comments are personal, not endorsed by clients.

The emphasis in Vision 2050 on persuading regional residents, especially the new folks making up population growth, to live in housing that is easily accessible to high capacity transit in transit-oriented development is striking. I say this because the forecasts out of the last big round of effort with Vision 2040 and Destination 2040 ended with a revelation in the Supplemental EIS of April 2018 that the modeled forecast public transit mode share in 2040 would be a mere 5%, that private motor vehicle driving would have a 74% market share, and that VMT is forecast to rise by 22% between now and 2040 from 81 million per day to 97 million per day (see tables at end of this statement). These numbers reflect the predicted result of executing both Vision 2040 and the Destination 2040, including completion and operation of the entire $54 billion Sound Transit regional light rail and BRT phase 3, plus local bus service expansion in all four counties.

These remarkably unsatisfactory results are the starting point for PSRC and its state and local partners doubling down on high capacity transit linking up dense nodes as the central focus for the new round of planning called Vision 2050 and Destination 2050.

I wish to report good news and bad news.

Starting with the bad news, Sound Transit claims that its four-car light rail trains on what will become the largest light rail network in the world beginning in the late 2030s are going to work just as well carrying lots of people as the eight car grade-separated heavy rail trains that were rejected by voters in 1968 and 70. That's a claim that will be demonstrated as right or wrong in the 2020s as the next round of expansion of the Puget Sound light rail network opens. My observations of crowded trains already rolling plus some capacity calculations suggest to me that our trains aren't big enough to comfortably support peak commuting loads in all the transit-oriented communities that are to be pushed to expand in Vision 2050. The Link Light Rail...
single track electric railroads stretching into the suburbs will fill up with users as growth happens just like four-lane freeways have filled up.

The good news is multi-part: first, new generations of buses can likely carry the excess loads that won’t fit on trains. Second, the world automobile industry is investing billions and striving to make car driving less polluting, safer and more comfortable even in stop and go congestion, and more affordable. Small cars suitable for small, limited parking in Smart Growth, compact walkable TOD will be available. Third, when the high volume ongoing private car use to be forecast in PSRC’s planning for 2050 appears on the streets, automated driver assistance in vehicle control for cars, buses, and trucks will help that traffic move more smoothly on the freeways than in the past.

Now a request for more display of the numbers: The PSRC Vision 2050 Regional Growth Strategy has an ambitious goal of “attracting 65% of population growth and 75% of employment growth to the region’s growth centers and high-capacity transit station areas, leveraging unprecedented investments to expand public transit throughout the region.”

This bold rhetoric screams for a requirement to let citizens digging into the plan understand where we are starting from right now with population and employment distribution and then provide a quantitative plan for reaching the future forecast, decade by decade.

Where in the Vision 2050 summaries is the simple table of numbers that shows distribution of population across the urban centers now, for 2040 under the present growth plan and for 2050 under the proposed Vision 2050 Plan? I didn’t see that. Where is the analogous table that distributes employment in the same way? Where are the modeled forecast results that show where people will live, where they will travel each weekday to work or school, and what mode they will use to get there and back? Where are the model results showing how many people will flow in the peak hours along major road and rail corridors?

Finally, PSRC must assume the burden of proof that the I-5 highway spine from the 1960s and the light rail spine corridor along I-5 sketched in the 1980s will have the people-moving capacity to support growth in the way that Vision 2050 forecasts.

Further questions, contact John Niles,
Performance forecast results from the Central Puget Sound 2018 Regional Transportation Plan, formerly called Destination 2040, prepared by Puget Sound Regional Council as shown in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, April 2018 Addendum.

### Exhibit 4
Regional Network Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Base Year (2014)</th>
<th>2040 Regional Transportation Plan</th>
<th>Percent Change, 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Compared to Base Year (2014)</th>
<th>Percent Change from the Base Year across the Range of Alternatives from the FEIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
<td>80,603,000</td>
<td>97,418,000</td>
<td>97,991,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Vehicle Hours Traveled</td>
<td>2,433,000</td>
<td>3,101,000</td>
<td>3,076,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (hours)</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>689,000</td>
<td>659,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (miles per hour)</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 5
Travel Mode Shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Base Year (2014)</th>
<th>2040 Regional Transportation Plan</th>
<th>Percent Change, 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Compared to Base Year (2014)</th>
<th>Percent Change from the Base Year across the Range of Alternatives from the FEIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ride</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmotorized</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers do not add to 100 due to rounding.
Anonymous
08/08/2019

Stop building in wetlands and parks. Stop making developers provide low income housing. Stop taxing us to death!

Anonymous
09/05/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should be a plan that integrates air and land transportation.

I believe Vision 2050 should align PSRC's environmental and climate goals with those of the four jurisdictions that it serves.

I believe that Vision 2050 should adopt an environmental justice framework that includes quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Anonymous
09/07/2019

Californication. I've seen it and recognize it. Boulder. Aspen. Hood River. WE need growth! WE need to accommodate greed! I chose to settle here and raise my children here. I have been subject for decades around here to blight left by some failed entrepreneurial wizard. Their endeavor failed (consider Wheaton Way and Riddell. I'd rather have the trees back that once stood there). Tracyton/Bremerton is a beautiful, still relatively unmolested environment. WE CHOSE to live here. We were here first but here goes the rug snapped out. The most intelligent thing that you with the power to do so is to shut it down for growth. Say no. It is going to be owned by others with the bright glint of $$$ in their eyes. And you with a dull glaze over yours, i.e., you holding the cards (and by Proxy; we who pay for your actions).

We are Carmel, CA but those holding the cards are, predictably so, too myopic, greedy or owned to see or care. Do nothing to accommodate invaders. Supply and demand...there is a finite supply of idyllic locales...demand will continue to flourish as long as that supply is fixed. When I can't find a place to leave my car to walk on the ferry to get to Seattle; it is over. Time to move on.

Wheaton Way will be 99, Aurora Ave. How can an accurate study, one with any credibility, be conducted with reference to baseline traffic flow when the traffic flow is completely chaotic and inefficient as the baseline/reference point? You have to optimize the status quo and then conduct a study. Community Development is either owned or dumb, or both.
Consider the 911 enhancement of the Blue and White address signs we, the residents/taxpayers, had to purchase to comply with a feather-in-the-cap promotion for someone; except if you are called upon to notify 911 of an emergency they have no information or correct data base to know what your Blue and White address means. I was told that my Blue/White address doesn’t exist. Must be a prank call eh? Nice job. A couple of conjoined lots in my Tracyton neighborhood, on Johnson St) were recently completely denuded of huge conifers. What beautification can we anticipate? Before and after. Bremerton, WA before and after; unless our elected officials, i.e., you Mayor Wheeler, have the foresight to just lay low. Think Mercer island, Magnolia, etc. not Federal Way/Kent/Covington. Think peaceful and physically beautiful locales where incomers would pay $$$ to live. If it turns into Federal Way...not so much. The smartest action would be to simply preserve what we have already. The rest will follow. Bremertonians will benefit and rejoice that we had a Mayor with a vision. We have something great, and so ripe for Californication! Good for You! How much does an old tall conifer go for these days anyway? $2,000? WooHoo! If we cut down eight of them we'll have...wait I'll do the math, $1,400 bucks! Umh, wait, $1,500 bucks!!

Daniel
09/15/2019

Why is the light rail system not include plans to go to Renton? Renton and the surrounding area seem to have been passed over for this service.

Talis Abolins
09/04/2019

Hello,

It is important to begin integrated planning of land and air transportation. The evolution of air travel has increased impacts on residents living near the airport, and the plight of Beacon Hill residence is a case study. This is one of the more diverse areas of Seattle, and is suffering a disproportionate amount of noise and air pollution because of proximity to interstate 5, and the SeaTac airport flight paths which were recently lowered by the FAA. These flights are projected to double in the near future. a significant percentage of flights involve cargo, which is then put onto the trucks and freeways, often heading to Eastern Washington. Coordinated planning will help facilitate more efficient delivery of cargo into Eastern Washington alternative airports that have more capacity and better proximity to the ultimate consumer, with reduced impacts to livability in urban areas.
Secondly, the city of Seattle is failing to fulfill the goals of growth management with regard to open space planning. There needs to be closer scrutiny of cities who identify but knowingly fail to meet critical open space needs, necessary to the health and well being of citizens in an increasingly dense urban environment. A case in point is the plight of current and future residents in the North Rainier Urban Village. The city identified the Mount Baker town center at the heart of this village as containing Southeast Seattle's worst open space gap. Community stakeholders came together with public agencies on an intensive plan to bridge this open space gap and realize a livable transit Community as envisioned by the North Rainier neighborhood plan and it's related comprehensive plan goals and policies. With the support of the King County conservation futures program, the city created the North Rainier Town Center Park acquisition project. This was years ago, and appropriately focused on one of the few blocks remaining in the open space gap area that had not yet been developed. Since that time, the city has failed to provide appropriate funding to implement the acquisition plan and alternative plans are being considered which will permanently remove open space opportunities. Concurrency is not occurring and this needs to be fixed, because the city openly acknowledges its shortfall in serving the critical open space needs of current and future generations, but articulates no meaningful plan to achieve those goals. The political environment has been captured by an industry that has elevated development and housing density above all other important values and livability. This short sighted industry capture should not shape the future for Washington citizens. Thank you.

---

**Robbie Adams**

07/24/2019

I am very happy to see this plan's focus on the environment, housing, and mass transit. Dense, urban, and transit-orientated development is key to reducing greenhouse gases, improving housing affordability, maintaining a strong economy, and protecting our green and rural spaces. Thank you for your strong vision for the future of the Puget Sound Region!

---

**Wendy Allen**

09/06/2019

We are considering moving because of all the planes over our neighborhood on Capitol Hill. It is unbearable. We have lived here since 1987. We love our city, but air traffic will destroy livability here.
Some must be done. It’s heartbreaking to be unable to sit outside on our lovely summer nights, being driven inside to turn up the radio to drown out the screeching planes.

Who can live like this????
City Leaders must solve this nightmare!!!

Monty Anderson
08/13/2019

Please prioritize community benefits. Community Hire and apprenticeship standards need to be part of the equation when picking projects.

Let create a real pathway out of poverty!!!!

James Anderson
08/13/2019

The SWUGA Planning Study Workshop just held on Aug. 7 presented a study that offered "scenarios" for growth in our rural area currently zoned R-5. I think it is crucial to stress that this area should stay that way. These "scenarios" offer ways to violate that policy.

The "hypothetical scenarios" presented were supposed to be "tools" to look at future growth. But these "hypothetical scenarios" show either 20,000 or 27-28,000 more housing units placed within this R-5 zone - consequently they would require going against the "Vision 2050" ideas, against the wishes of a vast majority of residents in that rural zone and would drastically exacerbate the already irresponsible situation where schools are at capacity before they are finished being constructed and roads are already beyond capacity in many areas. These scenarios are supposed to be supported by additional spending of from 1 to 3 billion dollars. I would submit, and the testimony of many in the county would support this, that the present infrastructure is about that far behind the present housing situation. Instituting these "scenarios" would be nothing but ways to help developers build more housing units and put the infrastructure many more billions of dollars behind.

This is a "tool" that supports the already continually egregious actions in the county where profitable building of single-family homes has always outpaced the infrastructure to support such development. Only one tiny, but very powerful, constituency would ever need to use such "tools." Snohomish County needs to get out from under the thumb of the real estate industry.
Iris Antman  
09/16/2019

The PSRC Climate Plan must have the following elements:

Climate pollution reduction targets that align with the latest science.

Decision making through a climate justice lens.

Evaluating whether we’re on the right track with annual evaluations and reports to the public.

Protecting vulnerable communities.

There is NO MORE TIME TO WASTE!

Thank you.

James Baatz  
09/16/2019

The Puget Sound region must embrace growth as a climate change mitigation strategy. While communities around the country have mistakenly limited development in the name of environmentalism, the Puget Sound region has an opportunity to be a national leader in encouraging sustainable development.

Given its temperate and water-blessed climate, the Puget Sound region is uniquely positioned to be an attractive place for people to come from less hospitable regions. Enabling population growth here will ensure that development is not pushed to unsustainable sunbelt settlements. But our region must grow in a responsible way to minimize our carbon emissions and environmental degradation. The region must grow in only its already developed urban footprint rather than expanding outward. The forests and wetlands around our region must remain intact to preserve ecosystems, store carbon, and mitigate flooding impacts from sea level rise. Given a likely increase in local wildfire activity, new growth in forested land should be prohibited.

Urban development means that we need policies that enforce the urban growth area boundaries. We also must dramatically loosen local zoning restrictions and pack as many jobs and residents into areas served by public transportation as we can.

Jeffrey Baxter  
09/06/2019
How can we be considering ADDING population to our rural areas? We should be adding in cities (where I live). More population in rural areas means more houses in rural areas, and therefore more deforestation. How can we call ourselves progressive when we are planning 1% more housing/population in rural areas and more deforestation? Add people in core cities w/ easy access to jobs and transit. Thanks.

Laura Loe Bernstein
09/16/2019

First of all I hope you prioritize the voices of folks too often left out of the discussion about the future... youth voices, New Americans, Communities of Color and indigenous folks.

I also hope you prioritize the voices of renters, people with disabilities and those who don’t know the land use jargon, politics or deeper impacts of our land use laws and plans.

This means working with groups like WA Tenants Union, WA CAN and Transit Riders Union, Front & Centered, Puget Sound Sage, Got Green and others on truly equitable development.

I hope you make bold steps to reduce single occupant auto trips by encouraging missing middle infill development near transit, expanding the walkshed, and raising the capacity targets for our region.

Please incorporate the emergency that is climate change in every sentence of what you write and address historic (and continuing) land use injustices with every meeting you have.

Thanks for your important work!

Sincerely,

Laura Loe Bernstein
98119 Renter

Jenny Boettiger
08/08/2019

Affordable housing is THE most crucial issue that must be addressed in this region. The supply of affordable housing is inexcusably inadequate--and will NOT be solved by simply allowing developers to build more units; as we've seen in Seattle (and here in Bellevue, where I live and have been surrounded by non-stop construction of new apartments and condos for what seems like a decade, which has only served to drive up the cost of my
apartment as the market rate for the area is increased by the new, more expensive developments), increased supply has only meant an increased supply of MORE UNAFFORDABLE UNITS. We need massive public investment in housing, local rent control ordinances must be instated, and a moratorium on development of anything other than affordable units for a set period of time should be explored to address this issue. King County's top priority should be to get this unconscionable housing and homelessness crisis under control. Housing is a human right, and people should be able to afford to live in the cities where they work, and not be driven further and further away from their jobs, causing them to have absurd (and costly) commutes and creating nightmarish traffic for the entire region.

Kenneth Boman
09/16/2019

Please respect the will of cities and their voters to not annex land for the purpose of justifying higher density zoning. Please also consider improving existing rural road infrastructure as many roads have not been updated for decades. Consider that taking transit does not work for many occupations that are growing in demand, (construction workers, painters, plumbers, electricians, real estate agents, delivery drivers). Roads will need upgrading, as people in these occupations grow, many also live in rural areas due to the lower cost of living. Also consider the impact of higher density large developments on schools. I see no mention of how to work with local school districts to manage the influx of lots of children by large and rapidly built developments. Existing residents will have to foot the bill by levies. Consider a proposal to have developers work with school boards to ensure the influx of students can be handled. Consider increasing the developer fees paid to schools, especially for higher density zoning and large projects (greater than 100 homes, etc)

Alan Borning
08/24/2019

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the VISION 2050 plan. I also attended your open house at Union Station recently.

Overall, the plan does not respond adequately to the threat posed by climate change. It gives the impression that this is a manageable problem that is being addressed by State and local agencies. To the contrary, we are not on track to meet the goals for GHG reduction (p 60-61). This is not simply an urgent issue with “significant crosscutting” aspects -- instead, reduction in GHG needs to be a primary driver for planning. The
proposed actions need to be much stronger, and backed up with specific goals and measures to ensure accountability.

Here are two specific topics of many. We need much better public transportation. It needs to serve more people, and be frequent and convenient. Better light and commuter rail is important, but we will still need buses as well. Buses must be truly prioritized in traffic. Accurate and complete information can help as well. The current real-time information provided by King County Metro, for example, needs to be more accurate and reliable. There should also be accurate information about stop closures, reroutes, etc, delivered to the riders who need it (and not a firehose of general information).

A second specific action concerns aviation. This is discussed only at a high level in VISION 2050, and the other information emails I get from PSRC from Josh Brown talk about increasing air travel assuming unrestrained growth. This isn’t compatible with a serious effort on climate change. For example, we should be drastically reducing the number of flights in the Vancouver – Eugene corridor – we need faster train service instead.

Colleen Brazil
07/29/2019

I was unable to attend the open house today, but I wanted to give my comments about the growth plan. It would be a mistake to let growth occur into the rural areas. Growth and new residential areas must occur primarily in the already established cities where the infrastructure exists. This is a quality of life issue for those of us living in the rural areas and for the urbanites who come to the rural areas to relax and enjoy. We must preserve our lands for the wild animals, birds and fish. I feel very strongly about this and I hope that planners will listen to the inhabitants of these areas and not listen to just developers who probably prefer to cut down trees and build on untouched land rather than work in an existing urban landscape. Growth belongs in cities, not sprawling out in rural farm and wild areas.

Thank you,
Colleen Brazil

Dale Bright
08/05/2019

First Bullet re-write

Provide opportunities for all.
VISION 2050 is about the people of the region. However, residents have not benefited equally from recent economic development success, and long-time residents have been displaced by skyrocketing housing costs. VISION 2050 needs to include policies and actions to address current and past inequities, particularly among communities of color, people with low-incomes, and historically underserved communities, and ensure that all people have access to the resources and opportunities to improve their quality of life. These policies should include the implementation of Apprenticeship Utilization Requirements and Community Workforce Agreements that allow access to living wage careers in the Building Trades.

Mark Brunson  
09/15/2019

According to the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory published by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency in 2018, the plurality (35%) of the emissions in the four counties represented in the PSRC comes from on-road vehicles. The overwhelming majority (74%) of those emissions come from passenger vehicles, the majority of which are single-occupancy vehicles. Land use is a key contributor of these emissions because much of our region is designed in such a way that a car is required in order to have a reasonable amount of mobility.

I support the PSRC Vision 2050 goal of focusing growth near high-capacity transit. However, it is not enough to simply replace commuting trips into major job centers. A substantial portion of emissions from single-occupancy vehicles comes from their production. Electric vehicles require even more resources during production even if the trade-off is cleaner operations. It simply isn't enough to meet our emissions targets to replace all of our gas-powered cars with electric cars. We need to reduce the total number of vehicles as well as the vehicle miles traveled.

Reducing vehicle miles traveled has the additional benefit of safer streets and cleaner air. Deaths from car collisions are on the rise and they affect the most vulnerable users of public space: pedestrians, cyclists, and people with disabilities. Furthermore, our most dangerous roads for these vulnerable users are located in areas with higher poverty and oppressed communities. Furthermore, these same communities feel the poor medical effects of pollution from vehicles that are funneled through their neighborhoods.

To the extent that the Vision 2050 plan can influence county and city plans, we need our land use and transportation plans to make owning a car unnecessary for the majority of our region. People need to be able to commute to their jobs, take their kids to school and activities, get groceries, and meet their friends all without depending on a car for transportation. This is accomplished by making sure that denser and mixed use
development is legal and encouraged everywhere inside our growth boundary, all with access to high quality transit. It is important to our environment that we reduce car ownership and use by making it convenient and affordable to take transit, walk, cycle, and roll to all of our destinations. It is also important to meet our equity goals by making it easy for families with a low income to be able to move around our region without having the burden of a car on a tight budget.

There are many other important issues to consider when shaping our region's long-range plan. I hope that the PSRC will make it a goal to reduce car ownership and vehicle miles traveled in the Vision 2050 plan. In the short term, we will see a reduction in injuries and deaths from car collisions. In the long term, we will have a reduced impact on our local and global environments. These are both major crises and they require ambitions solutions to solve effectively.

Robin Buxton
07/31/2019

I understand that Puget Sound is growing in population and will continue to do so, whether we like it or not. Planning makes sense and is necessary. But I no longer trust or believe in the integrity of the planning because the public has been deceived in the past, and I have no confidence VISION 2050 will not continue with the same deception.

I am speaking specifically about the southeast part of King County which was designated as rural and protected in the Growth Management Plan in the 90's. We moved into this area because I am a horse owner, and we wanted to raise our family in the country where we could most closely be in touch with nature, and the outdoors on a daily basis. The sacrifice was inconvenient access to shopping, entertainment, dining, other services, etc. All of that, we WILLINGLY turned away from because rural is rural, country not city, proximity to nature, not convenience. The area grew rapidly, with Covington, Maple Valley, and Black Diamond incorporating as cities. But the rural lines were clear, and Black Diamond-CLEARLY was a rural city surrounded by farm, country, two lane roads, and services centered in the areas of Maple Valley and Covington. That line was distinct. Even, when King County signed a large annexation agreement with Black Diamond (signed by Gary Locke-then King County Executive), it was understood that substantial set asides for open space and natural areas should be overseen by the city of Black Diamond and that growth would be moderated in such a way that would make sense for their designation by the county as a "rural city." That has not happened. Instead Black Diamond city government has been overtaken by OakPointe Development, the voices of citizen both in and outside of the city limits are muffled or ignored altogether, and OakPointe (a company comprised primarily of out of state investors) moves forward with only one goal in mind: maximizing profits and leaving the mess to us to figure out. If this is what is intended in your
"new" growth management plan it is a nightmare for those of us who live and WANT TO LIVE in a rural environment. There is not the infrastructure to support 6000+ homes in one development that will balloon the size of Black Diamond to an unmanageable level and impact the rural population for miles and miles. This affects farmland, families, small ranches, wildlife, and areas all along Green Valley Rd which is designated as an historic farmland preservation area. And what will become of Enumclaw? An area home to numerous horse farms, equestrian centers, dairy farms, cattle and agricultural lands? These are the very areas that are supposed to be PROTECTED. Your maps in the proposed plan are not readable so I can't tell what is protected.

But I can see what is not. It is right in front of me every day. Let's talk about climate change. Scientists has stated over and over that we can do two very important things right now to mitigate the damages of climate change: STOP CUTTING DOWN TREES, and PLANT MORE TREES. Yet here in our area, OakPointe and other developers are clear-cutting by the thousands, wildlife is left scurrying for safety and searching for food. The impact of carbon emissions is increased exponentially by the clear-cutting because it also represents more cars, trucks, construction vehicles and the massive level of emissions these vehicles. Air and water quality are diminished, our Cedar trees are dying due to the increases in dry months and higher temperatures. Yet all is labeled as 'GROWTH MANAGEMENT'

The legislature in 2017 passed the following:

In 2017, the Washington State Legislature amended the Growth Management Act to allow, under certain circumstances, schools serving urban and rural populations outside the urban growth area if certain conditions are met.

Let me clear: THERE ARE NO CERTAIN CONDITIONS TO BE MET that will not have MAJOR IMPACTS (all negative) to rural areas when schools are built in the rural landscape to accommodate urban populations. It is simply acquiring large amounts land (destruction of farms and open space) MORE CHEAPLY to accommodate building. And this building will bring more people, more pollution, and more pressure to build out even MORE of the space that surrounds that school.

When a growth management plan is frequently, consistently 'AMENDED,' it no longer protects or maintains what it was designed to do. This is exactly what happened in the 90's when King County handed over hundreds of acres of land to an uneducated and easily corrupted small town city government that cared nothing about the its citizenry, or the lives that would be forever impacted by profit motivated decisions.

So please label VERY SPECIFICALLY where rural will be so I can move there, because soon the trees, the clean air, peace and tranquility, and the quality of life that is special for those who live and visit my home, will be gone. It is tragic not just for those who call this place home, but also for the hundreds of urban dwellers who visit here on the weekends
and holidays to bike, hike, ride horses, or just drift out this way to touch nature in a beautiful place close by. They lose, and we all lose.

Large scale, massive MPD developers could care less about community, quality of life, or protecting our environment. They will cut corners at every turn to make more money. And then leave.

---

**Michael Byun, Megan Slade, Vincent So**  
09/04/2019

We ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.

---

**Greg Campbell**  
07/29/2019

I was on the Vision committee and that's where I first heard that you folks determined that the population of Everett would increase by that huge amount. I asked then, and I'll ask again, how did you come up with that figure. I don't believe for one minute that it's valid. There is not enough reasonable space in Everett to accommodate that many more people. Can you supply me with the study or whatever you used that determined this increase in population. By the way, when I asked our city leaders how that figure was determined, my answer at the time was "Just because".

---

**Thomas Campbell, Kate Lunceford**  
09/04/2019

I am concerned about adding 25,000 new residents to rural areas of Snohomish County by 2050. I do not believe the region has the resources to provide the necessary public facilities, including transportation facilities, to these areas. The increased growth in rural areas will also increase greenhouse gas pollution, reduce instream flows, increase water pollution, and adversely impact fish and wildlife habitats. I also ask you to incorporate the recommendations by Climate Solutions: Formally adopt specific targets to reduce emissions. Right now. Make sure projects and plans equitably reduce emissions in a way that supports adopted emissions reductions targets. Adopt an iterative process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions. Ensure those who are
disproportionately harmed by climate change will be centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.

---

**Catherine Carey**  
09/16/2019

I’m a Seattle resident, and concerned both about the noise pollution from planes overhead, and about the CO2 and toxic emissions of both air and land transportation. Therefore, please add these elements to the Vision 2050 Plan: 1) land transportation planning that is integrated with air transportation planning, and 2) environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I would appreciate getting your thinking on the 2 concerns and/or the 2 elements.

Thanks very much,

Catherine Carey

---

**Isabel Carrera**  
09/06/2019

I believe Vision 2050 should not only align PSRC’s environmental and climate goals with those of the four jurisdictions that it serves, paying special attention to equity efforts. In addition, it would be great to invite scientists to participate in this process such as UW College of the Environment or the UW Climate Impacts Group. Finally, it is important to recognize that when incorporating principles of equity and inclusion into such a transcendental work it is necessary to rely on both, quantitative but also qualitative data, since statistics tend to silence individual and community stories.

---

**Norris Carver**  
07/25/2019

Too much growth in high density areas. Almost no growth shown in rural areas, although for many this is an area which citizens find desirable. Growth is discouraged mainly in low density areas. Virtually no employment growth is shown in low density areas.(page 19) Apparently the downtown, hi-density planners have forgotten about work-at-home commuters. Wider use of the internet was not addressed anywhere I looked, and I find that a serious omission.
Planners have a deserved reputation for leaning all planning decisions toward high density living. Pierce county can do better and allow more rural and low density living and alter the long range planning to permit such lifestyles.

Christopher Conrad
09/12/2019

While I agree with much of what is in the plan, I found that it was somewhat vague when it talks about areas that are not urban, rural, or near transit, which is what my situation is. I live near the intersection of 180th and 35th in North Creek (between Mill Creek and Bothell) where residential development has exploded. When we moved here in 2012 it was mostly trees all around us, and now in our immediate area almost everything has been developed, and expanding out from there development is happening everywhere. This has caused the traffic on 35th to be unbearable in the morning heading south, and the reverse in the evening. I am sure it is all traffic trying to get to and from all of the newly built homes to the 405 freeway, which is another development disaster in its own right.

The plan talks about concentrating development near transit, but there is no transit in my immediate area, so I don’t understand the development in my area. Don’t get me wrong, I am not entirely against development, but I am against uncontrolled explosive development. The infrastructure (roads in particular, but everything including water, sewer, gas, electricity, cable, and emergency services) can’t sustain this kind of growth. When I see local propositions on the ballot asking for more property taxes to cover these things, I ask myself why there isn’t enough new taxes to cover this. And I wonder why the developers don’t seem to have to help pay for these services, excessive demand for which is being generated by them. I don’t really think it is fair for my property taxes to subsidize developers.

