What's changed since the DEIS?

New information and other corrections and revisions since issuance of the DEIS are described in cross-out (for deleted text) and underline (for new text) format. Entirely new sections or exhibits may be identified by a sidebar callout instead of underline.

3.7 OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION.

3.7.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION

Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) manages a 6,400-acre park system of more than 485 parks and open spaces that comprises about 12 percent of the Seattle's land area.[1] Other open spaces in Seattle include the Chittenden Locks, Olympic Sculpture Park, ~~portions of~~ the Burke-Gilman ~~Trail~~ and Chief Sealth trails, fields and playgrounds associated with public and private schools, waterfront access points provided by the Port of Seattle and the Seattle Department of Transportation, and open spaces on college and university campuses. There are also privately owned open spaces, such as plazas, available to the public.

Projected growth in Seattle would result in increased demand for parks and open space as well as recreation programming and services. Because the Comprehensive Plan guides most population growth to urban centers and urban villages, SPR expects parks and open space demand in those neighborhoods to grow substantially (SPR, 2016). SPR's planning is based on the adopted official growth estimates provided by Puget Sound Regional Council and adopted in the City's Comprehensive Plan, both of which are lower than the amounts analyzed in the action alternatives for MHA implementation. This chapter provides a programmatic assessment of potential impacts to parks and open space in the EIS study area resulting from potential increased housing and employment growth that could result from ~~capacity proposed as part of~~ MHA implementation (see Chapter 2).

---

1 Parks and open space include natural areas and greenbelts; community, neighborhood, and regional parks; mini/pocket parks; specialty gardens; community centers; pools; swimming beaches, fishing piers, and boat ramps; golf courses; small craft centers; outdoor camp; and tennis centers.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

This section summarizes plans and policies applicable to the provision of parks and open space in the study area in light of future residential growth.

Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan

The Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan outlines the City's goal to provide a variety of parks and open space to serve Seattle's growing population in accordance with the priorities identified in the City's Parks Development Plan. Accordingly, the City plans to expand its park holdings and open space opportunities, particularly in urban villages. The City also encourages private developers to incorporate on-site publicly accessible open space (City of Seattle, 2016). In addition, a goal in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan is to consider access to parks by transit, bicycle, and on foot when acquiring, siting, and designing new park facilities, or improving existing ones. The 2005 Comprehensive Plan provided quantitative, population-based goals for the provision and distribution of open space in urban center villages, hub urban villages, and residential urban villages, as well goals specific to village commons (City of Seattle, 2005). The Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan generalizes these open space goals, and the 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan ~~Draft Parks Development Plan~~ provides specific level-of-service (LOS) standards and walkability guidelines (SPR, 2017).

New to the FEIS

The 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan was adopted in August after the DEIS was published. Discussion of prior Parks and Recreation Development Plans was removed from the FEIS—including the 2011 Development Plan, DEIS Exhibit 3.7–1, and DEIS Exhibit 3.7–2—and updated with information on the adopted 2017 plan (see the revised *Seattle Parks and Recreation's 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan* section).

Seattle~~'s~~ Parks and Recreation's 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan ~~Development Plans~~

~~The Draft 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan~~ The 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan (Parks and Open Space Plan ~~the Draft 2017 Plan~~) is a six-year plan that "documents and describes SPR's facilities and lands, looks at Seattle's changing demographics, and lays out a vision for the future" (SPR, 2017). ~~There are substantial differences between the Draft 2017 Plan and the 2011 Development Plan.~~ In order to maintain a citywide LOS that is compliant with Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office requirements and the Growth Management Act, a citywide population-based standard of 8 acres per 1,000 residents is

Exhibit 3.7–1 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan Citywide LOS Standard

Guidelines/Standard	Location	Description
Population-based LOS	Citywide	8 acres/1,000 residents

Source: SPR, 2017.

proposed in the ~~Draft 2017~~ Plan~~, as opposed to the existing 1/3 acre per 100 residents goal (Exhibit 3.7–1)~~. In addition, the Plan includes ~~the individual urban village population-based open space goals would be replaced with~~ a long-term acquisition strategy based on walkability, in accordance with updates to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Parks and Open Space Plan ~~Draft 2017 Plan also~~ takes a slightly different approach to identifying open space gaps and prioritizing areas for acquisition than previous park development plans by considering a broader range of public resources as parks and open spaces (including public school property, major institutions and universities, and other non-park owned property), and considering equity, ~~and~~ walkability, and socio-economic factors in addition to population density. ~~The proposed LOS standard and the walkability guidelines are summarized in Exhibit 3.7–2.~~ Under the proposed walkability guidelines, it is suggested that parks and open space be within a 5-minute walk within urban villages and be within a 10-minute walk outside of urban villages.

