1. Welcome and Roll Call
PIC Chair Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM. 23 cities had representation [Attachment A]. Guests present included Councilmember Carol Simpson, Newcastle (PIC Alternate); Councilmember John Stilin, Redmond (PIC Alternate); Erika Harris, Puget Sound Regional Council; Lyman Howard, City of Sammamish staff; Diane Carlson, King County Executive Office staff; and Michael Huddleston, King County Council staff.

2. Public Comment
Chair Marts asked if any member of the public had any public comment. Seeing none, Marts closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

3. Approval of the September 13, 2017 Minutes
Councilmember Ed Prince, Renton, moved, seconded by Councilmember Janie Edelman, Black Diamond, to approve the September 13, 2017 PIC minutes. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Chair’s Report
Chair Marts noted that he would be concluding his term as the PIC Chair at the end of 2017. At the December PIC meeting, the PIC will elect a 2018 Chair and Vice Chair. SCA staff will soon distribute a Call for Nominations for both positions to PIC members. Current PIC Vice Chair, Councilmember Ed Prince from Renton, will be seeking the position of PIC Chair. Once the Call for Nominations is distributed, members can indicate their interest for either position by responding to SCA staff. Applications will then be forwarded to the PIC Nominating Committee, which will make a recommendation to the PIC at its December meeting. The PIC will then select a 2018 PIC Chair and Vice Chair at that meeting.

Chair Marts also reported on the work of the King County E-911 Strategic Planning Leadership Group. The Leadership Group met September 29 to consider which system architecture should be implemented for Next Generation 911 and came to a unanimous recommendation to support the Technology and Operations Task Force recommendation in favor of Platform architecture. The Platform architecture has a greater initial cost but is ultimately more resilient to failures. Regardless of the system architecture selected, King County’s 911 system will face a funding shortfall in the coming years.
Deputy Mayor Sheree Wen, Medina, noted that there has been related federal action that could provide funding for local E-911 needs.

5. SCA Staff Report
Brian Parry, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that the 2018 regional board and committee call for nominations [Attachment B] was distributed by email on October 10. There are over 100 positions on 23 regional boards and committees that will be appointed or recommended for appointment by SCA. November 10 is the deadline for individuals to submit the nomination form and a statement of interest describing any relevant background experience to be considered by the PIC Nominating Committee. The PIC Nominating Committee will recommend appointments to the full PIC for action at the December 13 PIC meeting.

Parry reported that the SCA Board would be considering candidates October 18 to be honored as SCA members emeritus. Per adopted Board policies, individuals who have served in elected office for at least eight years and provided distinguished service on behalf of SCA member cities are eligible to be honored as a Member Emeritus. Parry encouraged members of the PIC to send any recommendations to SCA staff and those recommendations will be shared with the Board.

Parry reported that SCA received a response to the letter sent to the Army Corps of Engineers requesting support for additional funding for much needed, non-routine maintenance of the Ballard Locks. He provided a copy of the response letter [Attachment C] to members of the PIC and thanked members, especially Kenmore Mayor David Baker, for their efforts to have the letter signed by every mayor in King County and the county executive.

Parry reported on Informational Item 12a on the PIC agenda concerning changes to Regional Centers designation criteria under consideration at the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). In September, the PIC was briefed on a draft proposal prepared by PSRC staff following discussion at the PSRC Growth Management Policy Board to update criteria for designating Regional Centers. At its October 5 meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board authorized releasing for public comment a full draft of the Regional Centers Framework. The draft is consistent with the materials provided to the PIC in a Regional Centers staff report in September. Parry provided members of the PIC with a copy of the draft Regional Centers Framework that was released by PSRC on October 10 for a 30-day public comment period ending November 8 together with a short fact sheet [Attachment D]. He reminded members of the PIC that SCA members on the Growth Management Policy Board were providing feedback consistent with the Guiding Principles document shared with the PIC in September and encouraged members to provide him any additional feedback.

Chair Marts asked for additional information about the response from the Army Corps of Engineers regarding the Ballard Locks. Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, said that the response was a good one that detailed investments in repairs and maintenance being made to the Ballard Locks by the Army Corps of Engineers. He said the letters to and from the Army Corps of Engineers were a first step and that more work will be needed to secure the full funding needed.
6. Appointment of 2018 PIC Nominating Committee Members

Chair Marts reported that the current PIC Nominating Committee members are: Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific; Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall; Council President Ed Prince, Renton, and Mayor Chris Roberts, Shoreline.

Chair Marts appointed the PIC Nominating Committee for 2018 consisting of:

- Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific, South Valley Caucus
- Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, Snoqualmie Valley Caucus
- Councilmember Ed Prince, Renton, South Caucus and
- Mayor Chris Roberts, Shoreline, North Caucus

7. SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda

Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported on preparations for the 2018 legislative session. Governor Jay Inslee invited members of the SCA Executive Committee to meet with him on October 3. During that meeting, the Governor encouraged SCA members to advocate for the swift passage of a capital budget for the ongoing biennium, and SCA Executive Committee members spoke to the priorities contained in SCA’s 2017 Legislative Agenda, which remain unresolved following the conclusion of this year’s legislative session. Also since the last meeting of the PIC, the SCA Board of Directors appointed members from each of SCA’s geographic caucuses to serve as this year’s SCA Legislative Committee. Wilson-Jones recognized members in attendance, Kenmore Mayor David Baker, who chairs the committee, as well as Renton Councilmember Ed Prince.

Wilson-Jones reported that the SCA Legislative Committee met September 27 to develop recommendations for consideration by the PIC. During the September 27 meeting, SCA Legislative Committee members discussed the need to maintain consistent messaging and pursue a longer-term advocacy strategy to achieve the previously adopted priorities. SCA Legislative Committee members agreed to recommend to the PIC that SCA maintain its current legislative priorities into 2018 and developed the draft SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda contained on page 26 of the PIC Packet. Furthermore, SCA Legislative Committee members for this year agreed with the framing developed last year and felt it was important to keep the legislative agenda specific enough that SCA’s priorities are clear but high level enough to be nimble in responding to issues as they arise during the legislative session. The committee also agreed with last year’s determination that SCA shouldn’t duplicate the work of AWC or try to cover all the issues that are important to member cities. Rather, they picked a focused set of priorities that are of special concern to cities in King County. Finally, the committee also discussed potential additions to the legislative agenda, but determined that the capital budget – of which the Housing Trust Fund is part – and responses to the heroin and opioid crisis are already encapsulated in SCA’s previously adopted priorities.

Wilson-Jones explained that the SCA Legislative Committee has recommended initial action by the PIC to advance the policy position contained in the gray box on page 21 of the PIC Packet setting the SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda. The recommended action would urge the Legislature to take three actions in 2018, summarized as follows: Adjust the Property Tax Cap, Invest in Public Health Services, and Address the Housing and Homelessness Crisis. Should the PIC vote to take initial action, the policy position would be brought back for a final action on a
recommendation to the SCA Board at the next meeting. Cities would have the intervening month to provide additional feedback to their PIC member before taking final action on the policy position. Wilson-Jones concluded by noting that additional detail about legislation falling within each of the three priority areas is contained in the PIC Packet beginning on page 23.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, moved, seconded by Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, to bring back to the next meeting of the PIC the following potential policy position setting the SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda:

The Sound Cities Association (SCA) urges the Washington State Legislature to take the following actions in 2018:

Adjust the Property Tax Cap
➢ The Sound Cities Association urges the Legislature to give local governments the option to replace the arbitrary annual 1% cap on property tax increases with a limit tied to inflation plus population growth.

Invest in Public Health Services
➢ The Sound Cities Association urges the Legislature to fund the core public health services provided by local health jurisdictions.