I am also struck by the plan not seeming to talk much about making development that does happen be required to make more of an effort to preserve the natural area in the vicinity of the development. Wouldn’t it be wonderful if clearcutting all the trees and stripping all the topsoil to sell at a profit wasn’t the norm? In the 80s I worked as a draftsman for a land planner in Northern Virginia. There it was required to preserve a certain percentage of greenspace and to do traffic studies. Is there anything like that now, or in your plan? There should be.

Overall, I am concerned that landscape that I moved here for will all be gone in 10 years, and the traffic and other problems that go with uncontrolled growth will make Western Washington more like Western Los Angeles. If it does, I for one will most likely flee this area as that is not what I moved here for.

--Christopher Conrad
Jeffrey Coughlin
09/09/2019

From my experience and knowledge base living in and talking to folks in downtown Bremerton, one of the biggest hindrances to growth appears to be the retention of downtown buildings in the hands of a few owners whose actions are resulting in them not being rented to businesses. Some owners will not bring their building up to code, resulting in a business not being able to afford to move-in given the large up-front costs to remodel. Some owners want exorbitant rent, and would rather let the building sit idle than rent at market rates. And most of these owners refuse to sell at reasonable offers.

I won't pretend to know the ideal solution, but it seems to me some sort of un-occupancy tax or fine is needed to penalize these owners and provide a significant financial incentive to fix up and rent out their buildings, else sell them to somebody who will. We can't sit by and let the potential of Bremerton sit untapped in the hands of a few old families.

Chris Covert-Bowlds
09/14/2019

We should make climate change/crisis the number one lens of guiding fact by which we make all decisions. This document needs to be much stronger in this regard. Many groups can be helpful to strengthen this approach.

Deirdre Curle
09/04/2019

My neighborhood, Beacon Hill, lies directly under the flight paths to SeaTac and between I-5 and I-90. In addition to the freeway noise and exhaust, also get noise from aircraft heading to Boeing Field or Renton Airport. Thanks to the FAA's Greener Skies plan, we get much more air noise and air pollution than other neighborhoods. We ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.

Taryn Curry
09/04/2019
Hello,

I am asking that for the PSRC Vision 2050 Plan to include:

air transportation planning be added and integrate it with its land transportation planning function,

2) to align environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and

3) to include environmental justice analyses in its reviews.

I would appreciate a response to my comments. Thank you for your time.

____________________________

Irene Danysh
09/16/2019

Dear friends at the Council:

I would like to see the following changes:

Specific targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which specifically align with The PS Clean Air Agency - i.e. identical with their targets.

2. I'd like to see the PSRC provide specific tools and policies to local governments to help them take climate action in their jurisdictions.

We need to review our we are meeting our targets of greenhouse gas emissions more often than every 4 years - I would like to see a yearly or at least twice-year review, so that we can adapt efforts if necessary.

Thank you so much! These changes will contribute to the question of the life and death of people, animals and beautiful plant species all around the world! Thank you so much in advance for your contribution to a life-saving mission.

Sincerely,

Irene Danysh

____________________________

Jonis Davis
09/04/2019

Please include Beacon Hill in your planning and give us some relief from jet noise and particulate pollution. Airplanes fly over my house during the night and prevent sleep.

What? NO INTEGRATED AIR & LAND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
9-3-19 Call for Action from El Centro De La Raza re Beacon Hill Air and Noise Pollution/Health Issues:

We are dealing with airplanes that fly over Beacon Hill every 90 seconds on the average. More will be coming with SeaTac’s projected doubling of international flights, tripling of air cargo and passengers increasing from 47 to 66 million by 2034.

Part of the Problem: There is no integrated air and land transportation planning in our region.

Part of the Solution: The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) is a 4-county land transportation planning agency. We want PSRC to be able to conduct integrated air and land transportation planning. PSRC covers King, Snohomish, Kitsap and Pierce counties, cities, towns, ports, tribes, and transit and state agencies in those counties.

El Centro is advocating for this long-term solution to help ourselves and others. If you think this is a good idea, e-ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.

Thank you.

____________________________

Charles Davis
09/05/2019

Concerned about further airport expansion. The airport is already beyond capacity. There is too much noise and too much pollution. Planning for a second airport is past due. Start now!

____________________________

Jeremy Dentinger
07/26/2019

I am relieved that there is a section on dealing with climate change. But that is not an isolated issue, it affects everything. Therefore, every policy in every section should be written with climate change and energy options.

In a perfect world, we could just rebuild our entire infrastructure from scratch. Since we obviously cannot do that, we need to make whatever changes we can.
Building codes should be updated to utilize every technology available to minimize environmental impact while maximizing energy efficiency.

State, county and city vehicles should all be electric or hybrid.

These are just a couple "no duh" ideas that need to be implemented immediately.

Jessica Dirks
09/06/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should adopt an environmental justice framework that includes quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Cynthia Druschba
09/07/2019

Please consider smaller cities like Duvall to be able to transfer back their potential UGA that are still in unincorporated King County. Duvall and the surrounding areas (Snoqualmie Valley) cannot handle all the growth and traffic. There is no economy to support most citizens to be able to not commute out of area for employment. And with Computer Technical employees moving to Snohomish County often commute through the two lane roads to connect up to 520. At this time I think smaller cities that can't handle the rampant growth should be able to transfer the # of homes that would be built in the UGA's if they become part of a city and let your centers be able to use the number of units there where roads, rapid transit and employment are located. Here is the program for individual property owners. Why not recommend one for UGA's that are in" holding" for future development and not within city limits yet.

Raymond Dubicki
09/16/2019

Members of the Puget Sound Regional Council,

Vision 2050 provides a well written and thoughtful framework for the Puget Sound region to responsibly and sustainably grow into the next thirty years. The policies recommended to address equity issues and the addition of a section on Climate Change show that the leaders in this region are aware of our complex problems and are looking for creative ways
to address them. Kudos to the project team for a very well written and good looking
document.

However, Vision 2050 is inherently an update to previous planning documents. While it
finds many new topics to explore, it is still fundamentally based on a very flawed, suburban
model that has not kept pace with the last decade of growth.

There are painfully few changes between the Regional Geographies map located on page
29 of Vision 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategies map found on page 18 of Vision
2040. There was the addition of designated tribal lands, which should have been include
in the first place. Besides some shuffling between towns, cities, and HCT Communities,
they’re the same map. Places in Seattle where growth has been centered - West Seattle
Junction, Rainer Ave., and Ballard - are not even shown on this updated map even though
they have absorbed most of the new arrivals in the city.

This represents a failure to recognize, describe, and plan for the process of increasing
density. Sure, Vision 2040 and now Vision 2050 talk about the end target of having dense,
transit intense, pedestrian places. But they do not cover the awkward adolescence of
densification.

The focus on the end result allows Vision 2050 to include policies that are contrary to
projects and programs that create urban places. Taking two examples:

MPP RGS 11 - Avoid increasing development capacity inconsistent with the Regional
Growth Strategy in regional geographies not served by high-capacity transit.

MPP EN 9 - Enhance urban tree canopy to support community resilience, mitigate urban
heat, manage stormwater, conserve energy, improve mental and physical health, and
strengthen economic prosperity

These policies sound excellent. They are positive, well written, and forward looking. But
they do not address the processes of creating healthy urban development patterns.
Opponents to accessory dwelling unit legislation can argue that zoning to allow flexibility in
single-family housing zones violates RGS-11. Opponents to bike lanes and building
complete streets can argue that removing street trees violates EN-9. We saw this in giant
front page type with the Seattle Times’ April 15, 2019 headline “Thousands of trees will be
removed to make way for Light Rail to Lynwood.” The term “character” appears in the
document 16 times, each of which can be used as an argument against reasonable
projects that simply look different that what exists right now. Anti-density and anti-
affordable housing lawsuits cite aspirational environmental and community policies to delay
and defeat housing and infrastructure projects.

To be a truly effective planning document, Vision 2050 must appreciate that the end goal is
not the only goal. Being able to create new, healthy urban development patterns
throughout the Urban Growth Area is key. The document should include a specific section
on allowing and sustaining neighborhoods of increasing density, containing varied housing and employment, that are structured around compete pedestrian-first streets. The Urban Development section must clearly state that there is no interpretation of Vision 2050 policies which contradict the goal of fostering these robust communities.

Finally, there are external threats to the economy, environment, and population of this region that are not discussed in this document. There is an extensive strategy to address the region’s contribution to climate change and building resilience for a natural disaster here. However, there is no place where the document talks about the ways growth caps in other areas will impact our region or ways to accelerate housing in anticipation of climate migration. Threats like these can tax local systems and undermine the effectiveness of the region’s governments. Vision 2050 should plainly state these limitations.

In conclusion, please consider the following changes to the Vision 2050 document.

Clearly show and label the Urban Growth Boundary on all maps in this document. Use the term “urban growth area” consistently throughout the document. Do not use the term “urban growth areas” or define how that is different that all places within the Urban Growth Boundary. Reflect on that map locations of high growth that are not otherwise described as Growth Centers.

2) Add a section on Urban Development Patterns - allowing and sustaining neighborhoods of increasing density, containing varied housing and employment, that are structured around compete pedestrian-first streets. The Urban Development section must clearly state that there is no interpretation of Vision 2050 policies which contradict the goal of fostering these robust communities. Remove the term “character” from the document.

3) Recognize that there are external threats that will trigger a significant restructuring and reconsideration of this comprehensive plan. There may be 1.8 million people moving to this region over the next 30 years. Or that many people may be on the move much sooner.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Raymond Dubicki, Jr.

Ballard

Jane Edelson
09/05/2019

I live in Beacon Hill and the planes that fly over are constant. They are so loud and so low, that not only are we exposed to almost constant noise pollution but pollution from their exhaust as well. We ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its
environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include 
environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my 
comments. Thank you.

---

**Cathy Ferbrache**  
09/14/2019

People in unincorporated Snohomish should not be taking in 25,000 new residents just 
because it is easier for builders to build on flat undeveloped land. Cities in Snohomish have 
not maxed out their buildable land. Density needs to be in cities and close to transit and 
services. Most people live in cities and prefer it because it is close to work and amenities. 
Low Income design with amenities like parks and open space are doable in a city.

DO NOT EXPAND THE UGA. All development needs to be done with climate change in 
mind. Set targets to reduce emissions, set quantifiable goals to improve fish habitat, 
canopy cover and tree retention. Present your findings to the community so that others 
might follow the same practices.

---

**Marjorie Fields**  
08/05/2019

I belong to Sierra Club and several other environmental groups, including Livable 
Snohomish County, which is composed of leaders from many of those groups. We all know 
about this from our email list serves as well as our group facebook pages.

The plans to protect the environment, address climate change, and control urban sprawl 
sound good. However, we have good plans already in place that are not being honored. 
How do you plan to enforce compliance with the vision?

---

**Tristan Fields**  
08/19/2019

As some of the federal acts change and become less stringent, such as the clean air act, 
have you thought about following more progressive acts or referencing acts from a specific 
time period?

Do you ever have citizens on the board? Or a citizen outreach board?
Maxx Follis-Goodkind  
08/08/2019

Dependence on fossil fuels needs to be our top priority. We need to eliminate our regional impact on climate change. There is only so much individuals can do and my experience in the corporate world has taught me that we are relying heavily on citizen guilt without holding corporations accountable. All corporations should be accountable to their impacts on climate change and we need to at least start assessing fees to counter their impact as soon as possible.

Jessica Forsythe  
08/13/2019

Diversity, inclusion, and equity must play a larger role in these plans. As a society, systematic oppression has gone on for far too long forcing marginalized communities to suffer. This is our opportunity to correct the course of history through data, action, and strategic plans. Please add more to these plans to focus on how to break down these barriers, things such as red lining still effect our communities to this day.

Please add data for cities to reference such as health outcomes for living near parks which can then inform public policy decisions.

Michael Foster  
09/15/2019

The VISION 2050 fails. Research repeatedly demonstrates that we are accelerating our regional and global ecosystem unraveling faster than scientists can keep up.

If you want to produce a document of governance, relevant and useful as a compass for our region, begin with CARBON ZERO VISION 2030.

Pollution is not just one more issue now. It's 2019 and we still pollute MORE every year. Greenland ice sheet, toast! West Antarctic, irreversible! Great Barrier Reef 50% died. 2/3rds of global creatures gone since 1970. We are not only next in line, we do it to ourselves.

Pollution is the on off switch for civilization. We flipped it on and it will not be shut off without unprecedented unblinking commitment to redo everything else in our lives.

For readers in the year 2030, for your VISION 2050 to appear as anything more than a horrible betrayal and a sorry reminder of how badly we failed to see the obvious and
ignored the train wreck we caused our future selves, START from zero carbon 2030 or BUST. Work backwards from there to figure how everything works as planners.

Otherwise you write unscientific utopian fiction.

Too hard? As Greta says, "our best is no longer good enough. Now we must do the impossible."

Sorry, but we start from facts telling how to survive, or we write nonsense and all our systems supporting consumption, pure evil.

---

**Steven Fry**
08/14/2019

I am very excited about the inclusion of MPP-CC4, however more focus needs to be applied to blue carbon strategies (wetland & estuaries) as these systems also provide tangible benefits to aquatic ecosystems that support salmon and orcas, as well as provide resiliency to coastal communities through the mitigation of sea level rise and soil erosion as well as protection from storms and flooding. All communities located on the coast or in/near flood plains need to be investing in these vegetative systems for these benefits IN ADDITION to carbon sequestration. Thanks for all you do.

---

**Alan Gangl**
09/16/2019

In Black Diamond the overwhelming number of residents have chosen to live there for the rural city it is now, not for what it might become after development occurs. We know there is a trade-off between quick access to all services and retail, and the ability to live in a quiet place with a little more land and more wildlife. We support the goals of Vision 2050 and thank you for the chance to comment.

PSRC should not support any subsidized infrastructure investment that encourages land developers to build in small towns and rural areas. To meet Vision 2050’s goals, PSRC should provide information to the regional and state government officials on how subsidizing growth in the wrong areas hurts us and makes us less prosperous. Land developers are already drawn to small edge cities property is often much less expensive there. Outside those cities in rural areas, there is often land ownership by developers speculating that they
can get permission to build at urban densities. The outdated model they are using is to encourage communities to expand roads, telling the people it is for their benefit. But if the roads expand, the developers have more transportation capacity to build more on their land investments. That is why we do not support any transportation funding from PSRC or others that subsidizes development in small cities or rural areas.

Victoria Gardner  
09/10/2019

I have lived on Beacon Hill in the same house for 40 years. More and more, I hear planes over my house every 90 seconds. It is impossible to have a conversation outside anymore. I ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.

Kelly Glenn  
08/06/2019

Would like to see more specific metrics for evaluating whether a goal was achieved.

Nice to see a range of housing types is a priority, but would like to see accessory dwelling units specifically called out as an option in the MPPs. This can be done with little to no public subsidy and provides affordable units for people who can't afford luxury condos.

Laura Goodfellow  
09/16/2019

Commit to climate targets and act on them! Also prioritize building, planning, and data collection for non-motorized modes of transportation, and recognize the variety of these modes and the different needs. Currently your survey can't even be bothered to distinguish between walking and running and wheelchair usage, which is fraught with problems, the first of which being that it is ableist. Commit to recognizing the different needs of people using modes including but not limited to walking, wheelchair, power wheelchairs, running, biking, e-bikes, adaptive bikes, rollerblades, kayaks, scooters, skateboards, strollers, etc.
Commit to accessible infrastructure that means the various needs of all of these users. Commit to amenities and infrastructure that supports active modes of transportation including public restrooms and drinking fountains.

Sarah Gustafson David Levitan  
07/28/2019

Thank you, PRSC, for choosing Transit-Focused Growth as the central principle for your Vision 2050 plan.

My husband David and I live in Bothell. We've made choices about our jobs, commute and childcare based on access to bus routes and bike lanes. We're environmentalists (at least we try to be green!)

To us, the link between the environment and transit-focused growth is clear. If we can concentrate development around transit lines, we can reduce pressure on our beloved green spaces. Thus, we urge PRSC to take the boldest possible path towards transit-focused growth.

~Sarah Gustafson & David Levitan

Brie Gyncild  
09/15/2019

The Climate Change goal is far too weak. By 2050, we must be carbon-neutral or carbon-negative - our contribution can't just have been substantially reduced. This language must reflect the recent information from the IPCC and other groups -- and our region's responsibility to ourselves and the rest of the world.

With SCL already carbon-neutral and with the technological advantages in our region, we can and should be carbon-neutral regionally by 2030.

And we can't omit some of our emissions in our calculations. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed.

We must be honest in collecting and analyzing the data, and we must be bold in transforming our region - particularly in terms of transportation - in order to avoid devastating consequences.
In the transportation section, the need to move people out of SOVs and to support biking and walking infrastructure is addressed. But in the climate section, the emphasis is on electrifying vehicles -- it's not just the gasoline that makes cars climate-unfriendly, and of course the congestion on our roads is a huge problem for productivity, safety, community cohesion, and many other causes. Moving people out of private vehicles whenever possible (recognizing the needs of people with disabilities and other special circumstances) must be part of the climate section as well. I'd also like to see the inclusion of safe, connected bike infrastructure networks in the climate section, as biking is the most climate-friendly mode after walking.

What's also missing is a vision for fewer flights in and out of our region. There are several statements about preserving airports and preventing the encroachment of land, and about supporting them as an essential component of economic growth. But aviation is a huge contributor to global warming -- and technology to neutralize its effect is just barely on the horizon, far from anyone thinking that even by 2050 we'll have climate-friendly airplanes. Painful as it may be to accept, we need to substantially reduce the number of flights in and out of our region while also increasing the efficiency of those that remain.

Overall, this is an impressive piece of work, and I'm proud to be part of a region that is so thoughtful about future growth. I especially appreciate and strongly support the emphasis on equity throughout the plan.

---

**Melissa Hall**

09/16/2019

Things that are good:

Equity Focus

Health Focus

New Climate Change Goal

Urban Development Patterns need explicit support because they will be essential to reaching housing, climate and transportation goals but they are not included in this document in a direct way. Urban development means housing near retail, especially food retail. It means housing and work near frequent transit and safe walking and biking routes.

Creating new areas of urban development is going to be essential to meeting climate and housing goals and to rectifying inequitable land use patterns. This isn’t going to happen without a specific set of policies and support for the development and change to new dense multiuse areas.
Nancy Hannah  
09/16/2019

The most important challenge of our time is climate heating the earth so life is not possible on our planet. We need to act now. As a region, we need to commit to climate heating reduction goals and evaluate decisions through the lens of whether actions will help us or prevent us from meeting those goals, as well as whether these actions are equitable and just. Please act now to make the changes necessary to stop the abnormal heating of our planet.

Ashley Hay  
09/16/2019

The projected growth for Mercer Island is absurd - our small Island community simply cannot support the levels of growth that the region desires, nor do we want this. I urge you to realistically evaluate the impacts of this Vision 2050 upon existing communities and current infrastructure. The current Vision is greatly flawed.

Matt Hays  
09/06/2019

It's crucial to:

--Limit sprawl

--Focus transportation dollars (and space) on transit and human-powered modes

--Build good urban places

Tyrell Hedlund  
09/04/2019

I want to ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.
Billy Hetherington
08/05/2019
The Vision 2050 is going to shape the way our region looks for generations to come. While this work will employ thousand of people in this region for decades to come, we need to look at this as an opportunity to build a skilled trained workforce that will benefit our region beyond 2050. Apprenticeship is the original four year degree and provides living wage jobs with benefits to those that take advantage of these programs in the building trades. I would ask the we attach apprenticeship standards to the project that the Puget Sound Regional Council extends funding to. This will ensure that these jobs are building the workforce of the future and providing a community benefit in the process.

Dana Hollaway
09/16/2019
MPP-T-28 Transportation Policy (page 120) and Transportation Actions. Regional Action. T-Action-5 Aviation Capacity (page 121) are outdated and MUST be updated to be relevant for 2050 Vision.
MPP-T-28 "optimize the existing aviation system prior to development of new airports."

- SeaTac International Airport has reached capacity, yet Port of Seattle’s proposed SAMP will increase passenger and air cargo flight operations. Current arrival/departures are minutes apart creating non-stop jet traffic over communities with no relief, not even during night-time hours, interrupting people’s sleep. In addition, current road infrastructure is already congested and in gridlock without the addition passenger traffic and freight trucks required to move the air cargo.

- It will take approximately 10-20 years to identify a location, develop the plan, and build another regional airport.

A previous study identified the need for another regional airport was never acted upon, elected officials either dropped the ball or were influenced by the Port of Seattle to take no action. If action would have been taken then, the addition airport would have already been build and functioning.

Action to develop new airports is now, enough with delay tactics that support the Port of Seattle which are have ongoing negative effects on community health and the environment.

MPP-T-28 "minimizing health and noise impacts in communities."

- Too little has been done to mitigate noise, and noise mitigation area was limited to a small geographic area. Implementation of NextGen by FAA and Port of Seattle has changed the flight path, increased flight frequency, lowered the altitude of aircraft, and
increased the geographic areas now impacted by aircraft noise and pollution/emissions that historical were not affected. When FAA and Port of Seattle actions change flight paths resulting in new areas impacted the mitigation must also change to include those areas.

- Action must be taken to minimize health impacts from both noise and pollution/emission to all the communities, residents and businesses impacted.

- The Washington Environmental Health Disparities Map Project and Mapping Tool identifies living and economic conditions combine with pollution to contribute to inequitable health outcomes and unequal access to healthy communities and it shows the communities around SeaTac Airport have the higher risk than other Washington communities. Data is available, PSRC needs to take action.

Access mapping tool
https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/wtn/WTNIBL?fbclid=IwAR1L02u_I11SjK4Ydklt4moqR-Py_u_EV_T8Hti9uO_Dt7Qoiw9oTiSDwfu

T-Action-5: Aviation Capacity.

- It is obvious SeaTac Airport has reached capacity and Puget Sound needs another regional airport now.

- It is time PSRC initiate the action to identify locations for new airports and take a leadership role to ensure new airport(s) get built as-soon-as-possible. Doing anything less, shows the communities impacted, that the PSRC does not care about them and their quality of life and health.

Please step up and represent all the people in Puget Sound and do not allow Port of Seattle control future airports.

Anne Holter
09/04/2019

We need an electric trolley/trackless system of some sort that goes along E/W main roads connecting Bothell area to Lynnwood Transit. That and/or a satellite transit station with better direct access to Lynnwood/Mill Creek at the cross-road between Brier/Lynnwood/Mill Creek. 164th Mill Creek and 196th Lynnwood are at full capacity and wasting money on short term infrastructure that does not extend toward remediation of impacts of SnoCo traffic, nor long-term solutions.

Please consider better E/W public transportation routes other than buses toward growing Transit Hubs.
Hilary Jauregui  
09/05/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should be a plan that integrates air and land transportation.

I believe Vision 2050 should align PSRC’s environmental and climate goals with those of the four jurisdictions that it serves.

I believe that Vision 2050 should adopt an environmental justice framework that includes quantitative and qualitative analyses, with explicit reporting on these analyses.

Anne Marie Jehle  
09/14/2019

Overall the Vision 2050 gives the impression that Climate change is a manageable problem that is being addressed by State and local agencies. This is not close to the truth. Between 1990 and 2015 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in Washington State have increased (Department of Ecology carbon dioxide equivalent study 2018). In the last two years the GHG in Seattle have gone up https://www.seattle.gov/environment/environmental-progress/climate-change. Laws to have public fleets transition to electric vehicles are ignored. https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/environment/washington-state-ordered-agencies-to-buy-electric-cars-theyre-falling-short-report-says/. Washington’s clean air rule is on hold p 60 Vision 2050.

Vision 2050 lists many goals for GHG reduction p60-61. The data cited above indicate that none of these goals will be met by 2020 and thus we are not on track to meet our goals beyond 2020. These facts need to be called out and presented as a major planning issue. GHG reduction is more than an urgent issue with “significant crosscutting” aspects. Reduction in GHG needs to be a primary driver for planning. It is not enough to use vague language with regard to GHG reduction like “substantially reduce” GHG from this or that sector. “Substantially reduce” could mean anything to anybody. There needs to be solid accountability ie meeting the already statutory goals and if we are not adjust policies and practices so that we will meet them. An analysis of how the PSRC planning will meet our goals should be in the Vision 2050 report so the public can see how we will meet our goals.

On page 59 the scope of climate change and impacts is described in very mild language. The impact of runaway climate change needs to be described vigorously. If we (locally and globally) do not meet our climate change goals we will have wide spread (global) social, economic and political instabibility. The Pacific Northwest will be adversely impacted by these disruptions and the Vision 2050 planning document does not acknowledge potential disruption that will be upon us. The exact nature of unmanaged climate change
consequences is not known but we need to be planning for worse case scenarios given the trajectory we are on with not meeting our goals. We are planning for 1.8 million more people to come and enjoy our lifestyle. How can that possibly be true when this document does not acknowledge how threatened our lifestyle is by global and local inaction on climate. Acknowledging the truth would be a good start, we are not meeting our current goals and are not on track to meet future goals.

It is not clear that PSRC got enough input from local non-profits and Universities who study climate change such as University of Washington Climate impacts group, Climate Solutions, Northwest energy coalition, Center for Sustainable infrastructure, Sightline institute, Coltura, and many other groups. I recommend rewriting Vision 2050 with climate change and meeting our GHG goals as a central theme. Meeting our goals will make other goals in the economic area possible.

Grace Jennings
09/14/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should be a plan that integrates air and land transportation. I believe that sound pollution should be taken into more serious consideration.

I believe Vision 2050 should align PSRC’s environmental and climate goals with those of the four jurisdictions that it serves. The environmental and climate goals should have an emphasis in equity—being mindful of who isn't at the table, and whose voices are being silenced at the table.

I believe that Vision 2050 should adopt an environmental justice framework that includes quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Nancy Johnson
09/04/2019

Please address Futurewise’s concerns. We cannot add 25,000 new residents to rural areas of Snohomish County by 2050. The region doesn’t have the resources to provide the necessary public facilities, including transportation facilities, to these areas. The increased growth in rural areas will also increase greenhouse gas pollution due to the need for commuting to work, reduce instream flows, increase water pollution, and adversely impact fish and wildlife habitats. Please also incorporate the recommendations by Climate Solutions: Formally adopt specific targets to reduce emissions immediately. Make sure projects and plans equitably reduce emissions in a way that supports adopted emissions reductions targets. Adopt an iterative process to determine whether the policies are leading
to reduced emissions. Ensure those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change will be centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.

We must act NOW to avert the worst of the climate crisis and to preserve Snohomish County’s unique mix of urban, rural and forested lands. Thank you. Nancy Johnson

Tom Johnston
09/02/2019

Differentiate resource areas from forest resource areas
Provide projected pop estimates @ 5yr intervals for all jurisdictions
Identify urban rural boundary on all maps

Lee Keim
09/10/2019

As I read through the draft Vision 2050 plan it struck me how often I read words like “substantially” reduce the regions contribution climate change and “significantly” reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Although I agree with almost all of the Environmental policies and Climate Change goals included in Vision 2050, it is time that PSRC commit to timely and measurable reductions in the greenhouse gas emissions that match the levels deemed imperative by the recent reports of the International Panel on Climate Change. The targets mentioned in the Climate Change section, those that have been adopted by King County and the K4C group are inadequate and will not do enough to save our community from the drastic impacts of the changes we are seeing now in our world. We need to hold a firm limit of less that 1.5 C increase to global warming about pre-industrial levels. By including this specific goal in the regional plan for 2050, PSRC will be taking the correct and bold action that is needed to spur our region, state and country to follow your lead. Puget Sound citizens, our precious natural world and future generations are in desperate need of your leadership.

Lee Keim

Pamela Kepford
07/27/2019

LOCAL citizen and organizational input is essential! Develop REQUIRED citizen committees to input to local planning. REQUIRE representatives of climate action groups, tribal
members, people of Color (NAACP, for example) to engage at all levels, especially on their own local city or county. Surprised at high proportion of people of color so even more near estuary to engage at local planning level. Applaud inclusion of greenhouse gas goals! Be sure climate active citizens are engaged at local level. After all, all politics are local. Thank you for all your hard work!
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Pamela Kepford
07/29/2019

Transit oriented growth, Hooray! Combined with the northward expansion of light rail, and additional BRT lines, it only makes sense to put people where the transit is and reduce the need to drive, fuel, park all those cars!