In the Parks and Open Space Plan, the following study area urban villages have been identified as being underserved in parklands as compared to other areas of the city:

- Aurora-Licton Springs
- Bitter Lake
- Northgate
- Ballard
- First Hill
- Fremont
- North Rainier
- North Beacon Hill
- Columbia City
- Othello
- Rainier Beach
- South Park
- West Seattle Junction
- Morgan Junction
- Westwood-Highland Park

Gap areas outside of urban villages that have been traditionally underserved and are home to marginalized populations are also considered included for consideration (e.g., the Georgetown neighborhood and Bitter Lake/Aurora area) (SPR, 2017).

Seattle Municipal Code

In certain zones, Seattle's Land Use Code (SMC Title 23) requires a minimum amount of open space for private development. When required, private open space must meet standards in SMC 23.71.014 and 23.86.018. Open space is often required as an "amenity." In Lowrise multifamily zones, new development must provide an amenity area equal

to 25 percent of the lot area, with at least 50 percent of the amenity area at the ground level. In commercial zones that allow residential development, five percent of residential floor area must be a residential amenity open to the outdoors (City of Seattle, 2016b; City of Seattle, 2016c). Although such open spaces provide benefits to Seattle residents and visitors, they are not counted in the quantities of open spaces analyzed below because they are privately owned.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Presently, about 43 percent of the City's parks are wholly or partially located in urban villages. But only five percent of total park acreage is located in urban village boundaries (City of Seattle, 2014; City of Seattle, 2014b). Seattle's six urban centers contain the largest number of parks, while the 18 residential urban villages contain the most park acreage. Among individual urban villages, Admiral has the highest share of parkland (12 percent), while parks comprise less than one percent of land in West Seattle Junction, Greenwood-Phinney Ridge, and Morgan Junction (City of Seattle, 2014; City of Seattle, 2014b).

Under the 2015 baseline conditions, the City of Seattle meets the ~~2011 Development Plan goal and 2017~~ citywide LOS standard by providing roughly 9.34 acres of parks and open space per every 1,000 residents and 0.93 acre of parks and open space per every 100 residents (Exhibit 3.7–2).

Exhibit 3.7–2 Baseline Condition Acres of Parks and Open Space per Population

Population (2015)	Acres of Parks and Open Space	Acres of Parks and Open Space per Population
686,800	6,414	9.34 acres per 1,000 residents 0.93 acre per 100 residents

Source: SPR, 2017.

Exhibit 3.7–3 shows the acreage of parks and open space for each urban village in the study area and the acres of parks and open space per 100 people under baseline conditions in 2015. Although there are no urban village scale population standards, identifying the number of acres of parks and open space per resident population is one measure to indicate how changes in population density could potentially change the relative need for additional parks and open space in urban village or neighborhood areas. Exhibit 3.7–3 also identifies urban villages in the study area that were noted in the ~~2011 and 2017 gap analysis findings as~~ Parks and

Exhibit 3.7–3 Baseline Conditions for Parks and Open Space Provision and Distribution