Address the Housing and Homelessness Crisis
➢ The Sound Cities Association urges the Legislature to partner with us to address homelessness and increase the supply of affordable housing in the following ways:
  o Expand and make permanent the Document Recording Fee
  o Invest $200 million in the Housing Trust Fund
  o Allow local governments to create and preserve affordable housing through optional local tools
➢ The Sound Cities Association urges the Legislature to address other underlying causes of homelessness by making investments in our state’s behavioral health system and enacting legislation to prohibit Source of Income Discrimination.

Discussion on the motion ensued.

Mayor Baker, the chair of the SCA Legislative Committee, spoke to the continued importance of these legislative priorities, which are consistent with the previously adopted SCA 2017 Legislative Agenda.

Council President Bill Boyce, Kent, requested clarification about the decision before the PIC and next steps before final action. Chair Marts spoke to taking an initial action this month and utilizing the next month to gain additional feedback from members’ cities before taking final action, consistent with the PIC’s two-step process for advancement of a policy position.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, noted that he has briefed his Council on the action currently before the PIC and will get further feedback before taking final action at the PIC on behalf of Redmond. Margeson stated that the draft SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda is

...
consistent with the adopted SCA 2017 Legislative Agenda because these are longer-term asks, likely going even beyond 2018, that will require consistent advocacy to gain traction.

Chair Marts inquired about the relationship between the proposed policy position before the PIC and the longer narrative included in the draft SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda proposed by the SCA Legislative Committee and contained on page 26 of the PIC Packet. Chair Marts noted the draft SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda included additional detail about the anticipated funding gap for Public Health – Seattle & King County and inquired whether the outcome of the proposed Veterans, Seniors and Human Services Levy would impact this figure. Wilson-Jones noted that the language in the proposed policy position includes the same direct requests of the Legislature as are contained in the draft one-pager SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda. The draft SCA 2018 Legislative Agenda document does, however, also include additional narrative that may need to be refined somewhat, under consultation with the SCA Legislative Committee, with respect to information provided about the public health funding shortfall, as King County is still developing their own legislative priorities for the year and framing their ask on this issue.

Wilson-Jones noted that the outcome of the proposed Veterans, Seniors and Human Services Levy – King County Proposition 1 – will impact the delivery of local services that impact health, housing, and other needs of King County residents but that the funding is not anticipated to directly impact the shortfall of the public health fund.

Mayor Ken Hearing, North Bend, asked whether passage of the capital budget should be added as a new priority. As context on the question, Wilson-Jones noted that the Association of Washington Cities has decided not to make the capital budget one of its four core priorities for 2018. Wilson-Jones added that advocating for swift passage of the capital budget would be consistent with the SCA Legislative Agenda, as proposed for 2018 and as adopted for 2017, because SCA has specifically called for Housing Trust Fund investments, which are part of the capital budget.

Baker noted that SCA Executive Committee members raised the issue of the capital budget with Governor Inslee during their recent meeting and asked him whether he would consider calling a special session to pass the budget. Baker stated that the SCA Legislative Committee has strived to keep the SCA Legislative Agenda to a single page, to maximize its impact, and decided against additional legislative asks.

There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Regional Affordable Housing Task Force
Brian Parry, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported on the progress of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force (Task Force). In May 2017, King County launched a Regional Affordable Housing Task Force to bring leaders from across the county together to collaboratively develop a countywide affordable housing strategy. SCA recommended four of the 12 voting members appointed to the Task Force, and Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, was selected as one of the co-chairs, along with King County Councilmember Claudia Balducci. A briefing related to the Task Force was provided to the PIC in July and members gave feedback that was included in the minutes to that meeting and shared with SCA representatives on the Task Force.
Parry reported that the Task Force has held two meetings to date during which they heard from local housing experts and reviewed initial data characterizing the affordability crisis; appointed a Standing Advisory Panel tasked with developing guidance and recommendations for the Task Force; and, reviewed a draft work plan that is scheduled to be adopted at the next Task Force meeting, on October 31.

Parry reported that the Task Force work plan divides the work of the Task Force into three phases. In Phase 1, which is ongoing, the Task Force is working to define the scale and causes of the housing affordability crisis in the region and to explore what current policies exist to address that problem. Parry noted that this effort will include a survey of existing policies, plans, and initiatives that will provide an opportunity to share best practices from the different actions jurisdictions are taking to address the problem. Parry said that Phase 2 is interconnected with Phase 1, but will have a focus on identifying which initiatives and best practices might be applicable in a regional context. He said that Phase 3 is scheduled to begin in May or June of 2018 and calls for identifying specific recommendations and strategies in preparation for a final report from the Task Force. He said the Task Force is scheduled to meet at least eight times over the next eight months, including three meetings with a heavy focus on community engagement and receiving input from the public.

Parry encouraged members of the PIC to provide feedback on the proposed work plan and the overall objectives of the Task Force.

Deputy Mayor Sheree Wen, Medina, said that one of the causes of housing price increases in the region is foreign investors purchasing homes as investment properties. She said the City of Vancouver, BC, imposed an additional tax on properties that are owned by non-residents and that such a tax could be considered in the region to support needed services.

Councilmember Tom Stowe, Town of Beaux Arts Village, said he believed Washington State eliminated a foreign investment tax in the 1960’s and that the issue may need to be addressed with the State Legislature. He asked where the Task Force meetings were scheduled to take place, and noted that it is particularly difficult to get to meetings located in downtown Seattle. He also asked that the meetings of the Task Force be publicized more broadly to encourage public participation. Parry responded that the Task Force was holding meetings in a variety of locations in the county to encourage participation from different geographic areas and that additional effort would be made to ensure SCA members are aware of the times and locations of future meetings. (Note: Meeting dates and additional Task Force information is available here.)

Chair Marts asked how the Task Force is identifying affordability and at what income level when compared to Area Median Income (AMI). He said that concerns about housing are not confined to very low income individuals, and that there is growing concern about affordable housing options for those who are earning 80-100 percent of AMI. Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, said that a broad range of needs were being considered by the Task Force, including very low income and workforce housing. He said a particular concern of his is retaining the affordable housing Kenmore currently has and addressing the needs of seniors, many of whom have very low incomes.
Mayor Ken Hearing, North Bend, said that the issue of non-resident investors raised by Deputy Mayor Wen, is something the Task Force should consider. He said that as a member of the Task Force, he is interested in hearing from other SCA cities about efforts they have tried that have been successful or unsuccessful. He said that in North Bend there is tension between some who want to make lot sizes larger and those who want to decrease lot and home sizes to encourage more affordable units to be built.

Chair Marts said that the City of Issaquah is working toward lifting a building moratorium by the end of 2017. He said one of the elements of lifting the moratorium is adopting policies to encourage development of more affordable units. He said the city is considering various options to do so, including a multi-family tax exemption, accessory dwelling units, and clustered housing with smaller lots. Mayor Hearing added that the City of North Bend is considering requiring accessory dwelling units in new developments.

Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, said that increasing density alone will not necessarily lead to the creation of new affordable units. He said Woodinville is seeing a high volume of new development, especially apartment units, but that even small units are going for very high monthly rents that are unaffordable to many.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, said that the city has a significant existing stock of affordable housing, but that those homes are aging. She said the city’s inspection program is intended to ensure their existing supply of affordable units are maintained into the future. The city is also working to prevent displacement of low income individuals when properties redevelop. She said that during the recent economic downturn, economic development leaders in the region sought out foreign real estate investment to help the economy and that the region should be cautious about applying a new tax to such investments. She said that she is concerned about the ability for residents to downsize and age in their communities. She said that the issue of affordable housing is very complex and responds to market changes that are beyond anyone’s control, but that she is happy the Task Force is working to address the issue.

Deputy Mayor Christie Malchow, Sammamish, said that their council is hearing from residents who are concerned about increasing density in their neighborhoods. She said many residents want larger building setbacks, but they do not want that to result in taller buildings. She said the city last week adopted a building moratorium.

Wen said that a tax on foreign investment like she had described earlier could help supplant cuts from the federal government to Housing and Urban Development or other important local services. She said a small tax would not discourage investment because there would still be significant potential profits for investors.

