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Thank you!

- Hilary Franz, Scarlett Ling, and Wren McNally, Futurewise
- Richard Gelb, King County
- Michelle Caulfield, Seattle
- Kristin Lynett, Tacoma
- Andrea Peet, STAR Communities Rating System

Note: This presentation uses data from these jurisdictions or organizations, but the views and opinions expressed here are my own and do not necessarily reflect their policies or positions.
The study’s intention

- Highlight relationships between built environment characteristics and equitable services and access
- Case studies: Use the STAR rating system to evaluate 3 station areas:
  - Shoreline 185th
  - Capitol Hill
  - Tukwila International Boulevard
Why these study areas?

- Receiving public investment, changing
- King County, Shoreline, Seattle, and Tukwila using STAR framework
- Each representative of a different type of community
STAR Communities

• First national framework and certification program for measuring community sustainability (released in 2012)

• Led by ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability, the U.S. Green Building Council, National League of Cities, and the Center for American Progress

• 200+ volunteers over 4-year process

• Still in pilot stage
**Goals, objectives, & measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Noise &amp; Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Water Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact &amp; Complete Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill &amp; Redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate &amp; Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening the Energy Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Sector Resource Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Efficient Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Efficient Public Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Minimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy &amp; Jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Retention &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Market Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Jobs &amp; Living Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Industry Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education, Arts &amp; Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunity &amp; Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Cultural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity &amp; Empowerment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health &amp; Health System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Prevention &amp; Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water in the Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each objective, the indicators are “outcome measures” and “action measures.”
### Focus Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built Environment</th>
<th>Climate &amp; Energy</th>
<th>Economy &amp; Jobs</th>
<th>Education, Arts &amp; Community</th>
<th>Equity &amp; Empowerment</th>
<th>Health &amp; Safety</th>
<th>Natural Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Noise &amp; Light</td>
<td>Climate Adaptation</td>
<td>Business Retention &amp; Development</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Active Living</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Water Systems</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Mitigation</td>
<td>Green Market Development</td>
<td>Community Cohesion</td>
<td>Civil &amp; Human Rights</td>
<td>Community Health &amp; Health System</td>
<td>Invasive Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact &amp; Complete Communities</td>
<td>Greening the Energy Supply</td>
<td>Local Economy</td>
<td>Educational Opportunity &amp; Attainment</td>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>Emergency Prevention &amp; Response</td>
<td>Natural Resource Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Affordability</td>
<td>Industrial Sector Resource Efficiency</td>
<td>Quality Jobs &amp; Living Wages</td>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Equitable Services &amp; Access</td>
<td>Food Access &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td>Outdoor Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Spaces</td>
<td>Resource Efficient Public Infrastructure</td>
<td>Workforce Readiness</td>
<td>Poverty Prevention &amp; Alleviation</td>
<td>Natural &amp; Human Hazards</td>
<td>Working Lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Choices</td>
<td>Waste Minimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safe Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose CCCs

• # determined by population (e.g., KC at 2 mil - 10 CCCs, Seattle at 635,000 - 8 CCCs)

• 1/2 mile walk areas around strong
  • mix of uses,
  • transit availability,
  • density, and
  • walkability,
  • while maintaining geographic diversity

• Built off of LEED ND
Compact & Complete Communities

Outcomes

1. Density, destinations, & transit
2. Walkability
3. Design
4. Affordable housing

10 local actions

• Policies and regulations
• Programs (e.g., design review, affordable housing)
Equitable Services & Access

Outcome: Access & proximity

• Determine local priority areas (based on income, race/ethnicity, and/or lack of resources)

• Demonstrate increased access to:
  • Transit
  • Libraries
  • Schools
  • Public spaces
  • Healthful food
  • Health and human services
  • Digital/high speed internet
  • Urban tree canopy
  • Emergency response times

8 local actions (e.g., equity plan, reduce disparities, construction)
Community Benefit Equity Assessment by Income - Forest Canopy

American Community Survey '05-'09 reported by census tracts

Annual Income per Capita (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Per Capita Income Range (US$)</th>
<th>Count Census Tracts</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Forest Canopy (%)</th>
<th>Average Forest Canopy (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Up to $24000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>272,164</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>14.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$24001 - $30000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>335,556</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>23.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$30001 - $35000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>293,515</td>
<td>54.78</td>
<td>28.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$35001 - $41000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>305,113</td>
<td>51.87</td>
<td>31.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$41001 - $49000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>329,266</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>31.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More than $49000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>323,174</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>31.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forest Canopy (%)

- Under 20% (no symbol)
- 20% - 40%
- Over 40%

Note: Forest Canopy (%) is the ratio of total upper leaf surface of vegetation to the surface area of the land on which the vegetation grows. Here, it is used as an approximation for the census tract greenness.