Urban Village	Acres of Parks and Open Space*	Acres of Parks and Open Space per 100 Residents (2015)**	~~Walkability Gap is Over Half of Urban Village (2017)~~ Underserved Urban Villages
23rd & Union-Jackson	63.19	0.65	
Admiral	12.33	0.61	
Aurora-Licton Springs	7.55	0.12	X
Ballard	11.54	0.07	X
Bitter Lake Village	10.36	0.18	X
Columbia City	32.16	0.67	X
Crown Hill	4.69	0.2	
Eastlake	6.16	0.09	
First Hill-Capitol Hill	17.73	0.03	X
Fremont	4.25	0.07	X
Green Lake	2.33	0.05	
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge	0.42	0.01	X
Lake City	4.52	0.1	
Madison-Miller	7.85	0.16	
Morgan Junction	0.66	0.03	X
North Beacon Hill	6.28	0.24	X
North Rainier	66.83	1.53	X
Northgate	19.88	0.25	X
Othello	11.52	0.23	X
Rainier Beach	31.52	1.16	X
Ravenna	2.85	0.1	
Roosevelt	0.15	0.01	
South Park	15.39	0.67	X
Upper Queen Anne	0	0	
Wallingford	4.49	0.08	
West Seattle Junction	1.39	0.02	X
Westwood-Highland Park	0	0	X
Outside Urban Villages	6,032	1.56	

** Parks and open space acreage in urban villages was calculated using 2014 SPR GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives (minus expansion areas).*

*** Urban village population figures come from 2015 baseline housing data (Chapter 2) assuming an average household size of 1.78 people. The population outside urban villages assumes 2.06 people per household (City of Seattle, 2016).*

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2017.

New to the FEIS

In the FEIS, underserved urban villages identified in the adopted 2017 Parks Development Plan are used as a metric instead of the walkability map metric used in the DEIS.

In addition, the "Open Space Gap is Over Half of Urban Village (2011)" column was removed from DEIS Exhibit 3.7–4 (see amended FEIS Exhibit 3.7–3).

Open Space Plan as being underserved in parklands as compared to other areas of the city having shortages in distribution of open space. ~~For the 2011 Development Plan, an open space gap over half of the urban village indicated that future park acquisition in that urban village would be necessary. Although the 2017 gap analysis has not been finalized, urban villages with walkability gaps over half their area or more are also considered for this analysis. It is likely that such areas would be slated for future acquisition and possible development projects under the 2017 Plan.~~

Under existing conditions, ~~11~~ 15 of the study area urban villages were identified as ~~having substantial open space gaps in the 2011 Development Plan and 8 were identified as having substantial walkability gaps in the Draft 2017 Plan~~ being underserved..

3.7.2 IMPACTS

IMPACTS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

No direct impacts to parks and open space in the form of physical disruptions, alteration, or removal of parks land would result from housing and job growth in the study area. Indirect impacts to parks and open space could occur from changes in the distribution, accessibility, use, or availability of parks and open space due to additional population growth. The primary impact to parks and open space under all alternatives would be a decrease in availability, or the acreage of park and open space land available relative to a specific number of people. Impacts to parks and open space users may be in the form of greater crowding in parks, a need to wait to use facilities, unavailable programs, or a need to travel longer distances to reach an available park facility. Population growth without a commensurate increase in the quantity of parks and open space decreases availability. The quality or level of services available within parks and open space is another factor in the determination of adequacy of parks and open space, but because measures of quality are difficult to obtain and subjective this analysis focuses on the amount of and walkability to parks and open space lands, and distribution of parks and open space.

To assess impacts to parks and open space, this Chapter uses SPR's ~~2011 distribution goal of 1/3 (0.33) acre of parks and open space land for every 100 residents citywide, hereafter referred to as the 2011 distribution goal, and the~~ 8 acres per every 1,000 residents (0.80 acre per 100 residents citywide) LOS, hereafter referred to as the ~~2017~~ citywide LOS.

Exhibit 3.7–4 LOS Evaluation of Alternatives

	ALTERNATIVE 1 (2017 PARKS PLAN)*			ACTION ALTERNATIVES 2 ~~AND ALTERNATIVE 3~~**		
	Population	Acres Parkland	Acres / 1,000 Residents	Population	Acres Parkland	Acres / 1,000 Residents
2015	686,800	6,414	9.34	686,800	6,414	9.34
2035	806,800	6,414	7.95	855,900	6,414	7.49
Additional Acres of Parkland Needed to Meet LOS by Seattle 2035		*40*			*434*	
With Additional Park Land		*6,454*	*8.00*		*6,791*	*8.00*

** Growth estimated in the 2017 Parks Plan is considered as the No Action scenario for this analysis.*

*** A rounded, 95,000 additional household growth amount is assumed for the action alternatives (Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and the Preferred Alternative) for the purposes of this analysis. Average household size is 1.78 persons per household.*

Source: SPR, 2017.