Mayor Rich Crispo, Newcastle, said that every city in the region is facing challenges with growth and affordability. He said Newcastle is expected to grow by 3,000 people, or 25 percent of the city’s population, in the next three years and that most of this population growth would be housed in new apartments. He said the primary affordability issue is driven by the market, the huge population growth ongoing in the region and the amount of available land for housing. He
said the Task Force should focus its efforts on areas where it can have an impact because many of the factors driving the real estate market are outside of their control.

9. Flood Control District Update
Cynthia Foley, SCA Policy Analyst, noted that October has been declared Flood Awareness Month by King County Executive Dow Constantine and provided an update on the Flood Control District. During four meetings over the course of the summer, the Flood Control District Advisory Committee recommended the approval of a budget, and made several additional recommendations. These included involving the Committee in the creation of a new flood hazard management plan, sharing the results of the dam hazard planning study with appropriate authorities and increasing the ability of municipalities to access funds for flood prevention projects.

Through a Sub-Regional Opportunity Fund, municipalities have access to funding for stormwater, watershed management, and other capital projects that prevent floods. Applications for funding municipal flood prevention projects are being accepted through October 19. The Sub-Regional Opportunity Fund receives slightly more than 10 percent of the flood district property tax levy. Funding levels available for each municipality to apply for are listed on page 48 of the PIC Packet. (Note: The funding levels were inadvertently duplicated in the October PIC Packet. The information presented on both pages 48 and 49 is the same.)

Foley also highlighted the King County Dam Safety Emergency Planning Gap Analysis Report, completed in August of 2017. In February 2017, the King County Council requested this review of the existing emergency action plans associated with the major dams in King County and a list of actions to update or create plans for evacuation and shelter for those affected by dam failures. She noted that the responsibility to maintain dams and create emergency plans lies with the owner of each dam.

Foley summarized a few high priority recommendations from the report: Emergency Action Plan text must be revised and kept up-to-date; inundation maps must be developed for 12 dams that do not have them and updated regularly for all dams; and all high hazard dams should conduct simulated emergency exercises every five years, or when significant changes occur at the dam or in the surrounding area. She noted that recommendations related to mass care and sheltering included evaluating worst-case-scenario impacts and conducting a formal shelter needs assessment. She stated that the report also identified the need to increase public awareness by posting information about dam safety hazards on several public websites, conducting workshops, and other measures. The report suggests conducting a regular survey of public awareness of dam hazards.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, asked if she could receive a list of the dams that do not have inundation maps, and Foley said she would provide this list.

Chair Marts asked for an explanation of Sub-Regional Opportunity Fund allocations. Foley explained that the table show current fund levels and projected values for 2018. She noted that the application process is not competitive, but is intended to determine whether the project meets eligibility criteria.
Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, noted that the table listing Sub-Regional Opportunity Fund allocations was duplicated on pages 48 and 49 in the PIC Packet. Both tables are the same.

Deputy Mayor Sheree Wen, Medina, asked how funds are allocated. Foley stated that funds are allocated according to the percent of funds that property tax payers in the city contribute to the Flood Control District.

**10. Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County**

Brian Parry, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported on the list of potential levies and ballot measures in the PIC Packet. If members have updates to the list, they can be provided to SCA at brian@soundcities.org. Parry noted as a correction to the PIC Packet that the recall election in Black Diamond is in December 2017. He said that in November SCA staff would provide a report on results of the general election and that there would be an opportunity for members of the PIC to provide an update on election results for their city.

Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported on a pair of potential ballot measures related to Community Health Engagement Locations (CHELs). Last year, the King County Heroin and Opiate Addiction Task Force recommended that two CHELs, also called safe injection sites, be established in King County on a pilot program basis, to serve as a place for supervised consumption to occur for adults with substance use disorders. Opponents of the CHEL recommendation have since filed Initiative 27. The Initiative would prohibit the use of public funds for such sites, make it unlawful to operate one, and allow for civil legal action against site operators and for criminal penalties. The King County Council has not yet acted to accept this Initiative or to place it on the ballot, and a challenge to the Initiative is currently in King County Superior Court. While opponents of Initiative 27 pursue the legal challenge, a majority of the King County Council have sponsored a counter proposal that could go on the ballot alongside the Initiative. Under Council legislation expected to be voted on October 17, up to two CHELs could be established on a pilot program basis for three years.

Chair Marts reported that the Issaquah City Council recently held a meeting that lasted more than seven hours because of the level of public interest in an ordinance that would have banned CHELs within the city. He said the issue caused a great deal of public debate although it was very unlikely a CHEL would ever be proposed to be located in the city. He said the City Council voted to refer the proposed ordinance to their Human Services Commission for further work.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, said Tukwila was also a very unlikely location for a CHEL to be proposed. She said they were not currently considering an ordinance related to locating a CHEL within the city because it is not necessary to do so. She said that if a CHEL were to be proposed in Tukwila, the city would not be required to accept that it be located within its boundaries, making it unnecessary to take action on any legislation at this time.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, said that he agreed with the comments from the previous speakers. He said that a large number of Kirkland residents asked the City Council to consider
voting to prohibit CHELs within the city, but that Kirkland staff researched the issue and determined that a King County budget proviso requires that a city must affirmatively act to allow for a CHEL to be sited there.

Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, noted that the Northshore School District may be considering a levy in 2018 and asked SCA staff to confirm this and provide an update to the PIC if so.

11. Potential Upcoming SCA Issues
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that this is a recurring monthly agenda item providing a list of potential issues that SCA will track and may bring back at a later time. Wilson-Jones noted that one issue on the list, the impact of growth on the region, has been central to a number of initiatives SCA members have been engaged in this year, including the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force, Regional Centers updates, and legislative priorities, all discussed earlier in the PIC meeting, as well as the Regional Transportation System Initiative currently underway. SCA will hold caucus meetings on December 6 and 7, and members will have an opportunity during those meetings to discuss issues they would like SCA to focus on in 2018.

12. Informational Item
Chair Marts reported that an informational item on Regional Centers is contained in the PIC Packet beginning on page 55. Members with questions should contact SCA Senior Policy Analyst Brian Parry at brian@soundcities.org.

13. Upcoming Events
Chair Marts reported that the next PIC meeting will be held November 8, 2017 from 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM at Renton City Hall with a pre-PIC workshop at 6:00 PM. Chair Marts noted that the PIC meeting will be the day after the general election and same night as an Association of Washington Cities regional meeting. Chair Marts highlighted the importance of ensuring there is a quorum and encouraged PIC representatives to identify an alternate to represent their cities should they be unable to attend the November PIC meeting.

The SCA Annual Meeting and Networking Dinner will be held on Wednesday, November 29, 2017 at 5:30 PM at the Renton Pavilion Event Center.

The South and South Valley Caucus Meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 6, 2017 from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM at the Auburn Community & Event Center.

The North and Snoqualmie Valley Caucus Meeting will be held on Thursday December 7, 2017 from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM at the Redmond Senior Center.

14. For the Good of the Order
Chair Marts highlighted the month’s “Did You Know” on the PIC agenda, which features the City of Kent. Chair Marts requested a volunteer for the November “Did You Know.” Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, volunteered. Chair Marts asked if any member wished to offer further comments.
Councilmember Janie Edelman, Black Diamond, reported that Black Diamond resident Ginger Passarelli was featured on “Returning the Favor,” a series by former “Dirty Jobs” host Mike Rowe. The segment about Passarelli and her Soup Ladies group’s work to feed first responders is available online.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, shared a comment letter [Attachment E] provided to the Federal Communications Commission in response to a proposal to redefine broadband speeds. Kruller noted that the official comment deadline has passed but encouraged others concerned about broadband speed standards to contact the FCC. Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, noted that the National League of Cities Information Technology and Communications Committee has also been engaged on this issue. Baker and Chair Marts noted that greater broadband speeds have become the standard in other countries and at lower costs to users.

15. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.
Public Issues Committee Meeting  
October 11, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Bill Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td>John Holman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</td>
<td>Richard Leider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>John Stokes</td>
<td>Kevin Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Janie Edelman</td>
<td>Tamie Deady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>James McNeal</td>
<td>Tris Samberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Austin Bell</td>
<td>Nancy Tosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Dustin Green</td>
<td>Kim Lisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Fran Hollums</td>
<td>Joseph Cimaomo, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Robert Back</td>
<td>Melissa Musser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Will Ibershof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Jan Molinaro</td>
<td>Mike Sando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Lydia Assefa-Dawson</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Joseph Sabey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Mariah Bettise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td>Nigel Herbig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Bill Boyce</td>
<td>Dana Ralph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td>Bill Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Sheree Wen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Benson Wong</td>
<td>Wendy Weiker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Susan Johnson</td>
<td>Debra Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New castle</td>
<td>Rich Crispo</td>
<td>Carol Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Michelle Sipes-Marvin</td>
<td>Jonathan Chicquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>David Storaasli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>John Stilin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td>Armondo Pavone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Christie Malchow</td>
<td>Bob Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Erin Sitterley</td>
<td>Pam Fernald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Keith Scully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Bob Jeans</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>Thomas McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmas</td>
<td>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow Point</td>
<td>Dicker Cahill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Cynthia Foley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Parry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellie Wilson-Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting members are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are bolded.
Regional Board and Committee Seats Open in 2018

Nominations for 2018 board and committee appointments are due November 10, 2017. All interested members (including those currently serving on boards and committees whose term expires in 2017) must submit a nomination form to be considered for appointment.

SCA Appointment Timeline
Deadline for nominations to 2018 boards and committees November 10, 2017
PIC Nominating Committee forwards recommended slate of appointees to PIC December 1, 2017
PIC makes recommendation on slate of appointees to the SCA Board of Directors December 13, 2017
SCA Board of Directors finalizes 2018 board and committee appointments December 20, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board or Committee Name</th>
<th>Number Open Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council on Aging and Disability Services (ADS Advisory Council)</td>
<td>1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Home Coordinating Board</td>
<td>2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Health (BOH)</td>
<td>2M / 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Youth Advisory Board (CYAB)* (term begins 2/1/2018)</td>
<td>1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Initiative (DVI) Regional Task Force</td>
<td>4M / 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Council (EDC) (formerly enterpriseSeattle) – City must currently be EDC Investor</td>
<td>TBD by EDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) (elected or staff) *</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC)</td>
<td>6M / 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Conservation District (KCD) Advisory Committee</td>
<td>3M / 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Accountable Community of Health Governing Board*</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Consortium Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) for CDBG</td>
<td>4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee (KCFCDAC)</td>
<td>4M/4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP) Management Coordination Committee</td>
<td>1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Clear Air Agency (PSCAA) Advisory Council*</td>
<td>1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development District Board (EDDB)</td>
<td>2M / 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Executive Board</td>
<td>3M / 3A / 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Growth Management Policy Board (GMPB)</td>
<td>3M / 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Operations Committee</td>
<td>1M / 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Transportation Policy Board (TPB)</td>
<td>3M / 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Law, Safety, and Justice Committee (RLSJC)</td>
<td>8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Policy Committee (RPC)</td>
<td>4M / 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit Committee (RTC)</td>
<td>8M / 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC)</td>
<td>4M / 2A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates that this appointment is for a multi-year term. Three-year terms: CYAB, EMAC, KC ACH Governing Board (unexpired term ending April 30, 2020), PSCAA (unexpired term ending June 30, 2020).
Mr. David Baker, President  
Sound Cities Association  
6300 South Center Boulevard, Suite 206  
Tukwila, WA  98188  

Dear Mr. Baker:

Thank you for your Association’s August 15, 2017, letter expressing interest in the infrastructure funding for the Hiram M. Chittenden Locks (Locks). The Northwestern Division and Seattle District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have worked collaboratively for 100 years to ensure the safety and functionality that mariners have come to rely upon at the Locks in Ballard.

The Corps evaluates and prioritizes project funding nationally, based on a number of criteria, one of which is cargo tonnage. Although the Locks are the busiest in the nation, passing more than 40,000 vessels each year, the overall tonnage moving through the locks is considered moderate-usage at 1.1 million tons. It is the 12th highest used lock in the nation with 7,500 commercial vessel transits.

We also recognize several unique criteria that make the Locks a critical piece of infrastructure to maintain for our region and the nation. These features were recently highlighted in the Economic Impact Study for the Locks, prepared for the Lake Washington Ship Canal Users Group, which includes some of your members.

Maintaining and safely operating the Locks is a key mission for the Seattle District. In addition to routine operations and maintenance funding, the Seattle District annually develops an integrated list of priority projects based on priority needs, safety, logical sequencing, and stakeholder concerns. The Corps has received funding and executed projects on that list, averaging one per year the last several years. The current list of projects includes several key infrastructure projects, with a per-project-cost ranging from $5 to $10 million. This year, the District received funding for the Locks’ Emergency Closure System, which will begin construction in FY18. One of the next projects awaiting funding are the Filling Culvert Valves and Machinery. Corps officials are continually evaluating and prioritizing infrastructure modernization and upgrades needed to keep the Locks safe and operating.

The opportunity for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to communicate our near term design and construction capabilities at the Locks is during the ongoing development of Work Plan for FY18 and during ongoing development of the FY19 budget. The
President's FY18 budget has already been released and is on line at http://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Budget/

We understand the concerns for the continued reliability of the Locks. Our staff at the Locks, with technical support from District Dam Safety and Structural Engineers, will continue their hard work to maintain a fully functioning facility.

If you require more information, my point of contact is COL Mark Geraldi, Seattle District Commander (206) 764-3690, or Nate McGowan, Operations Project Manager, Hiram M. Chittenden Locks, at (206) 789-2622 (Ext. 201).

Sincerely,

Scott A. Spellmon
Major General, U.S. Army
Division Commander
Regional and local centers are the cornerstone of the region’s long-term plan for growth in VISION 2040. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has identified regional-scale mixed use and industrial centers that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment. These centers include metropolitan downtowns like Seattle, Tacoma and Bremerton; growing areas supported by regional transit investments like Lynnwood and Redmond; and major industrial areas, such as Paine Field and the Port of Tacoma.

Working with its members, PSRC has initiated the first comprehensive review of the system since most centers were designated in 1995. The Puget Sound Regional Council’s Growth Management Policy Board is seeking public input on a draft centers framework proposal.

The project had several goals:

- **Identify shared expectations.** The standards for centers have varied by county and over time – this project provides an opportunity to review the expectations for new centers and existing centers. Establishing common designation criteria and procedures would improve overall consistency and coordination for centers planning.
- **Define the role of places.** The current centers framework only formally identifies regional centers. This project has allowed the region to consider the role of other types of places, such as countywide centers, transit stations, and military installations.
- **Implement regional policy and recommendations.** The project implements VISION 2040 policies, along with recommendations from Growing Transit Communities Strategy and the Regional Industrial Lands Analysis.

**Features from the Draft Centers Framework Proposal**

- Encourage larger centers to plan for greater growth by establishing different types of regional growth centers
- Create a new path to designate manufacturing/industrial centers to preserve industrial lands for the future
- Retain existing centers, but provide additional options to achieve the new minimum standards
- Recommend recognizing the role of major military installations in the VISION 2040 update
- Create minimum standards to designate countywide centers in each county
- Add new planning expectations to advance social equity
- Better reflect existing policy and goals, including a focus on transit service, regional role, market potential, and core industrial zoning.
What Would These Changes Mean?

Implementation over time. The centers framework proposal provides direction on how the plans, policies, and procedures should be updated to reflect our vision for regional centers. Upcoming updates to PSRC plans, policies, and procedures will implement the revised framework.