King County GIS Center

Data Sources:
- Forest Canopy Data: U.S. Geological Survey 2003, King County GIS Center
- Demographic Data: American Community Survey '05-'09 reported by Census 2000 Tracts

Note:
The American Community Survey is a small sample and margins of error may be high. These data should be used with caution as showing a generalized spatial distribution. The margin of error for income in the census tracts varies between $1,295 and $31,061.

Income and population distribution within census tracts was treated as being even.
The annual income per capita (in 2009 inflation-adjusted dollars) for whole King County is $37,797 US.

Produced by Andreas Braun
Map: equity_income_canopy.mxd

May 5, 2011

This information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.
Community Benefit Equity Assessment by Income - Change in Vegetation Density 2000 - 2009

American Community Survey '05-'09 reported by census tracts

Annual Income per Capita (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Per Capita Income Range (US$)</th>
<th>Count Census Tracts</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Average Change in NDVI Value '00-'09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Up to $24000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>272164</td>
<td>-0.0317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$24001 - $30000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>335556</td>
<td>-0.0252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$30001 - $35000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>283535</td>
<td>-0.0165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$35001 - $41000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>305113</td>
<td>-0.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$41001 - $49000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>329266</td>
<td>-0.0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More than $49000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>323174</td>
<td>-0.0060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NDVI Value Change 2000 - 2009
- The 50 tracts with highest decrease in NDVI value (<=-0.0388)
+ The 50 tracts with highest increase of NDVI value (>=+0.0018)

King County
GIS Center

Data Sources:
Demographic Data: American Community Survey '05-'09 reported by Census 2000 Tracts

Note:
The American Community Survey is a small sample and margins of error may be high. These data should be used with caution as showing a generalized spatial distribution. The margin of error for income in the census tracts varies between $1,295 and $31,651.
The annual income per capita (in 2009 inflation-adjusted dollars) for whole King County is $37,797 US$.
The Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) is a measure for vegetation cover and biomass production derived from multispectral satellite data. Values range between -1.0 and 1.0. Increasing positive NDVI values indicate increasing amounts of green vegetation. NDVI values near zero and decreasing negative values indicate non-vegetated features such as barren surfaces and water.

Produced by Andreas Braun
Map doc: equity_income_NDVIchange.mxd

June 16, 2011

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.
Community Benefit Equity Assessment by % Non-white - Change in Vegetation Density 2000 - 2009

King County Census 2010 Block Groups
Share of Non-white Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Non-White Percentage Range</th>
<th>Count Block Groups</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Non-white population (%)</th>
<th>Average Change in NDVI Value '00-'09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Up to 13%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>299,300</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.01% - 19.00%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>302,390</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>-0.0140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.01% - 25.00%</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>351,063</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>-0.0168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.01% - 37.00%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>336,876</td>
<td>32.31</td>
<td>-0.0196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.01% - 49.00%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>338,771</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>-0.0254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Over 49.00%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>300,949</td>
<td>62.74</td>
<td>-0.0305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NDVI Value Change 2000 - 2009
- The 150 blockgrps with highest decrease in NDVI value (<-0.0463)
+ The 150 blockgrps with highest increase of NDVI value (>0.0055)

King County GIS Center
Data Sources:
Demographic Data: American Census 2010

Note:
The Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) is a measure for vegetation cover and biomass production derived from multispectral satellite data. Values range between -1.0 and 1.0. Increasing positive NDVI values indicate increasing amounts of green vegetation. NDVI values near zero and decreasing negative values indicate non-vegetated features such as barren surfaces and water. 27.33% of King County's total population are non-white.
The case studies

How does a great built environment (as planners understand and promote it) relate to a community’s social equity characteristics?
Shoreline NE 185th St

Built environment
Lots of room for improvement (9/100 STAR CCC points)

Equitable services & access
King County performs well on all except tree cover and healthful food access

PSRC’s access to opportunity score
Mid-range
1. Density, Destinations, & Transit

Residential density: 3 du/acre
(min. 12 du/acre for credit)
Employment density: **0.3 jobs/acre** (min. 25 jobs/acre for credit)
Diverse uses: 7 (meets threshold)

Transit availability:
~100 weekday, 50 weekend trips (> threshold)
## 2. Walkability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of roadways contain sidewalks on both sides</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of crosswalks are ADA accessible</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of block faces have street trees at ≤40-foot intervals</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of roadways have travel speeds ≤25 mph</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. 90 intersections per sq. mi.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from futurewise
Qualitatively, comfortable pedestrian and bicycling environment on most streets.
3. Design