Anywhere the light rail runs should be incorporated into urban boundaries.

Pamela Kepford
09/03/2019
Kimberly Kinchen
09/16/2019

To: Puget Sound Regional Council

Please find my comments on the Vision 2050 draft.

As a layperson who tries to make time for transportation advocacy, I have to admit I found the prospect of commenting on this draft daunting. I’m surprised that a document that has so much influence on housing, transportation, and land use broadly has only three months of public comment, and not much apparent outreach. I only learned about it a few days ago.

I do appreciate the work that goes in to this kind of planning. I know that many moving parts and people are involved, but my first comment is that PRSC needs to make this process more accessible to lay people and develop outreach that demystifies the planning process. Not with in-person meetings and open houses, which are likely to skew wealthy and white, but probably with plain language and easier, less overwhelming opportunities to comment online.

It’s a good development that this draft recognizes the importance of housing affordability, and has broken out sections on equity and climate change. But overall, the draft represents the continuation of many destructive planning policies that have historically supported inequitable development, housing, and transportation policies. For every goal and policy statement, I urge the council to consider how it can revise Vision 2050 to make it into a policy tool that accelerates responses to inequities and climate change. We don’t have much time, and my understanding is that while this document is called "Vision 2050" the process of developing such plans occurs in 10-year increments. So it’s time to be bold.

A few specific, hodgepodge comments under this deadline.

First, I agree with my associate Melissa Hall, who is also providing comment, that enabling the development of healthy urban development patterns and importantly creating new development patterns by developing greater density in areas that, although they fall well within city limits and have good proximity to urban resources, were and continue to be developed as if they were suburban areas. In other words, we need to move beyond the urban village growth strategy, which has concentrated so much development in a few places. Without explicit support for new urban development patterns we can’t meet our housing, transportation, and climate needs in the next ten years, let alone by 2050. We need to not simply encourage policies that facilitate change -- we need clear prioritization...
of those policies and clear measures in place designed to correct past imbalances as quickly as possible.

As with everything, language matters. There are many instances in which tepid language is used in summarizing critical topics. Here's the draft language of matrix item MPP-En-21: "Continue efforts to reduce pollutants from transportation activities, including through the use of cleaner fuels and vehicles and increasing alternatives to driving alone, as well as design and land use."

We are in that last ten years of being able to turn around climate catastrophe. Our investments and planning must focus on not merely on continuing what we have done - we need to prioritize making big changes in how most people move around our region. Promoting -- actively or passively -- cleaner vehicles is not sustainable given the resources this would require. We don't have time for a shift to electric vehicles to have a meaningful impact on climate. And, even if we did, these won't be affordable to many, many households and will likely perpetuate inequities. I suggest instead: "Aggressively prioritize efforts to reduce pollutants from transportation activities by prioritizing design and land use planning for high-capacity transit and other alternatives to low-capacity transportation."

I would also revise the language of CC-Action-1 and CC-Action-3 along the same lines, including revisiting the transportation plan on a much more frequent basis than every four years in order to spur quicker adoption of far-reaching goals.

MPP-En-9 states "Enhance urban tree canopy to support community resilience, mitigate urban heat, manage stormwater, conserve energy, improve mental and physical health, and strengthen economic prosperity."

That's a laudable goal, but the public often equates building more dense housing and dense urban development generally with the loss of tree canopy, without applying the same test to existing single-family homes. Consider a different measure that aim for the same goal. Or spell out the way this goal is to be achieved in a way that will not provide fodder for those who oppose all dense housing development.

MPP-En-15 is almost perfect. "Provide parks, trails, and open space within walking distance of urban residents. Prioritize historically underserved communities for open space improvements and investments." I would add that it's time to prioritize historically underserved communities for all improvements and investments across the planning spectrum.

Finally, while ADA and accessibility does come up, there is little sense of any integrated vision of rebuilding and shaping our people-occupied spaces as accessible ones. Accessibility helps everyone. In many instances, designing and planning for accessibility solves other issues. Please revisit this draft with a strong eye toward how it your work can prioritize planning for accessibility.
Sincerely,
K. Kinchen
Capitol Hill
Seattle

Ingrid Langston
09/04/2019

I am a resident of North Beacon Hill and my children attend school in the neighborhood as well. We ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. Thank you.

Cacima Lee
09/04/2019

I’m asking that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.

Janet Lenart
08/12/2019

Please, please, please plan for mass transit. We need space set aside for high speed rail from Canada to California. We need regional Puget Sound mass transit more accessible and running more frequently. We need fewer cars parked on roadways in order to free up road space for microvehicles and multi-occupant vehicles.

Thank you.

Michele Leslie
08/07/2019
Does comprehensive planning ever consider access to medical care? It's recently come to my attention that hospital space has not kept pace with growth, particularly within the City of Seattle, and I'm not clear on how planning for that works. Is it something we can ask jurisdictions to consider?

---

**Lynn Lichtenberg**

09/05/2019

I have read much of the report and attended the open house at the County Admin building. I have serious concerns about the draft plan. I agree with Futurewise’s concerns about adding 25,000 new residents to rural areas of Snohomish County by 2050. I do not believe the region has the resources to provide the necessary public facilities, including transportation facilities, to these areas. The increased growth in rural areas will also increase greenhouse gas pollution, reduce instream flows, increase water pollution, and adversely impact fish and wildlife habitats. I also ask you to incorporate the recommendations by Climate Solutions: Formally adopt specific targets to reduce emissions. Right now. Make sure projects and plans equitably reduce emissions in a way that supports adopted emissions reductions targets. Adopt an iterative process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions. Ensure those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change will be centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.

---

**Rachael Ludwick**

09/16/2019

My main concerns that I believe this document should address include:

Any long-ranging document about regional governance MUST assert that a specific target for regional carbon emissions. I believe that specific assertion should be net neutral for all regionally generated emissions by 2034. Regardless, this document needs a very explicit goal that local governments can use.

Given the tight timelines on when we need to reduce emissions, PSRC should propose to review progress on climate goals more frequently.

A consensus has started that addressing climate change needs to be done equitably. That is, our policies to reduce emissions need to take into account communities that historically have been left out or disproportionately harmed. PSRC’s Vision 2050 plans should incorporate encouraging governments to make policy in such a fashion.

Thank you!
Kate Lunceford  
08/22/2019  
I oppose the plan's recommended increase in population in rural areas from 2% to 6% in Snohomish County. The plan anticipates an additional 25,000 people moving to rural areas by 2050. Only 4,000 new jobs are anticipated for the rural area and no new transit. This will force 21,000 more drivers onto rural roads. It will mean more paved farmland reducing available croplands and increasing surface water runoff.

Bernedine Lund  
09/16/2019  
Thank you for the chance to comment on the draft Vision 2050 plan. It’s difficult to project these plans when there are so many unknowns, for example, how will climate change effect the region. There is one thing that has been consistent in the planning for this region. Growth has exceeded all projections, particularly in the aviation industry.

One of the Vision 2050 goals is stated in the second paragraph in MPP-T-28:

".... Accomodate anticipated regional growth in aviation while minimizing health and noise impacts in communnities."

The one part that has not been taken into account in the Vision 2050 plan is the negative impact of aviation on the local communities. MPP-T-28 states the plan to accommodate the growth while minimizing the noise and health impacts. Multiple studies from around the world including the 2018 WHO of Europe state that the excess noise is estimated to reduce the life spans by 1 year for those people living under the aircraft flight plans. The noise also has a negative effect on the cognitive functioning of children in school.

Other studies on ultrafine particles, both published and ongoing, show that there is an increase in disease for those living under the flight paths. People experience higher rates of certain cancers and autoimmune disease from the microparticles of toxic metals. Tests on baby teeth show that the fetus absorbs the microfine particles in the mother’s womb and deposits the toxic chemicals in teeth and bone.

Even those on jet aircraft experience fume events, where the jet engine air is contaminated and pumped into the aircraft cabin and cockpit. The smoke from jet oil leaking into the engine creates toxins that have a negative neurological effect. Some pilots and others have been permanently injured form these events.
Lead was banned from car and truck engines years ago because of the danger to the public, but it is still allowed in non-jet aircraft. This harm from noise and microparticles does not take into account the lead that is deposited from non-jet aircraft that still use leaded fuel.

Noise mitigation and special filtration systems can in part reduce the negative effects for residents under the new flight paths. There is no way, however, that people could enjoy the parks, yards, or even just walking in their neighborhoods without exposure to the harmful effects. The FAA’s implementation of Next-Gen navigation only increased the concentration of noise on emission to the people on the ground. These people have become the sacrificial communities. Even a recent governmental review of the FAA implementation of Next-Gen stated that the reaction of the public was not well considered in the implementation.

Reports in 1997 discussed the impact of building the 3rd runway. In March 1997, the Kitsap Sun reported that “A third runway at Sea-Tac Airport could cause as much as $4 billion in economic damage to neighborhoods and schools, a state-funded study says.” The monetary damage does not take into account the morbidity and mortality of the people who experience the burden of poor health and disease caused by the aviation noise and emissions.

There is a solution to the demand for more airports. It is the same solution that slowed the increasing tobacco smoking that was also initially unknowingly harming smokers. The public must be made aware of the dangers of aircraft emissions and flying, and offered an alternative transportation system: the hyperloop train. India and China are already investing in initial segments of hyperloop and it’s embarrassing that the US is not considering it as well. While building the hyperloop trains needs an initial large investment, consider the money put into the airline industry over the past 20 years. Sea-Tac airport invested almost $1 billion in the new international building, just to encourage more international flights.

I encourage you to broaden your view of what is possible with transportation, and do not assume that aviation is the only solution.

Julianne Martinson
08/24/2019

I'm particularly interested in protecting water & air quality, especially with sewage lagoons being overwhelmed by rising sea levels and flooding, and with any sewage or chemical discharge into watersheds or waterways, to protect Puget Sound fisheries & Orcas. I recognize the need to cluster housing near transit hubs, but we need to protect all open, natural spaces and get them planted with tree canopies to absorb CO2, and to keep
developing rapid transit throughout the area to enable citizens to leave cars at home. We need to restrict farms from releasing toxic fertilizer and manure lagoons into rivers and to develop ways to transform that waste into electrical power generation. One of the most effective way of reducing CO2 emissions is to prevent any further 'natural' gas development or transmission in our counties and transition as rapidly as possible to all-electric clean energy. And we need to create great public and media buy-in campaigns as part of the overall effort to encourage public transportation and keep our region clean and livable.

One further comment: we need more styrofoam recycling areas, at least one per County, since we have volunteers driving from Marysville or Lynnwood to a recycle facility in Kent after collecting from their communities. Or, ban it entirely from all take-out places in all 3 Counties, except allowing where required for safely transporting heavy tools & machinery in packing from factories.

Jennifer Mayer
09/16/2019

Would like to see Vision 2050 have a broader vision for multigenerational housing. It described households getting smaller but what I'm seeing in many areas - families wanting/trying to live together - is not reflected at all. There's a chicken and egg problem here - you may not be seeing very much of these housing configurations, because so many areas limit ADUs or duplexes that allow for this. Also it should take note of the demand for cooperative housing, cohousing and other forms of ownership that provide greater affordability and stability. How can PSRC incentivize these? Current financing structures make it hard for cooperatives/cohousing to get off the ground - can PSRC help or encourage others to create financial assistance for these? On a quick read of the housing section I saw no mention of the enormous racial wealth gaps that fuel displacements - the legacy of redlining and oppression that made it harder for people of color to have wealth to inherit that other Americans were able to build through housing. On the transportation plan - why is there no vision for a regional bike network, or for minimum standards of walking access? Your plan has the goal of prioritizing pedestrian and walk modes, but doesn't map out pedestrian or bike access, doesn't seem to contain any goals, best practices, or plans for how it's going to improve. Could you at least call for regional coordination on improving bike and ped infrastructure? Every dollar invested in bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure pays many dividends for climate and health as well as land values. Vision 2050 investment priorities should reflect this. The highway mode is highly subsidized (gas taxes don't begin to cover the cost of highway and street infrastructure construction and maintenance, as well as the maintenance of free street parking. Every dollar spent on car infrastructure requires greater subsidy, while every dollar spent on bike/ped infrastructure reduces individual and societal cost of trips. Finally, the plan doesn't mention prioritizing mass
transit over solo vehicle travel - a step that needs to happen in order for the plan to meet its climate and transit capacity goals.

Christine McAfee  
07/31/2019

STOP!!' Stop until this county can establish an infrastructure that will support this growth! We are paying for RTA yet we only have the services if you TRAVEL to receive them. Our major roads can not continue to support what this county is allowing as far as apartments, high density housing and warehouses. We are fighting with tow hulk drivers, carrying multiple vehicles, racing down 2 lane roads to drop them off. We have two lane roads that have so much traffic emergency vehicles are having difficulty getting through traffic. You have schools, where traffic is blocking a lane if travel while parents drop off or pick up children!

You have semi trucks, traveling up and down Canyon RD, taking up both lanes, and people driving cars/trucks racing to get past them, there by cutting them off or driving under the speed limit, impeding the entire flow.

South Hill is a nightmare traveling, no matter what time of day because of the lack of improved roadways. People are using 2 lane, narrow roads (122nd St E) to skirt Meridian however traffic is backing up to Shaw Rd from 144th.

I cringe to think what 70th Ave E is going to end up like one the new Bethel Hugh School is constructed, just down the road from Graham-Kapowsin High School where we have young drivers who shouldn’t be driving.

This is not what we chose when we moved out here. Fix the infrastructure before adding more and more people and vehicles.

Nick McCarty  
09/05/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should be a plan that integrates air and land transportation.

Jeff McGrath  
09/14/2019

We need to include air transportation planning. All flights are being routed over Beacon Hill one jet every 80 seconds for up to 16 hours depending on wind direction. Noise is awful,
not to mention ultra ultra fine particulate emissions and fuel contamination [oily sheen on rain barrels]. What is most disgusting is we are forced to pay taxes to the Port of Seattle to ruin our health and home values all to attempt to concentrate flight paths over the length of a HILL. Please keep us posted for any developments!

**Michael McMurray**  
09/05/2019

The PSRC has some ambitious and nice goals. The one thing that's quite apparent is it lack's focus on private property ownership. It seems in this model of development people will be paying rent not mortgages? I suggest the leadership read the book "Capitalism in the 21st Century". Author is one of the world authorities on income inequalities in the world. Property ownership spawned the middle class, by creating wealth creation (paying down debt/increasing equity) and sense of pride in ones ownership. Something to consider in this vast model of the PSRC is setting up CO-OP ownership in these Thousands of new apartments that most likely will be the result of this plan.

Cheers,

Mike McMurray

**William McPherson**  
09/16/2019

PSRC should adopt the same emissions reductions targets as the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. A goal of “substantially reducing greenhouse gas emissions” is ambiguous. More specific goals and a timetable for meeting them are necessary.

**Sameth Mell**  
09/05/2019

Greetings, I live in Renton, right next to the Boeing company. Almost every other day or frequently- I am bombarded by air noise from the planes. It is a nuisance and unnatural. I do understand the business imperative for the industry, but I also hope that for Vision 2050, the region has an integrate air and land transportation plan. Especially for the communities on Beacon Hill, who are affected tremendously by air plan noise. I believe that our region’s future deserves a well integrated plan to address how we can mitigate the impact of air noise pollution and land transportation. The region is experiencing a huge growth and I hope that our leaders foresee the best ways to integrate planning.
Karen Mitchell
09/14/2019

Adding 25,000 new residents to rural areas of Snohomish County by 2050 greatly concerns me. It is my belief that our region does not have the resources to provide the essential public facilities, including transportation facilities, to these outlying areas. The increased growth in rural areas will also exponentially increase greenhouse gas pollution, reduce instream flows, increase water pollution, and adversely impact fish and wildlife habitats, not to mention getting to and from work without a gut-wrenching commute. Low cost housing must be factored in to any plans for expansion, as well.

Anna Mockler
09/15/2019

This plan doesn't go far enough to combat the climate crisis. It's an intelligent plan to concentrate housing in denser, more urban centers and near transit -- but where 74% of emissions come from passenger vehicles, that's not a plan that will really slow, let alone halt, global heating in the next decade. New "green" requirements for new construction won't truly impact the large percentage of emissions coming from existing residential, commercial, and industrial buildings. Retrofitting these buildings would be more effective, but retrofitting is expensive, often more expensive than new construction. Plans to convert PSE, for example, entirely away from their current 37% of coal to generate electricity would be a good step. Encouraging public transit, bicycle use, and boats -- from kayaks to ferries -- would help us avert the catastrophe of global heating. This draft plan should incorporate recent scientific research that planting forests will demonstrably aid in sequestering carbon, and propose planting trees throughout every part of the region: rural, suburban, and urban.

It is not sexy to tell a region's people that they must change or die. Nonetheless, it's our duty to do so.

Edward Mohs
09/01/2019

TRANSPORTATION: BEFORE any homes, buildings, plazas, box stores, industries are built, PLEASE complete ALL highways, roads, bridges, retention ponds, intersections, parking lots, traffic signals, stop signs, traffic circles in and out of such new construction. Please!
• Request an increase to 95% reduction by 2050 (Per the IPCC SR15 and UW “No Time to Waste” Assessments). We need to achieve low emissions as fast as we, and exceed our targets wherever possible. ?https://cig.uw.edu/resources/special-reports/no-time-to-waste/?https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/
• Emphasis on greenhouse gas emissions reductions, not only transit and density planning.
• Accelerate EV Charging Station support infrastructure in the community ….powered by 100% clean energy purchase. Ensure EV charging and EV transport is a part of new multi-use buildings and new transit infrastructure.
• Adjust population planning for new estimates on Southern US resident relocation to the North and into our region.
• Continue emphasizing climate impact planning and resiliency (Fire, Heat, Storms, Flood Zones, Smoke). And access for all residents to mitigation services.
• All building and home sales should include Energy Audit information disclosures, to encourage building efficiency upgrades.
• Tightening our tree removal permitting process, assessing mortality rates of new trees and struggle species ranges shifting Northward (including previous native plants), re-evaluate the Arborist sign-off process for private companies.??
• Mandating the “Food Plus Program” waste stream reductions for multi-family, business, and restaurants to increase our composting and recycling stream reduction management efforts.
• Emphasize wetland and marsh restoration to mitigate flooding and ensure emissions sequestration. Providing greater education/service access to residents, with an eye towards impacts to local streams, rivers, and salmon habitat especially in development currently underway for housing and Sound Transit.
• Increase building efficiency standards in permitting and construction. ?
• Accelerate delivery emissions standards partnering with UPS and FedEx in town.
• The PNW is experiencing a glut of water in Winter and a potential death of water in Summer…adequate climate planning for future water conditions given warming with year round balance for feast-or-famine water cycles. ?
• Encourage local shopping, local food sourcing, waste reductions, and emissions reductions in residential homes.

Thank you for your efforts, planning, and for taking public input into consideration.

Sincerely,

Rachel Molloy - Redmond
Arvia Morris  
08/22/2019

I am not sure my comment was submitted for Vision 2050, so I am resubmitting.

Overall the Vision 2050 gives the impression that Climate change is a manageable problem that is being addressed by State and local agencies. This is not close to the truth. Between 1990 and 2015 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in Washington State have increased (Department of Ecology carbon dioxide equivalent study 2018). In the last two years the GHG in Seattle have gone up  
https://www.seattle.gov/environment/environmental-progress/climate-change. Laws to have public fleets transition to electric vehicles are ignored.  

Vision 2050 lists many goals for GHG reduction p60-61. The data cited above indicate that none of these goals will be met by 2020 and thus we are not on track to meet our goals beyond 2020. These facts need to be called out and presented as a major planning issue. GHG reduction is more than an urgent issue with “significant crosscutting” aspects. Reduction in GHG needs to be a primary driver for planning. It is not enough to use vague language with regard to GHG reduction like “substantially reduce” GHG from this or that sector. “Substantially reduce” could mean anything to anybody. There needs to be solid accountability ie meeting the already statutory goals and if we are not adjust policies and practices so that we will meet them. An analysis of how the PSRC planning will meet our goals should be in the Vision 2050 report so the public can see how we will meet our goals.

On page 59 the scope of climate change and impacts is described in very mild language. The impact of runaway climate change needs to be described vigorously. If we (locally and globaly) do not meet our climate change goals we will have wide spread (global) social, economic and political instability. The Pacific Northwest will be adversely impacted by these disruptions and the Vision 2050 planning document does not acknowledge potential disruption that will be upon us. The exact nature of unmanaged climate change consequences is not known but we need to be planning for worse case scenarios given the trajectory we are on with not meeting our goals. We are planning for 1.8 million more people to come and enjoy our lifestyle. How can that possibly be true when this document does not acknowledge how threatened our life style is by global and local inaction on climate. Acknowledging the truth would be a good start, we are not meeting our current goals and are not on track to meet future goals.
It is not clear that PSRC got enough input from local non-profits and Universities who study climate change such as University of Washington Climate impacts group, Climate Solutions, Northwest energy coalition, Center for Sustainable infrastructure, Sightline institute, Coltura, and many other groups. I recommend rewriting Vision 2050 with climate change and meeting our GHG goals as a central theme. Meeting our goals will make other goals in the economic area possible.

Thank you for considering my view.

Arvia Morris PhD
Seattle Wa.

---

David Morton
09/16/2019

As the Puget Sound region prepares to grow, it is hoped that the following objectives are kept in mind:

• Reduce the total energy use of all buildings built before 2010 by 25%.

• Achieve zero net carbon emissions in all new buildings and homes.

• Supply 50% of all energy used in buildings from renewable resources, with 10% produced within King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties from on-site renewable sources, such as solar.

• Create vibrant neighborhoods where 80% of residents can easily walk or bicycle to meet all basic daily, non-work needs and have safe pedestrian or bicycle access to transit.

• Reduce daily per capita vehicle miles traveled by 30% from 2008 levels.

• Improve the efficiency of freight movement within and through the metropolitan areas.

• Increase the fuel efficiency of passenger vehicles in use to 40 miles per gallon and manage the road system to minimize emissions.

• Reduce lifecycle carbon emissions of transportation fuels by 20%.

• Reduce consumption-related emissions by encouraging sustainable consumption and supporting Puget Sound region businesses in minimizing the carbon intensity of their supply chains.

• Reduce food scraps sent to landfills by 90%.

• Reduce per capita solid waste by 33%.
• Recover 90% of all waste generated.
• Reduce the consumption of carbon-intensive foods.
• Support community-based food systems.
• Sequester carbon through increased green infrastructure (trees, plants, soil) and natural areas.
• Reduce effective impervious areas where possible.
• Expand urban forest canopies to cover at least one-third of all cities, with a minimum canopy cover of 25% of each residential neighborhood and 15% of the central cities, commercial and industrial areas.
• Reduce risks and impacts from heat, drought and wildfire by preparing for hotter, drier summers with increased incidence of extreme heat days.
• Reduce risks and impacts from flooding and landslides by preparing for warmer winters with the potential for more intense rain events.
• Build City and County staff and community capacity to prepare for and respond to the impacts of climate change.
• Engage communities, especially impacted underrepresented and under-served populations, in the development and implementation of climate change-related policies and programs.
• Motivate all residents and businesses within the Puget Sound region to change their behavior in ways that reduce carbon emissions.
• Reduce carbon emissions from all City and County operations by 53% from FY 06-07 levels.
• Build City and County staff and community capacity to ensure effective implementation and equitable outcomes of climate action efforts.

The 2015 City of Portland, Oregon and Multnomah County Climate Action Plan demonstrates that it is possible to achieve significant carbon emission reductions while growing the economy and population.

Paul Nathan
09/16/2019
Hi
Fig 21 clearly demonstrates the need to essentially obliterate personal vehicles as common use by 2050. Growth in non metro cities should be frozen to 2030 levels and the only growth permitted should be that where enough transit infrastructure exists to permit people to live 99% of lives car free. This is tacitly recognized by the growth management plan directing growth to metro & core cities.

Housing should similarly be supported in breadth by public housing, with the aim of all income levels being pleased to dwell in the public housing residences- and doing so.

By focusing on these aims, the Region can manage it's environmental impact far more efficiently than otherwise.

Thanks,

Paul

---

**Tari Nelson-Zagar**

09/04/2019

I live in Rainier Valley. The noise and air pollution here seem to be getting much worse in the past year or so. I used to be able to have phone conversations in my house with the doors/windows closed and clearly understand what the other person was saying, now I have to move to a downstairs room in the back of my house away from the air traffic in order to have a normal volume conversation much of the time. Especially at night, when it is important to have good sleep, the airplane noise is getting terrible. We have new windows in our house, so that helps, however, it is still very loud and uncomfortable. The increase in air traffic alone has prompted thoughts of moving, but I don't think I can afford to do that as I have been in my house for almost 20 years, and won't find anything affordable in the city where I live. It seems that there is no unified approach to managing all the transportation. I have visited municipalities that have a large and well-planned approach to managing transportation from bikes to airplanes, and it can be done.

---

**Alan Ness**

09/14/2019

Please make Climate Change the primary lens for all regional planning decisions.

---

**Caitlin Newman**

07/30/2019
Kitsap County is doing next to nothing to prepare for or reduce climate change impacts on people or environment. As an employee in a county division that has the potential to have a large impact, I have seen this first hand. The county has no employees dedicated to resource management and no comprehensive climate change action plans. Our internal trip commute reduction program is barely promoted. DCD only recently put out a RFQ for a Climate Change Resiliency Assessment; this is reactive, not proactive. We have the power to DO something, yet all the county does it show sustainability films. Our solid waste system is incredibly cheap for anyone to use. There are NO financial or behavioral incentives to reduce waste by recycling household, business, or industrial waste. There is no strategic action plan to reduce waste, at all!

David O'Hern
07/23/2019

It looks like PSRC is projecting the population growth rate to stay the same as it was since the 80s. I think this is an underestimation. Our region will be seen as a refuge from the disasters caused by climate change. As other regions see more hurricanes, flooding, wildfires, rising sea levels, etc., the Seattle metro area will see primarily a change in the rain (more of it and more frequent). That change is very minor compared to the rest of the country. As those climate disasters throughout the rest of the country become worse and more frequent, we will see more and more climate change refugees settling in our region due to its relatively minor impacts.

We need to plan for that large influx of population now. I think the 2050 population of this four-county region could potentially hit 8 million, rather than your estimate of 5.8 million. Your 2050 plan needs to make room for all 8 million in order to keep the housing supply large enough to keep housing prices affordable and stable.

Emily Paddison
09/08/2019

Hi -- please take care to include aircraft and its impacts on Puget Sound communities! As one of the many thousands of residents who live under the flight path/next to airports, me and my family are significantly impacted by aircraft noise and pollution. And air travel stands to increase exponentially increase as Seatac and the region's population expands. We need to set reasonable limits on air travel and take pains to understand its impact on the Puget Sound.

Thank you.
Annie Phillips  
09/16/2019

I'm extremely concerned about climate change as it affects the future of my 7 grandchildren. It seems that since the IPCC report came out a year ago, even more urgent reports and deadlines by-which-time-we-must-reduce-GHG’s-by _% OR ELSE.....have come out. We must act now and we can't waste time, energy or money on things that don't work. So we need almost constant monitoring and updating - every 4 years is much too long.

Please consider shortening the review mileposts to every 2 years.

David Plummer  
07/22/2019

Is there a copy of the draft plan that can be opened in Mac safari; I don't have a copy of something called 'Firefox."

RSVP,
David Plummer

Lindsey Pruitt  
09/07/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should be a plan that integrates air and land transportation.

I believe Vision 2050 should align PSRC’s environmental and climate goals with those of the four jurisdictions that it serves.