New regional centers. The draft proposal changes the regional criteria, which may allow some new regional centers to be designated. In particular, the criteria propose a lower employment threshold for manufacturing/industrial centers, which may lead to designation of new manufacturing/industrial centers.

New types of growth centers. By establishing different types of regional growth centers, larger centers would be encouraged to plan for greater levels of growth, and VISION 2040 could better address the different characteristics and growth trajectories of centers.

New countywide centers. The draft proposal establishes basic standards for countywide centers, which would create a more consistent system of places planning for growth and prioritized for countywide transportation funds. This may lead to designation of new countywide centers.

Military installations. The draft proposal recommends identifying major military installations in the update to VISION 2040 to recognize the influence these installations have on regional growth patterns, the economy, and transportation system. This may provide new opportunities for collaboration. Smaller military installations may be designated as a type of countywide center to recognize their role.

A more consistent system. The draft proposal does not recommend removing regional designation for any existing regional centers in the VISION 2040 update. The proposal does establish a time period and expectations for existing regional centers to meet the revised criteria.

Track progress over time. The draft proposal focuses on evaluating progress for individual centers over time.

Many existing policies won’t change. The framework incorporates procedural changes, but the basic structure of designating new centers doesn’t change. Local governments will be responsible for seeking designation, with the concurrence of the countywide organization in each county. PSRC’s Executive Board will continue to be responsible for designating new regional centers.

The draft proposal does not recommend higher or lower funding priority for different types of regional centers and encourages local governments to designate other types of local centers.

Key Review Questions

In addition to general review of the draft proposal, the Growth Management Policy Board is continuing to discuss several issues related to the centers framework and welcome feedback on several issues:

- Subarea Planning. The draft proposal includes a timeline for all existing regional centers to have some type of adopted subarea plan by 2020. Center plans would need to be consistent with the updated planning expectations by the next Growth Management Act periodic update
(prior to PSRC monitoring check-in in 2025). Is the planning timeline reasonable and appropriate?

o **Redesignation Standards.** For existing regional centers that may not meet the draft minimum standards, the draft proposal requires the jurisdiction to demonstrate reasonable progress on planning and development of their center. These include:
  - Adopted subarea plan consistent with center criteria,
  - Completed market study,
  - Availability of transit service (not required for manufacturing/industrial centers), and
  - Recent capital investments by the local government in the center and commitment to appropriate infrastructure in the jurisdiction’s capital improvement program to support planned growth

  Are the criteria appropriate? Too subjective? If so, how could it be more objective? Not robust enough? Do you have any additional suggestions?

o **Countywide Density Criteria.** The draft proposal includes minimum criteria for countywide organizations to designate countywide centers. Among other criteria, countywide growth centers would need to have a minimum of 10 activity units per acre. Activity units are the combined population and employment for a given area. Is the minimum density standard for countywide centers too low, too high, just right, or necessary to include?

  The countywide industrial centers currently don’t provide minimum expectations for a minimum number of jobs or acres of industrial land. Should there be a minimum number of jobs and acres? If so, what should be the minimum acre and employment thresholds for countywide industrial centers?

o **Mix of Uses in Regional and Countywide Growth Centers.** The current policy calls for centers to plan for a mix of uses, but doesn’t set a specific minimum. Should the centers framework establish a minimum mix of planned uses for growth centers?

---

**How to Comment**

The draft centers framework proposal is available for review on the project webpage, along with other project resources. The public comment period will run from Tuesday, October 10, 2017 through Wednesday, November 8, 2017 at 5 pm.

**E-mail:** [CentersComment@psrc.org](mailto:CentersComment@psrc.org)

**U.S. Mail:** ATTN: Centers Framework Comment, PSRC, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104-1035

**In Person:** Growth Management Policy Board meeting, 10:00 a.m. on November 2 at PSRC, 1011 Western Ave, Suite 500, in Seattle.

**Fax:** ATTN: Centers Framework Comment, 206-587-4825

The Growth Management Policy Board will review comments on the draft proposal prior to making a recommendation to PSRC’s Executive Board.
## Overview of Draft Centers Framework Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Standards</th>
<th>Draft Proposal (October 2017 version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Growth Centers</strong></td>
<td>Two types of regional growth centers -- metro growth center and urban growth center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| One type of regional center | Include additional criteria:  
  - Transit  
  - Market potential  
  - Regional role  
  - Distribution & number of centers |
| Primary focus on existing and planned density, commitment when reviewing new centers |  |
| **Manufacturing/Industrial Centers** | Two pathways to designate either large industrial areas or major employment centers |
| One pathway | Include additional criteria:  
  - Core industrial zoning  
  - Job type  
  - Preservation strategies |
| Primary focus on existing and planned jobs, commitment when reviewing new centers |  |
| **Military Installations** | Recommend to recognize major installations in the VISION 2040 update |
| Major installations like Joint Base Lewis McChord and the Bremerton Shipyard are not fully addressed in VISION 2040 | Guidance on countywide designation for smaller installations |
| All installations are eligible to be countywide centers |  |
| **Redesignation** | Common expectations |
| Some centers do not meet current standards | 2025 performance check-in, with options to demonstrate commitment through planning actions |
| Different expectations based on when designated |  |
| **Social Equity** | Additional housing planning prior to designation |
| Subarea planning required  
  - Provisions for affordable housing and special housing needs  
  - Plan for amenities like parks and civic places | Update center plan checklist to address topics like displacement, access to opportunity, and environmental justice |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Equity (cont.)</th>
<th>Current Standards</th>
<th>Draft Proposal (October 2017 version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage walkability and transit-supportive planning</td>
<td>New regional analysis and guidance on equitable community engagement + displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop framework to measure progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Rolling application window</td>
<td>Application window every five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc review of thresholds</td>
<td>Revisit thresholds during updates to VISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review based on checklist alone</td>
<td>Consider distribution, location, and number of centers in designation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Centers</td>
<td>No shared definition of countywide centers</td>
<td>Establish shared criteria for countywide centers; recognize places beyond regional centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only regional centers have common definition and recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria and designation vary by county</td>
<td>Criteria focus on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed use, planning for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Multimodal options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Industrial zoning, retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Performance monitoring reports on ad hoc schedule</td>
<td>Five-year monitoring report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Set performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional review if not meeting performance expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Centers Framework Update – Draft Board Proposal

The Puget Sound Regional Council’s Growth Management Policy Board is seeking public input on the draft centers framework proposal. The public comment period will run from Tuesday, October 10, 2017 through Wednesday, November 8, 2017 at 5 pm.

The draft centers framework proposal that follows describes potential updates to plans, policies, and procedures to support different scales of mixed use and industrial centers in the region. The draft proposal includes minimum criteria and expectations for regionally-designated mixed use and industrial centers, recommends a role of military installations in the regional plan, and provides guidance for designation of countywide centers in King, Pierce, Snohomish and Kitsap counties.

The Growth Management Policy Board will review comments on the draft proposal prior to making a recommendation to PSRC’s Executive Board. The draft centers framework proposal is available for review on the project webpage, along with other project resources.

How to Comment:
E-mail: CentersComment@psrc.org
U.S. Mail: ATTN: Centers Framework Comment, PSRC, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104-1035
In Person: Growth Management Policy Board meeting, 10:00 a.m. on November 2 at PSRC, 1011 Western Ave, Suite 500, in Seattle.
Fax: ATTN: Centers Framework Comment, 206-587-4825

Key Review Questions

In addition to general review of the draft proposal, Growth Management Policy Board continues to weigh policy options and is particularly interested in feedback on specific policy areas:

**Subarea Planning.** The draft proposal includes a timeline for all existing regional centers to have some type of adopted subarea plan by 2020. Center plans would need to be consistent with the updated planning expectations by the next Growth Management Act periodic update (prior to PSRC monitoring check-in in 2025). Is the planning timeline reasonable and appropriate?