Building setbacks

RESIDENTIAL
- 25 ft or less
- greater than 25ft

49% of residential buildings meet standard (need 80%)

COMMERCIAL
- greater than 10ft
- n/a or vacant

0 commercial buildings meet standard (need 80%)

Other uses (e.g., school)

Half mile walkshed
Blank walls/parking structures: standard in progress
## 4. Affordable housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% of residential units are affordable</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% recently built/rehabilitated units are dedicated as subsidized</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the dedicated long-term units are deeply affordable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equitable Services & Access

Tree canopy example
Median Household Income, 2011

Median household income Block Groups, King County
- $4,722 - 49,000
- $49,001 - 66,000
- $66,001 - 83,000
- $83,001 - 105,300
- $105,301 - 250,001

City boundaries

Half mile walkshed

Seattle median: $61,037 (ACS 2011)
King County median: $67,806 (ACS 2009)

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
Median household income, 2011

Median household income Block Groups, King County

- **$4,722 - 49,000**
- **$49,001 - 66,000**
- **$66,001 - 83,000**
- **$83,001 - 105,300**
- **$105,301 - 250,001**

Seattle median: $61,037 (ACS 2011)
King County median: $67,806 (ACS 2009)

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
KING COUNTY 3 STATION AREAS

Race/Ethnicity, 2010

Percent non-white*
Census 2010 Blocks
- 45 - 100%
- 27 - 44%
- 18 - 26%
- 10 - 17%
- 0 - 9%
- No data

*“Non-white“ is the combination of all racial categories and hispanic ethnicity other than non-hispanic white.

Seattle non-white: 33.7%
King County non-white: 35.2%

Data source: Census 2010
Race/ethnicity, 2010

Percent non-white
Census 2010 Blocks

- 45 - 100%
- 27 - 44%
- 18 - 26%
- 10 - 17%
- 0 - 9%
- No data

Total non-white: 36%
Linguistically diverse: 24%

Seattle non-white: 33.7%
King County non-white: 35.2%

*"Non-white" is the combination of all racial categories and Hispanic ethnicity other than non-Hispanic white.

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
SHORELINE 185TH STATION AREA

Land value, 2012

Appraised land value per square foot

King County parcels

- $0 - 12 / sq. ft.
- $13 - 25 / sq. ft.
- $26 - 47 / sq. ft.
- $48 - 112 / sq. ft.
- $113 - 600 / sq. ft.

Half mile walkshed

- 82% units owner-occupied
- 53% households have affordable housing costs
- 2.76 ppl/hshld

Data source: King County
Built environment
Quintessential urban design (71/100 STAR CCC points)

Equitable services & access
King County performs well on all except tree cover and healthful food access

PSRC’s access to opportunity score
High
1. Density, Destinations, & Transit

Residential density: 31 du/acre (gets extra points for being over 25 du/ac)
Employment density: 30 jobs/acre
(gets extra points for being over 25 jobs/ac)
Diverse uses: >32 (gets all available points)

Transit availability:
~2500 weekday, 1250 weekend trips (gets all available points)
## 2. Walkability

### STANDARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of roadways contain sidewalks on both sides</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of crosswalks are ADA accessible</td>
<td>data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of block faces have street trees at ≤40-foot intervals</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of roadways have travel speeds ≤25 mph</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. 90 intersections per sq. mi. (bonus for over 140 i./sq. mi)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Design

SEATTLE CAPITOL HILL BROADWAY

High score

RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS
Setback from right-of-way
- 25 ft or less
- greater than 25 ft
- n/a

95% meet standard (need 80%)

COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS
Setback from right-of-way
- 10 ft or less
- greater than 10 ft
- n/a

88% meet standard (need 80%)

Other buildings
Blank walls/parking structures: standard in progress
## 4. Affordable housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% of residential units are affordable</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% recently built/rehabilitated units are dedicated as subsidized</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the dedicated long-term units are deeply affordable</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Median household income, 2011

Median household income Block Groups, King County

Seattle median: $61,037
(ACS 2011)

King County median: $67,806
(ACS 2009)

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
Race/Ethnicity, 2010

Percent non-white*
Census 2010 Blocks
- 45 - 100%
- 27 - 44%
- 18 - 26%
- 10 - 17%
- 0 - 9%
- No data

Total minority: 27%
Linguistically diverse: 18%

Seattle non-white: 33.7%
King County non-white: 35.2%

"Non-white" is the combination of all racial categories and hispanic ethnicity other than non-hispanic white.

