

POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

SUMMARY OF GROWTH DATA AND TARGETS

Population and employment growth data and the City's growth targets are summarized in Table 3-22, followed by additional discussion. Demographic data results from analysis of the 2000 Census data. Growth targets, observed trends in growth, and estimated development capacity are provided by DPD staff analysis.

Resident Households

Demographics

As of 2005, approximately 1,000 households resided in Pioneer Square and approximately 2,000 households resided in Chinatown/I.D. Census data from 2000 further indicate:

- many single-person or two-person households
- a large segment of the Chinatown/I.D. population is older and born outside the United States
- average household incomes in both neighborhoods are considerably lower than the citywide household average income
- a majority of residents in both neighborhoods live in income-restricted subsidized housing
- a population segment that is either homeless or accommodated within group quarters such as shelters and transitional housing.

Within the past few years, building renovations and new construction are bringing additional residents that influence the demographics of these neighborhoods. The Tashiro Kaplan Building artist housing near Yesler Way and Prefontaine Place, the renovated Lowman Building apartments near First Avenue and Cherry Street, the new Quintessa apartments at Second Avenue and Yesler Way, and other new residential construction are increasing the overall residential presence in these neighborhoods, as well as broadening the age and income diversity. Apartment conversions to condominiums have also occurred, increasing the presence of homeowner households. At the same time, other new buildings such as the Nihonmachi Terrace and Washington Terrace continue to add to the population of senior citizens and families in the northern portion of Chinatown/I.D.

There is no known residential population in the industrially-zoned portion of the study area. Potential residents may include building caretakers or artists in live-work spaces. Just south of S. Dearborn Street at S. Maynard Street, the William Booth Center includes 48 units of transitional housing that is adjacent to the industrial area at S. Charles Street. Just outside the study area near S. Atlantic Street and Utah Avenue S., the Bemis Building provides live/work space for more than 30 tenants within a general industrial zone, although not all of the spaces may be residentially occupied.

**Table 3-22
Summary of Residential and Employment Growth Data and Targets**

| Pioneer Square | | |
|--|--|---|
| Demographics (2000 Census) | Approximately 755 households Average household size: 1.26 persons Relatively low population of children and seniors Average income (1999): \$11,130 | |
| Growth Targets (Comprehensive Plan) | For 2004 to 2024: Residential: 1,000 households Employment: 3,500 jobs | Prior target for 1994 to 2014: Residential: 2,100 households Employment: 4,800 jobs |
| Net Growth | For 1994 to 2005: Residential: Net gain of approx. 256 dwelling units Employment: Net loss of approx 1,040 jobs. Total emp. = 9,850 in 2004 | |
| Current Development Capacity | Approx. 1,000 dwelling units*; and Approx. 1.1 million square feet of non-residential uses* | |
| Chinatown/International District | | |
| Demographics (2000 Census) | Approximately 1,514 households Average household size: 1.54 persons Relatively large population over age 70 Average income (1999): \$11,200 | |
| Growth Targets (Comprehensive Plan) | For 2004 to 2024: Residential: 1,000 households Employment: 2,000 jobs | Prior target for 1994 to 2014: Residential: 1,300 households Employment: 2,800 jobs |
| Net Growth | For 1994 to 2005: Residential: Net gain of approx. 513 dwelling units Employment: Net gain of approx 2,500 jobs. Total emp. = 6,600 in 2004 | |
| Current Development Capacity | Approx. 3,750 dwelling units; and Approx. 2.2 million square feet of non-residential uses | |
| Greater Duwamish Manufacturing & Industrial Center (whole center)** | | |
| Demographics (2000 Census) | Not applicable to this study area | |
| Growth Targets (Comprehensive Plan) | For 2004 to 2024: Employment: 9,750 jobs Residential: None | Prior target for 1994 to 2014: Employment: 10,860 jobs Residential: None |
| Net Growth | For 1994 to 2005: Residential: Not applicable to this study area Employment: Net gain of approx 3,900 jobs. Total emp = 61,550 in 2004 | |
| Current Development Capacity | Approx. 42 million square feet of employment uses, equivalent to approx. 28,500 jobs | |

* Pioneer Square capacity levels assume that the Qwest Field north parking lot and vacant floor area in existing structures are available to accommodate a share of household and employment growth.