**Redesignation Standards.** For existing regional centers that may not meet the draft minimum standards, the draft proposal requires the jurisdiction to demonstrate reasonable progress on planning and development of their center. These include:

- Adopted subarea plan consistent with center criteria,
- Completed market study,
- Availability of transit service (not required for manufacturing/industrial centers), and
- Recent capital investments by the local government in the center and commitment to appropriate infrastructure in the jurisdiction’s capital improvement program to support planned growth.

Are the criteria appropriate? Too subjective? If so, how could it be more objective? Not robust enough? Do you have any additional suggestions?

**Countywide Density Criteria.** The draft proposal includes minimum criteria for countywide organizations to designate countywide centers. Among other criteria, countywide growth centers would need to have a minimum of 10 activity units per acre. Activity units are the combined population and employment for a given area. Is the minimum density standard for countywide centers too low, too high, just right, or necessary to include?

The countywide industrial centers currently don’t provide minimum expectations for a minimum number of jobs or acres of industrial land. Should there be a minimum number of jobs and acres? If so, what should be the minimum acre and employment thresholds for countywide industrial centers?

**Mix of Uses in Regional and Countywide Growth Centers.** The current policy calls for centers to plan for a mix of uses, but doesn’t set a specific minimum. Should the centers framework establish a minimum mix of planned uses for growth centers?

These topics are called out in the document with a symbol.
Purpose and Background

Purpose

Centers are the hallmark of VISION 2040 and the Regional Growth Strategy. They guide regional growth allocations, advance local planning, inform transit service planning, and represent priority areas for PSRC’s federal transportation funding.

In 2015, the Growth Management Policy Board adopted a scope of work to review the existing centers framework. The regional centers have been integral to regional planning for over 20 years, and this update represented an opportunity to reassess the system in place today and opportunities to recognize other places that are serving important roles in the region. The Regional Centers Framework outlines a revised structure and criteria for regional and countywide centers and direction to update policies and procedures to update to the regional centers framework.

This update will:

- Clearly define the types of central places—both larger and smaller—within the region that are the focus of growth, planning, and investment.
- Establish criteria and planning expectations that ensure centers are developing as thriving and connected communities with sufficient market potential to accommodate new jobs and residents.
- Provide for consistent designation of centers at the regional and countywide levels across the region.
- Address requirements for new centers and redesignation of existing regional centers.

As important focal points for investment and development, regional centers represent a crucial opportunity to support equitable access to affordable housing, services, health, quality transit service, and employment, as well as to build on the community assets currently present within centers.

In the project scope of work, the Growth Management Policy Board adopted the following guiding principles for the project:

- **Support the Growth Management Act and VISION 2040.**
- **Focus growth consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.**
- **Recognize and support different types and roles of regional and subregional centers.**
- **Provide common procedures across the region.**
- **Guide strategic use of limited regional investments.**
- **Inform future planning updates at regional, countywide, and local levels.**

PSRC convened a joint board session in 2016 that identified several project objectives:

**Growth:** Centers attract robust population and employment growth—a significant and growing share of the region’s overall growth.

**Mobility:** Centers provide diverse mobility choices so that people who live and work in centers have alternatives to driving alone.
Environment: Centers improve environmental sustainability by diverting growth away from rural and resource lands, habitat, and other critical areas, and towards urban areas with existing infrastructure.

Social Equity and Opportunity: Centers offer high access to opportunity, including affordable housing choices and access to jobs, to a diverse population.

Economic Development: Centers help the region maintain a competitive economic edge by offering employers locations that are well connected to a regional transportation network, and are attractive and accessible to workers.

Public Health: Centers create safe, clean, livable, complete and healthy communities that promote physical, mental, and social well-being.

The Regional Centers Framework Update project included significant outreach and committee and board discussions. The process was informed by staff-level Technical Advisory Group and Stakeholder Working Group, joint board sessions, county-level workshops, and ongoing outreach to local governments. A staff-level Stakeholder Working Group met from June 2016 through January 2017 and identified recommendations and alternatives for PSRC’s boards to consider. Their final report informed deliberation by the Growth Management Policy Board in 2017.

Regional Centers Designation Procedures

The Designation Procedures for New Centers contains detailed requirements for designation and review of regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers. The procedures are adopted by the Executive Board.

PSRC will update the Designation Process for New Centers to incorporate the following procedural changes:

1. When designating new regional centers, the PSRC boards will also consider:
   - Distribution of centers throughout the region and whether new center locations would be advantageous for overall regional growth objectives. Centers should be distributed in rational places, consistent with the regional vision, and in areas that do not place additional development pressure on rural and resource lands.
   - The overall number of centers in the region.

2. Application and review of new regional centers will be limited to major regional growth plan updates (VISION 2040 and its successor plans) and every five years, following the results of performance monitoring.

3. Employment and/or activity thresholds for new regional centers will be reviewed and potentially updated when the regional growth plan is updated to account for overall growth in centers over time. Center designations should remain relatively stable over the long term, but will allow centers to change into new types when they have achieved higher levels of activity and other criteria.
Regional Growth Centers Eligibility and Criteria
Regional growth centers are locations of more compact, pedestrian-oriented development with a mix of housing, jobs, retail, services, and other destinations. The region’s plans identify centers as areas that should receive a significant share of the region’s population and employment growth compared with other parts of the urban area, while providing improved access and mobility—especially for walking, biking, and transit.

Eligibility Criteria for Regional Growth Centers
The minimum eligibility requirements for new centers ensure consistency in centers designation and ensure that new regional growth centers meet the intent of VISION 2040 while allowing for flexibility. The Designation Procedures for New Centers will be updated to identify additional supporting documentation:

- **Local commitment.** Evidence center is a local priority and sponsor city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in creating a walkable, livable center.
- **Planning.** Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) that meets regional guidance in advance of designation. Environmental review that demonstrates center area is appropriate for dense development.
  - Assessment of housing need, including displacement risk, as well as documentation of tools, programs, or commitment to provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes and strategies to further fair housing
- **Jurisdiction and Location.** Regional growth centers should be located within a city, with few exceptions. LINK light rail stations in unincorporated urban areas (including those funded through the Sound Transit 3 ballot measure) may be eligible for center designation at any scale, provided they are affiliated for annexation or planned for incorporation. Other unincorporated urban areas may be eligible for countywide center status, provided they are affiliated for annexation or planned for incorporation.
- **Existing Conditions.** Existing infrastructure and utilities sufficient to support new center growth, a mix of both existing housing and employment, justification of size and shape (recommend centers to be nodal with a generally round or square shape), and pedestrian infrastructure, amenities, and a street pattern that supports walkability

Designation Criteria for Regional Growth Centers
The Regional Centers Framework Update defines two distinct types of regional growth centers with tailored minimum criteria as described in this section. The criteria are expanded to include discussion of appropriate size, minimum transit service, market potential, and regional role. The center types will be used to inform future growth planning.
### Regional Centers Framework

#### Regional Growth Centers

**Urban Growth Center**
These centers have an important regional role, with dense existing jobs and housing, high-quality transit service, and planning for significant growth. These centers may represent areas where major investments – such as high-capacity transit – offer new opportunities for growth.

**Metro Growth Center**
These centers have a primary regional role – they have dense existing jobs and housing, high-quality transit service, and are planning for significant growth. They will continue to serve as major transit hubs for the region. These centers also provide regional services, and serve as major civic and cultural centers.