Data source
Census 2010, Public Law 94-171
Summary File, King County GIS Center
Half mile walkshed

Data sources

Income: ACS 2011, B19013
Tree canopy: King County GIS Center, U.S. Geological Survey 2003
### SEATTLE CAPITOL HILL BROADWAY

#### Land value, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraised land value per square foot</th>
<th>King County parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - 12 / sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13 - 25 / sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26 - 47 / sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48 - 112 / sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$113 - 600 / sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **18%** units owner-occupied
- **58%** households have affordable housing costs
- **1.45** ppl/hshld

*Data source: King County*
Tukwila International Boulevard

Built environment
Room for improvement
(25/100 STAR CCC points)

Equitable services & access
King County performs well on all except tree cover and healthful food access

PSRC’s access to opportunity score
Low
1. Density, Destinations, & Transit

Residential density: 4 du/acre
(min. 12 du/acre for credit)
Employment density: 2 jobs/acre
(min. 25 jobs/acre for credit)
Diverse uses: 14 (gets extra points)
Transit availability: ~900 weekday, 600 weekend trips (gets max. pts)
## TUKWILA INTERNATIONAL BOULEVARD

### 2. Walkability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% of roadways contain <strong>sidewalks</strong> on both sides</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of <strong>crosswalks</strong> are ADA accessible</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of block faces have <strong>street trees</strong> at ≤40-foot intervals</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of roadways have <strong>travel speeds</strong> ≤25 mph</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. 90 <strong>intersections</strong> per sq. mi.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from futurewise
3. Design

**Residential**

- Setback from right-of-way:
  - 25 ft or less: 38% meet standard (need 80%)
  - greater than 25 ft: n/a
  - Other parcels

**Commercial**

- Setback from right-of-way:
  - 10 ft or less: 11% meet standard (need 80%)
  - greater than 10 ft: n/a
  - Other parcels
Blank walls/parking structures: *standard in progress*
Qualitative observations

- Auto-oriented environment, especially closest to station.
- Newer development, although meets design standards, is fast food (measured in healthful food standard).
Well-used painted pedestrian routes didn’t count as sidewalks.
• Not measured - appropriateness of pedestrian routes.
• Not measured - discomfort.
# 4. Affordable housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% of residential units are affordable</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% recently built/rehabilitated units are dedicated as subsidized</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the dedicated long-term units are deeply affordable</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equitable Services

Tree canopy example
Median household income
Block Groups, King County

- $4,722 - 49,000
- $49,001 - 66,000
- $66,001 - 83,000
- $83,001 - 105,300
- $105,301 - 250,001

Seattle median: $61,037
(ACS 2011)

King County median: $67,806
(ACS 2009)

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
Race/ethnicity, 2010

Total minority: 73%
Linguistically diverse: 44%

Seattle non-white: 33.7%
King County non-white: 35.2%

*"Non-white" is the combination of all racial categories and hispanic ethnicity other than non-hispanic white.

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
Tree canopy, 2000-2009

Tree canopy
Percentage of land that is vegetated
(no symbol) <20%
20 - 40%
>40%

One of the 150 block groups in King County with the greatest decrease in vegetation (NDVI value)

Median household income
Block Groups, King County
$4,722 - 49,000
$49,001 - 66,000
$66,001 - 83,000
$83,001 - 105,300
$105,301 - 250,001

King County median: $67,806 (Census 2010)

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
• 30% units owner-occupied
• 50% households have affordable housing costs
• 2.49 ppl/hshld

Data source: ACS 2011, B19013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>DIVERSITY</th>
<th>ACCESS</th>
<th>“CCC”</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Woodsy residential, traditional place to raise a family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hill</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>Quintessential urban design, has experienced gentrification over last 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Great access to commercial services &amp; transit for diverse community; affordable commercial space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takeaways

Capitol Hill: affordable and great CCC, but low diversity

- A great built environment does not preclude affordable housing.
- Families and diverse populations
- Continue affordable housing policies (in UDF and ST property developer agreements)
Shoreline: mid/high access to resources, mid/high level of diversity, poor CCC

• Station area siting makes CCC points difficult to achieve

• Resource-rich area good for affordable housing

• Long-term risk of displacement

Source: King, Pierce County Assessor Data, 2011; Dupre + Scott Spring 2011 Apartment Survey; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington State Department of Commerce, Washington State Housing Finance Commission, Pierce County, King County, City of Tacoma, City of Seattle