I believe that Vision 2050 should adopt an environmental justice framework that includes quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Vicki Roberts-Gassler  
09/04/2019

As a President of League of Women Voters of Snohomish County I am concerned about adding 25,000 new residents to rural areas of Snohomish County by 2050. I do not believe the region has the resources to provide the necessary public facilities, including
transportation facilities, to these areas. The increased growth in rural areas will also increase greenhouse gas pollution, reduce instream flows, increase water pollution, and adversely impact fish and wildlife habitats.

Mark Rose  
09/04/2019

The air traffic over Beacon Hill is constant and close to our homes. It produces an incredible amount of noise pollution. We ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.

Dennis Schmit  
08/08/2019

Vision 2050

First the region needs to recognize that regional efforts for transit and growth plans are not about cities, but the entire region.

Mass transit plans have to be develop and serve the surrounding community not the city that the transit services are located in because of rail or freeway access corridors. The first question has to be what is necessary to server the commuters for the next 10 years, develop the plan to server the requirements, and finally ask the city what they would like to see the: style, colors, and landscaping to be utilized on the project, and if any issues they anticipate might need to be addressed to better serve the commuters and residents accessing the area and transit center (such as turn lanes, traffic lights synchronized, side walk improvements, street lighting). Then you move forward without the cities approval, because too much money and time is wasted trying to please cities that don't have any interest in the needs of the commuters needing to utilize the transit centers.

Environmentally the issues are about maintaining trees and porous/permeable surfaces to support the streams and rivers and all the fisheries. The goal has to be more housing in denser configurations to maintain green belts, and farmland and reduce urban sprawl, bringing the working population closer to the transit centers and highway corridors.

Infrastructure requirements must be part of the costs of medium to large size developments, (if more than 25 cars will be added to the roads serving the development then the traffic impacts have to be part of the cost of development.
It would be wonderful if all road improvements required the inclusion of a biking lane shoulder in the improvements so that alternatives to cars are available more throughout the state.

The I5 corridor should include a high speed rail / monorail over the freeway where necessary to move more people down the transit corridors with bus and link rail services feeding to the Highway based transit services.

Don’t ask for money for projects more than 10 years out and don’t ask for money until the last project list approved by votes is complete or scheduled to be completed on budget and on time. Plans that look more than 10 years out are not realistic and change so drastically that you can’t know the requirements or costs. Things that were promised on ST1 are still not done and we are collecting taxes for ST3, two projects and many years ahead of the first set of requirements and commitments being addressed.

Jamie F Schnirch  
09/12/2019

I think you should cap growth, but we all know you are going to do what you darn well please if it puts more money into the coffers. Why do we need more growth? Why not look for ways to keep the population as it is and still stay vital. We don’t need to ruin (any further) our beautiful and charming Kitsap communities with all this planned growth. Most of our problems now are a result of increased growth - the land and the people can't take much more. I was born here and always thought I would spend my last days here with family and friends but bureaucracy is making it less likely.

Nathan Schumer  
09/16/2019

Really need to curtail growth outside of urban growth areas, increase density, and expand as much housing near transit as possible. We should also be planning for much higher population growth, given climate change, and for aggressively providing the housing to take that growth in.

Sarah Shifley  
09/07/2019

Dear PSRC,
I am very concerned about the failure of your planning document to include aviation. If emissions is measured by fuel use, Aviation makes up over 1/4 of King County's GHG emissions. Moreover, Sea-Tac is planning to DOUBLE the number of planes going in and out of its facilities in the next decade. This is dangerously unsustainable and counter to our regions GHG emission reduction targets. We know that we need to cut emissions in half by 2030 to avoid devastating and catastrophic impacts. PSRC is the perfect planning body to address this issue and to ensure that our region does not blow all emission reduction targets by allowing air travel to increase exponentially.

We ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews.

I appreciate getting a response to my comments.

Thank you.

Sarah Shifley

---

Preeti Shridhar
09/05/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should be a plan that integrates air and land transportation.

---

Paula Sills
08/15/2019

I am a new resident in the state of Washington. I have resided in multiple states prior to my relocation here. Although I appreciate the need for “affordable housing”, I am appalled at the seeming inability to prepare infrastructure for the quickly growing population base. Roads are a large problem. In many other locations builders are responsible for massive contributions to building infrastructure before they build. Homes, roads, water, sewer, and new schools are completed at approximately the same time as housing (3-6 months). Retail establishments quickly follow. I’m surprised to see the seeming disconnect between building “affordable” housing and providing infrastructure for the population especially in such an environmentally aware state as Washington.
Joan Smith  
09/05/2019

Over and over, the public has weighed in on preservation and protection of Snohomish County rural lands. Market demands should not override thoughtful planning for the future. Let us NOT be a process that expands urban boundaries by generating a higher percentage (6%) of population into what are now farms.

Infilling of the major cities is important to this effort as is placing greater density around the transit centers and corridors. More incentives must occur within the city and county planning departments to assist this. Furthermore, more work must be done within the cities themselves to make them attractive to families and long term residents. Even those need designs for "gathering" spaces and neighborhood parks, excellent educational opportunities to take pressure away from rural zones.

Thank you for considering my ideas,

Joan Smith

---

Mary Ellen Smith  
09/16/2019

I encourage the PSRC to be more specific in certain areas of the Vision 2050 statement. Specifically I believe that the PSRC should align with and adopt the same specific emission reductions targets as the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. I would also encourage you to have yearly or at least every two year interim reviews of whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions compared to the goals for emissions reductions that have been set. It is also extremely important that the PSRC have a set of policies that local governments can employ to promote climate justice. We must not continue to harm those individuals and families that are currently being disproportionally harmed by climate change.

---

Cameron Sparr  
09/10/2019

The vision of growth in Vision 2050 is not ambitious enough on climate change. Significant reductions in emissions by 2050 are not enough, we need to be carbon neutral by 2050.

The Puget Sound is one of the richest regions in the world and it is our responsibility to be world-leaders on reducing carbon emissions. We are not currently meeting that responsibility and the VISION 2050 plan would not have us meeting that responsibility either.
Please consider amending the plan to be stronger on climate change and reducing our region's impact even further.

Aviva Stampfer
09/05/2019

I believe that Vision 2050 should adopt an environmental justice framework that includes quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Louise Stonington
09/15/2019

In preparing the plans for VISION 2050, a primary goal should be to maximize the energy efficiency of every project and use of clean energy and low carbon technology and to minimize or eliminate the use of fossil fuels. Extra weight should be given in every decision to increase the likelihood that the proposed rule or action would result in reduced carbon emissions in both short term and long term.

Furthermore, in calculating the economic value of development, a very low discount rate should be used. The inability of society to reduce the proportionate use of fossil fuels and the consequent accelerating rate of damage and depletion of natural resources argues strongly for a need to protect future generations.

Penny Swanson
07/26/2019

I've been hiking Mt Rainier for over 50 years and have seen tremendous changes in the reduction of glaciers. I probably won't be around by 2050 but conservation of water is a huge concern of mine. Builders keep building new construction and some of our run down neighborhoods get neglected, even though there is potential to fix up these abandoned buildings. Granted there isn't as much money in fixer uppers, but it would generate healthier communities. Rebuilding old neighborhoods would also help keep us from expanding into critically impacted wildlife areas. And if there isn't a resolution to the homeless/drug addiction problem in this county, a lot of our tax revenues are going to continue to be spent on this issue. Who is going to pay for your big plans for your 2050 vision?
Cathy Tuttle  
09/14/2019

Please rewrite Vision 2050 with climate change and meeting our Greenhouse Gas goals as a central theme. Meeting our goals will make other goals in the economic area possible. Thank you.

Justas Vilgalys  
08/09/2019

Thanks for the chance to comment on the plan. Looking at the transportation plan, I would like to see more buses coming through cottage lake directly to areas such as Microsoft campus, Bellevue etc (without detouring through Redmond). the current buses take too long to get to the 520 because they snake through English hill and Redmond instead of going straight down Avondale. Also, these buses need to run all day and night so that we can use them when we go out to the city.. Not just during commute hours.

While I am at it, please do not allow wineries etc to encroach on farmland. If this means that we shut down Matthew cellars, so be it. They are breaking the rules today and should be shut down.

Patty Villa  
07/26/2019

It is important to note that there is indeed consensus among the responses from the various counties. While the percentages vary a bit on each individual question, the answers show the clear priorities. I think the emphasis on the "differences" is overblown in this report on the responses from the various areas involved. Clearly there is agreement on what is most important to people in the area in almost all of the questions posed. There is a problem with the wording in one of the questions- how important is it that the area is a "leader" in protections against greenhouse emissions, etc. When answering that question, the person is stuck having to decide if being a "leader" is important in the bigger scheme of things rather than deciding if it is important to them to reduce emissions in the area or work to make improvements in the area. Not sure who wrote the questions the way they were written, but it changes the way people answer the questions. It felt to me like political agenda instead of research/data collection- they were looking for something other than the value of reducing greenhouse emissions. That is just an example.
We clearly want to protect lands for agriculture, reduce urban sprawl, reduce pollution of our air and water, and protect and preserve the natural resources we have here for aesthetics and enjoyment.

Liz Vogeli  
09/14/2019

I am concerned about adding 25,000 new residents to rural areas of Snohomish County by 2050. I do not believe the region has the resources to provide the necessary public facilities, including transportation facilities, to these areas. The increased growth in rural areas will also increase greenhouse gas pollution, reduce instream flows, increase water pollution, and adversely impact fish and wildlife habitats.

Let's continue to work towards urban growth and development within close proximity to various mass transit options.

Constance Voget  
09/16/2019

I wholeheartedly approve that this draft Vision 2050 plan contains a section entirely devoted to climate change and covers both mitigation and adaptation. Clearly any plan for guiding growth to support thriving communities, a strong economy and a healthy environment must address climate change, whose impacts affect and will continue to affect in increasingly severe ways the resources upon which thriving communities and strong economies depend.

I also wholeheartedly support that this draft Vision 2050 plan adopts the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency’s greenhouse gas reduction targets for Central Puget Sound (reduce emission to 50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% by 2050).

What needs clarifying is how progress will be measured and monitored and actions adjusted if necessary to meet targets. What may need modifying is the four year evaluation cycle, given the urgency to act quickly indicated in the most recent report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. More frequent interim reports may be needed, possibly every two years.

Rich Voget  
09/16/2019
Climate change is the main driver of all decisions regarding all the other aspects of Draft VISION 2050. At all times, the best available science has to be used. Since climate change is accelerating, all other aspects of Draft VISION need to be able to change also.

C Walton
07/21/2019

I was not very impressed with your "Open House" presentation. It is very vague and high-level to the point of not saying much at all about who you folks are. I understand the purpose of the organization but what I don't see in your presentation is the "how" you plan to implement things you determine are needed. Do you have any regulatory power or specific influence on government?

Ted Willhite
09/16/2019

Dear PSRC Staff:

Thank you for preparing and circulating the very important draft of the 158 page VISION 2050 plan.

It is thoughtful, inclusive and well researched. Speaking as an individual and as someone who has been involved in recreation and conservation activities state-wide, I would respectfully suggest that the plan might benefit by incorporating plans of the differing state agencies that interface with PSRC and regional governments. One example is the State Recreation Plan found at https://www.rco.wa.gov/StateRecPlans/. Similar plans exist for the Department of Natural Resources, State Parks, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The basic concept that needs to be advanced is that all public and private agencies state-wide should be (and generally are) "rowing in the same direction on these issues.

Thank you for your consideration-and keep up the good work!

Ted

Sylas Wright
09/05/2019

Our Puget Sound region lacks an integrated, long-term air and land transportation plan to address the environmental impacts of a projected 41% increase of Sea-Tac passengers on
the Puget Sound region. I believe Vision 2050 should align PSRC’s environmental and climate goals with those of the four jurisdictions that it serves. I live on Beacon Hill and we already struggle with the environmental impact of increased travel through SeaTac airport. We cannot withstand even more airplane pollution and noise in our neighborhood.

Samantha Yard
09/05/2019

I ask that PSRC Vision 2050 Plan: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews. I appreciate getting a response to my comments. Thank you.

Dorian Yeager
07/19/2019

I see much in the plan that seem utopian. Unfortunately I don't believe they are attainable without some massive changes, nor do I believe the numbers/statements I am seeing, particularly pertaining to sprawl.

Having lived here my entire life, I continue to see sprawl in areas that will likely never be effectively served by mass transit. Dupont, Puyallup, Black Diamond, and I'm sure communities further North that I spend less time in.

Cities continue to encourage unmanageable growth (see the traffic on 167 and the repeated pleas to improve the overwhelmed school districts) obviously to attain more tax revenue. If this was effectively planned, traffic would not be getting worse. It is. That's fact. But it's "worth it" to drive two to four hours a day for cheaper housing.

Railroad right of way from Renton to Bellevue was almost immediately torn up after being severed to "improve" 405. This was and is exceptionally shortsighted. The traffic on 405 could have been massively alleviated utilizing existing trackage and facilities, instead we will pay billions to replace what already was. Rails to trails ideas need to be squashed at every opportunity. Unused freight rails MUST be converted to rapid transit rights of way above any other use, or at least preserved for future use in that capacity. Sorry, but no one wants to ride buses if they have a choice.

Affordable housing means going up. Rent will only go down if capacity exceeds demand. High rise apartments near light rail hubs, also fed from outlying areas by bus and multi story parking garages are the only way to get affordable housing, that does not increase sprawl, as it is presently doing.
We can't build ourselves out of this problem with roads. Go to California and see how well 10 lane roads through neighborhoods work. We have the opportunity to avoid that fate, but at every turn, I see our "leadership" in these cities and towns choosing to increase their tax revenue, not be part of the preventing the worsening of an already bad situation. If we do not focus on high density, urban housing, well served by mass transit, we will become California.

Reb Zhou
09/16/2019
Make public transit free!

Chelsea Zibolsky
09/16/2019
"Increasing the supply of housing throughout the region and providing a variety of housing types and densities for both renters and owners will help the region meet its housing goals. Special emphasis is placed on providing affordable housing for low-, moderate-, and middle-income households across the region, with a focus on promoting housing opportunities near transit, and appropriate housing for special needs populations. VISION 2050 also encourages more homeownership opportunities for low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income households and acknowledges historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for people of color."

There is housing that is being taken over by developers and spiked - they are not being taxed for empty units. We need more programs like the Bremerton Rental Assistance Program for people who need help.

Steps need to be taken NOW to make sure outside developers who are buying up apartment buildings in Kitsap County (& beyond) are not able to spike rent for renters who are on fixed/low income. We have seen homelessness/displacement go up because of these developers. The Stratford Company is an example of what has been happening: http://www.thestratfordcompany.com/


They are still buying properties and spiking rents, causing homelessness that the city will pay for. PLEASE do something to stop this from happening.
The most important aspect of this project is communicating its effects to the community. The community needs to understand clearly that change will come, and that the kind of change that comes will be affected by the plans or lack thereof. That is one of the biggest efforts that the group putting together the plan has to engage in. Advantages, disadvantages, costs (not just financial), benefits (also not just financial), etc. The other thing that the community has to understand is that all parts of the plan will not be to their liking, that compromise will be indispensable. But you already know all that. Just a bit of emphasis, I guess.

To some specific issues. There are some recent academic works that may be of interest to you, both for the understanding of the project, and perhaps for couching the outcomes and benefits in the best terms for the community. Spin? You could call it that, perhaps.

- “The Making of the Modern Metropolis: Evidence from London.” The authors investigate the changes resulting in the city of London from changes in transportation technology 1801-1921. People started living outside of London, which caused a significant increase in property values in central London. They don’t identify in that paper who benefited from that increase. Owing to the peculiarities of land tenancy in England, several hundred acres of central London are owned by four big estates. The beneficiaries of those estates reaped all the value. Here’s the Abstract:

  Modern metropolitan areas involve large concentrations of economic activity and the transport of millions of people each day between their residence and workplace. We use the revolution in transport technology from the invention of steam railways, newly-constructed spatially-disaggregated data for London from 1801-1921, and a quantitative urban model to provide evidence on the role of these commuting flows in supporting such concentrations of economic activity. Steam railways dramatically reduced travel times and permitted the first large-scale separation of workplace and residence. We show that our model is able to account for the observed changes in the organization of economic activity, both qualitatively and quantitatively. In counterfactuals, we find that removing the entire railway network reduces the population and the value of land and buildings in Greater London by 20 percent or more, and brings down commuting into the City of London from more than 370,000 to less than 60,000 workers.

It’s a paper published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, and available on its web site for a fee (although you may not have to pony up that fee). One of its authors has it on his personal web site for download: https://personal.lse.ac.uk/sturmd/papers/wp/MMM_7Sept2018_paper.pdf

- Hsieh and Moretti looked into the relationship between supply of housing and supply of buildable land in a paper published in 2015/17 in the American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, felicitously titled “Housing Constraints and Spatial Misallocation (pdf).” (Those economists; I kid.) They find that since the 1960s, wage growth has not been uniform across the US; wages have grown more in some areas than others. Their contention is that overall US GDP would increase by several percentage point if more workers were in those high wage areas (~4% in their estimation, or ~$3,700 per capita). The summary in their paper:

  If productivity of labor is vastly different across cities, output can in principle be increased by expanding employment in high productivity cities at the expense of low productivity cities. We argue that the
growing dispersion of the nominal wage across cities reflects growing spatial misallocation which ultimately lowers aggregate growth in the US.

The increase in spatial wage dispersion is driven at least in part by cities like New York, San Francisco and San Jose, which experienced some of the strongest growth in labor productivity over the last five decades ((Moretti 2012)). These cities also adopted land use restrictions that significantly constrained the amount of new housing that can be built. As described by (Glaeser 2014), since the 1960s coastal U.S. cities have gone through a property rights revolution which has significantly reduced the elasticity of housing supply: “In the 1960s, developers found it easy to do business in much of the country. In the past 25 years, construction has come to face enormous challenges from any local opposition. In some areas it feels as if every neighbor has veto rights over every project.”

Misallocation arises because the constraints on housing supply in the most productive US cities effectively limit the number of workers who have access to high productivity. **Instead of increasing local employment, productivity growth in housing-constrained cities primarily pushes up housing prices and nominal wages.** The resulting misallocation of workers lowers aggregate output and welfare of workers in all US cities. [emphasis added]

I got interested in one point in the relationship between wages in Seattle and housing prices—the issue in the text with emphasis—and spent a lot of time investigating in particular the possible effect of Amazon’s employment growth in the center city and cost of housing. But I didn’t have the chops to make a good case. Some of the problem came from the effect of the Great Recession (2008+) on housing prices. It’s like a tsunami rolling over the data, and hard for me to disentangle from the other effects. So that never came to fruition, although I still have reams of data and graphs and charts. (Part of my academic training is in economics, although I never practiced as one; the other part of my academic training is in computer science—much more lucrative work.)

During that period, I looked at the relationship between transportation and population growth—specifically the effect of the bridges across Lake Washington. Although there’s always the correlation-causation issue, the effect is easy to see, and it mirrors to some degree the findings in the paper on the changes in London, but with a different transportation infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bellevue Pop.</th>
<th>Kirkland Pop.</th>
<th>Redmond Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>7658</td>
<td>4713</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>12809</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>61196</td>
<td>14970</td>
<td>1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>73903</td>
<td>18785</td>
<td>2331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>86874</td>
<td>40052</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>109569</td>
<td>45054</td>
<td>4525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>122363</td>
<td>48787</td>
<td>5414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. 2017</td>
<td>144444</td>
<td>88630</td>
<td>6429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-90 Floating bridge opens (1940)

Evergreen Point Floating bridge opens (1963)
Light rail will likely have a similar effect, although probably much larger. That is, if communities are dissuaded from doing a Mercer Island on their zoning (two-story max near transit stop on the island).

That investigation brought to light a geographic concern in Seattle. I’m sure it’s implicit in many of your plans, but I wonder if anyone has made a disciplined analysis of the effects and consequences. The area of concern for your efforts, the Puget Sound Region, is split up by four bodies of water, three large ones running north-south (Puget Sound, Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish) and one smaller one running east-west (Lake Union and its connections to the Puget Sound and Lake Washington). Those are impediments for land transportation; if you look at all your maps, most land transportation links run north-south. There are only a few links running east-west: the afore-mentioned bridges and the ferry system.

There’s some other information out there which deals with a different aspect of your project: the sociocultural aspect. That is the project being undertaken in Barcelona, Spain, to transform the central city from a car-oriented space to a people-oriented space. You probably already know all about this, but here’s a link to a popular view of the project, published by Vox: https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2019/4/8/18273893/barcelona-spain-urban-planning-cars (part one of five). I love Barcelona; I spent a couple of years there as a student, lo, these many years ago, and have visited a couple of times since.

Those are my thoughts at this point. I hope they have some value to you.

Bob Ackerman

*Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm.* — James Madison (No shit, Jemmy!)
One of the mentioned goals, equity, and another prevention of displacement, can be achieved through ensuring public dollars go to living wage jobs, with community workforce agreements we can ensure all communities are involved and benefit from local improvements to infrastructure. With good, living wage jobs the quality of life of our citizens stays high, and the communities that may otherwise be displaced from rising property values are able to stay in the neighborhood that they love and live. Live and love.

These sorts of agreements strengthen our communities & improve our standard of living. Other powerful policies include using prevailing wage in projects funded by taxpayers.

- Increased building standards (insulation, LEED, union built, etc)
- T.O.D, with smart planning to ensure adequate parking & driving capacity, capacity of buses near new developments
- Replacing, updating, upgrading fire pipe, fiber optics, electrical & other utilities

Name: Son Michael Alexander Hicks
Sign: Son Michael Alexander Hicks
Laborers Local 242
City: Federal Way
Dear PSRC Staff,

The UN reported last month that the danger from the climate crisis is closer than we thought, and it involves food insecurity brought on by crop failures. https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/2019/08/ipcc-un-food-security/

This is the most immediate threat that Vision 2050 should address. Our region needs to work with food security experts to store enough food and water to address the increasing risk of massive crop failures, and the region needs to increase its ability to feed its own population without imports on an ongoing basis — because, as the UN’s IPCC report says, the crop failures can repeat.

Your emissions goal is weak, but I’ll let others tell you about that. For now, please ensure we can feed our population in the event of crop failures.

Sincerely,
Melissa Allison
Seattle, WA
Local governments keep ASSUMING that "growth" is inevitable, and that it is good. Actually, much "growth" is DANGEROUS AND BAD. Cancer is a growth.

We need to CHOOSE A BETTER FUTURE. We ABSOLUTELY MUST RESTRICT "growth." We must COMMIT OURSELVES TO PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY.

Kick the real estate developers out of their privileged roles in shaping local government decision!!!
Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

1. Overseas investors and the "ultra-rich" purchasing properties to rent as a profit stream causing rent inflation and lack of affordable housing.

2. Encourage drivers to "give buses a try" by offering free or reduced passes for people who drive. I would try riding to work but it would cost me $100/week (loss of use of building parking and out of pocket bus passes).

3. In South Beacon P&R, lots of commercial parking lots (Vista, Lowe's, Fred Meyer) have "no transit" parking spots - is there a way to fix it up?

Name: ____________________________

Organization (If Applicable): ____________________________ Zip Code: ____________

Email or Mailing Address: ____________________________

☐ Yes! Add me to the VISION 2050 email list

How did you hear about this open house?

☐ Email/newsletter
☐ Social media
☐ Newspaper/news media
☐ A friend or colleague

☐ An event
☐ Other (please specify)
The Puget Sound Regional Council's plans for the future are astonishingly deficient, weak, and vague. Their impact is minimal and already dangerously outdated.

The goal dates are set so far in the future that any compliance would take place only when irreversible climate change will already have wreaked havoc and death on our communities, agriculture, forests, health, and city government.

These are the problems:

- **Emissions targets.** In keeping with UN science panel recommendations, the region must **decarbonize by 2030.** Or sooner.
- **Climate justice.** PSRC approves /unlimited/ local growth plans and allocates transportation funding; it should and must make certain that all projects, private and commercial alike, immediately initiate the reduction of emissions equitably. PSRC's forthcoming Regional Equity Strategy should inform its Greenhouse Gas Strategy to ensure that those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change are central in its mitigation and adaptation strategies. This should be happening right now, not at some vague date in the future.
- **Accountability.** We are facing a climate emergency, one from which there is no recovery unless major action is taken immediately. What we do now and **well before 2030** is critically important. Why plan for 2050 when the emergency will be irrecoverable by then?
- **Facts that must be considered now.** PSRC must adopt an iterative process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions, and make strong, science-based adjustments now and every year.

Above all, members of the PSRC must read Greta Thunberg's factual reporting on climate breakdown.

See these important links:


To stall and prevaricate now for fear of stepping on someone's toes, or causing "loss of jobs" is absolutely unjustified for a group organized to do regional planning. Your current trajectory may preserve some jobs now, but will cause countless thousands to lose their lives in the very time frame you set out.

Please do your homework and make certain your plans are revised to be strong enough, and that their enforcement is guaranteed and effectively pursued.

Thank you for considering my comments,

SA, Seattle, Washington
As a 41-year resident of King County, I am writing to share my very serious concerns about the limitations of the current PSRC 2050 Plan. It is woefully insufficient to address the CRITICAL issue of climate change facing our region, our country, and the globe.

First, PSCR emission targets are NOT compatible with the latest climate science research, including the U.N. science panel, and fall FAR short of the level needed to prevent climate disaster (i.e. food shortages, wildfires, droughts, and flooding of countries as well as areas around Puget Sound). We need BOLD, IMMEDIATE action to avert this crisis with a goal to decarbonize by 2030.

The PSCR Plan also needs to identify measurable, coordinated steps that will insure adequate resources and mitigation go to those most affected by the fallout of climate change. Climate justice must be a critical piece of the solution as we move forward in addressing this impending crisis.

Lastly, the Plan needs to create, and put in place, a robust process for measuring progress toward emission targets, with severe consequences for inaction. And it must provide a clear way to make changes/adjustments if goals are not being met.

I urge the Council to re-think its current 2050 Plan that will be "too little, too late," and to have the courage to create a plan that actually is actually strong and tough enough to address the the realities of the crisis we are facing.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide input,

Karen Bachelder
Seattle, WA
Hello PSRC,

I just wanted to provide some obvious input for your plans for the Puget Sound's future. In looking towards the future and considering how the puget sound region will develop, you should take the best available science for climate change very seriously. Water is so influential in this region that your council is named after it. Not considering how that water will change in the face of our climate crisis will seriously hinder your ability to do your job in any helpful way. Please make the PSRC Vision 2050 plan set emissions targets that are in line with the best available science in order to save yourselves, the public, our earth, and the ecosystems we count on to survive. Without them, we will all be worse off, and your plan will have actively made it worse.

Help us all, help yourself,

Michael Bailey
Dear PSRC Staff,

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that we as a people have to change our idiotic ways. Specifically, we must pay attention to all this data we as a species have which clearly tells us to reduce carbon emissions by 45% in ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. This 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to help our own species avoid misery and death on a global scale or hinder that outcome.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030. This is the very least we must do. The minimum. Our real target should be to slash emissions altogether. We know how to do this but are too lazy and beholden to dim, short-term thinkers. Your lesser target concedes that our region refuses to do its part to avert a catastrophic world. This supposedly enlightened, liberal city of technology would not be able to muster enough will outshine a Dallas or an Anaheim.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. We count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation and do not include consumer emissions (goods made abroad but purchased here). So some of our largest emission go unacknowledged, unaddressed, and waiting like time bombs to undermine any progress we DO make.

We can’t pretend anymore. Be bold. Be confident. The mega-corps who tremble at the loss of a dime in revenue will be OK, I promise. You can pat them soothingly on the arm and say, "Shh. You can still drench yourselves with short-sighted greed, honey, but mommy and daddy need to save everyone's futures."

Sincerely,
Christopher Bryant
Redmond, WA
Dear PSRC Staff,

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change rang the alarm bell that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. These are scientists; by nature, the field is conservative and reserved, speaking in conditionals and moderation. Scientists don't say "trigger feedback loops that could be incompatible with 70% of life forms" unless they feel pretty sure it's a possibility. This 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to address the problem before it's too late.