### Urban Growth Center Criteria
Center must meet the following criteria:
- **Existing density.** 18 activity units per acre minimum
- **Planned target density.** 45 activity units per acre minimum
- **Size.** 200 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)
- **Transit.** Existing or planned \(^1\) fixed route bus, regional bus, Bus Rapid Transit, or other frequent and all-day bus service. May substitute high-capacity transit mode for fixed route bus. Service quality is defined as either frequent (≤ 15-minute headways) and all-day (operates at least 16 hours per day on weekdays) – or – high capacity
- **Market potential.** Evidence of future market potential to support planning target
- **Role.** Evidence of regional role
  - Clear regional role for center (serves as important destination for the county)
  - Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy

### Metro Growth Center Criteria
Center must meet the following criteria:
- **Existing density.** 30 activity units per acre minimum
- **Planned target density.** 85 activity units per acre minimum
- **Size.** 320 acres minimum - 640 acres maximum (may be larger if served by an internal, high capacity transit system)
- **Transit.** Existing or planned light rail, commuter rail, ferry, or other high capacity transit with similar service quality as light rail. Service quality is defined as either frequent (≤ 15-minute headways) and all-day (operates at least 18 hours per day on weekdays) – or – high capacity (e.g., ferry, commuter rail, regional bus, Bus Rapid Transit). Evidence the area serves as major transit hub and has high quality/high capacity existing or planned service.
- **Market potential.** Evidence of future market potential to support planning target
- **Role.** Evidence of regional role:
  - Clear regional role for center (for example, city center of metropolitan cities, other large and fast growing centers; important regional destination)
  - Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and employment growth under Regional Growth Strategy

---

\(^{1}\) "Planned" transit means funded projects or projects identified in the constrained portion of Transportation 2040. The Transportation 2040 constrained project list incorporates projects in transit agency long-range plans where funding is reasonably expected during the 2040 planning horizon.
Manufacturing/Industrial Centers Eligibility and Criteria

Manufacturing/industrial centers preserve lands for family-wage jobs in basic industries and trade and provide areas where that employment may grow in the future. VISION 2040 calls for the recognition and preservation of existing centers of intensive manufacturing and industrial activity and the provision of infrastructure and services necessary to support these areas. These centers are important employment locations that serve both current and long-term regional economic objectives.

Eligibility Criteria for Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Minimum eligibility requirements ensure consistency in centers designation and ensure that new regional growth centers meet the intent of VISION 2040 while allowing for flexibility. The Designation Procedures for New Centers should be updated to identify additional supporting documentation:

- **Local commitment.** Evidence center is a local priority had city/county has sustained commitment over time to local investments in infrastructure and transportation. Demonstrated commitment to protecting and preserving industrial uses, incentives to encourage industrial uses in the center, and established partnerships with relevant parties to ensure success of manufacturing/industrial center

- **Planning.** Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent) that meets regional guidance in advance of designation. Environmental review that the area is appropriate for development

- **Location.** Manufacturing/industrial centers should be located within a city with few exceptions.

- **Existing Conditions.** Adequate infrastructure and utilities to support growth, access to relevant transportation infrastructure, documentation of economic impact, and justification of size and shape of manufacturing/industrial center

Designation Criteria for Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

The Regional Centers Framework Update identifies two distinct pathways to designate manufacturing/industrial centers. Minimum eligibility for regional designation is described in this section. The criteria are expanded to include discussion of appropriate employment type, core industrial zoning, industrial preservation strategies, and regional role. The center pathways may be used to inform future growth planning.
Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

These centers are highly active industrial areas with significant existing jobs, core industrial activity, evidence of long-term demand, and regional role. They have a legacy of industrial employment and represent important long-term industrial areas, such as deep-water ports and major manufacturing. The intent of this designation is to, at a minimum, preserve existing industrial jobs and land use and to continue to grow industrial employment in these centers where possible.

Center must meet each the following criteria:

- Existing jobs: 10,000 minimum
- Planned jobs: 20,000 minimum
- Minimum 50% industrial employment
- Access to transit or defined transportation demand management strategies in place
- Presence of irreplaceable industrial infrastructure.
- At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses
- Industrial retention strategies in place
- Regional role

These regional clusters of industrial lands have significant value to the region and potential for future job growth. These large areas of industrial land serve the region with international employers, industrial infrastructure, concentrations of industrial jobs, and evidence of long-term potential. The intent of this designation is to continue growth of industrial employment and preserve the region’s industrial land base for long-term growth and retention.

Center must meet each the following criteria:

- Minimum size of 2,000 acres
- Existing jobs: 4,000 minimum
- Planned jobs: 10,000 minimum
- Access to transit or defined transportation demand management strategies in place
- At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses
- Industrial retention strategies in place
- Regional role

Regional Center Redesignation Standards

To establish a regionally-consistent system, all regional centers will be reviewed based on the revised criteria.

- The first evaluation of existing centers will occur in 2018-2020 as part of the VISION 2040 update. PSRC staff will work with cities and counties to identify the applicable center types and whether all the criteria are already met or could be met.

- A first monitoring review period, scheduled for 2025, will follow the next major comprehensive plan periodic update. At that time, jurisdictions that do not meet adopted minimum activity requirements must demonstrate progress planning for and investing in the center, including:

---

2 Industrial-related infrastructure that would be irreplaceable elsewhere, such as working maritime port facilities, air and rail freight facilities.

3 Zoning designations dominated by traditional industrial land uses such as manufacturing, transportation, warehousing and freight terminals. Core industrial does not include zoning that permits both industrial and commercial uses together.
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- Adopted subarea plan,
- Completed market study,
- Availability of transit service (not required for manufacturing/industrial centers), and
- Recent capital investments by the local government in the center and commitment to appropriate infrastructure in the jurisdiction’s capital improvement program to support planned growth

o The board will maintain flexibility in evaluating existing centers to consider when centers are very close to the existing conditions criteria, to account from economic recessions, progress and growth, local investments or the lack of investments, and regional importance of a particular area.

o Criteria related to physical improvements should be included in center plans, but may need to be addressed over the long-term, such as developing a complete walkable street network.

- Cities and counties will have some form of center plan (subarea plan or similar) already in place by the time of the VISION 2040 update (2020), recognizing that the adopted plan may not be fully consistent with the new criteria. At the latest, cities and counties would be required to meet the updated planning requirements for regional centers by the next major comprehensive plan periodic update in 2023/2024.

Countywide Centers

The countywide planning policies include criteria and processes for countywide centers, though the approach currently varies significantly by county. Through the Centers Framework Update, designation of countywide is delegated to a countywide process using consistent regional standards.

The checklist below represents basic standards expected for countywide centers in each county. Depending on county circumstance and priorities, countywide planning policies may include other numeric criteria (such as planning requirements or mix of uses) or additional standards within this overall framework. Countywide center designations will be reviewed by an established timeframe and process set by the countywide planning body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide Centers</th>
<th>Countywide Growth Center</th>
<th>Countywide Industrial Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center must meet each the following criteria:</td>
<td>Demonstration that the center is a local planning and investment priority:</td>
<td>Demonstration that the center is a local planning and investment priority:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Identified as a countywide center in a local comprehensive plan; subarea plan recommended</td>
<td>o Identified as a countywide center in a local comprehensive plan; subarea plan recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Clear evidence that area is a local priority for investment, such as planning efforts or infrastructure</td>
<td>o Clear evidence that area is a local priority for investment, such as planning efforts, or infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Countywide Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide Growth Center</th>
<th>Countywide Industrial Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(cont.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(cont.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The center is a location for compact, mixed-use development; including:</td>
<td>The center supports industrial sector employment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A minimum existing activity unit density of 10 activity units per acre</td>
<td>o Minimum existing jobs and/or acres of industrial land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Planning and zoning for a mix of uses, including residential</td>
<td>o Defined transportation demand management strategies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Capacity and planning for additional growth</td>
<td>o At least 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The center supports multi-modal transportation, including:</td>
<td>o Industrial retention strategies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transit service</td>
<td>o Capacity and planning for additional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Pedestrian infrastructure and amenities</td>
<td>o Important county role and concentration of industrial land or jobs with evidence of long-term demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Street pattern that supports walkability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bicycle infrastructure and amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Compact, walkable size of one-quarter mile squared (160 acres), up to half-mile transit walkshed (500 acres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Centers and Other Types of Centers

VISION 2040 calls for central places in all jurisdictions to support a centers-based approach to development in the region. These places range from neighborhood centers to active crossroads in communities of all sizes. These centers play an important role in the region and help define our community character, provide local gathering places, serve as community hubs, and are often appropriate places for additional growth and focal points for services.