Although not a LOS metric, ~~T~~the analysis also considers the findings of the ~~2011 and 2017~~ gap analyses in that ~~they~~ it indicates areas where there are deficiencies in the existing parks and open space network. A project impact comes in the form of decrease in parks availability, as these urban villages will have more residents populating areas that may not have adequate park resources. ~~All of the alternatives would meet the 2011 distribution goal. However, n~~None of the alternatives would meet the ~~2017~~ citywide ~~population based~~ LOS. Exhibit 3.7–4 describes how many additional acres of park and open space land would need to be acquired for the ~~2017~~ citywide LOS to be met. Under Alternative 1, 40 acres of park and open space land would need to be required, and under Alternatives 2, ~~and~~ 3, and the Preferred Alternative, approximately 434 acres would be required.

Significant impacts are only assigned to proposals that would result in the City not meeting the citywide ~~2017~~ LOS.

For analysis purposes in this EIS, the population density per acre of park land is also assessed at the urban village level to better understand the distribution of impacts associated with the various alternatives. Exhibit 3.7–5 compares parks and open space availability by urban village under each alternative. All alternatives anticipate housing growth over the 20-year planning horizon both inside and outside urban villages, with Alternatives 2 and 3 and the Preferred Alternative directing more growth to urban villages than Alternative 1. To better understand the changes that would occur as a result of each of the action alternatives, the impact assessment focuses on how demand for parks and open space would change in urban villages in the study area, particularly those identified

New to the FEIS

In the FEIS, underserved urban villages identified in the adopted 2017 Parks Development Plan are used as a metric instead of the walkability map metric used in the DEIS.

In addition, the "Open Space Gap (2011)" column was removed from DEIS Exhibit 3.7–6 (see amended FEIS Exhibit 3.7–5 on the next page).

Exhibit 3.7–5 Comparison of Parks and Open Space Availability Across Alternatives

URBAN VILLAGE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY (ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS)

	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative	~~Walkability Gap (2017)~~ Underserved Urban Villages
High Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity						
Rainier Beach	1.16	0.88 (24%)	0.55 (53%)	0.57 (51%)	0.97 (16%)	X
Othello	0.23	0.17 (26%)	0.33 (+43%)	0.19 (17%)	0.27 (+17%)	X
Westwood-Highland Park	0.00	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	X
South Park	0.67	0.51 (24%)	0.45 (33%)	0.47 (30%)	0.47 (30%)	X
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.13 (28%)	0.12 (33%)	0.12 (33%)	0.12 (33%)	X
Low Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity						
Green Lake	0.05	0.04 (20%)	0.04 (20%)	0.03 (40%)	0.04 (20%)	
Roosevelt	0.01	0.00 (100%)	0.00 (100%)	0.00 (100%)	0.00 (100%)	
Wallingford	0.08	0.06 (25%)	0.05 (38%)	0.05 (38%)	0.05 (38%)	
Upper Queen Anne	0.00	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)	0.05 (29%)	0.05 (29%)	0.05 (29%)	X
Ballard	0.07	0.05 (29%)	0.04 (43%)	0.04 (43%)	0.06 (14%)	X
Madison-Miller	0.16	0.12 (25%)	0.11 (31%)	0.10 (38%)	0.10 (38%)	
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge	0.01	0.01 (0%)	0.01 (0%)	0.01 (0%)	0.01 (0%)	~~X~~
Eastlake	0.09	0.07 (22%)	0.07 (22%)	0.07 (22%)	0.07 (22%)	
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)	0.01 (50%)	0.01 (50%)	0.01 (50%)	X
Admiral	0.61	0.48 (21%)	0.46 (25%)	0.43 (30%)	0.44 (28%)	
Crown Hill	0.20	0.13 (35%)	0.06 (70%)	0.05 (75%)	0.10 (50%)	
Ravenna (2)	0.10	0.05 (50%)	0.05 (50%)	0.05 (50%)	0.05 (50%)	
High Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity						
Columbia City	0.67	0.52 (22%)	0.24 (64%)	0.25 (63%)	0.48 (28%)	X
Lake City	0.10	0.07 (30%)	0.07 (30%)	0.07 (30%)	0.07 (30%)	
Northgate	0.25	0.15 (40%)	0.06 (76%)	0.06 (76%)	0.12 (52%)	X
First Hill-Capitol Hill	0.03	0.03 (0%)	0.02 (33%)	0.03 (0%)	0.03 (0%)	X
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.19 (21%)	0.08 (67%)	0.09 (63%)	0.17 (29%)	X
North Rainier	1.53	1.09 (29%)	0.64 (58%)	0.65 (58%)	1.17 (23%)	X
23rd & Union-Jackson	0.65	0.50 (23%)	0.38 (42%)	0.33 (49%)	0.64 (1%)	
Low Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity						
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.10 (17%)	0.09 (25%)	0.09 (25%)	0.09 (25%)	X
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)	0.02 (33%)	0.02 (33%)	0.02 (33%)	X
Outside Villages	1.56	1.47 (6%)	1.43 (8%)	1.44 (8%)	1.36 (13%)	

Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2011.

~~as having open space gaps or~~ walkability gaps ~~in the 2011 Development Plan or the Draft 2017 Plan, respectively~~.

However, it is important to note that 95 percent of City parks and open space land is outside of urban village boundaries. Therefore, it is likely that parks and open space near urban villages that lack sufficient facilities would also experience greater demand as the urban village populations grow. This growth would exacerbate existing deficiencies.

IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION

Parks and open space impacts under Alternative 1 No Action would be the same as those evaluated for the Preferred Alternative in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Final EIS (City of Seattle, 2016). Although Alternative 1 would meet the 2011 distribution goal, it would not meet the ~~2017~~ citywide LOS unless 40 acres of park and open space land is acquired. According to the ~~Draft 2017~~ Parks and Open Space Plan, acquiring the land to mitigate for projected growth under Alternative 1 is feasible (SPR, 2017). Therefore, existing and future parks and open space resources can serve the growth anticipated under the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan, even though gaps in geographic availability or shortfalls from optimal location, size, or number of parks could remain over the long-term.

Exhibit 3.7–6 details the urban villages identified as having ~~open space and/or~~ walkability gaps and the potential reductions in park availability

Housing and job growth over the 20-year planning period would generate more demand for parks, recreation facilities, and open space across the city. Urban villages would see residential growth that would proportionately increase demand for parks and open space close to these areas. As certain urban villages have an existing shortage relative to the goal, growth would widen the existing gap between supply of and demand for parks and open space, resulting in less availability, particularly in the urban villages identified in Exhibit 3.7–6. Impacts could also occur on parks and open space in urban villages served by current and future light rail transit as these parks and open spaces would become more accessible to people residing elsewhere. Light rail stations in urban villages also make parks and open spaces outside the urban villages more available to urban village residents. ~~In addition, there would also~~

~~be an increased potential for impacts on parks and open space in urban villages served by current and future light rail transit as these parks and open spaces would become more accessible to people residing outside of the urban villages.~~

~~Significant open space~~ Walkability gaps in single-family areas in northwest Seattle~~, northeast Seattle, and West Seattle~~ would likely continue. As neighborhoods outside urban villages grow under Alternative 1, ~~impacts on parks and recreation could increase as~~ demand for parks and open space would likely increase~~s~~.

Exhibit 3.7–6 Changes in Park Availability in Underserved Urban Villages ~~with Open Space and/or Walkability Gaps~~, Alternative 1 No Action

~~URBAN VILLAGE~~ PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY (ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS) IN UNDERSERVED URBAN VILLAGES

New to the FEIS

The "Open Space Gap (2011)" and "Walkability Gap (2017)" columns were removed from DEIS Exhibit 3.7–7 (see amended FEIS Exhibit 3.7–6).

	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 1 No Action
High Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Rainier Beach	1.16	0.88 (24%)
Othello	0.23	0.17 (26%)
South Park	0.67	0.51 (24%)
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.13 (28%)
Low Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)
Ballard	0.07	0.05 (29%)
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)
~~Ravenna (2)~~	~~0.10~~	~~0.05 (50%)~~
High Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Columbia City	0.67	0.52 (22%)
Northgate	0.25	0.15 (40%)
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.19 (21%)
North Rainier	1.53	1.09 (29%)
Low Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.10 (17%)
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)

Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, ~~2011~~2017.

IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 2

Growth under Alternative 2 would have similar types of impacts to Alternative 1, but to a larger degree due to the potential for more growth.

Under Alternative 2, Othello would have an increase in parks and open space availability because urban village boundaries would expand to include existing parkland. Population and job growth in Alternative 2 would generate more demand for parks and open space than Alternative 1 in study area urban villages. This impact would be greatest in urban villages with the largest increases in growth under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1, such as North Beacon Hill, Columbia City, ~~Ballard,~~ Northgate, First Hill-Capitol Hill, ~~North Beacon Hill,~~ Rainier Beach, and North Rainier~~, and Aurora-Licton Springs~~ (Exhibit 3.7–7).

Exhibit 3.7–7 Changes in Park Availability in Underserved Urban Villages ~~with Open Space and/or Walkability Gaps~~, Alternative 2

~~URBAN VILLAGE~~ PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY (ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS) IN UNDERSERVED URBAN VILLAGES

	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 2
High Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Rainier Beach	1.16	0.55 (53%)
Othello	0.23	0.33 (+43%)
South Park	0.67	0.45 (33%)
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.12 (33%)
Low Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)
Ballard	0.07	0.04 (43%)
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)
~~Ravenna (2)~~	~~0.10~~	~~0.05 (50%)~~
High Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Columbia City	0.67	0.24 (64%)
Northgate	0.25	0.06 (76%)
First Hill-Capitol Hill	0.03	0.02 (33%)
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.08 (67%)
North Rainier	1.53	0.64 (58%)
Low Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.09 (25%)
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)

Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, ~~2011~~2017.

New to the FEIS

The "Open Space Gap (2011)" and "Walkability Gap (2017)" columns were removed from DEIS Exhibit 3.7–8 (see amended FEIS Exhibit 3.7–7).

IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 3

Impacts to parks and open space ~~in~~ under Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2. Compared to Alternative 2, urban villages across the study area would see similar level of parks and open space availability reduction; however, with the different distribution of growth, certain urban villages would experience higher percentages of growth than under Alternative 2. ~~However, o~~Overall, ~~there would be~~ similar reductions in park and open space availability would occur under Alternatives 2 and 3 in most of the underserved urban villages ~~with walkability or distribution gaps~~ (Exhibit 3.7–8). However, under Alternative 3 there would be less of a decrease in availability in First Hill–Capitol Hill, ~~and~~ North Beacon Hill, South Park, and Columbia City. In addition, under Alternative 3 the Othello Urban Village would experience a reduction in parks and open space availability due to its smaller boundary expansion.

New to the FEIS

The "Open Space Gap (2011)" and "Walkability Gap (2017)" columns were removed from DEIS Exhibit 3.7–8 (see amended FEIS Exhibit 3.7–8).

Exhibit 3.7–8 Changes in Park Availability in Underserved Urban Villages ~~with Open Space and/or Walkability Gaps~~, Alternative 3

~~URBAN VILLAGE~~ PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY (ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS) IN UNDERSERVED URBAN VILLAGES

	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 3
High Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Rainier Beach	1.16	0.57 (51%)
Othello	0.23	0.19 (17%)
South Park	0.67	0.47 (30%)
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.12 (33%)
Low Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)
Ballard	0.07	0.04 (43%)
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)
~~Ravenna (2)~~	~~0.10~~	~~0.05 (50%)~~
High Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Columbia City	0.67	0.25 (63%)
Northgate	0.25	0.06 (76%)
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.09 (63%)
North Rainier	1.53	0.65 (58%)
Low Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.09 (25%)
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)

Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, ~~2011~~2017.