I have friends here in Seattle with kids. At least one family stopped saving for college because "there won't be any point to education in the future world that my kids will inherit." I've stopped saving for retirement. I'm thirty-seven, and I believe that my country and the rest of the world are so dedicated to disastrous extraction that either the global monetary system will collapse or I'll be dead by sixty-seven. Our governments, so far, has failed us at every level. We are rapidly losing hope and every day that we delay, people grow more desperate.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is laughably inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, and we are one of the richest cities in the wealthiest empire the world has ever known, the least we could do to justify our outsized leadership role is cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world. It's arrogant, cruel and shows us to be unworthy of the largesse visited on our region. It will not serve.

Vision 2050 must also accurately put forth the scope of our contribution to emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These shortcomings leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. I recognize that the vagaries of the global supply chain make this estimation task difficult. But if we are going to avoid global catastrophe, our leaders must demonstrate themselves to be worthy of that title and at least try.

We can't pretend anymore; our PR measures will not save us; our regional wealth will not save us. We must boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation. We must show that a different way of life is both desirable and achievable. We must rapidly and dramatically build a carbon neutral future, or there will not be a future. And if there is no future, you face a lot of people who feel they have nothing left to lose and know who you are and what you did.

Sincerely,

Julia Buck
Seattle, WA
To whom it may concern,

My name is Lela Bynum and I am writing this comment and statement regarding VISION 2050. I am currently in the apprenticeship program through Local 242 and couldn't be more grateful for this opportunity that this program has provided for me and my family. I am a single mother of 5 children and have always worked multiple jobs without benefits and long hours only to not be able to provide sufficiently for my family. I was working for a locally owned construction company for multiple years sometimes up to 13 hours per day only being paid $18.00 per hour with no overtime pay, no benefit package at all - when I was approached by a veteran journeyman from 242 that was a friend of mine. I let my friend know that I knew only a few things - mostly remodeling and demolition - and my friend assured me that through the apprenticeship program and work experience I would learn everything I needed to know. After being informed not only of the pay but the entire benefit package

Name Lela Bynum
Sign Lela Bynum
Laborers Local 242
City Shoreline
I was more than willing to give the apprenticeship program a shot. To this day, my only regret about joining the union and becoming an apprentice is that I didn't join sooner. I read on your website the actual vision that you have however, I noticed a clear path was not laid out. The pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship program provides a clear path to gain the equity you speak of, a way to fill the clear gap in your planning to accomplish the goals you have set. The apprenticeship program not only helps provide a well-trained workforce for future projects but makes for a self-sustaining, successful community full of members that have confidence in their own future and the future of their children. What you will be doing by taking the apprenticeship program into consideration when doing your scoring is providing your vision with a concrete footway to success in its entirety.

Thank you,

Leta Bynum

Name: Leta Bynum
Sign: [Signature]
Laborers Local 242
City: Shoreline
Vision 2050 is asking for projects down the line for the Puget Sound regional council. We will look at these for future projects. This will ensure a strong workforce for generations down the line. I ask that cities and towns should commit to apprenticeships. This will build a strong labor standard in your scoring criteria down the line.
I like to see the use of apprenticeship options and project labor agreement or community workforce agreement. 2050 vision needs the building trades apart of the vision.

Name: John Collins
Sign: 
Laborers Local 242
City: Seattle
Hello and thank you for your time.

Thank you for working hard and creating vision 2050. Please know, you can do better!!
At the current pace of consumption/pollution the Planet will reach no-return point by 2030. **We CANNOT wait until 2050.**
Current emissions targets of vision 2050 are somehow compatible with wildfires, drought, food shortages and submerging island nations and parts of Seattle, and incompatible with science and a livable planet.

Here are some things you should adjust the vision for:

- **Emissions targets** in keeping with UN science panel recommendations: **decarbonize by 2030.**
- **Climate justice.** PSRC approves local growth plans and allocates transportation funding; it should make sure projects reduce emissions equitably. PSRC's forthcoming Regional Equity Strategy should inform its Greenhouse Gas Strategy to ensure those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change are centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.
- **Accountability.** We're facing a climate crisis, and what we do now and **well before 2030** is critically important PSRC should adopt an iterative process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions, and make adjustments each year.

Let's SAVE the Planet together!
Best regards,
LR
Dear PSRC Staff,

We must reduce carbon emissions by AT LEAST 45% within the next 10 years. We must reach "carbon neutrality" by 2050.

Unfortunately the Vision 2050 goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is inadequate.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate the whole truth about carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and don't include consumer emissions, like for goods made abroad and purchased here.

Omissions like this ignore our largest sources of emissions, and they remain unacknowledged and unaddressed.

To avoid global catastrophe, this must change. Please super-charge the emission inclusions.

Thank you.

Dr. Demian

Sincerely,
Dr. Demian
Dear PSRC Staff,

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2018 Special Report sounded the alarm that global warming is worse than previously thought, and that aggressive, sustained action is required to maintain a habitable planet. Serious and damaging change is locked in, but the absolute worst effects can still be prevented. To do so, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050.

There are no second chances. We are out of time. There is no more runway to prevaricate, handwave and accede to "political reality".

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution condemns us to a Dante-esque future. Vision 2050 must establish a firm deadline of cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that the industrial world, and Seattle in particular, has polluted well over our fair share globally, the real 2030 target must be zero.

To do less makes us, and you, the moral equivalent of the Third Reich.

Vision 2050 must calculate carbon emissions in deadly earnest. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). This willful blindness leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. This cannot continue.

Nature never falls for funny-money math. It is not interested in our wishes. We must institute a plan twenty years ago to transform everything about how we live and use energy. This must be done. Any other result of all your meetings simply retraces the steps of the infamous Final Solution meeting, but for all children for all time.

Sincerely,
Derek Dexheimer
Seattle, WA
Dear PSRC Staff,

We can't afford to keep doing what we've been doing that got us into this Carbon mess. We need you, our leaders, to be on the right side of history and create a sustainable plan. Please, for the sake of our children and grandchildren.

Sincerely,

Susan Dodson
Olympia, WA
I would like to comment on the need for low – income housing. Not affordable housing but low- income housing especially for senior citizens and the disabled.

Cindy Druschba
Members of the Puget Sound Regional Council,

Vision 2050 provides a well written and thoughtful framework for the Puget Sound region to responsibly and sustainably grow into the next thirty years. The policies recommended to address equity issues and the addition of a section on Climate Change show that the leaders in this region are aware of our complex problems and are looking for creative ways to address them. Kudos to the project team for a very well written and good looking document.

However, Vision 2050 is inherently an update to previous planning documents. While it finds many new topics to explore, it is still fundamentally based on a very flawed, suburban model that has not kept pace with the last decade of growth.

There are painfully few changes between the Regional Geographies map located on page 29 of Vision 2050 and the Regional Growth Strategies map found on page 18 of Vision 2040. There was the addition of designated tribal lands, which should have been included in the first place. Besides some shuffling between towns, cities, and HCT Communities, they’re the same map. Places in Seattle where growth has been centered - West Seattle Junction, Rainier Ave., and Ballard - are not even shown on this updated map even though they have absorbed most of the new arrivals in the city.

This represents a failure to recognize, describe, and plan for the process of increasing density. Sure, Vision 2040 and now Vision 2050 talk about the end target of having dense, transit intense, pedestrian places. But they do not cover the awkward adolescence of densification.

The focus on the end result allows Vision 2050 to include policies that are contrary to projects and programs that create urban places. Taking two examples:

MPP RGS 11 - Avoid increasing development capacity inconsistent with the Regional Growth Strategy in regional geographies not served by high-capacity transit.

MPP EN 9 - Enhance urban tree canopy to support community resilience, mitigate urban heat, manage stormwater, conserve energy, improve mental and physical health, and strengthen economic prosperity

These policies sound excellent. They are positive, well written, and forward looking. But they do not address the processes of creating healthy urban development patterns. Opponents to accessory dwelling unit legislation can argue that zoning to allow flexibility in single-family housing zones violates RGS-11. Opponents to bike lanes and building complete streets can argue that removing street trees violates EN-9. We saw this in giant front page type with the Seattle Times’ April 15, 2019 headline “Thousands of trees will be removed to make way for Light Rail to Lynwood.” The term “character” appears in the document 16 times, each of which can be used as an argument against reasonable projects that simply look different that what
exists right now. Anti-density and anti-affordable housing lawsuits cite aspirational environmental and community policies to delay and defeat housing and infrastructure projects.

To be a truly effective planning document, Vision 2050 must appreciate that the end goal is not the only goal. Being able to create new, healthy urban development patterns throughout the Urban Growth Area is key. The document should include a specific section on allowing and sustaining neighborhoods of increasing density, containing varied housing and employment, that are structured around compete pedestrian-first streets. The Urban Development section must clearly state that there is no interpretation of Vision 2050 policies which contradict the goal of fostering these robust communities.

Finally, there are external threats to the economy, environment, and population of this region that are not discussed in this document. There is an extensive strategy to address the region’s contribution to climate change and building resilience for a natural disaster here. However, there is no place where the document talks about the ways growth caps in other areas will impact our region or ways to accelerate housing in anticipation of climate migration. Threats like these can tax local systems and undermine the effectiveness of the region’s governments. Vision 2050 should plainly state these limitations.

In conclusion, please consider the following changes to the Vision 2050 document.

1) Clearly show and label the Urban Growth Boundary on all maps in this document. Use the term “urban growth area” consistently throughout the document. Do not use the term “urban growth areas” or define how that is different that all places within the Urban Growth Boundary. Reflect on that map locations of high growth that are not otherwise described as Growth Centers.

2) Add a section on Urban Development Patterns - allowing and sustaining neighborhoods of increasing density, containing varied housing and employment, that are structured around compete pedestrian-first streets. The Urban Development section must clearly state that there is no interpretation of Vision 2050 policies which contradict the goal of fostering these robust communities. Remove the term “character” from the document.

3) Recognize that there are several external threats that will trigger a significant restructuring and reconsideration of this comprehensive plan. There may be 1.8 million people moving to this region over the next 30 years. Or that many people may be on the move much sooner.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Raymond Dubicki, Jr.
Ballard
Dear PSRC Staff,

I'll soon be 76, so won't be here to experience the worst of the Climate Crisis to come. But I do have children, and like most parents, I would do anything to protect them. Wouldn't you? They, their cohort around the world, and generations to come will suffer the brutal consequences of an increasingly polluted earth atmosphere. By acting boldly we can make a big difference, both by pulling our own weight in this global struggle, as well as by setting an example for others to follow. We all must mobilize (as if it were WW-3!) to do all we can to push back Climate Chaos. Vague goals and small measures will not cut it. Please step forward and do your part. It will require real leadership. I pray that you and all of us are equal to the challenge. My family and I will stand behind you.

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we've polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but “the whole truth” of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,
Janet Duecy
Seattle, WA
this plan is totally unrealistic because no one can predict the future, especially when the future is 30 years out. ask any meteorologist. you should become familiar with chaos theory. ten years ago could you have predicted the housing situation in the Puget sound region today? I think not. in my opinion 5 year plans would be much more relevant and achievable
Dear fellow citizens,

Please dramatically lower your carbon emission targets for Vision 2050. Our growth induced climate crisis will not be remedied by partial measures. Nothing but a complete overhaul of our economic system will make our planet safe for human life in the decades to come. Our hubris and yours, our sick obsession with endless growth has imperiled feature generations of humans and devastated the natural world resulting in a human caused mass extinction that rivals any extinction in our planet's existence, which spans 4 billion years. Industrialization, corporate expansion, and globalization have been the bane of the natural world. Our world.

You curse future generations of human children by not deviating from suicidal policies of energy expansion and growth at all costs. It defies science and reason. It is madness. Please burn your MBA’s and cleanse your minds of economic zealotry. Preserving our planets life sustaining systems is YOUR number one priority. Our destructive and cruel economic system needs unwinding. Do it, please.

Sincerely,
Jeff Fernandes

PS. Plant trees. A lot of fucking trees. 😊
-----Original Message-----
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 7:46 AM
To: Andi Markley <AMarkley@psrc.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Monday, September 16, 2019 - 07:45 Submitted by anonymous user: 71.212.67.35 Submitted values are:

Your Name: Peter Fiddler
Email: [REDACTED]

Question or Comment?
I just read the opinion piece in the Seattle Times by Ryan Mello and John Chelminiac. They talk about the vision 2050 plan and direct the reader to a website, PSRC.org/vision.

When I go to the website, it says that the comment period started in July and ends today. Since I only just heard about this, and there is a lot to read, I’m not sure that I will be able to comment today. I am wondering why the writers waited so long to share this article with us.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
I am commenting today to try and convince you all that apprenticeship utilization and PLA's (Project Labor Agreements) should be required on the new Vision 2050 projects. With the use of this language it could solidify the opportunity for the proper training, livable wages & careers for all that work on these projects.

Name  EFREM FIELDS
Sign  [Signature]
Laborers Local 242
City  DES MOINES
Dear PSRC Staff,

I love Washington! I love living in the Puget Sound area! However, I am having difficulty with understanding why, as an informed progressive society, we have waited so long to create livable spaces for humans that are carbon neutral (at the least) or carbon capturing (at its best). As we approach 2020, our community fully understands what our leading scientists have outlined about climate change, and the future that is in store for the entire planet based on current carbon projections. It is up to us, NOW, to act and mitigate the damage humans have already caused to our environment. As we plan our communities and future infrastructure development, please secure a robust public transportation system, please include a robust physical transportation system (dedicated and secure bike trails and pedestrian lanes), and please include communities which have services at the hub of neighborhood living centers to reduce transportation needs to obtain the basic living needs of the people (shopping, entertainment, and business services). Thank you!

~Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but “the whole truth” of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can’t pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don’t boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Friedman
Gig Harbor, WA
-----Original Message-----
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 2:08 PM
To: Paul Inghram <PInghram@psrc.org>
Subject: [PSRC Question] VISION 2050

Your Name: Andy Goulding
Your Email: [REDACTED]
Message:
Re: 2050 Plan,
Also today's Times: "...relying on property tax and development creates a formula for gentrification. Hindsight.

Work for tax reform in Washington.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Dear PSRC Staff,

PLEASE GOOGLE SEARCH "Copenhagen Aims To Be World's First Carbon Neutral Capital By 2025" and reset your ambitions. Please reimagine what we're capable of. Please read Dahr Jamail's "End of Ice" if you still don't have the fire within you to move quicker! Because any goal that isn't carbon neutral by, at latest, 2030... is genocide. When the glacier melts of the Himalayas disappear, so will the water source for 1 BILLION PEOPLE... Droughts and starvation will hit us before the sea level rise. New diseases and water wars will hit before your child is able to consider their 401k contributions.

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC's last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,

michael graham

Seattle, WA
Please add the following comment to the record:

Commenter: Linda Gray, [redacted] (submitted as PSRC blog post comment, July 29, 2019)

Dear Sirs - I am writing to voice my opposition to the preferred alternative for Snohomish County Vision 2050. That plan calls for Everett to accommodate merely 20% and Core Cities to handle just 11% of the projected growth. I believe the distribution should be more like the plans for King or Pierce County at a minimum. Too much growth has occurred to date in supposed HCT and unincorporated rural areas that don’t have the infrastructure to support current or future growth without a huge investment in infrastructure. Snohomish County lets developers dictate rather than the interests of their constituents. Developers feel building in urban areas is too expensive so the County lets them put high intensity development in rural areas dramatically increasing traffic. Everett should be the hub for growth in Snohomish County not HCT’s. To date there is almost nothing happening in that city. I count maybe one crane and no apartments over 5 stories at all. To make up for growth that should have already occurred, to address GMA and to address the stated Regional Growth Strategy Policies below Everett needs to handle at least 50% period.

"Under the Growth Management Act, counties, in consultation with cities, are responsible for adopting population and employment growth targets to ensure that each county collectively is accommodating projected population and employment. These population and employment growth targets are a key input to local comprehensive plans. Jurisdictions use growth targets to inform planning for land use, transportation, and capital facilities. The Regional Growth Strategy provides a regional framework for the countywide growth target process by defining expectations for different types of places.

Regional Growth Strategy Policies
MPP-RGS-4 Accommodate the region’s growth first and foremost in the urban growth area. Ensure that development in rural areas is consistent with the regional vision.
MPP-RGS-5 Ensure long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth area consistent with the regional vision.
MPP-RGS-6 Encourage efficient use of urban land by optimizing the development potential of existing urban lands and increasing density in the urban growth area in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.
MPP-RGS-7 Attract 65% of the region’s residential and 75% of the region’s employment growth to high-capacity transit station areas to realize the multiple public benefits of compact growth around high-capacity transit investments. As jurisdictions plan for growth targets, focus development near high-capacity transit to achieve the regional goal.
MPP-RGS-8 Focus a significant share of population and employment growth in designated regional growth centers.
MPP-RGS-9 Focus a significant share of employment growth in designated regional manufacturing/industrial centers."

Thank you - Linda Gray

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
VISION 2050 Comments

Following are a series of quotes from the Vision 2050 July 2019 draft and a few observations that might be of assistance:

Vision 2050 appears to not define a problem to be solved. The problem of reducing commute times to a defined number of minutes is not addressed.

Vision 2050 does not define the cost of implementing the plan, nor are there numerical baselines or goals. There is no way of measuring progress toward meeting goals.

There are no measures of potential negative impacts of implementing Vision 2050. Would it be appropriate to measure the percentage of the population that reaches HUD “housing affordability standards” and percentage of homeless as time progresses?

Vision 2050 fails to define or promote measurable merits that are of benefit to the population, such as commute time and gains in housing affordability.
p. 2 Vision 2050 proposes our local population will add 1.8 million people in the next 30 years. The draft attempts to accommodate this increase.

p. 5 Predicts: “the need for cars (will be) reduced” by developing walk-able spaces and increasing mass transit. Vision 2050 leaps to the conclusion that car usage must be reduced, without acknowledging the mobility benefits of car usage. The proposal of “electrifying transportation” in order to reduce carbon emissions does not address the sources or costs of electrical production, nor the high levels of “line loss” transporting the electricity from generation to consumer. Where it has been attempted, converting to wind and solar typically doubles the cost of these utilities.

Mass Transit is emphasized (light and heavy rail, ferries and bus rapid transit). Automobiles are not mentioned. The “all-in” cost per ride of each of the forms of transportation is not measured.

Housing and employment will be within walking distance of transit hubs (“walking distance” needs to be defined.)

Observation: Developing population in walk-able distance to stores results in smaller stores with limited range and depth of inventory and resultant higher prices.

p. 6 Goal: More than 2 million people connected by high capacity transit system. Recognize that providing that transportation capacity to Portland, Oregon was shown to exceed the GDP of Portland. The only way to achieve this goal is to focus residents and businesses very close to transit hubs. A review of the Hong Kong experience where this has be applied would been in order.
Note: High-rise housing construction is the highest cost per square foot

p. 26 Reduce displacement of lower-income people and businesses. This is challenging while mandating very high cost high-rise construction. My experience is our lowest income people gravitate toward “downtown” because they can live there at the lowest cost and often they cannot afford cars. (See note for p. 72 comment, below.)

p. 44 65% of population growth and 75% of employment growth attracted to region’s growth centers and within walking distance of high capacity transit. See comment p. 78, below.

p. 72 “Success of the Regional Growth Strategy depends on accommodating new growth without displacing existing residents and businesses.”

p. 72 “Communities that are compact, with jobs, parks and transit in walking distance, have better health outcomes...” “...and “promote physical activity...” I’m not aware of studies that support this assertion.

p. 78 High Capacity Transit Stations map shows the highest concentration of new population and business in Port Orchard to be along the waterfront on Bay Street. This is a physical impossibility. The p. 78 map contains numerous other examples.

p. 79 “This regional plan expects that by 2050 all urban area(s) will be annexed into existing cities or incorporated as new cities.” The text admits this to be challenging, as citizens must vote to approve annexations.
Local Housing Responsibilities under GMA (RCW 36.70A.070) (both have been significant challenges for Kitsap County):

1. “An inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs
2. Identification of sufficient land for a range of housing types to match community needs”

Today’s housing mix:

- 86% single family homes
- 4% single family attached
- 3% multifamily 2-19 units
- 2% multifamily 20+ units
- 5% mobile home/other

Vision 2050 appears to fail to reconcile conversion of existing lifestyle to morph into compliance with the Vision.

Affordable housing/housing affordability:

- 30% of gross income toward housing costs (including utilities)

“Housing ownership less of a reality” ignores placing people in high-rise apartments precludes them from home ownership. At retirement, those who own their home are average ten times the net worth of renters. How will we afford a region of impoverished retired people?

43% of Puget Sound households earn less than 80% of area median income. See p. 97 comment below.
p. 95 Promoting infill and more compact development, without defining the level of "compactness."

(Currently developers are looking toward 200 sqft apartments in order to market to lower income people)

p. 97 “…develop a comprehensive regional housing strategy to support the 20203-24 local comprehensive plan update.” That includes “… expansion of market rate and subsidized affordable housing…” Note subsidized rents bring the contract rent up to market rate. There will never be enough money to achieve that goal for all 43% who qualify.
Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

THE PSRC PLANS APPEAR TO IGNORE COMPLIANCE WITH GOAL 4 OF GMF, WHICH MANDATES AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR ALL INCOME LEVELS.

WASHINGTON STATE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES COMPENSATION WHEN A PROPERTY IS TAKEN OR DAMAGED FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES. CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCES OFTEN MANDATE BUFFERS AND SETBACKS, EVEN WHEN PROHIBITING USE OF PORTIONS OF PARCELS. NO COMPENSATION IS OFFERED. THIS APPEARS TO VIOLATE THE STATE CONSTITUTION.

Name: Michael Gustason
Rizzo Alliance of Property Owners
Organization (If Applicable): __________________________ Zip Code: 98386

Email or Mailing Address: [Redacted]

☐ Yes! Add me to the VISION 2050 email list

How did you hear about this open house?
☐ Email/newsletter
☐ Social media
☐ Newspaper/news media
☐ A friend or colleague
☐ An event
☐ Other (please specify)
Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

Kitsap Population is 268,000
We have 94.3% dwelling units (Kitsap Tax Assessor)
At 2.51 people per dwelling unit,
We require 107,492 dwelling units
We are currently short 130,744 dwelling units

Cost of regulation in Kitsap County today adds 50% to the cost of new construction housing.

Name: Michael Gustavson
Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners
Organization (If Applicable): 
Zip Code: 98386

Email or Mailing Address: michael.gustavson@mac.com

☐ Yes! Add me to the VISION 2050 email list

How did you hear about this open house?

☑ Email/newsletter  ☐ An event
☐ Social media  ☐ Other (please specify)
☐ Newspaper/news media  ☐ A friend or colleague
I - 116

Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

Today I have learned more rides occur on Uber and Lyft than on mass transit.

Cost per mile for constructing light rail is $20,000; 400 million per mile.

Mass transit does not provide a presence to urban or accommodate intermediate corridors.

A better solution is to improve highways, on which occur 97% of destination rides.

Name: Michael Gustavson

Organization (if applicable): KITAP Alliance of Property Owners

Email or Mailing Address: michael.gustavson@mac.com

☑ Yes! Add me to the VISION 2050 email list

How did you hear about this open house?

☑ Email/newsletter ☐ An event
☑ Social media ☐ Other (please specify)
☑ Newspaper/news media
☑ A friend or colleague

Puget Sound Regional Council
we moved to Black Diamond BECAUSE it's a small town. Please keep it that way, traffic is already a mess and my sister who lives in Maple Valley is ready to pull out and head to Anacortes because of the traffic/congestion

Respectfully
David and Linda Hagen
Black Diamond, WA
I am concerned with the growth of this region in a equitable manner. These projects should include apprenticeship requirements. Giving community members access to living wage to the building trades.

Name: Eric 
Sign: Eric
Laborers Local 242
City: Seattle

Date: 8/8/19
Dear PSRC:
Why are your emissions targets so low? Your numbers are incompatible with science and livable planet. Under your plan, Puget sound will have more wildfires, drought and food shortages. These very low targets will contribute to submerging island nations and parts of Seattle.

Here's what the plan should include:

- **Emissions targets** in keeping with UN science panel recommendations: **de-carbonize by 2030**.
- **Climate justice**. Instead of approving local growth plans and allocating transportation funding; you should make sure projects reduce emissions equitably. PSRC's forthcoming Regional Equity Strategy should inform its Greenhouse Gas Strategy to ensure those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change are centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.
- **Accountability**. We're facing a climate crisis, and what we do now and **well before 2030** is critically important PSRC should adopt a process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions, and make adjustments each year.

In the immortal words of Bill Nye the Science Guy: "The world is on fire!" Do something, you idiots!

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lFgBFYkBZ6E

Susan Helf,
Seattle
Hello,
I'd like to submit comment regarding the PSRC Vision 2050 Plan:

In order to comply with recommendations of climate scientists, we must decarbonize by 2030. The emission targets of Vision 2050 are incompatible with what we need to prevent climate catastrophe. When adapting plans to reduce emissions, we must also focus on climate justice to ensure that those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change are centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies. We also need a process that allows for flexibility and adjustments each year as we work toward our bold goal for carbon neutrality.

Respectfully, we can do better than what's currently proposed for Vision 2050.

Thank you,
Stephanie
My name is Bruce Hildebrand
Bellevue, WA

I am in district 6.

I have read much of the vision 2050 proposals.

I reject the climate change proposals because they are deceptively written and will fail to make any measurable difference in the world’s Climate Change.

In addition it will cost this region billions of dollars.

I am all for making sure our environment stays clean, livable and sustainable, but let’s get real.

If all carbon and greenhouse gasses of Washington State were suddenly stopped tomorrow (something that could NEVER happen), the impact on global climate change would barely be measurable. (0.001 of 1) percent. This is statistically insignificant. THINK ABOUT THAT!

I would like to see the following policy implemented:

1. Labeling “Climate Change” correctly. It used to be global warming, but when the USA was noted as cooling instead of warming (NOAA figures), “Climate Change” was invented. I would like to see all references to “Climate Change” changed to “Man Made Climate Change” (MMCC), so we can differentiate between nature’s impact and human’s impact.

2. Remove water vapor from the term “Greenhouse Gas”. Yes, it acts a little like carbon in our atmosphere, but the problem is that we need water vapor in our atmosphere, and if it starts raining more (especially around here), we won’t get meaningful numbers. Carbon is the real threat here. Let’s show it, or come up with a term to represent greenhouse gases less the water vapor component. Throwing around GG is vague and or ambiguous (Sort of like “climate change”). Let’s use “GGLWV” to represent the real threat.

3. A truth in statistics policy. As we have for our proposed legislation, we need a financial impact assessment on the costs associated with these VISION 2050 proposals. In terms of MMCC, we also need a MEASUREABLE IMPACT that these proposals will have on a GLOBAL SCALE. It does us no good to make radical changes here, when China and India don’t change their ways as well.

If you want to make meaningful change in GGLWV emissions tell India and China that they must reduce their carbon footprint first. We can boycott their goods until those results are achieved. We have succeeded in accomplishing many things this way. Remember South African Apartheid and the boycott
against South Africa by the city and county?

Now Then:

The vision 2050 proposals make a LOT of assumptions. Many I believe are simply wrong on do not display data in a meaningful manner. Much of the data displayed is politically motivated.

1. That we can make a difference in global “MMCC” through legislation.

2. We are going to continue to produce carbon emissions and greenhouse gasses at the current rate. This is false. You need only look around you to notice the vast and growing numbers of Electric and hybrid vehicles. Since 35% of our emissions come from on-road vehicles, and three fourths of that is passenger vehicles, that means roughly 25.9% of overall greenhouse gasses are produced by passenger cars (VISION 2050 numbers). That number will be going down as sound transit begins to serve the area and hybrid and electric vehicles continue to be sold in increasing numbers (even if there is no change in the rate of sales, as old vehicles are retired, the impact of passenger cars will automatically be reduced by newer more efficient and less polluting vehicles.)