** Greater Duwamish data reflect the entire industrial center, not just the Livable South Downtown study area.

Residential Growth Trends

Over the past 15 years, the Chinatown/I.D. neighborhood has grown faster than Pioneer Square, adding about 1,000 new households since 1990, while Pioneer Square has added about 400 additional households (see Table 3-23). For both neighborhoods, half or more of the new residential influx since 1990 has occurred in the last five years. However, Pioneer Square has grown more slowly than the other Downtown neighborhoods—only half as fast as Downtown overall. This may reflect the limited availability of development sites in Pioneer Square. In contrast, Chinatown/I.D. grew in an amount and pace that was relatively steady and comparable to, though somewhat slower than the Downtown Urban Center as a whole.

Similar to other Downtown neighborhoods, the amount of residential growth appears related to economic cycles, with a peak approximately five years ago and a recent upsurge in residential construction activity. Newer residential growth is occurring where parcels are available, such as the Japantown hill vicinity east of 5th Avenue S. and Chinatown between S. Weller Street and S. Dearborn Street.

Table 3-23
Residential Growth Trends in South Downtown Neighborhoods, 1990-2005

| Downtown Urban Center Villages | 1990 HHS* | 2000 HHS* | 2005 HHS* | Percent Change 1990 to 2000 | Percent Change 2000 to 2005 | Percent Change 1990 to 2005 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Pioneer Square | 603 | 755 | 940 | 25% | 25% | 56% |
| Chinatown/I.D. | 941 | 1,514 | 1,880 | 61% | 24% | 100% |
| Downtown Urban Center | 6,661 | 11,361 | 15,406 | 71% | 36% | 131% |

*HHS = Households. Source: Downtown Height & Density Draft EIS (Nov. 2003) and U.S. Census data (2000), Comp. Plan Urban Village Element Appendix, Net Housing Unit Growth spreadsheet, 2006. Dwelling unit to household conversion assumes an 8% vacancy rate based on PSRC data.

Employment

Current Employment

Employment data from 2004 indicate approximately 9,850 jobs in Pioneer Square and 6,600 jobs in Chinatown/I.D. These neighborhoods have the lowest employment totals of any neighborhood in the Downtown Urban Center. Total employment in the industrial zoned Stadium Area portion of the study area is estimated at roughly 1,000 jobs, including warehouse, office and a lesser amount of retail jobs (this does not include stadium-related jobs). Jobs in the Stadium Area appear oriented toward wholesale and retail trade, manufacturing, business services, and entertainment sectors. Immediately adjacent to and west of the stadium area, the Port's freight terminal complex is a major employment center and driver of regional economic activity.

Employment Growth Trends

Employment data from 1995 to 2004 illustrate a spike in employment in 2000 influenced by the “dot-com boom” economic cycle, and later a decline in employment levels with an economic slowdown. During the 1995-2000 period, total employment in the Downtown Urban Center expanded by 25%, while employment in Pioneer Square grew by about 29%, and employment in Chinatown/I.D. grew by 13%. However, from 2000-2004, overall Downtown employment declined by 16%, Pioneer Square declined by 30%, and Chinatown/I.D. in contrast rose by 42% (see Table 3-24). Pioneer Square employment was

likely affected by the downturn in Internet-related business, not only through loss of office jobs but also loss of other service, retail and tourism-related jobs. Job growth in Chinatown/I.D. over the past decade is likely attributable to growth in office employment at the Union Station complex as well as other economic activity in Little Saigon and Chinatown. The Stadium Area during this period maintained a diversity of industrial and commercial businesses (and construction employment as the stadiums were built), but trend data on the employment levels for this particular area are not available.

**Table 3-24
Employment Growth Trends in South Downtown Neighborhoods, 1995-2004**

| Location | 1995 Emp | 2000 Emp | 2004 Emp | % Change 1995 to 2000 | % Change 2000 to 2004 | % Change 1995 to 2004 |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Pioneer Square | 10,887 | 13,995 | 9,848 | 29% | -30% | -10% |
| Chinatown/I.D. | 4,099 | 4,646 | 6,588 | 13% | 42% | 61% |
| Downtown Urban Center | 138,151 | 172,932 | 145,310 | 25% | -16% | 5% |

Source: City of Seattle comprehensive planning, 2006.

Residential and Employment Growth Targets

Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan sets 20-year growth targets for Urban Centers and Urban Villages. These targets represent a minimum amount of growth for which the City plans. The citywide growth targets are the minimum amount of growth the City must plan for under requirements of the State Growth Management Act. These targets are derived from State forecasts and are determined through discussions among all King County jurisdictions through the Growth Management Planning Council. Due to this approach, these growth targets are different than the projections of the Puget Sound Regional Council.