The Regional Centers Framework recognizes the importance of these places, but does not envision a regional or county designation for all types of local centers. The designation criteria outlined in this document may provide a path to regional or county designation for locations that continue to grow and change over time.

Per program eligibility requirements, rural centers that participate in PSRC’s Rural Town Centers and Corridors funding competition are located in either a freestanding city or town that is outside the region’s contiguous urban growth area or a county’s unincorporated rural area. These centers are designated through a local planning process, not through the Regional Centers Framework process.
**Military Installations**

Military installations are a vital part of the region, home to thousands of personnel and jobs and a major contributor to the region’s economy. PSRC recognizes the relationship between regional growth patterns and military installations, and recognizes the importance of military employment and personnel all aspects of regional planning.

**Designation Criteria for Types of Military Installations**

PSRC’s Executive Board will identify *Major Military Installations* in the update to VISION 2040, subject to adoption of the plan by the General Assembly. Major installations are defined as installations with more than 5,000 enlisted and service personnel. As of 2017, four installations met the minimum size criteria: Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Pierce County, Naval Base Kitsap–Bangor and Naval Base Kitsap–Bremerton in Kitsap County, and Naval Station Everett in Snohomish County.

This recognition in the regional plan advances active collaboration between military installations, neighboring jurisdictions, and the region. The region recognizes military installations are major employers, associated with congestion, and that regional designation can help work to alleviate impacts.

Through this recognition, regional expectations include:

- Ongoing coordination between the military installation, countywide planning forum, and neighboring jurisdictions regarding planned growth, regional impacts, and implementation of multimodal transportation options
- Support for multimodal commute planning and mode split goals for installation
- Complete a Joint Land Use Study or similar coordinated planning effort

Smaller military installations may continue to be recognized by countywide planning forums as a type of countywide center or equivalent. The minimum size criteria for countywide center designation will be as specified by RCW 36.70a.530 and identify “federal military installation[s], other than a reserve center, that employs one hundred or more full-time personnel.” As of 2017, five installations met the minimum criteria: Naval Base Kitsap Keyport, Seattle Coast Guard Station, Naval Base Kitsap Jackson Park, Camp Murray, and Naval Base Everett – Smokey Point Support Complex.

**Planning Requirements**

PSRC’s Plan Review Manual contains guidance and requirements for comprehensive plan certification, including center subarea plans. The *Regional Center Plans Checklist* in the PSRC’s Plan Review Manual addresses planning expectations for center subarea plans. PSRC will work with the Regional Staff Committee to update the Plan Review Manual to amend requirements and provide best practices, with consideration for local variability.

The *Regional Growth Center Plan Checklist* will be updated to address the following topics:

- Affordable housing, including housing targets, needs assessment, affordable housing goals, and strategies to encourage new housing production with long-term affordability
- Displacement risk analysis and strategies to prevent or mitigate displacement
Transit access, including transit service, transit-dependent populations, and safe and connected pedestrian and bicycle networks

- Equitable community engagement
- Access to opportunity, including employment and education opportunities and neighborhood quality of life
- Environmental justice impacts
- Specific transportation planning investments, programs, and resources identified.
- Availability of public services, like K-12 education, to meet needs of households with children.

The Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center Plan checklist will be updated to address the following topics:

- Equitable community engagement
- Access to opportunity, including employment and education opportunities
- Environmental justice impacts
- Expectations around core industrial uses, residential encroachment, and commercial and office uses that do not support manufacturing/industrial function
- Clearly articulated long-term commitment to protect and preserve manufacturing/industrial land uses and businesses in the center
- Specific transportation planning investments, programs, and resources identified

Regional Support

Funding to Support Centers

Staff will research and identify other potential funding sources or programs to support development in centers. This may include housing in regional growth centers, economic development, other capital funds, additional state resources, marketing, and other strategies. PSRC should collaborate with other agencies and funders to identify additional funding sources for designated centers. PSRC will also explore funding for centers planning and technical assistance.

Regional Center Types

The Regional Centers Framework does not establish a distinction between different types of regional centers for the purpose of PSRC’s funding framework.

Performance Measures

In the VISION 2040 update, PSRC will develop performance measures for centers as a whole to evaluate success of the overall framework. Metrics may include overall growth goals or mode split goals for centers, level of local or regional investment, or other measures as appropriate, such as housing affordability, mix of uses, and health and equity.

PSRC will continue to conduct ongoing monitoring of performance measures for individual centers. This may include progress towards growth targets and mode split goals, tracking implementation actions, or tracking other measures consistent with the designation requirements.
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- PSRC will publish a centers performance monitoring summary every five years in order to stay on top of regional trends in centers development.

- PSRC will review centers for performance as part of the monitoring review and prior to regional plan update years, and consider possible changes or reclassification if the local jurisdiction is not taking steps to plan and support growth in center to meet targets or goals.

**Implementation**

**Procedures and Planning Expectations.** The board directs staff to prepare updates to the Designation Procedures for New Centers, Regional Center Plans Checklist, and develop administrative procedures for existing centers.

**Plan Updates.** The board directs staff to identify issues for VISION 2040 update:
- Identification of military installations a regional geography
- Preservation of industrial land, both within designated manufacturing/industrial centers and in other industrial areas in the region
- Growth goals for regional centers

**Countywide Planning Policies.** The board requests updates to the countywide planning policies in each county to implement countywide centers and achieve consistency with the regional framework.

**PSRC Work Plan.** The board directs staff to develop an implementation work plan and schedule to engage with PSRC membership and other stakeholders as appropriate on additional analysis, research, and guidance. The work plan should incorporate the following tasks to support ongoing work on regional and countywide centers:
- **Performance measures.** Develop framework to track performance and outcomes over time. This may include assessment of demographic characteristics, housing affordability, employment, amenities, and access to opportunity.
- **Update growth planning guidance.** Update the guidance paper on center targets to discuss changes to growth expectations for centers and the mix of employment and residential activity envisioned in regional growth centers.
- **Social equity**
  - Complete additional analysis and research on displacement and displacement risk in centers.
  - Provide additional resources and best practices addressing equitable community engagement, including opportunities for local planning staff and policy-makers to learn about tools that have been successfully used by cities and counties in the region.
  - Research and recommend a best practice approach to a comprehensive equity impact review tool to address social equity through policies and implementation decisions for centers throughout the region.
- **Tribal land & centers.** Complete additional review and consultation with tribes on the role of tribal lands in the centers framework.
Funding opportunities. Research other funding opportunities and opportunities to leverage existing designations. Collaborate with other agencies and funders to identify additional funding sources to designated centers. Explore funding for centers planning and technical assistance.

Projects supporting centers. Review and develop policy guidance on types of projects that support development in centers and corridors connecting centers.

Number and distribution of centers. Research guidelines to manage the number and distribution of centers, factoring in projected growth, jurisdictional size, location within the county, competition for market share, and allocation of limited regional resources.
October 3, 2017

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

To Whom it May Concern:

We are deeply concerned regarding the notice of inquiry to redefine broadband speeds from 25 mbps to 10 mbps. Broadband access is vital in education, business, and government. Reducing the standards for broadband accepts the status quo of the current state of US broadband, and will permanently put the United States behind the rest of the developed world in providing quality access to all. In the city of Tukwila, we strive to provide our communities with the best services possible to live, work, and play. One way we do that is by pushing our local service vendors to provide affordable quality telecommunications services. This proposal would only serve to harm our efforts and give vendors and providers an excuse not to provide quality services to our residents. In addition, this could potentially increase the cost of services, and while providing lower quality. **We urge you not to redefine broadband speeds to the detriment of our community.**

Sincerely,

Dennis Robertson, Council President