3. The sources of GG chart assumes that electricity consumption is a large contributing factor. According to the proposals, 67% of all GG is produced by “built environments” or 2.5 times the amount produced by passenger vehicles*. Why do “Built Environments” produce this? They say it is electricity usage, but all the electricity in the county is a combination of hydroelectric and wind turbine generated power. Where is the carbon emission? Could it be that many structures have air conditioning that MIGHT have a small impact on water vapor? We need much better figures. The numbers here aren’t believable. (I might believe these apply to east coast cities that use coal fired power plants.) Please source these numbers.

3. While it is laudable to try and reduce GGLVV in the state, it will have ZERO statistical impact on the global climate at a cost to the residents of billions of dollars. Why are we doing this? We could better use this money elsewhere.

* That’s 2.5 times is calculated as follows: (74% of the 35% emissions of on-road vehicles is by passenger cars or 25.9% of the total GG. Compared to 67% for all built environments. The proposal states that these emissions are from consuming electricity. (All from Vision 2050 Data.)

OK let’s address housing.

Again are assumptions:

1. The study predicts that by building single family dwellings, that this is somehow this is the cause of unaffordable housing. I don’t believe that is true. If you look around at all the construction cranes in the area, you will find that when they are not building office structures, they are building Retail on the bottom and residential on top (ROBROT). Just look around and you will see that this sort of housing density is going up exponentially. More supply means reduce prices. The free market is solving the housing crisis. We don’t need legislation.
2. The study does not take into account that one of the most significant costs of building anything in this area today is the extensive permitting and licensing that must be done. These fees account for roughly ONE THIRD of the costs associated with building housing. (Want to make housing more affordable? Find a way to reduce that cost. It is one of the highest in the nation).

3. I am sure that the study attributes the “Homeless Crisis” to lack of affordable housing. This is simply not true. Roughly 80% of the homeless are druggies. (You don’t believe it? Ride along with Union Gospel’s Search and Rescue Vans one evening). Of the remaining 20% probably 15% are mentally unstable and cannot afford even moderately priced housing. This is a mental health issue and not a housing issue. That leaves 5% that still cannot afford housing. We have many programs to aid these individuals (Section 8, DSHS cash, food and housing disbursements, and a multitude of private agencies and churches). Many of these places have restrictions against alcohol and/or drugs. Much of our homeless will not accept these restrictions.

Maybe they should consider living in a place that is NOT the fourth most costly city to live in (nationally). After all, other cities/-states are literally shipping their homeless to us on busses so that WE have to handle them.

4. Being a “Sanctuary City/County/State” has nothing to do with the housing crisis. Washington state law prohibits dispensing funds to non-citizens; however, it is done every day. The “TANF” program will fund illegal immigrants. And many non-federally funded programs allow illegal immigrants to claim benefits that are for citizens by simply saying they are citizens. (Per DSHS policy, the verbal claim of citizenship is enough, and no further proof is required). This puts further pressure on an already tight housing market. I realize that we need migrant workers to assist our Eastern Washington farmers, but that has nothing to do with King County. Nevertheless, being a “sanctuary city/county/state”, does affect those in Western Washington. Funds that might help Washington Citizens are being diverted. Federal programs mandate proof of citizenship. Since the verbiage of the DSHS law is clear, shouldn’t that same level of proof be required for DSHS?

Since I haven’t read the entire proposal, I may have comments on other sections in the future.

Please take the time to consider these points. If you need documentation for claims outside of the Vision 2050, let me know and I will be glad to provide it.

Bruce Hildebrand
MAKE USE OF APPRENTICE ON JOBS

Connect Light Rail to Olympia

Blind Housing Close to Light Rail

Name: VERNE HOFFMAN
Sign: [Signature]
Laborers Local 242
City: DES MOINES
NOTE: There was a problem when I trying to Submit my online comment (9/16/2019 about 1:30pm) so I do not know if it got submitted so I am sending this email to ensure my 2050 Vision comments are received by PSRC.

How did you hear about the Draft VISION 2050 Online Open House?
Social Media

COMMENT

**MPP-T-28 Transportation Policy** (page 120) and **Transportation Actions. Regional Action. T-Action-5 Aviation Capacity** (page 121) are outdated and MUST be updated to be relevant for 2050 Vision.

1. **MPP-T-28** "optimize the existing aviation system prior to development of new airports."
   - SeaTac International Airport has reached capacity, yet Port of Seattle’s proposed SAMP will increase passenger and air cargo flight operations. Current arrival/departures are minutes apart creating non-stop jet traffic over communities with no relief, not even during night-time hours, interrupting people’s sleep. In addition, current road infrastructure is already congested and in gridlock without the addition passenger traffic and freight trucks required to move the air cargo.
   - It will take approximately 10-20 years to identify a location, develop the plan, and build another regional airport.

   A previous study identified the need for another regional airport was never acted upon, elected officials either dropped the ball or were influenced by the Port of Seattle to take no action. If action would have been taken then, the addition airport would have already been build and functioning.

   Action to develop new airports is now, enough with delay tactics that support the Port of Seattle which are have ongoing negative effects on community health and the environment.

2. **MPP-T-28** "minimizing health and noise impacts in communities."
   - Too little has been done to mitigate noise, and noise mitigation area was limited to a small geographic area. Implementation of NextGen by FAA and Port of Seattle has changed the flight path, increased flight frequency, lowered the altitude of aircraft, and increased the geographic areas now impacted by aircraft noise and pollution/emissions that historical were not affected. When FAA and Port of Seattle actions change flight paths resulting in new areas impacted the mitigation must also change to include those areas.
   - Action must be taken to minimize health impacts from both noise and pollution/emission to all the communities, residents and businesses impacted.
   - The Washington Environmental Health Disparities Map Project and Mapping Tool identifies living and economic conditions combine with pollution to contribute to inequitable health outcomes and unequal access to healthy communities and it shows the communities around SeaTac Airport have the higher risk than other Washington communities. Data is available, PSRC needs to take action.

   Access mapping tool [https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/wn/TNTNBL?fbclid=IwAR1L02u_I11SjK4Ydklt4moqR-Py_u_EV_T8Hti9uO_Dt7Qoiv9oTi5DsfU](https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/wn/TNTNBL?fbclid=IwAR1L02u_I11SjK4Ydklt4moqR-Py_u_EV_T8Hti9uO_Dt7Qoiv9oTi5DsfU)
3. **T-Action-5: Aviation Capacity.**
   - It is obvious SeaTac Airport has reached capacity and Puget Sound needs another regional airport now.
   - It is time PSRC initiate the action to identify locations for new airports and take a leadership role to ensure new airport(s) get built as-soon-as-possible. Doing anything less, shows the communities impacted, that the PSRC does not care about them and their quality of life and health.

Please step up and represent all the people in Puget Sound and do not allow Port of Seattle control future airports.

Respectfully,

Dana Hollaway
I'm commenting today on Vision 2050 in order to throw my support behind transparent and equitable basic-wage living jobs for the future and beyond. PLEASE support apprenticeship programs and working with laborers locally in order to serve the needs of unions the most.

Name: Harold Whitehead
Sign: 
Laborers Local 242
City: Seattle
Hello,

First off, thank you for the hard work that your office does to lead this effort in envisioning the future of our region. Attached are my comments and input to the draft document. As I am a person of color, I hope that you take your time and thoughtfully review them with care.

Best regards,

--
Andrew "Ace" Houston, AIA
B. Architecture | B.A. Urban Studies - May '14
UTSoA | The University of Texas at Austin
Andrew Houston regarding the draft VISION 2050
September 16, 2019

These comments were extracted from a digital copy of Draft VISION 2050. PSRC has original version of comments on file.

Introduction, Page 11, Adjacent to Regional Growth Strategy and Implementation Mitigation
“Overall through the focus of the Regional Growth Strategy, there needs to be an explicit emphasis on creating walkable neighborhoods that provide the everyday necessities that people need. This is essential to creating thriving neighborhoods in all communities within the region.”

Regional Growth Strategy, Page 26, Access to High-Capacity Transit
“Move to higher numbers (75/85%)”

Regional Growth Strategy, Page 26, Housing, Displacement, and Jobs-Housing Balance
“Promoting this shift would have to be done by removing incentives for development in King County and creating incentives in the other counties, something that seems infeasible”

Regional Growth Strategy, Page 27, adjacent to Metropolitan Cities bullet point
“These two top groups should require that all individuals within their boundaries be in walking distance to a high-capacity transit line”

Regional Growth Strategy, Page 29, Figure 5, Regional Geographies Map
“I think it’s important to put the Urban Growth Area boundary on this map”

Regional Growth Strategy, Page 44, MPP-RGS-7
“This should be higher: 75% and 85%”

Environment, Page 49 [Developing regional-scale environmental planning information and policies]
“very important to do this and also look at communities that are underparked”

Environment, Page 51, “12,000 acres of farmland”
“The Regional Growth plan should make an effort to reclaim this land back to farming or forestry and that should be a priority for the region”

Climate Change, Page 61, adjacent to greenhouse gas emission reduction bullet points.
“70, 100”
Development Patterns, Page 77, Figure 25, Regional Growth Center map
“Lake City should be identified as a regional growth center”
“Ballard should be designated as a Regional Growth Center”
“West Seattle should be designated as a Regional Growth Center”

Development Patterns, Page 80, Conserving Traditional Landscapes: Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands
“Very key”

Development Patterns, Page 82, MPP-DP-1
“This is good, however I am uncomfortable with the words local character. Character is created by people and preserving local character can be misconstrued as preserving white neighborhoods for white people.”

Development Patterns, Page 83, MPP-DP-10
“Yes, but to clarify this to promote the shift of private public space like golf courses into parks that are usable by all”

Development Patterns, Page 84, MPP-DP-21
“yes!”

Development Patterns, Page 85, MPP-DP-22
“yes!”

Development Patterns, Page 87, MPP-DP-45
“Given our needs and threat of climate crisis, we will need to require high-performance buildings as opposed to simply incentivizing.”

Development Patterns, Page 87, MPP-DP-46
“YES!”

Development Patterns, Page 87, MPP-DP-50
“Concurrency (chicken and eggs at the same time) is key. Yes!”

Development Patterns, Page 87, MPP-DP-52
“yes!”

Development Patterns, Page 88, Dp-Action-4
“Yes, though station areas should include bus transit centers.”

Development Patterns, Page 88, Dp-Action-8
“yes!”

Housing, Page 92, adjacent to Local Housing Responsibilities Under the Growth Management Act
“Very Key”

Housing, Page 96, MPP-H-1
“I think allowing for additional density is key so there can be safety around potential climate refugees and providing space for them”

Housing, Page 96, MPP-H-2
“Yes!”

Housing, Page 96, MPP-H-3
“I think it’s important to differentiate where preservation and new development happen. This can be construed by individuals in core cities to mean the preservation of their homes and that new development to happen on existing areas with (affordable) rental housing.”

Housing, Page 96, MPP-H-4
“Creating funding streams is so key”

Housing, Page 97, MPP-H-8
“Yes!”

Housing, Page 97, MPP-H-9
“YES” and “That said, we need to prevent single-family only zoning from being allowed in any core city. It is acceptable to still build single family, however allowing for duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes will ensure density appropriate for transit.”

Housing, Page 97, MPP-H-10
“Seattle needs to get rid of public design review”

Housing, Page 97, MPP-H-12
“yes”

Economic Development, Page 105, MPP-EC-6
“I think it’s important to emphasize how these flows happen. I think it’s key to prioritize freight and high-capacity transit on our roads while reducing usage of single-occupancy vehicles as much as possible.”
“Yes!”

“Very key”

“Something I would love to see in Transportation is more emphasis and prioritization of high-capacity transit, including High-Speed Rail.”

“Yes”

“I think allowing for a carbon fee to be paid into local efforts to restore forests and tree canopies could be one way to solve this”

“important to emphasize frequent and reliable”

“Prioritize* transportation investments. We need to do everything possible to create a modal shift, particularly in our metropolitan and core cities.”

“needs to include reliable connections and an emphasis on ‘on-time’ connections”

“yes!”

“NO expansion of roads in any part of the region that is not directly tied to high capacity transit or freight”

“yes”

“Yes!”
Public Services, Page 130, MPP-PS-26
“Yes!”

Implementation, Other Regional Actions, Page 137, adjacent to Regional Equity Strategy bullet point
“Yes! This is great.”
To whom it may concern,

Your Vision 2050 plan sets carbon emission targets that are completely incompatible with what science tells us we must do to prevent climate catastrophe.

Please ensure that your 2050 plans include the following:

- **Emissions targets** in keeping with UN science panel recommendations: **decarbonize by 2030**.
- **Climate justice**. PSRC approves local growth plans and allocates transportation funding; it should make sure projects reduce emissions equitably. PSRC’s forthcoming Regional Equity Strategy should inform its Greenhouse Gas Strategy to ensure those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change are centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.
- **Accountability**. We’re facing a climate crisis, and what we do now and **well before 2030** is critically important. PSRC should adopt an iterative process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions, and make adjustments each year.

Sincerely,

Jared and Whitney Howe

Seattle, WA
-----Original Message-----
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 11:04 AM
To: Andi Markley <AMarkley@psrc.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Monday, September 9, 2019 - 11:04 Submitted by anonymous user: 162.222.252.53 Submitted values are:

Your Name: Karen Hutchinson
Email: [REDACTED]

Question or Comment?
I am extremely unhappy with the traffic congestion in the Puget Sound area. My children and grandchildren in Portland will no longer visit us in Anacortes because of the traffic problem beginning in Olympia and continuing through to Marysville.

Have you read the article by Mark Harmsworth of the Washington Policy Center? It offers ideas and solutions.
https://www.washingtonpolicy.org/publications/detail/study-shows-building-road-capacity-has-a-widespread-economic-benefit

Please fix the traffic congestion!!!

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
-----Original Message-----
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2019 6:17 AM
To: Andi Markley <AMarkley@psrc.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Wednesday, September 4, 2019 - 06:17 Submitted by anonymous user: 67.40.215.103 Submitted values are:

Your Name: Esther John
Email: [REDACTED]

Question or Comment? Beacon Hill in Seattle has flights causing noise every 90 seconds. I want the PSRC Vision 2050 Plan to: 1) add air transportation planning and integrate it with its land transportation planning function, 2) align its environmental/climate goals with the goals of the jurisdictions it serves, and 3) include environmental justice analyses in its reviews.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello,

My name is Alan Kaptanoglu and I am a Seattle King County Voter, and a STEM graduate student at the University of Washington. I’m deeply concerned that the PSRC Vision 2050 contains climate-change related plans that are much weaker than the scientific evidence demands of us. We need to fully decarbonize as soon as possible, promote green and sustainable urban growth and transportation, and in general, make sure all of our policies are in line with reducing greenhouse emissions. Especially in Washington, we must include serious proposals for dealing with wildfires and the changes coming to our food and water resources.

This is the Puget Sound area. We are expected to set the gold standard for sustainable and environmentally-friendly living, and we cannot do this with the current plan. We must adopt a much more aggressive and hopeful plan that takes seriously the warnings from climate scientists across the globe.

Best,

Alan Kaptanoglu
Comments on Vision 2050, Puget Sound Regional Council

September 13, 2019
My name is Jennifer Keller and my email is [redacted] I live in Bellevue in the [redacted] zip code.
I heard about Vision 2050 months ago, at an event held for youth in Bellevue (although I am not a youth).

I have lived in the Puget Sound region for 40 years. I am commenting on Vision 2050 because I am very concerned about the climate. For the sake of the young people, future generations, and the beautiful green place we live in, we must substantially reduce (meaning cut by about half) our greenhouse gas emissions in the next 11 years.

Appreciation for Vision 2050 and for the TOD emphasis: Thank you for your work on Vision 2050, and especially for Vision 2050’s advocacy for transit-oriented development (TOD). From a climate perspective as well as from other perspectives, it is important to cluster housing and basic amenities around transit stations and other access points for transportation, such as dedicated bike pathways. This makes it easier for everyone to have straightforward ways to choose public transit, biking, walking, and other alternatives to single-occupancy gas-powered vehicles. Thank you for advocating for TOD, and please do as much as you can to make this element of Vision 2050 as strong as possible.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Monitoring as outlined in the plan is not frequent enough. On page 64 of the draft plan, it says, “The Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy is evaluated and refined every four years as part of the update of the Regional Transportation Plan.” Based on reports from the UN’s International Panel on Climate Change, we have about 11 years to make serious reductions in our emissions levels. If we wait four years to evaluate progress, and our efforts are falling short, we will have already lost crucial opportunities to make adjustments. This could have dire consequences in terms of our ability to reduce emissions as quickly as necessary. We must evaluate progress every 2 years, at least for the first crucial decade of the plan. This monitoring could partly happen through strong technical support for monitoring efforts of county and local jurisdictions, with transportation funding tied to whether counties and local jurisdictions are monitoring reduced transportation emissions frequently enough. In any case, there must be monitoring that happens more frequently than every four years.

Clear climate pollution reduction targets: It’s important for the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) to adopt specific targets to reduce emissions, not just aim for “substantially reducing greenhouse gas emissions.” At a minimum, PSRC should aim for the same targets as the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

Climate and environmental justice: When planning to increase emissions reductions, PSRC should work to do so in an equitable way. For example, low-income communities already dealing with excessive air pollution (affecting the health of local residents) should be prioritized for efforts to reduce emissions.
Collaboration for climate action: In the Regional Collaboration Policies section (starting on page 18), in the multicounty planning policies (MPPs), there should be an explicit policy that calls out the importance of climate planning, climate planning analysis, and climate action. In the collaboration section, climate gets only a slight mention in the last MPP, but climate action is far too important to only be mentioned here in passing (even though there is a Climate Change section as well). There should be a policy such as "Make climate planning, climate planning analysis, and climate action across the region a priority when developing and carrying out regional, countywide, and local plans."

Technical assistance: Wherever technical assistance is relevant in Vision 2050, make an explicit mention of technical assistance for climate-action planning and analysis. We need to rapidly increase the knowledge level of all the planners in our region regarding effective climate-action planning and analysis. This is a fast-developing field. If we already had all the expertise needed right here in our cities and counties (expertise seen in other cities that have taken truly effective action--a small number of cities across the world, but growing), we would be close to hitting our previous targets for greenhouse gas reduction. We are missing those targets. We need to learn from cities who are hitting their targets, and from consultants who are closely following the policies and results in those cities.

This is especially relevant in the Climate Change section of Vision 2050. In this section, there should be a policy such as “Provide or encourage technical assistance and training for climate-action planning and analysis in jurisdictions across the region, so that all planners have solid knowledge and access to the best current understanding of how to effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions at the local and regional level.”

Promoting high-speed trains for transportation into and out of the region: On page 120, items MPP-T-27 through MPP-T-29, recognize the importance of high-speed trains for transportation into and out of the region, by making changes such as the following:

- **MPP-T-27** Coordinate regional planning with rail line capacity expansion plans, including expansion of high-speed passenger trains into and out of the region, and support capacity expansion that is compatible with state, regional, and local plans.
- **MPP-T-28** Promote coordinated planning and effective management to optimize the existing aviation system and increase alternatives such as high-speed passenger trains, prior to development of new airports. Recognize anticipated pressures toward regional growth in aviation while minimizing pollution, health, and noise impacts in communities.
- **MPP-T-29** Support the transition to a cleaner transportation system through investments in zero emission vehicles, low carbon fuels, zero emission high-speed trains, and other clean energy options.
Alternative to Congestion are needed
so that alternative to driving are attractive.
Doesn't help for people on the bus to be stuck
in the same congestion - crew cut, alternative
paths is critical for connecting to light rail
& support growth near transit
Articulate as a part of transportation &
growth policies
Look at how Comp plan certification
Process can incentivize investments in
transit & alternative to congestion

Encourage multi-modal concurrency
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As PSRC considers planning for 2050, I ask that your goals be revised to what scientists say is necessary to avert a climate disaster. This means net zero carbon by 2030. Addressing the climate crisis also has the added benefits of improving water and air quality, preserving critical species, and making a more livable future for all of us. But this won't be possible without big commitments and bold action. We have no time to waste and we have no time for half-measures. 25% reduction by 2035 is woefully insufficient.

Today, the City of Seattle passed a resolution for the Green New Deal, including the commitment to being fossil-fuel free by 2030. King County Councilmember Larry Gossett was in attendance at this meeting and voiced his support for the city passing the resolution so he can use the template at the county level.

We have an opportunity to work together to make positive change. Please join in to help drive this forward.

Thank you,
Emily Knudsen
Sept 16, 2019

Dear Puget Sound Regional Council,

Thank you for receiving our comments on the PSRC Vision Plan 2050.

The entirety of these comments are focused on how carbon emissions can be brought down in our region, to the point where we can even look at 2050.

From an article last year in VOX:

“In its most recent assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reported that we may have as little as 12 years to cut our greenhouse gas emissions in half compared to today’s levels to limit average global warming to **1.5 degrees Celsius**, a benchmark to avoid some of the worst impacts of climate change. It also reports that every scenario for doing this requires pulling carbon dioxide out of the air, also known as “negative emissions.”

In this vein, we urge you to put all of your goals and sections, in addition to the Environment and Climate Change sections, ie, transportation, economy, housing, land use, agriculture, manufacturing and services, etc, through this lens, with equitable choices across all communities, so that one community does not gain at the expense of another. In fact, if there are to be short term gains, they should first be with those communities who have already suffered the worst of the pollution. This response is not just about justice; it is about our region’s survival. In other words, equitable emissions.

While the overviews and sections within this 2050 Plan, do seem to understand much of the above sentiment, they do not have emissions goals and they use outdated emissions numbers from 2015, as the standard, for figuring emissions output. With the growth this region has seen with burgeoning population and all the growth of old infrastructure that entails, our region’s emissions have been skyrocketing. As the environmental groups of Climate Solutions and 350Seattle say, reduction targets should be formally adopted which align with the latest science. Not only should there be identifiable goals, perhaps short and long term, but accountability needs to be attached, along with re-iterative evaluation to check on progress and correct as needed.

Please continue to connect the whole region with each process as part of all the others. One Plan and set of goals for housing, transportation, built environment, natural environment, public services, economic growth and emissions reduction throughout.

Sincerely,

Anne Kroeker and Richard Leeds
Recommended Changes to the Environment Section:

Please include MPP-En-1, “Develop regionwide environmental strategies, coordinating among local jurisdictions and countywide planning groups” in all sections along with equitable emissions goals.

Please add accountable goals to MPP-En-4, “Ensure that all residents of the region, regardless of race, social, or economic status, have clean air, clean water, and other elements of a healthy environment”.

Please add natural systems to the array of choices for development along with their corresponding economic values to MPP-En-5 “Locate development in a manner that minimizes impacts to natural features. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance”, and include the impacts of pollution of all the choices and corresponding costs, both short and long term.

Please add the same aspects to the goals for MPP-En-17 “Maintain and restore natural hydrological functions and water quality within the region's ecosystems and watersheds to recover the health of Puget Sound” and for MPP-En-18 “Reduce stormwater impacts from transportation and development through watershed planning, redevelopment and retrofit projects, and low-impact development”, including the benefit of the pollution cost not realized when using natural system choices.

Please add metrics to study current and past tree canopy areas, including the economic value of tree loss for MPP-En-9 “Enhance urban tree canopy to support community resilience, mitigate urban heat, manage stormwater, conserve energy, improve mental and physical health, and strengthen economic prosperity” and for MPP-En-13, “Preserve and restore native vegetation and tree canopy, especially where it protects habitat and contributes to overall ecological function.”

Please include aviation operations specifically in MPP-En-21 “Continue efforts to reduce pollutants from transportation activities, including through the use of cleaner fuels and vehicles and increasing alternatives to driving alone, as well as design and land use”, both on the ground and overhead, with more options pertaining directly to this transportation mode.

Please specify which air quality standards will be used, preferably the strictest ones ever enacted, which air toxic emissions, preferably those which come from all modes of industry and human uses, and which GHG emissions are being counted, preferably all that are known for MPP-En-22 “Meet all federal and state air quality standards and reduce emissions of air toxics and greenhouse gases.” Accountable goals need to be set and included. Where are air quality tests given? They should include those around the
airport and under all the actual jet paths. In addition, ultrafine particles should be part of the air quality testing.
Recommended Changes to the Climate Change Section:

Current emissions need to be calculated, not those from 2015, for MPP-CC-1 “Advance state, regional, and local actions that substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions in support of state, regional, and local emissions reduction goals, including targets adopted by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.”

Figure 20 – Sources of Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Figure 21 Sources of Regional Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emissions, do not report the huge increase in transportation since 2015, especially with the airplane operations, which has seen a 7 and a half million passenger increase and about 100,000 metric tons for cargo.

(from the PSCAA 2015 Methodology document):

“For Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (“Sea-Tac”), we included all landing and takeoff emissions from the airport. We obtained jet fuel supplied at Sea-Tac for 2015. We then applied standard jet fuel emission factors from the U.S. EPA Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks report (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017). We used a standard landing-takeoff factor, assuming that 10% of all fuel consumed by aircraft are used during landing and takeoff, and are thus part of the airport’s emissions profile”

The model estimates only a 2 minute takeoff, rather than all fuel pumped, as it does with estimation of car emissions. The problem with only using 2 minutes of takeoff and landing, is that it doesn’t include the new longer (and dirtier) approaches nor the multiple flyarounds nor the heavier use of fuel for larger international and cargo planes. As fuel emissions are not considered on entry to our State, it should be considered on exit, in the form of the full fuel pumped on the ground.

Please add aviation, train and bus specific alternatives, both short and long term goals to MPP-CC-3 “Reduce greenhouse gases by expanding the use of conservation and alternative energy sources, electrifying the vehicle fleet, and reducing vehicle miles traveled by increasing alternatives to driving alone.”

Please add accountable goals such as GHG emissions reduced per method and comparative economic values for each action vs doing nothing for MPP-CC-4 “Protect and restore natural resources that sequester and store carbon such as forests, farmland, wetlands, estuaries, and urban tree canopy.”

Please add calculations of past adverse impacts on affected communities to MPP-CC-6 “Address impacts to vulnerable populations and areas that have been disproportionately affected by climate change.”
Both CC-Action-1 “Greenhouse Gas Strategy. PSRC will advance the implementation of the region’s Greenhouse Gas Strategy, including future versions, to achieve meaningful reductions of emissions throughout the region from transportation, land use, and development. Regular evaluation and monitoring will occur as part of the development of the Regional Transportation Plan every four years”

and CC-Action-3 “Emission Reduction: Cities and counties will incorporate emission reduction policies and activities in their comprehensive planning. Elements include supporting the adopted Regional Growth Strategy, providing multimodal transportation choices, and encouraging a transition to a cleaner transportation system”

need to include air transportation as part of the Strategy and Emissions Reductions, which will mean the counties within which an airport is located will be accountable and the cities for how much each of their businesses and residents use air transport. It will not be enough to evaluate every 4 years; until a regular reporting and reduction scheme is underway, there should be constant monitoring and feedback to achieve accountable emissions goals.
When inacting the 2050 vision that the Puget Sound Council will prioritize Apprenticeship utilization in their criteria, adding the social equity component will ensure that we are building a workforce for the future and giving access to living wage jobs.
FYI, I've written this person, asking if they were commenting on VISION, but haven't heard back. -Andi

-----Original Message-----
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2019 11:36 AM
To: Andi Markley <AMarkley@psrc.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Sunday, September 8, 2019 - 11:35 Submitted by anonymous user: 173.164.116.25 Submitted values are:

Your Name: Art Lewellan
Email: [masked]
Question or Comment? "The Regional City" (Calthorpe/Fulton) since its publication has been my ideal development model. The principles of New Urbanism - mixed-use infill transit-oriented development, simpler to understand at single district level - with Regionalism addresses how dozens of new urbanist districts within metropolitan 'regions' are tied together. Thus, its solution isn't density, but rather diversity - the economic diversity of mixed uses as prescribed complementary development of 'single-use' suburban subdivision housing to add various employment opportunities, institutional services, retail outlets, amenities, entertainments. Regionalism planning philosophy would not let market forces direct densification of CBDs without complementary development throughout metropolitan regions. Mass transit, rather than freeways, defines regionalist travel connections with LRT & BRT trunklines. Smaller, conveniently connecting shuttle buses replace standard 40' buses that don't convert very well to hybrid nor all-battery nor suitable for stop-n-go in traffic operation. Lastly, "driverless" car tech is a fraudulent ruse. Give it a rest and consider the compromise position short of driverless. Most every household should have an EV in the garage, more PHEVs than BEVs, neither driven nowhere as much as today.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at
https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

Light Rail everywhere!
We are so far behind!
Fix it!
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Puget Sound Regional Council
Dear PSRC Staff,

Only bold policy goals are realistic these days. Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2027. The real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2033. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of greenhouse emissions. Methane must be regulated as well as Co2. Fracking and ports catering to "natural" gas or tar sands fuels must be prohibited. Time to invest deeply in alternative powers: literal, social and physical.