These The 20-year growth targets are planning estimates that describe how projected-long-term growth (amounts determined as described above) could or should be accommodated in the city, within the framework of the urban village strategy. Individual growth targets are set for the neighborhoods within the Downtown Urban Center. These are currently set for the period of 2004 to 2024, during which the growth targets for the neighborhoods are as follows:

| | <u>Residential Growth Target</u> | <u>Employment Growth Target</u> |
|---------------------|---|--|
| ▪ Pioneer Square: | 1,000 additional households | 3,500 additional jobs |
| ▪ Chinatown/I.D.: | 1,000 additional households | 2,000 additional jobs |
| ▪ Duwa. M&I Center: | No additional households | 9,750 additional jobs |

The 75-acre portion of the Greater Duwamish MIC within the study area represents approximately 1.5% of the land area in the MIC. The building area that could be built on properties likely to be redevelopable in this area is similarly limited—accounting for only about 2.2% of the possible growth in the MIC. By this measure, the industrial-zoned portion of the study area could be seen as proportionately responsible for accommodating 215 additional jobs to meet its share of the MIC growth target.

Development Capacity Estimates

The City's Comprehensive Plan is based on analyses of available capacity for additional development in neighborhoods around the city. For all properties, the City's method compares the relative value of a building (or other improvements) to the assessed value of the land. If a site is vacant or the building's assessed value is very low compared to the land, it is rated as more likely to be redeveloped in the future. A site's capacity for future growth is calculated, allocating proportional amounts to residential and non-residential uses depending on the site zoning. This tool is best used for evaluating capacity of large areas, but does not suggest which properties may be more likely to redevelop over the long-term. Capacity for non-residential uses is shown in terms of additional jobs that could be accommodated, using standard assumptions about floor area per employee. See Table 3-27 later in this section for a comparison of existing capacity and capacity under the alternatives.

One unusual situation is Pioneer Square's shortfall in calculated development capacity compared to its 20-year growth target. In other urban villages, sufficient capacity to meet the 20-year growth target is identified using standardized assumptions about availability of property for future development. For Pioneer Square, the growth target does not rely on the standard assumptions about property availability. Rather, it anticipates that renovation of existing structures and the availability of the Qwest Field north parking lot for development can account for some of the capacity needed to meet the 20-year growth target.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT

25-Year Growth Projections Assumed for this EIS

Livable South Downtown planning recommends actions that encourage improved livability and infill growth. Changes to zoning may stimulate more residential and employment growth than might otherwise occur if the existing zoning pattern is retained. This analysis assumes an amount of additional development will occur over a 20-25 year period, which allows for an impact analysis of future growth. Assumptions about growth align with growth projections of the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) for 2030. The predicted geographic distributions of growth in the alternatives studied in this EIS represent a few hypothetical scenarios for how this amount of growth would or could be distributed throughout the study area.

The total amount of growth to be studied in Alternatives 1, 2, ~~and 3~~ and the Preferred Alternative includes: approximately 6,000 dwelling units and nearly 24,600 additional jobs. Of these amounts, the EIS analysis projects that most of the residential growth and approximately 15,000-~~16,000~~ jobs would occur within new structures. Other projected employment growth is assumed to be accommodated within existing structures, some located within Downtown near Pioneer Square.

For the No Action Alternative (Alt. 4), the same amount of employment growth within existing structures is assumed as in the other alternatives. However, a lesser amount of employment and residential growth is assumed to occur within new structures than under the other alternatives. This describes a hypothetical growth scenario if zoning is not changed and lesser amounts of new development are stimulated due in part to assumed constraining effects of current zoning. With these assumptions, the total amount of growth to be studied in the No Action Alternative is approximately 3,400 dwelling units and 16,600 jobs by the year 2030.

Population and Employment Impacts on Neighborhood Subareas

Tables 3-25 and 3-26 illustrate the distribution of projected population and employment growth, per the hypothetical growth scenarios, that would occur in newly developed structures through 2030. This illustrates the portions of the projected growth that would most directly affect these neighborhoods.

