What's Happening

Survey: Cost of living top dislike for region’s residents

April 5, 2018

Support for developing affordable housing in urban areas near transit

The survey results will help shape the development of VISION 2050.
Today the Growth Management Policy Board was briefed on early results from a statistically valid survey of 2,000 residents in King, Pierce, Snohomish and Kitsap counties.

The survey was conducted in March 2018 to measure attitudes and opinions about growth and other issues related to VISION 2050.

We’ve posted the survey online so anyone can share their thoughts on growth and how things are going in the central Puget Sound region.

The board will receive a full briefing on results next month after all the survey data is fully analyzed. Initial results include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Responses</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Pierce</th>
<th>Kitsap</th>
<th>Sno.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Living</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Environment</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate/Weather</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Crime</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth/Development</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost of living, homelessness and transportation are top dislikes.
Most believe encouraging development in urban areas, near transit is best for creating more affordable housing.

The survey and public comments received during the scoping period will help inform VISION 2050.

**Topic:** VISION 2050

**Comment**

affordable Housing near transit

Submitted by Deborah Knight on Fri, 2018-04-06 13:13

How do we encourage more transit near affordable housing in addition to building more affordable housing near transit? Is it less expensive to extend transit options near existing affordable housing in communities like Monroe rather than try and
build more affordable housing in urban areas near existing transit lines. More data
on these options rather than an binary survey question (e.g. transit vs. highways)
would be more helpful in guiding where future development is allocated during
Vision 2050.

Thank you

Permalink Submitted by psradmin on Fri, 2018-04-06 14:27

Thanks for your comments. Connections between affordable housing and
transit services came up frequently in many of the comments we’ve received
so far on VISION 2050. We’ll be diving into this issue in greater detail as we
conduct research and analyze data for VISION 2050.

parking

Permalink Submitted by Gridlocked and … on Fri, 2018-04-06 18:03

Gee, I’d consider parking lots. Huge parking lots.

transit

Permalink Submitted by Ted on Wed, 2018-04-11 14:17

You need to separate buss from rail if you are discussing "transit", they are
greatly different. Rail makes no sense outside of densely populated areas
(cities). Take a car to to buss park, take a buss to the rail stop, take rail to a
buss, take the buss to work/shop/recreate VS take a buss to
work/shop/recreate.

We are not Europe where population density supports the Tube. Nor are we
Japan. Acquire the right of ways such that they can be used by buss and be
adequate for rail AFTER and AS the population supports it. We in Pierce County
are not thrilled with buying Seattle’s rail. I’ll be dead long before it’s in Pierce
County.
Infrastructure is inadequate

*Permalink Submitted by Gridlocked and ... on Fri, 2018-04-06 18:02*

When growth is forced, like it has been in King, Snohomish, Pierce and Kitsap Counties, without the necessary improvements to infrastructure, the growth fails.

Seattle is too dense, too dirty and too many homeless people. Soon, the rodents that feed on the garbage surrounding the homeless tents will spread (thru bites or fleas) diseases that will result in some innocent child or adult dying.

The Health requirements of very large populations have not been met. PRSC.org and those who profit from all this unwanted growth need to step back and think about what they have created: a real mess.

Unaffordable land near transit precludes affordable housing

*Permalink Submitted by Tris Samberg on Sun, 2018-04-08 12:29*

The installation of transit infrastructure has caused the subsequent skyrocketing price of land around that infrastructure. Housing can’t be affordable when the underlying land is now overvalued. The planners for PSRC and Sound Transit should have predicted that obvious outcome. Providing more transit options to outlying affordable areas (like Monroe mentioned by previous writer) is a more cost-effective choice. How likely the $250M+/mile, light-rail enamored, Sound Transit and PSRC boards will embrace cost-effective options (e.g. BRT) remains to be seen. The boards’ ability to engage in strategic misrepresentation is well-known, and requires that they "stay the course" to validate earlier decisions.
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PSRC’s mission is to ensure a thriving central Puget Sound now and into the future through planning for regional transportation, growth management and economic development.