We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a pipe dream if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,
Laura Loper
Milton, WA
Dear PSRC Staff,

The new Fracking storage facility that is still underway with merely a pretense at legal process, represents the Puget Sound Corporate controlled decision making.

Your actions and decisions will now prove the degree of control over you by industry, and its forces for destruction for your children and their future, .

We await to find out the degree of corruption, or not under which you, each of you, operates with regard to the lobbying and other industrial interests at work, re Puget Sound, presently proven in their dominance.

Independent, or their mouthpiece?

Rock the boat and stand for a clean and safe future generations and species, or stay in bed with Industry?

We wait to see.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Richard Maclaurin
Dear PSRC Staff,

I am underwhelmed by the current goals of Vision 2050, and asking you to please do better. We do not live in a bubble--our country is responsible for 1/3 of the total cumulative emissions currently in our atmosphere, and it’s horrifying to see the people of Mozambique and Puerto Rico and Haiti (to name a few) suffer and die just so we, the citizens of one of the richest cities in the richest country, can continue to consume and pollute.

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can’t pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don’t boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,

Dave McCaul

Seattle, WA
Good evening, PSRC team,

Please accept my congratulations on completing a climate plan for our region! While many policy groups around the state, nation and world drag their feet or bury their heads in the sand, you acted, and worked, and created something meaningful.

If I were able to attend the open house on Tuesday, I would make the following comments:

1) Create a mechanism to hold emitters accountable. I do not see such a mechanism in the plan, and I believe this is key to prevent the increased emissions we continue to see in Seattle, despite the best intentions
2) No more CO2 by 2030. *In doctor voice* We have the technology!
3) Climate justice! To me, the lowest hanging fruit here is “trip reduction”

My sincere thanks,
Ian
--
IAN MCCLUSKEY - NABCEP PV INSTALLATION PROFESSIONAL
We are losing tree canopy in North AND South Seattle. Tree canopy needed for more walkable, comfortable neighborhoods. Needed safe walkways from side streets to arterials - transit corridors. This will increase transit use & demand - fewer drivers. Bike safety & pedestrian safety will improve as well. Slower traffic speeds on arterials would also help & save lives. More crosswalks clearly signed or with flashing pedestrian signals.

Treses sequester carbon.
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Puget Sound Regional Council
Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

BUS RAPID TRANSIT/ELECTRIC OR HYBRID BUS. NEEDED - EFFICIENT EAST AND WEST TRANSIT FOR NORTH SEATTLE-P. SOUND TO LAKE CITY/LAKE WASHINGTON NEIGHBORHOODS. FREQUENT BRT FOR NORTH & SOUTH AREAS OF CITY NOT SERVED BY RAIL AS WELL AS EAST/WEST EFFICIENT ROUTES THAT CONNECT W/RAIL AS WELL AS EAST/WEST DESTINATIONS (ARTERIALS & TRANSIT CONNECTIONS)
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Puget Sound Regional Council
Dear PSRC Staff,

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but “the whole truth” of carbon emissions. For example, we currently do not have strict building laws about new buildings and their carbon emissions. What? This is an area of huge pollution. We don’t have proper waste removal throughout cities and city businesses = horrible waste. We don’t ensure that all people are able to access public transportation, leading to more usage of automobiles within cities. Horrible and very outdated. Someone should visit Toronto. These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can’t pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be our demise and our children’s polluted world if we don’t boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,
marlene meyer
Bellevue, WA
Dear PSRC Staff,

Today I write as not only a long-time WA resident, and a parent/grandparent, but also as a small business owner. The scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,

NJ Morgan

Vashon, WA
Roads are severely lacking in the north. Construction and widening of state roads should be before housing construction.
Didnt happen. Accidents and deaths every day on hwy 2 and 9. Train is not reliable from Everett to downtown. Limited schedule. Need to have a significant investment.
I live and run a small business in Seattle WA and I'm commenting on the Puget Sound Vision 2050.

I tried to submit a comment directly from your website at 10 pm September 16 but the website wouldn't allow me to comment. The link I'd seen in several places to comment was https://www.psrc.org/user/login?destination=node/8543

This page leads to a login site with no option to create an account if you don't already have one. I don't know if this was intentional, as a way to limit public participation, or an oversight. The website says comments accepted until September 16. There was no final hour to comment, so I should have been able to submit my comment via the link until midnight. I'm sending this email on September 16 at 11:12 pm, so you should still be able to accept it.

Regarding Puget Sound Vision 2050, I'm concerned about excessive growth in King County, and specifically about it in Black Diamond. Black Diamond has been overrun by the OakPoint Development, which is turning a formerly lovely small town into an overdeveloped nightmare. Huge clearcuts have destroyed the natural environment the developer is ramping up for more. The town mayor and city council are beholden to the developer and have lied to members of the community who have voiced their concerns.

The cost of new infrastructure that Black Diamond is being forced to pay is a waste to taxpayers all over the county. Taxpayers are now paying for projects the developer promised to cover, but is not. I am not happy that as a taxpayer, I'm subsidizing OakPoint.

Growth should be shifted to bigger cities that already have at least some of the necessary infrastructure, and where new investments could be spread out among more people.

I hope you will consider my comments. I want a response to know they've been accepted.

Sincerely,
Allison Ostrer
1) In the transportation sub-plan executive summary, on the last page are listed objectives the sub-plan attempts to meet. Not listed is “mobility”. If there is anything a transportation plan should attempt to achieve, it is mobility.

2) In conjunction with this, an absolute “no brainer” is to turn the region’s freeway HOV lane system into a HOT system, with the bar as to ‘who drives free’ set high enough to insure 24/7 free-flow bus rapid transit.

3) If carbon reduction is a major goal, which it seems to be, then, by any measure, the way to go is a carbon tax and dividend approach.

3) The 2050 plan does not mention the subject of the documentary, “Seattle is Dying”, namely the social disfunction caused by the substantial sub-population of homeless in the grips of addiction and/or severe mental illness. The documentary advocates a tough love approach, which seems reasonable.
Dear PSRC,

We are in an unprecedented period of climate emergency. Please make the Vision 2015 meaningful. This is what I support:

- **Emissions targets** in keeping with UN science panel recommendations: **decarbonize by 2030**.
- **Climate justice**. PSRC approves local growth plans and allocates transportation funding; it should make sure projects reduce emissions equitably. PSRC’s forthcoming Regional Equity Strategy should inform its Greenhouse Gas Strategy to ensure those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change are centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.
- **Accountability**. We’re facing a climate crisis, and what we do now and **well before 2030** is critically important. PSRC should adopt an iterative process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions, and make adjustments each year.

Sincerely,

Barbara Phinney
Seattle, WA
Hi,

Thank you so much for providing this opportunity. I just recently bought my very first home in Port Orchard this year (my sister already lives in Port Orchard and our parents are over in Bremerton). However, I lived in San Francisco/Oakland, California from 1996-2001 and 2006-2016 and experienced the same kind of exponential growth that eventually priced me out of the area completely, so I'd like to offer some insights based on that experience. Here are three main issues that are most important to me:

1. Public transportation to downtown Seattle
Currently I take the Southworth ferry and drive in but would happily leave my car in Port Orchard if I could quickly get to downtown Seattle. I live far enough away that I have to drive to the ferry terminal so if you maintain the current location consider installing a parking garage, or set up public transit that can quickly get us to the ferry terminal on time. In Oakland we used to do something called a casual carpool where people would pick up people needing to get across the bay bridge and dropped off in downtown San Francisco. People would usually contribute $1 to the driver to cover the toll and gas. Perhaps help set up something similar for the ferry but make people register for it, so that you have an official record of who is participating to help ensure it remains safe and allow you to track its effectiveness.

2. Volunteer opportunities in the public schools
This suggestion would need to be heavily regulated because you need to make sure any potential volunteers working with kids are safe, especially if they are not a parent with a child already in the school system. However, it is important to make sure that the kids growing up in the community have access to the skills needed to be able to easily obtain the jobs that are creating the economic boom in their area. So making sure there are volunteer opportunities to share those skills is really important. I used to volunteer tutor for free to make sure I did what I could to make sure kids had access to help with their homework if they needed it. The shortfall of this idea however, is making sure volunteers have at least basic training on what makes a good volunteer so they are helping rather than hindering teachers. Any program should be guided by teachers to identify what they may need help with for their students and ensure it is effective for their needs. It may also make sense to open tutoring opportunities to non students in case any adults are looking for these skills as well.

3. Solar Panels for Communities to help eliminate green economic divide
I hope to be able to invest in solar panels for my house within the next three years but it would be great if we could address this idea as a neighborhood rather than house by house and that would need oversight or assistance from the city or county. When I'm ready to invest in solar panels I intend to talk to my neighbors anyway to see if we can install them in such a way as to benefit multiple homes.

I just wanted to offer up these comments in case I am unable to attend the Aug. 15th open house.

Thank you again for the opportunity and hope these suggestions are helpful!

My best regards,
Natalie
Dear PSRC Staff,

One of the largest contributors to greenhouse gases is also the one most Americans are tied closest too...the automobile.

I recently made the decision to ditch the automobile and commute to work by bike. It's a long ride by bike commute standards...18 miles one way. Some of it is on surface roads with wide bike lanes...some with no bike lanes at all...some on high volume higher speed roadways...and some on trail (North Creek Trail and the Sammamish River Trail). What I find is that many drivers are distracted (texting, phone calls, tired...or maybe they just don't like cyclists). The danger involved with being a bike commuter is significant.

I'd like to see more bike routes. Not bike lanes...but dedicated routes. Bike superhighways. There are a lot of bike commuters out there and having a safe high volume route dedicated to bike commuters would be a significant way to ensure the safety of cyclists but just think of all the greenhouse gases that we aren't pumping into the atmosphere!

I want more light rail. More bike lanes. Anything that is going to get people out of their cars and into an eco friendly mode of transportation!

Just think about how moving people out of their cars and onto their bikes would help reduce traffic congestion!

Sincerely,

Janet Putz

Snohomish, WA
Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

- Proactively work with local governments to provide density around future HCT stations
- Amend GMA (work with Dept. of Commerce) to allow PSRC to enforce land use decisions w/ funding
- Think about weakening protections for general aviation airports so they can be converted to other uses if they're too much of a financial drain on communities
- Consider pollution and racial and socioeconomic equity issues when coordinating with the military and planning aviation-related transportation
- Work with suburban local governments to not have housing be away with hosing in diversity and support more dense housing
- Get local government environmental review in line with SEPA, like is in consideration in Seattle
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Ben Larson

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 3:28 PM
To: VISION 2050
Subject: Our last chance to get it right

Dear PSRC Staff,

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. We should also aim to be carbon negative by 2050 across all sectors in our region. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation. It is shocking that we do not include emissions from our health sector -- recent research from Health Care Without Harm has found that health care is 7.6% of the national footprint for the United States, with 546.5 MtCO2e, or 1.7 tCO2e per capita. These numbers include transit for employees (which are likely accounted for by your calculations) but also include waste generated in the operations, distribution channels, capital goods, and purchased goods and services. We should also consider consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe and ensure a livable future for the next generation, much work is needed to expand the conceptualizations of our emissions and work across sectors to come up with new goals and solutions.

Vision 2050 does not seem to incorporate ways that communities will adapt to the new reality of climate change-- that wildfire smoke will occur more frequently and for longer periods of time in this region as climate change continues. Even if we stop with our carbon emissions immediately, the region will continue to experience the negative impacts of climate change. As such, a Vision for 2050 should include centers where people can go and have clean, cool air during the summer, and even where the air will be clean to such an extent that individuals can run and play indoors. Otherwise, disparities in health will continue and worsen, as people who are wealthy may be able to access these spaces more readily than people with fewer financial resources. Given increased heat in the summer, we should find alternatives to air conditioning and design all buildings so that they are cooler (there are ways to do that!)

Vision 2050 also does not seem to incorporate the reality that we could have 30% less rain during summer and much heavier rain the rest of the year by 2050 and what this will mean for water access for our population (you do mention clean water, as flooding has the potential to cause problems with clean water). I would rest easier if there were clear plans for preparing for water shortages, including rainwater capture systems.

In regards to the significant potential food shortages by 2050, the region should invest in educating people (for free) on how to grow their own food and how to do so throughout the year. There is significant potential that the region can capture carbon from the atmosphere through organic farming practices.
Lastly, to create an equitable world, we should have a 35-hour work week to compensate for the increased time that it takes to be lighter on the planet.

We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,
Claire Richards
Seattle, WA
Good Morning,

I have read the Vision 2050 draft and related documents, and attended an excellent workshop. In my opinion the Vision 2050 draft is a good update of the regional long-range growth plan, but falls short in the climate area.

Our world is facing a climate crisis. PSRC at a minimum should formally adopt the PSCAA targets of reducing emissions 50% from 1990 levels by 2030, and 80% by 2050, and determine a carbon budget based on these targets.

The targets should be used in evaluating local growth plans and allocating transportation funding. Further regular review of the effectiveness of policies to reduce emissions is needed, with adjustments as necessary.

Thank You,

Dave Russell
(former GMPC chair, PSRC president (early '90's))
Regional growth center - great! But when any jurisdiction like Kent & Auburn decides to spread out, since they have little transit, what's the point? I don't really have opinions on how growth is dished out as long as you reduce urban sprawl. We cannot have another 20-30 years of urban sprawl. What will Puget Sound look like if we must wait another 20 years to kill urban sprawl?

As such, please find some way to ensure jurisdictions stop sprawl before 2040/2050

Work w/ the state to stream the GMA

Name: Andrew S. [Redacted]

Organization (If Applicable): UW Student

Email or Mailing Address: [Redacted]

☐ Yes! Add me to the VISION 2050 email list

How did you hear about this open house?

☐ Email/newsletter
☐ Social media
☐ Newspaper/news media
☐ A friend or colleague

☐ An event
☐ Other (please specify)
Share Your Thoughts!

Note: You can also provide comments online at https://www.psrc.org/draft-vision-2050-plan-comment-form

Use weighted population density for designate growth centers.
It's not really good density. It's just the population density.

Name: ___________________________

Organization (If Applicable): ___________________ Zip Code: _______

Email or Mailing Address: ____________________________

☐ Yes! Add me to the VISION 2050 email list

How did you hear about this open house?

☐ Email/newsletter
☐ Social media
☐ Newspaper/news media
☐ A friend or colleague

☐ An event
☐ Other (please specify)
I'm asking that when looking at future projects in the 2050 vision that the Puget Sound Regional Council will look at their scoring criteria for future projects and add an element of Apprenticeship criteria. Doing this will ensure that we are building a strong workforce in the region for future generations. Would ask that cities and towns will commit to Apprenticeship and strong labor standards will be rewarded in your scoring criteria.

Name:  Kelly Santos
Sign:  
Laborers Local 242
City:  Enumclaw
Dear PSRC,

I am writing to you today, with hopes that you make an inventory utilization program inside the Vision 2050 plan.

It is vital to have Vision 2050 plan projects be staffed by local union workers who are and can be trusted to complete projects in the field. Each project must have a social equity component. We're King County, and for years we have demanded solidarity with workers. Let's make it happen.

Name: Kevin Shilling
Sign: [Signature]
Laborers Local 242
City: Bremerton, WA
My name is Owen Shimmings, and I am currently an apprentice. As a member of local 242, I would like to see the apprenticeship program and pre-apprenticeship program be taken into consideration when addressing your scoring process. By doing so, you will be creating a path to gain equity just like you state on your website.
Dear PSRC Staff,

I live in Beacon Hill, Seattle where we have some of the worst air pollution in the city with some of the lowest tree canopy and nosiest skies. I am a business owner and parent in my community, and want a healthier environment for all. The costs of carbon emissions on our individual and planetary health are too high to continue to ignore. At the current rate, our skies are expected to get noisier and air less healthy as air flights are allowed to dramatically increase. Business as usual is making us sick. We expect our leaders to advance a vision that is healthier for all.

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don’t boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,

Megan Slade
Seattle, WA
I am writing to comment on the Vision 2050 plan which sadly makes no decisive, strong actions that will protect our region as well as show our regions serious participation in reducing global warming. The UN Science panel has been clear that decarbonizing by 2030 needs to be achieved. We have no future without a liveable planet.

Sincerely,

Marcy

--

Marcy Stafford, M.A., LMHC
Dear PSRC Staff,

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years to reach carbon neutrality by 2050.

Unfortunately, Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution falls quite short.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but “the whole truth.” For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, we do not include consumer emissions -our energy company swears conscientiousness, yet wants to promote fracking as a primary resource exploitation -solar & wind are greatly under-represented -all shapes and sizes of commercial boats are polluting ports -while commercial fishing fleets not only deplete our waters but many are old, inefficient, "bad-gas" users that leave a trail of pollution alongside their nets

(...Need I go on? There must be thousands writing in with many points to ponder!)

Our transportation plans and infrastructure are woefully short-sighted. Who has the courage to act among those who control the politics and purse strings to do anything? (Or will we just leave it to greedy corporate profiteers who only fund self-serving networks and fund lackeys like the Kochs and their ilk?)

We can't pretend growth and sustainability are an actual priority for the region if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lori Stevens

Seattle,
Dear PSRC Staff,

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

We need to acknowledge the popularity of this region and make an enjoyable place to live in much closer quarters. We need to reduce traffic by drastically improving public transportation infrastructure that serves urban villages that have been very slow to develop. The PSRC can push the vision to make that goal a reality.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we benefit from abundant hydropower, good wind and sun resources, the real target must be cutting emissions to 0 by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can’t pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don’t boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,

Greg Stinson
Seattle, WA
Hello,

In reviewing the Vision 2050, there are some issues to address.

First, the emissions targets are not good enough. We must do better if we want life to continue on this planet. A better target, in line with the UN science panel, is to decarbonize by 2030.

Second, and in relation to the first point, there needs to be a review process yearly by which you can evaluate emissions reductions, and adjust accordingly if not meeting goals. All corporations emitting carbon and methane must be held accountable for their actions, and made to reduce emissions, not just pay fees for greater pollution.

I also want to note that this plan needs to include an equity lens. It's great to want to have electric delivery fleets, but many drivers at the Port of Seattle own their vehicles, and cannot afford to update them. There should be some assistance in this fleet change.

Please do consider the concerns that you will surely hear about this plan. We need to act fast, and in much bolder ways than before. Slow moving bureaucracies are not equipped to make the kind of rapid change we need - it's time to propose something visionary and work towards it.

Thank you,
Kara Sweidel
Kenmore, WA
please leave plenty of towering evergreen trees, our chunk of the state just wouldn't feel right without them.
------Original Message------
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 8, 2019 1:59 PM
To: Andi Markley <AMarkley@psrc.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Thursday, August 8, 2019 - 13:59 Submitted by anonymous user: 97.126.3.237 Submitted values are:

Your Name: Synnove Turner
Email: 
Question or Comment?
I attended one of your mtgs. this spring at Emerald Ridge. Along with my comments and those of others in the group, the concerns fell into two categories. The concern of added traffic to our already congested streets and the concern of standing drainage due to development. I honestly don’t think either of these issues will be addressed so I find attending future meetings rather futile. I know that developers pay an impact fee when constructing new developments, but I also know that the money collected can go anywhere in the county, not to the area directly impacted. I have also seen such a waste of money as in 112th by Costco where huge issues arose & Shaw Rd. where closures effected thousands of people and in the case of Shaw Rd., traffic wasn’t improved at all. I know this might be City of Puyallup jurisdiction, but I haven’t seen any improvements on the Pierce Co. roads that I travel regularly!
It seems that the greed of development overrides all issues related to the quality of life that we once enjoyed here on South Hill.
I am so disappointed as I see more of our beautiful valley paved over to house warehouses and our roads congested with angry drivers.
Synnove Turner

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
My concerns for my region in an equitable manner should include apprenticeship requirements to avoid unnecessary displacement of unemployment.
Dear PSRC Staff,

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but “the whole truth” of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can’t pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don’t boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Aside from the boilerplate, I want to ask you personally. I was born in Seattle (Ballard, actually) because both my mom and dad moved here from out of state. I love this place and can’t imagine myself living outside of the PNW long-term. We must take excessive, bold action to mitigate the damage that climate change will have on our community. We need to develop infrastructure (public transit, affordable housing, energy profile) to support thousands, millions of people who will be fleeing the equator and moving to livable climates in the coming decade. We need our buildings held to a higher standard in terms of insulation/energy efficiency. We must dive deeply into all of these complex, interconnected problems and more that I haven’t listed or that I’m not aware of, all at the same time. Please help us.

Sincerely,

Peter Tynan

Seattle, WA
-----Original Message-----
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 8, 2019 8:23 AM
To: Andi Markley <AMarkley@psrc.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Thursday, August 8, 2019 - 08:22 Submitted by anonymous user: 206.53.193.178 Submitted values are:

Your Name: Jan von Lehe
Email: [REDACTED]
Question or Comment?
Your vision 2050 needs the following:

1. Climate pollution reduction targets that align with the latest science. PSRC should formally adopt targets to reduce emissions 50% below 1990 levels by 2030, and 80% by 2050 and determine a carbon budget based on these targets.
2. Decision-making through a climate justice lens. PSRC approves local growth plans and allocates transportation funding. When doing so, it should make sure projects and plans equitably reduce emissions in a way that supports adopted emissions reductions targets.
3. Evaluating whether we’re on the right track. We’re facing a climate crisis, and what we do well before 2050 will determine whether or not we bake! Therefore, PSRC should adopt an iterative process to determine whether its policies are leading to reduced emissions and make adjustments when necessary.
4. Centering of climate justice. PSRC’s forthcoming Regional Equity Strategy should inform its Greenhouse Gas Strategy to ensure those who are disproportionately harmed by climate change will be centered in mitigation and adaptation strategies.

Wish I could attend the open house - - but please know we must reduce growth of these fossil fuel based activities! We must incorporate the UN IPCC reports! The climate crisis is real and will cost so much more than shifting our behaviors and that comes with leadership from groups like PSRC! thank you!

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
To: vision2050@psrc.org

GENERAL I was born in W. Washington. I'm not an eco-activist, but I'm a 7-decade regional resident. Almost anyone who's lived in or around SE King or NE Pierce Counties for 10 or more years should know instinctively that the area needs to remain "population-modest". A tree canopy really takes a half-century to start. We are upstream of a substantial chunk of the Seattle and the Puget Sound region so, even without science, radical and rapid development ought to be disconcerting to everyone downstream.

The SE King County plateau area, which really ought to be thought of as sufficiently distant from salt-water (or I-5) to remain naturally forested for at least a few more generations, doesn't appear now like it'll make it. Instead, it looks like it'll soon resemble Bellevue or Tukwila: built to the hilt.

At the same time, what's curious are so many acres that exist much closer to the I-5 corridor or the Auburn-Kent valley -- largely undeveloped or completely vacant.

MOBILITY I used to love my location near Lake Sawyer just for itself, and for being "somewhere between" Snoqualmie and Cayuse/Chinook Passes. While those reasons remain, others are gone or rapidly fading primarily from congested reductions in mobility. I'm not sure what local leaders expected by promoting excess population in an area still sparsely served by a 1930s vintage farm-&-mine-to-market road system ... and a local rail system which was discarded (despite increasing growth) for bicycles and joggers? Question: Isn't mobility the very impetus of liberty? ... and of life?

I've seen a list and a map proposing physical road adjustments to “accommodate” current and future growth. Beyond an optimistic 5-to-10% alleviation of current traffic coagulation, I don't believe it can assure anyone -- except perhaps the most gullible or heavily invested -- of congestion relief for now or in the future. When we sit behind a tenth-mile of traffic waiting for a traffic light to cycle multiple times (as we too often do), we already know something is wrong, and that it's not likely to get better by adding hundreds of acres of new homes, 12? feet apart, or by adding a couple dozen token road adjustments.

COST In the trend I see now, existing Black Diamond residents are sure to get stuck with increased costs for that new roadwork, new schools and new utilities (which won't benefit them), and for more safeguards or even repairing public mistakes.

I am absolutely in support of "growth paying for growth". Indeed, why should us long-retired old-timers be on the hook for an economic paradigm that came much later than our careers? That's even worse than making "our children pay down our debt" because, at least, the children actually have a shot at it. What's come at us recently defies logic; it's insane and immoral. We never built our careers or signed on for growth at such a stunning rate that it starts to feel like entrapment. If there are not reasonable and accessible exemptions from the impending costs of massive development, I expect many will become financial "toast".

Thanks very much for considering.

Phil VonWalter
Black Diamond, WA
CLIMATE

Greenhouse Gas Emissions-GHG

Carbon dioxide-CO$_2$

Nitrogen oxides-NOx

All calculations are for Sea-Tac Airport, the largest single facility generator of greenhouse gas emissions in the county and possibly the region

Figure 20

These comments are mainly focused on the aviation industry global warming emissions and specifically Sea-Tac Airport for the following reasons:

1) Aviation is the fastest growing contributor to global warming emissions in the world
2) Sea-Tac Airport is one of the fastest growing airports in the US
3) Sea-Tac Airport is the single largest facility producer of greenhouse gasses in the county and possibly the region
4) Aviation is the only sector that currently experiences no regulatory controls or reduction strategies
5) Most of the information in the US ignores this sector pushing responsibility for reduction measures away from industry and onto individuals
6) Most of the scant information that is available is false, misleading or lacking information

Air travel is listed as 2% of the regional total. This figure is incorrect.

Please refer to the 2007 State Greenhouse Gas Emission Study where Department of Ecology used all jet fuel pumped and found that at Sea-Tac Airport, of the 4.7 million metric tons (mmtpy) of annual CO$_2$. Of that total, 4.2 mmtpy from Jet A fuel pumped and 90% of the total from Sea-Tac Airport represented 22% of the King County total. [https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/1002046.pdf](https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/1002046.pdf) In 2015, the total had climbed to 2.5 million gallons of Jet A per day and 5.4 mmtpy of CO$_2$. This figure is predicted to double by 2035-2050 and forecast to be half the county total due to potential rapid growth in aviation coupled with reductions in other sectors.

Along with CO$_2$ that IPCC 5th Assessment (2014) calculates as a 1 for Global Warming Potential (GWP) Sea-Tac’s aviation contribution to NOx in 2017 is 3,704 tons per year with a GWP of 265, methane 0.85 ton per year with a GWP of 28. NOx impact from Sea-Tac Airport is more than 8-10% of the King County total. To consider this contribution is 265 times greater than carbon dioxide is concerning but has not been added to any GHG total from the aviation sector in any talks so far.

The method used to calculate the GHG from airports is the same method FAA uses in its AEDT model to estimate ground level impact from criteria and toxic emissions and is not an acceptable method for global warming emissions. All fuel pumped has been the standard from agencies and credible sources. This is the method used for cars, trucks, busses, ships, trains. Unlike aviation, when a car, truck or train travels outside the borders of the city, county or state, the GHG is still counted by gallons of fuel pumped. The aviation industry wants to have for itself a unique and unusual method of counting only those emissions released before climbing to 3,000 feet. This method that uses a 2 minute operation of
jets leaves 90% of the global climate impact of aviation never counted. Since CO₂ is not just a local issue but a global impact, all fuel pumped is the only accurate method. An inventory that leaves 90% uncounted in the midst of worldwide discussions and controversy at Geneva, Corsia at ICAO and endangerment finding at EPA with only market based measures like trading schemes beginning in 2020 is strange for a climate conscious region.