**Table 3-25
Projected Residential Growth Distribution Through 2030 (Dwelling Units)**

| Study Subarea | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | <u>Preferred Alternative</u> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Pioneer Square north of S. Jackson St. | 637 | 637 | 637 | 544 | <u>975</u> |
| 1 st Ave. S. & Occidental Ave. corridor, north of Royal Brougham | 286 | 69 | 633 | 69 | <u>69</u> |
| 1 st Ave. S. corridor, south of Royal Brougham | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <u>0</u> |
| Stadium North Lot and "Over-Tracks" property | 956 | 956 | 956 | 956 | <u>650</u> |
| Japantown: 4 th , 5 th Ave, Main St. vicinity (I.D.) | 867 | 1,092 | 1,069 | 683 | <u>987</u> |
| Central Chinatown (I.D.) | 1,379 | 1,562 | 909 | 788 | <u>1,379</u> |
| Little Saigon west of 12 th Ave. S. (I.D.) | 682 | 796 | 517 | 295 | <u>732</u> |
| Little Saigon east of 12 th Ave. S. (I.D.) | 677 | 677 | 677 | 60 | <u>966</u> |
| South-of-Dearborn St. vicinity | 242 | 225 | 665 | 0 | <u>242</u> |
| TOTALS | 5,726 | 6,014 | 6,063 | 3,395 | <u>6,000</u> |

Notes: Distribution based on hypothetical growth scenarios within the study area, varying by zoning alternatives.

Commentary on All Alternatives

Review of the assumed growth amounts shows they are generally consistent with the overall themes defined for the alternatives, e.g.:

- Alternative 1 would concentrate more residential and employment growth toward 1st Avenue S. and Pioneer Square
- Alternative 2 would concentrate more residential and employment growth toward 4th Avenue S. and Chinatown/I.D.
- Alternative 3 would concentrate more residential and employment growth toward 4th Avenue S. and south of Dearborn Street, as well as residential growth concentrated in Chinatown/I.D.
- Alternative 4 would result in broader distribution of residential and employment growth around these areas
- The Preferred Alternative would concentrate residential growth in the neighborhood areas of Pioneer Square, Chinatown, Japantown and Little Saigon, with little expected residential growth

in the 1st Avenue S. and Occidental Avenue S. corridors or the area south of S. Dearborn Street near Chinatown. Employment growth would be concentrated most notably along the 1st Avenue S. corridor, in the south-of-Dearborn Street vicinity, and in the Qwest Field north parking and “over-tracks” property vicinity.

These differing growth alternatives would contribute to varied amounts of increased activity, increased traffic generation, and increased density of residential and employment density in the study area. It is worth noting that a significant proportion of the anticipated growth is expected to occur in or near the Chinatown/I.D. neighborhood under any of the alternatives, likely due to the greater availability of redevelopable properties when compared with Pioneer Square.

Table 3-26
Projected Employment Growth Distribution Through 2030, in Newly Developed Structures
(Number of Employees)

| Study Subarea | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | <u>Preferred Alternative</u> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Pioneer Square north of S. Jackson St. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <u>22</u> |
| 1 st Ave. S. & Occidental Ave. corridor, north of Royal Brougham | 5,239 | 3,279 | 3,461 | 1,989 | <u>4,346</u> |
| 1 st Ave. S. corridor, south of Royal Brougham | 1,661 | 1,366 | 1,273 | 1,366 | <u>1,680</u> |
| Stadium North Lot and “Over-Tracks” property | 1,382 | 4,902 | 3,600 | 746 | <u>3,019</u> |
| Japantown, 4 th & 5 th Ave. S. vicinity (I.D.) | 322 | 176 | 322 | 176 | <u>322</u> |
| Central Chinatown (I.D.) | 853 | 216 | 216 | 514 | <u>853</u> |
| Little Saigon west of 12 th Ave. S. (I.D.) | 808 | 1,347 | 582 | 485 | <u>852</u> |
| Little Saigon east of 12 th Ave. S. (I.D.) | 2,861 | 1,433 | 2,387 | 1,429 | <u>1,200</u> |
| South-of-Dearborn St. vicinity | 1,621 | 2,954 | 3,438 | 858 | <u>3,686</u> |
| TOTALS | 14,747 | 15,673 | 15,279 | 7,563 | <u>15,980</u> |

Notes: Distribution based on hypothetical growth scenarios within the study area, varying by zoning alternatives.

Demographic Trends in Future Growth

Residential Populations

Patterns of future development would probably result in a wider representation of households with different income levels in the study area, due to growth in housing resources affordable to more median-income and above-median-income households over time. The Pioneer Square neighborhood plan expressed a preference for this kind of residential growth trend, which the plan theorized would bring

improved stability to the neighborhood. The Chinatown/I.D. neighborhood plan does not explicitly express such a preference.