IMPACTS OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Impacts to parks and open space under the Preferred Alternative would be similar to Alternatives 2 and 3. Urban villages across the study area would see similar levels of reduced parks and open space availability; however, with the different distribution of growth, certain urban villages would experience higher percentages of growth than under the other build alternatives. Overall, there would be similar reductions in park and open space availability in most of the underserved urban villages (Exhibit 3.7–9). However, the Preferred Alternative would not result in any of the urban villages having a greater decrease in park and open space availability than either of the other action alternatives. In addition, there would be less of a decrease in availability in Rainier Beach, Ballard, Columbia City, Northgate, North Beacon Hill, and North Rainier than under Alternatives 2 or 3. The Preferred Alternative would also result in

New to the FEIS

Impacts of the Preferred Alternative, including Exhibit 3.7–9, is a new section since issuance of the DEIS

Exhibit 3.7–9 Changes in Park Availability in Underserved Urban Villages, Preferred Alternative

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY (ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS) IN UNDERSERVED URBAN VILLAGES

	Baseline (2015)	Preferred Alternative
High Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Rainier Beach	1.16	0.97 (16%)
Othello	0.23	0.27 (+17%)
South Park	0.67	0.47 (30%)
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.12 (33%)
Low Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)
Ballard	0.07	0.06 (14%)
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)
High Displacement Risk & High Access to Opportunity		
Columbia City	0.67	0.48 (28%)
Northgate	0.25	0.12 (52%)
First Hill-Capitol Hill	0.03	0.03 (0%)
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.17 (29%)
North Rainier	1.53	1.09 (29%)
Low Displacement Risk & Low Access to Opportunity		
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.09 (25%)
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)

Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2017.

less of a decrease in availability in Rainier Beach and Ballard than under Alternative 1. Also, there would be an increase in parks and open space availability in Othello (due to expanded urban village boundaries), but it would be less than under Alternative 2.

The Preferred Alternative would result in a greater decrease in parks and open space availability outside of urban villages (Exhibit 3.7–5). However, this is likely due to there being a larger number of urban village expansion areas, resulting in more existing parks and open space being located within urban villages.

3.7.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Given greater overall demand for parks and open space in the study area, SPR should consider these MHA growth projections for the next open space ~~gap~~ analysis to address future potential impacts through the next (2023) Development Plan. According to the ~~2017~~ citywide LOS, approximately 40 acres of new parks and open space land would be required under Alternative 1 by 2035, and approximately 434 acres would be required under Alternatives 2 and 3. Provision of additional parks and open space land should occur in urban villages with substantial walkability gaps that would see a reduction in park and open space availability.

The mitigation strategies outlined in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan EIS would provide tools necessary to accomplish the City's parks and open space goals. One of these strategies is to incorporate incentives and other regulatory tools to encourage and enforce developers to set aside publicly accessible usable open space. Examples of specific vehicles to achieve mitigation in this way include impact fees for open space, or a transfer of development rights (TDR) for open space that could be implemented in certain zones or locations. The City could study and develop a recommendation for a Parks and Open Space impact fee on new development to support the acquisition of new park land. However, decision-makers would need to evaluate such an impact fee in conjunction with potential impacts fees for other services, including public schools.

Additional mitigation measures include providing more activities and programs in existing parks and open spaces, increasing the acreage of public spaces through partnerships with other public entities, and improving accessibility to existing parks and open space.

The City will support community-led efforts to increase benefits from existing parks by extending the hours of operation of certain recreational facilities and working with community groups to provide more activities and programming that serve a larger and more diverse group of park users. In addition, the City will create additional public open space through partnerships with Seattle Public Schools, Seattle Public Utilities, and the Seattle Department of Transportation. By upgrading schoolyards, building drainage facilities that also provide open space, and providing play streets and other public space in street rights-of-way, the City will be able to increase the amount of parks and open space. The City will also work to improve pedestrian, bike, and transit connections to nearby parks.

In future planning processes, SPR could modify the citywide level of service standard to consider the quality of facilities and availability of SPR programs and services, in addition to, or instead of, a standard based solely on parks acreage per population.

3.7.4 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

~~Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would have significant adverse impacts to parks and open space. However, these impacts can be avoided through mitigation as described above.~~ Future growth under all EIS alternatives would result in significant adverse impacts to the availability and accessibility of parks and open space. The impacts would be experienced in the form of increased crowding in parks, longer wait times to use facilities for some activities, or a need to travel longer distances to access available park facilities. The impacts of implementing MHA would affect community members differently depending on when and how they use park facilities. However, under all of the alternatives, the City as a whole would not meet the citywide LOS and the overall impact is considered to be significant. It is expected that the significant impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level if some combination of the mitigation measures described above are utilized.

« intentionally blank »