If reducing over time with a baseline of 1990, it is important to see what that inventory is and where reductions are happening in a mathematical format. These are real numbers that can be produced with real goals in mind. For instance, if starting at 20 mmtpy CO₂ for cars in King County, that is now reduced to 19 over 10 years we can see that hybrid and electric vehicles have made a difference because there are more cars on the road with less overall fuel use. Meanwhile, the airport has reduced the 10% of the non-jet CO₂ by 3% but has increased the 90% jet fuel CO₂ by 10% per year. This is like emptying a pool with a firehose. The 4.2 in 2007 has risen to 5.4 in 2015 (less than 10 years) so the gain in automobile reduction has been absorbed and even exceeded by just one sector. Without figures, it is impossible to validate whether any of PSRC’s strategies will work. Without accurate figures it is useless.

Sea-Tac Airport communications likes to talk about relying on biofuels for aviation reduction. However, without identifying a sustainable fuel or the emissions of GHG from any potential fuel it is unknown
whether this is a viable solution. At best, a supply chain that delivers 50 million gallons per year will produce no net reduction since this represents only a small fraction of future fuel use amidst a doubling of operations (16 days of 365).

Aviation is the fastest growing contributor to climate change emissions in the world. Sea-Tac Airport is the fastest growing contributor to climate change emissions in the state and one of the fastest growing airports in the country while remaining the only one without any kind of local, national or international control, reduction strategy or transparency for 90% of its emissions. To put the aviation contribution at just Sea-Tac alone into perspective, it is double the largest refinery in Washington State and rivals a coal fired power plant. An attempt was made to fine the refinery for its releases, while the Centralia Coal Fired Power Plant is slated for closure due to its inventory. Neither of these industries had plans to double their inventory as the airport does but were targeted by our state.

To target the individual and ask we live near transit to give up our cars, limit parking, pay tolls, per mile charges, drive electric while one untouched sector takes up and exceeds all reduction achievements for the region is unjust.

MPP-CC-1

Needs to include an inventory of emissions from each sector, what reductions will be achieved, what has been achieved so far in each sector and which sectors need more attention. Please use a method to calculate existing emissions such as the State Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory from 2007 so that a baseline is transparent and people can see which sectors are growing and which ones are shrinking. Percentages of total regional inventory such as Figure 20 are lacking information.

MP-CC-4

The South King County area has 60% less trees than north King County and the largest inventory of GHG in the county due to Sea-Tac Airport. The airport recently cut thousands of trees for flight path safety. You have said nothing specific about areas that should be targeted for less growth and more forest or replacement of tree canopy. A recent inventory of a greenbelt in Burien found the majority of trees dead or dying. Restoring or maintaining tree health is an area not identified in this policy.

If this region really cares about climate change emissions it will work to implement the following:

1) Climate tax will be added to ticket pricing for air travel. The majority of people fly very little and a very small percentage fly frequently. Ticket tax for climate impact should reflect a social justice element. A graduated cost structure should be applied so that the few frequent users who often derive great financial benefit from the industry and who are largely responsible for the majority of demand driving growth, are not being subsidized by the disproportionately impacted poor and damaged.

2) Demand system management should be added to aviation so that peak demand at Sea-Tac, which drives the need for expansion of facilities and grows the industry will be controlled. Peak hour pricing should be added to airline user fees. Currently, too much demand is catering to airline profits rather than public health and environmental protection.

3) Aviation must be spread out over the region so that one group of residents is not disproportionately burdened by excessive noise and emissions. Please see attached power point showing some of those disproportionate impacts. Please notice that those living with the
highest noise levels in the state, highest emissions in the region, highest facility producer of climate emissions in the county, with the highest environmental degradation are also the poorest and predominately minority residents experiencing significant health impacts. This is an environmental justice issue that EPA has taken notice of and PSRC should coordinate with both EPA Region X and Department of Ecology at the state level for a better understanding of who and how people are living with extreme health and welfare disparities.

4) Integrate intermodal connections. The highest emission sources per passenger mile are jet travel while the lowest is rail. People should use aviation only for long haul flights and integrated transportation would take them from plane to train to bus to car seamlessly. Train travel or other alternate hybrid or electric plane should be used for short hop trips under 500 miles.

5) Encourage or demand that the majority of cargo from airports and seaports are transferred to rail rather than semi-trucks which will help reduce costly road repairs, freeway congestion and reduce overall regional emissions. A short rail connector to Kent valley will need to be built from Sea-Tac Airport or another primary air cargo facility with those connections in place should be identified. Sea-Tac was never built or intended for cargo operations. The airport at Moses Lake is capable of handling cargo in this manner.

No mention has been made of the warming potential of impervious surfaces or how encouraging use of pervious can reduce warming potential. This figure should be included in the graph with reduction goals for planning purposes included.

No mention of tolling pushing more traffic onto local surface streets and how this affects local communities with added congestion, noise and emissions.

No monitoring of air quality impacts has been conducted in South King County and near Sea-Tac Airport since 2001. Since that time significant growth at the airport and on access roads may have caused exceedances of federal air quality standards as was predicted in 1996 during the third runway EIS. Maintenance may be threatened for ozone and particulate standards and CO violations may be occurring in the parking garages at Sea-Tac Airport. Regional monitoring that ignores these areas should assure compliance before promoting more residential uses in these areas.

HOUSING

University of Washington has discovered that ultrafine particulate is blanketing areas overflown primarily by arriving aircraft. Kent, Auburn Valley, Sea-Tac, Tukwila, Seattle, Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way and Vashon Island are impacted by flight paths for Sea-Tac and Boeing Field and have high health disparities already. Research is ongoing but findings indicate the ultrafine causes lung and brain inflammation. This is especially dangerous for children because they are still developing. There is risk of permanent damage. The region should not be encouraging more densification in areas considered unhealthful until further analysis confirms ways to mitigate exposure, protect public health, create a buffer for protection from impacts, or remove all sensitive land uses from impact areas which are quite large (see plume of UFP in attached Disproportionate power-point).

Traditionally, the south King County area has been targeted for the majority of affordable housing units in the region. Often, those occupying affordable housing are young families with children. The number of children per household is also higher than average in these circumstances where low income and minority residents are concentrated. A good example is zip code 98168 which has on average 4 children
per household, which is double the King County average. This particular zip code has more minority and low income residents than most, along with cost-burdened renters, 20% non-english speaking majority and 20% no access to healthcare, 88% free and reduced price lunch students in Highline School District living in 90 to 100th percentile of risk, exposure and negative health outcomes, one of the most impacted zip codes for environmental degradation in the county.

The housing element seems to assume a migration into the region in the next 30 years of predominately low and very low income residents. Please justify this assumption.

MPP-H-4

This element needs to identify by city the amount of affordable housing targets that have been met and where cities are deficient in meeting those goals. Some cities in South King County have taken a disproportionate amount of affordable housing. Because some of these cities are much poorer than eastside cities, the high service needs of affordable housing and densification of population has created budget constraints. Density needs such as road capacity and improvement, parking, stormwater upgrades, utility needs, school capacity, social and human services are infrastructure that needs to be in place before further densification demand is added. To add a new category of very low income residential to comprehensive plans without knowing if this category is sustainable for cities is faulty. Please see disproportionate slides attached and notice the high number of low income and cost burdened renter locations concentrated in South King County.

MPP-H-6

Workforce housing seems to be yet another category. In SeaTac City a new development of this type is highlighting affordability. Why is the workforce of the future unable to afford anything other than a cheap apartment? What kind of workforce is envisioned here? Is this the service industry workforce near transit that goes to Seattle who can’t afford to live in Seattle? Again, PSRC seems to assume that the majority of people moving into the region in the next 20 to 30 years are low and very low income and that future jobs will be relatively low paying. Please explain these assumptions.

Cities within the region with capacity and budgets that can handle the type of growth the PSRC foresees should be identified in the plan. Cities deficient on affordable housing targets should be identified. Cities meeting targets who are now experiencing budget constraint should be excluded from the plan and receive on balance mitigation consideration.

Cities with significant environmental impacts, health and welfare impacts, low performing schools and larger than average affordable housing availability should receive the kind of regional help and support envisioned in state law; a right to a healthful environment, equal right to education, environmental justice consideration, and the largest share of on balance mitigation in support of EJ communities, vulnerable and youth populations.

Thank you,
Debi Wagner
Disproportionate Impacts
Maps: King County Health, State Department of Health, EPA EJ Screen, Port of Seattle, Flight Pattern Kids

Cities in South King County experience a high level of disproportionate impacts from Sea-Tac Airport operations. Existing condition include:

- Low income residents, highest poverty levels in the county, many areas predominately minority eligible for Environmental Justice consideration
- Language barriers
- Higher illness rates
- Lower life expectancy
- Less access to healthcare
- Highest concentrated noise levels in the state
- Highest concentrated emissions in the county
- 90 to 100th percentile of risk, exposure and negative health outcomes
Highest noise levels

• Recent studies have found that the 45 db interior noise level Sea-Tac used as the maximum is not protecting health. WHO recently found that 40 interior noise is the maximum people should be exposed to for proper rest and sleep. This means that the entire noise mitigation program is deficient and should be retrofitted. Costs have not been estimated.

• Studies have found that noise levels typical of airport environments can cause cardiovascular effects, diabetes, hypertension, spike in blood pressure, delay in cognitive development and learning detriments in children.
Disproportionate impacts of noise

US DOT Noise Map shows highest noise levels in the region centered around Sea-Tac Airport and flight paths. Boeing Field also shows up in purple. A review of the map shows highest noise levels in the US centered around the nation’s airports.
Highest poverty and health disparities in the region mirror the areas with the highest noise impact and follow the flight path. Blue teardrop is Sea-Tac Airport.
FAA states the aircraft have a ground level impact on air quality when below 3,000 feet. Regional impacts below this level follow the concentrated flight path north and south of Sea-Tac, Auburn/Kent Valley for both Sea-Tac and Boeing Field.
Highest emissions per acre

- New Jersey Institute of Health found that airport related air toxics affect an area 10 miles in circumference around an airport boundary with levels 10 times higher than average.

- High levels of nitrogen oxides combined with hydrocarbons create ozone. Ozone causes lung structure damage in children. Nitrogen oxides contribute to lung illness and asthma.

- An air toxics analysis in neighborhoods around Sea-Tac in 1993 found levels of several pollutants including benzene, acrolein and formaldehyde, well above those allowed by state law for new sources of toxic emissions.
Flight Pattern Kids household health questionnaire shows reported cancer and immune disease concentrated in the highest noise and emissions/health impacted areas around the airport and flight path.
King County Health and Economic Maps: Language barriers
King County Health Maps: Cost Burdened Renters
King County Health Maps: Life Expectancy
King County Health Maps: English as a second language
King County Health Maps: Low Income
King County Health Maps: Poverty
Disproportionate impacts of pollution from New Mapping tool (DEOHS) developed by Department of Health and UW shows highest overall levels in South King County.
EPA EJ Screen census tracts near Sea-Tac Airport in the 90\textsuperscript{th} to 100\textsuperscript{th} percentile of risk, exposure and negative health outcomes.
Current UW investigation of Ultrafine Particulate (UFP) finding highest levels in the flight paths for landings at Sea-Tac Airport. The small green bars in the graph to the right are from Three Tree Point while the orange bars off the chart are from the flight path.
UW Estimated size and distance of ultrafine particulate plume to the north of the airport
UW Estimate of the size and distance of the ultrafine plume to the south of the airport.
Asthma patients experience Lung Inflammation and reduced lung function while walking in a flight path.

Short-Term Effects Of Airport-Associated Ultrafine Particle Exposure On Lung Function And Inflammation

R. Habra1, S. P. Eckel1, S. Fruin1, T. Eneblish1, E. Rappaport1, F. Gilliland1

1University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

- Randomized crossover study of 21 non-smoking adults with mild to moderate asthma
- 2-hr scripted, mild walking activity both inside and outside of the high LAX UFP impact zone (avg. difference ~30,000 /cc)
- Mean particle size at LAX impact zone was 29 nm
- Observed an increase in inflammatory blood markers and a reduction in lung function
- “Preliminary data suggest a relationship between airport-related UFP exposures and adverse acute lung effects in asthmatics”

The abstract is funded by: The Southern California Environmental Health Sciences Center (grant # P30ES007048) funded by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and the Hastings Foundation.
State Department of Health found statistically significant higher than average asthma cases in zip code 98168 directly north of Sea-Tac Airport


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis Group</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Age-Adjusted Rate</th>
<th>Age-Adjusted Lower CI</th>
<th>Age-Adjusted Upper CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of trachea bronchus and lung (162)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9168</td>
<td>34497650</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of trachea bronchus and lung (162)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>10008810</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>24.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of trachea bronchus and lung (162)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>98168_Seattle_King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>172403</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of trachea bronchus and lung (162)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>98198_Seattle_King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>174919</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>33.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of brain (191)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3373</td>
<td>34497650</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of brain (191)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>10008810</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of brain (191)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>98168_Seattle_King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>172403</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Malignant neoplasm of brain (191)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>98198_Seattle_King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>174919</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>16.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Asthma (493)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>20274</td>
<td>34497650</td>
<td>58.78</td>
<td>57.96</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Asthma (493)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5847</td>
<td>10008810</td>
<td>61.98</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>63.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Asthma (493)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>98168_Seattle_King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>172403</td>
<td>75.34</td>
<td>62.68</td>
<td>90.26; p=0.0144 Elevated Compared to State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##Asthma (493)</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>98198_Seattle_King</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>174919</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>47.27</td>
<td>71.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boston Logan Airport area Asthma Cases

LOGAN AIRPORT POLLUTION CURRENTLY CAUSES:

- 360% increase in Probable Childhood Asthma
- 200% increase in COPD (Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease)

Destination: East Boston from Lucas La Battaglia on Vimeo.

The film appears to be connected to Airport Impact Relief, Inc., a nonprofit.
Summary: Sea-Tac Airport area and flight paths have been found to have:

- Highest noise levels in the state
- Highest poverty levels in the county
- Health risk and health disparities including asthma and cancer
- Dense population with double the average children per household
- Risk, exposure and negative health outcomes in the 90-100th percentile for a large percentage of census tracts around the airport
- Aircraft related UFP impacts with no mitigation ideas, plan or costs
A March 2000 report prepared jointly by DOH, the Washington State Department of Ecology, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, Public Health—Seattle and King County and several other agencies and community representatives found that, in the SeaTac Airport area, there are statistically significantly higher rates of the following conditions:

- Lung cancer cases within one mile of the airport compared to the rest of King County and to Washington State;
- Oral and pharyngeal cancer cases within one mile of the airport compared to Washington State;
- Deaths from lung cancer and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in an area approximately three miles to the west and north and one mile to the east and south of the airport (defined by census tracts) compared to King County; and
- Hospital admission for asthma and pneumonia/influenza in an area approximately three miles to the west, north and east and one half mile to the south of the airport (defined by zip codes) compared to King County.

The March 2000 report recommended that an air quality study be conducted around SeaTac Airport. This recommendation was, in part, forwarded because of environmental justice concerns. The report states, “Fundamental to the concept of environmental equity is the value that one group of people not incur environmental exposures from commercial activities from which another group benefits. Those who use SeaTac Airport often derive great financial and other benefits from worldwide travel. The extent to which these benefits come at the expense of environmental degradation affecting the people who live around the airport is unknown, since a comprehensive air quality study has not been performed at SeaTac Airport to determine the impacts attributable to airplane emissions and airport-related traffic” (Washington State Department of Health et al., 2000, p. 8). [pages 14, 15] (emphasis added)
Highest noise, highest emissions, highest risk, highest poverty levels, high negative health outcomes
Dear PSRC Staff,

The Pacific Northwest needs to be a leader in showing others how to grow responsibly and how to exist in harmony with our planet, even in the modern world. We need to provide incentives for businesses to go green, and show that we can create jobs in an effort to map a greener future.

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030, and the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Sincerely,
Katie Weber
Seattle, WA
-----Original Message-----
From: Puget Sound Regional Council <website-no-reply@psrc.org>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 8:54 PM
To: Andi Markley <AMarkley@psrc.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Monday, September 16, 2019 - 20:54 Submitted by anonymous user: 98.203.132.40 Submitted values are:

Your Name: Marian Wineman
Email: [redacted]
Question or Comment?
Comments on VISION 2050:
We have spent over 3 decades doing far too little to address Climate Change. Now, we have less than a decade to act boldly and decisively to ameliorate our current climate crisis. This document does not do that at all. Climate Change should be the primary focus for all regional planning decisions. Climate is clearly not a significant priority in the current draft of Vision 2050. Reduction in GHG needs to be the or at least a primary driver for planning. There needs to be solid accountability i.e. meeting the existing statutory goals and if we are not meeting them (which we are not on either a local or state level), adjust policies and practices so that we will meet them. An analysis of how the PSRC planning will meet our goals should be in the Vision 2050 report so the public can see exactly how these goals will be met. PSRC apparently did not get enough input from local non-profits and Universities who study climate change such as University of Washington Climate Impacts Group, Climate Solutions, Northwest Energy Coalition, Center for Sustainable infrastructure, Sightline Institute, Coltura, and many other groups. I strongly recommend rewriting Vision 2050 with climate change and meeting our GHG goals as a central theme. Otherwise we cannot accommodate the 1.8 million new people coming to enjoy our lifestyle.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
During the public comment period, PSRC received over 200 nearly identical form emails related to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, establishing an ambitious target to reduce emissions, and measuring emissions. The content of that email and the names of all submitters is provided below.

In addition to the content of the form email, some emails included a limited number of additional comments, which are captured starting on page 221.

Other emails that originated from this email campaign were substantially changed from the form email. These comments are included in their entirety in this compilation of individual comments.

All emails received by PSRC from this email capaign are available here.

Subject: Our last chance to get it right

Dear PSRC Staff,

Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right.

Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate. At the very least, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the real target must be cutting emissions altogether by 2030. To have a lesser target is to concede that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world.

Vision 2050 must also incorporate not just the truth but "the whole truth" of carbon emissions. For example, we currently count only 10 percent of emissions from aviation, and do not include consumer emissions (such as for goods made abroad and purchased here). These failures leave some of our largest sources of emissions unacknowledged and unaddressed. If we are going to avoid global catastrophe, this must change.

We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don't boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation.

Comment received by:

Sherry Abts
Aditya Agrawal
Brian Allen
Virginia Alvord
Iris Antman
Katherine Apone
Loretta Arvizu
Rachel Babin
Dennis Bahr
Elliott Bales
Jeremy Bang
Lisa Barnes
Donald Barrie
Athena Bautista
Molly Belleveua
Derek Benedict
Fiona Bennitt
Blythe Benson
Ann Bickel
Matthew Black
Merna Baker Blagg
Frances Blair
Wendy Blair
Mindy Blaski
Jai Boreen
Elizabeth Braverman
Peter Breyfogle
Vicki Brix
Alan Brown
Vernon Brown
Annika Browne
Beth Brunton
Eric Buhle
Katie Cain
Mark Canright
Rebecca Canright
Steven Carlino
Laura Carr
Rebecca Caulfield
Curtis Cawley
Chris Chapin
Avu Chatuvedi
Judith Cohen
Randall Collins
Marisa Coluccio
Mike Conlan
Norm Conrad
Marko Constans
Marilee Corey
Nancy Corr
Karen Cowgill
Bob Cox
Elizabeth Cunningham
Ruth Darden
Virginia Davis
Kathy Dawson
Leilani Dey Rey
Jeanne Deller
Rebecca Deutsch
Brittney Dodson
Del E Domke
Farida Dowler
Jayne DuBois
Reed Duecy-Gibbs
Cindy M. Dutka
Judi Edwards
Christina Ellis
Nick Engelfried
Theresa Eskridge
Ruth Neuwald Falcon
Fred Fall
Sondra Fay
Laura Fine-Morrison
Charlie Fink
David Foster
Vince and Dianne Foster
Jenaleigh Fox
Laureen France
Barbara Fristoe
Alexander Froehlich
Victoria Garcia
Libby Garrett
Nicolia Gibbs
Monica Gilman
Katherine Giseburt
Adam Giuliano
William Golding
Robert Gordon
Todd Gray
Dennis Greathouse
Joan Greathouse
Madelynn Hamilton
David Hand
Liberty Harrington
Jessica Hart
Emily Hazleton
Tyrell Hedlund
Lindsey Heller
Daniel Henling
Denise Henrikson
Amy Hensen
John Heurman
Kathleen Hewitt
Nicholas Heyer
Nate Hildebrand
Gregory Hill
Wendie Hipolito
Joan Hobbs
Casey Holmberg
Phillip Hope
Theresa Horstman
Jared Howe
Laura Huddleston
Kevin Hughes
Alec Humphreys
Asukaa Jaxx
Blaine Jensen
Lorraine Johnson
Reece Johnson
Emily Johnston
Stacey Jones
Brandon Juhl
Jean Katayama
Harry Katz
Katherine Kauffman
Sarah Kavage
JP Kemmick
Nancy Kilgore
Paul Kim
Ellen Kissman
Constance
Knudsen Ty Kocher
Irina Lelikova
Michelle LeSourd
Joyce Liao
Lars Liden
Jeannine
Lish Alice Lockhart
Brandy Lomax
Sammy Low Macey
Lucas
Tom Lux
Sally Mackey
Carrie Aadland – I live here. Climate change is here. Too many profits. Stop more development now. Or have nots will be angry. Lots of them.

Hal Anthony – Children can only be supported through sustainable actions, so we owe children a viable, healthy world. However and tragically, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has found that to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years, and reach carbon neutrality by 2050.

Callie Arnold – The tools to stop climate catastrophe exist, and Vision 2050 should push us towards using these tools.

Andrea Avni – At a minimum, Vision 2050 must guide our region toward cutting emissions in half by 2030 — and given the fact that we've polluted well more than our fair share globally, the real target must be CUTTING EMISSIONS ENTIRELY by 2030. A lesser target says loud and clear that our region is refusing to do everything possible to avert a catastrophic 6th extinction of life on this planet.

Greg Bamford – I ask not only for myself, but for my children - who are anxious, and deeply seek a Puget Sound that is livable and vibrant.

Ann Bickel – The City of Tacoma's Human Rights Commission and the Puyallup Tribe of Indians have strongly stated this leviathan needs an SEIS for safety risks to the local people. The time to stand has arrived. Email Tacoma City Manager Elizabeth Pauli and demand an SEIS!

Radka Chapin – We need to do everything in our power to mitigate the effects of climate change if we're to have any livable future.

Dan DiLeva – CAPITALISM CANNOT BE SUSTAINABLE!

John Dunn – As a metropolitan area, we must keep our carbon footprint as minimal as possible and also choose to be as sustainable as possible.

E Ellis – We can't pretend anymore: the scenarios of growth and sustainability found in Vision 2050 will be a travesty if we don't boldly ramp up to properly account for carbon generation and emissions and set new standards for what is allowable to transform our regional infrastructure and transportation so that Washington State is aggressively preparing to address higher atmospheric carbon and climate change.

Steven Gary – Will we lead on Climate Change? I'm proud to live in Seattle but I am not happy with our progress on cutting carbon emissions. I probably will not be alive in 2050 but I want the people who are to know we did our best to make the world very habital.

Julia Glover – We have to do much better than this! WAKE UP!!! If we are going to avoid global catastrophe,THIS MUST CHANGE!!! The plan falls WOefully short — it's not a map for the transformation we need, and it completely ignores some of our largest sources of climate pollution. PLEASE DO SOMETHING ABOUT THIS!!!

Benjamin Heege – Please take the time to read the requests below, and I urge you to put them into motion as part of your Vision 2050 process. The Puget Sound region has the opportunity to continue to demonstrate leadership toward fixing the Climate Crisis before us, and if we lead, others will follow!

Lloyd Johnston – We are at least forty years late on addressing this issue and yet we are still allowing and sometimes promoting the expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure.

Alan Kaptanoglu – Please drastically increase the measures designed to tackle climate change. We must be world leaders on tackling this challenge.
Teresa Lamb – I came here from Detroit originally, and I have been so happy, even proud to call the Pacific Northwest my home. This was always a place that cared about people and the environment. But now ....

Ambre Lane – If we don’t make these changes, what kind of legacy are we going to leave our children? It breaks my heart that my 12-year-old boy I can’t imagine a livable climate. He anticipates early death because of climate crisis!

Sue Little – Our last chance to get it right. The planet needs help. We are polluting it with so many vehicles & lots of toxic products, like Round up. I bought a Hybrid vehicle we all need to think about carbon emissions & move forward to a cleaner environment. Thank

Lynn Lomax – Our last chance to get it right. I stand with millions of others who will voice the immediacy of this Climate Catastrophe that has already brought instability to our planet. Disruption of Eco-systems on such a fast track is not acceptable.

Harry Maher – We need to do better to be the region leading the charge on climate change; here are my comments from 350 Seattle

Priscilla Martinez – We need to take better care of what is left of our environment, our wildlife, and our marine life.

Sean McHugh – PLEASE get it right!! Today is a good day, for wise and healthy choices, let's do this!! 🌍🌱❤️

Anne Miller – As a mother and person of faith, I am deeply concerned about the degradation to our environment.

Guila Muir – It is essential to make sure that the plan has a solid vision in place to reduce carbon emissions by 45%.

David Perk – I’m disappointed that Vision 2050 misses the mark so substantially on climate pollution. There’s no mention of transitioning from fossil fuels like fracked gas and oil to 100% renewables, for example, and while various means of sequestering carbon are mentioned, by 2050 sequestration will need to be a sector of its own in our region’s economy.

Peggy J. Printz – You know full well, to avoid the most severe climate catastrophes, we must reduce carbon emissions by 45% in just over ten years. That means that this 10-year update is PSRC’s last chance to get it right. Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply inadequate.

Andrea Say – Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution will be one cog in a machine that will lead to climate catastrophe

David Scheer – Changes in punctuation and capitalization throughout when compared to original letter. “Vision 2050’s goal to “substantially reduce” climate pollution is deeply “inadequate”! At the very least, Vision 2050 MUST guide our region toward cutting emissions “in half” by 2030 — AND, given the fact that we’ve polluted well over our fair share globally, the “REAL TARGET MUST BE” cutting emissions 'altogether' by 2030! To have a lesser target is to ‘concede’ that our region is refusing to do its part to avert a catastrophic world!”

Joanna Schoettler – We must have sustainable building practices using Green Materials. Plastic usage needs to be reduce. Packaging needs to be transformed and reduced. We need the WHOLE State to join this vision.

Tatiana Soutar – I'm committed to reducing emissions to 0. This plan isn't radical enough to stave off catastrophe.

Dakota Spear – We must boldly transform our regional infrastructure and transportation, and this Vision 2050 is our chance to do that.
Scott Species – Stop cooking the books or else we’re all going to be cooked.

Kara Sweidel – It is mandatory to use the most current science regarding the realities of climate catastrophe. If we do not update the Vision 2050 to be stronger and more comprehensive, we will no longer have the opportunity to be visionary. Life on earth as we know it is in peril. Please act accordingly.

Linda Thompsen – A step in the right direction would be to require that solar panels be installed on all new buildings or retrofits. Additionally, give financial incentives to current home and business owners to add solar power. More wind power! More electric cars!! Etc etc etc.

Kathleen Tracy – We are counting on your leadership.

Joachim Veith – We need to address every aspect of sources, from removal of trees to impact on the atmosphere of refrigerator coolant leaks (some sources say this is the biggest source of CO2 trapping).

Katie Weber – The Pacific Northwest needs to be a leader in showing others how to grow responsibly and how to exist in harmony with our planet, even in the modern world. We need to provide incentives for businesses to go green, and show that we can create jobs in an effort to map a greener future.