Livable South Downtown planning has identified probable benefits of increased residential development such as providing more people on the street that could increase activity levels, public safety, and result in an increase in customers for local businesses. There is some evidence that housing growth trends are already underway, with recent new family housing, senior housing and workforce housing in Chinatown/I.D. and Pioneer Square, and a conversion of apartments to condominiums at two Chinatown buildings. See the Housing and Historic and Cultural Preservation sections in this chapter for additional discussion of potential impacts related to this trend, such as the potential for displacement of affordable housing.

Employment Populations

Future employment growth would likely consist of primarily office workers with some complementary retail and service employment growth. Future mixed-use development in the neighborhoods would also be likely to generate additional retail and service employment growth. The Dearborn Street proposal would represent the largest such concentration of retail employment growth, centered near Rainier Avenue S. and S. Dearborn Street in Little Saigon. The net effects of areawide employment growth would be a more diverse range of employees in the neighborhood than are currently present, but with increasing numbers of office workers. This would provide additional daytime populations that would patronize restaurants and small retail shops. See the Land Use—Economic and Business Impacts for further discussion of potential impacts, such as the potential for displacement of businesses.

DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

Table 3-27 summarizes the alternatives' differing implications for overall estimated development capacity within the study area.

**Table 3-27
Summary of Development Capacity Changes Under Each Alternative**

| Alternative & Subarea | Residential Capacity (Dwelling Units) | Commercial Capacity (Number of jobs) |
|---|--|---|
| Pioneer Square | | |
| Alternative 1 – Emphasis to west | 4,029 <u>1,130</u> | <u>3,465</u> <u>3,500</u> |
| Alternative 2 – Emphasis to east | 4,152 <u>1,260</u> | 3,454 <u>3,490</u> |
| Alternative 3 – Balanced | 1,031 | 3,461 |
| Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning | 842 | 3,856 |
| <u>Preferred Alternative</u> | <u>1,270</u> | <u>4,000</u> |
| Stadium Area: 1st Ave. S. corridor (not including PSM zone) | | |
| Alternative 1 – Emphasis to west | 339 | 9,977 |
| Alternative 2 – Emphasis to east | 0 | 10,105 |
| Alternative 3 – Balanced | 296 | 9,977 |
| Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning | 0 | 10,409 |
| <u>Preferred Alternative</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>11,300</u> |
| “Over-tracks” property: 4th Ave. S. | | |
| Alternative 1 – Emphasis to west | 318 | 2,396 |
| Alternative 2 – Emphasis to east | 382 | 3,542 |
| Alternative 3 – Balanced | 409 | 2,926 |
| Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning | 229 | 2,187 |
| <u>Preferred Alternative</u> | <u>400 - 450</u> | <u>3,200</u> |
| Chinatown/I.D west of I-5 | | |
| Alternative 1 – Emphasis to west | 3,374 | 3,240 |
| Alternative 2 – Emphasis to east | 3,242 | 3,146 |
| Alternative 3 – Balanced | 3,068 | 3,481 |
| Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning | 2,922 | 3,637 |
| <u>Preferred Alternative</u> | <u>3,600</u> | <u>3,240</u> |
| Little Saigon | | |
| Alternative 1 – Emphasis to west | 1,947 | 11,359 |
| Alternative 2 – Emphasis to east | 3,492 | 8,826 |
| Alternative 3 – Balanced | 1,264 | 13,360 |
| Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning | 389 | 7,540 |
| <u>Preferred Alternative</u> | <u>3,900</u> | <u>8,200 – 8,300</u> |
| South-of-Dearborn, east of 4th Ave. S. | | |
| Alternative 1 – Emphasis to west | 135 | 2,360 |
| Alternative 2 – Emphasis to east | 122 | 2,714 |
| Alternative 3 – Balanced | 550 | 1,838 |
| Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning | 32 | 648 |
| <u>Preferred Alternative</u> | <u>170 - 200</u> | <u>2,700 - 2,800</u> |
| TOTAL | | |
| Alternative 1 – Emphasis to west | 7,142 <u>7,243</u> | 32,832 |
| Alternative 2 – Emphasis to east | 8,319 <u>8,427</u> | 31,823 |
| Alternative 3 – Balanced | 6,640 | 35,043 |
| Alternative 4 – Existing Zoning | 4,414 | 28,277 |
| <u>Preferred Alternative</u> | <u>9,340 – 9,420</u> | <u>32,640 – 32,840</u> |

MITIGATION STRATEGIES

No mitigation measures are proposed in this section. Differences in distributions of population and employment growth among the alternatives would generate varying levels of impacts within other environmental categories. Please see the analyses and mitigation strategies recommended for the other sections in this chapter.

SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

None are identified.