Growing Transit Communities Partnership
Existing Conditions Report V: Housing and Housing Affordability | May 2013
Tukwila: highest diversity, poor pedestrian environment, great commercial atmosphere

• Businesses and residents vulnerable to displacement (PSRC’s Community Typology report)

• “Poor” urban design is not hurting existing businesses, and perhaps fostering them

• Carefully improve pedestrian environment if desired by community

• Over half of households have moderate to severe housing cost burden. Increase affordable housing, esp. for families.
Built Environment and Social Equity
A STAR assessment of 3 King County station areas

Rachel Miller
rachelm@makersarch.com
2014 STAR leadership program

- STAR is currently seeking communities to participate
- Applications due Oct. 15
- Financial assistance is available
- See www.starcommunities.org for more info
Opportunity Defined

- "Opportunity" is a situation or condition that places individuals in a position to be more likely to succeed or excel.
- Opportunity structures are critical to opening pathways to success:
  - High-quality education
  - Healthy and safe environment
  - Stable housing
  - Sustainable employment
  - Political empowerment
  - Outlets for wealth-building
  - Positive social networks

Central Puget Sound Indicators of Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Economic Health</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Neighborhood Quality</th>
<th>Mobility/Transportation</th>
<th>Health &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Test Scores (4th Grade)</td>
<td>Access to Living Wage Job</td>
<td>Housing Vacancy Rates</td>
<td>Transportation Cost/Cost per commute</td>
<td>Distance to nearest park or open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Test Scores (4th Grade)</td>
<td>Job Growth Trends; % Change in Jobs from 2000–2010</td>
<td>Housing Stock Condition</td>
<td>Transit access; Proximity to Express Bus Stops</td>
<td>Land Use; Proximity to Toxic Waste Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Poverty</td>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Foreclosure Rate</td>
<td>Averages Transit Fare</td>
<td>Access to healthy food; percent of food desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher qualifications</td>
<td>High-Cost Loan Rate</td>
<td>Modifiability, % of commutes by walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Crime Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approaches to improving opportunity

1. Increase accessibility of low opportunity neighborhoods to higher opportunity neighborhoods.

   For example: Transit investments and funding should seek to connect high and low opportunity neighborhoods.

2. Direct affordable housing investments to higher opportunity areas.

   For example: Section 8 voucher holders receive a higher value voucher for use in high opportunity neighborhoods.

3. Direct investments in education, health, and safety to lower opportunity neighborhoods.

   For example: Focus regional public health effort on low opportunity neighborhoods.
Total population, disabled population, and foreign born population are distributed fairly evenly across the opportunity spectrum. Whites and Asians are more concentrated in high opportunity areas. African Americans, Latinos, and American/Alaskan Natives are more concentrated in low opportunity areas.

Half of people in poverty live in low opportunity areas. 75% of households receiving public assistance are in low opportunity areas.

Using opportunity maps in Puget Sound Region

Fair and Affordable Housing
- Results will be incorporated into a regional Fair Housing & Equity Assessment (FHEA)
- Housing authorities promote ‘move to opportunity’ for Section 8 voucher holders
- Prioritize housing resources in high opportunity areas

Regional Planning
- Transportation project prioritization
- Bicycle route prioritization
- Prioritize recommendations for transit communities (i.e. station area typology)

Kirwan Recommendations
Build Upon the Success of HUD Site-Based Affordable Housing
Use the Map to Help Advise Voucher Holders to Move Towards Opportunity

Lessons Learned from mapping opportunity
- Regional map works as a conversation starter about social equity
- Important to break down the ‘comprehensive index’ into meaningful information (online maps work great)
- Calling neighborhoods low and high opportunity areas creates controversy. Be ready to back it up with data.
Using opportunity maps in Puget Sound Region

King County Housing Authority

- Resolution 5382. May 9, 2012
  The Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority of the County of King hereby directs the staff to give strong consideration to Opportunity Neighborhood indicators, such as education, employment, access to food, parks and transportation, when acquiring new properties, placing project-based Section 8 subsidies and developing mobility counseling and other programs and to integrate these criteria into the decision making on these programs to the maximum extent possible.

- Currently 1/3 of KCHA’s housing investments are located in high or very high-opportunity neighborhoods, and over half are in low or low-quality neighborhoods
- Consideration of neighborhood quality when acquiring new properties and placing project-based vouchers

Change / Displacement Risk axis

Based on UC-Berkeley Center for Community Innovation framework for measuring susceptibility to gentrification

Nominal categories (low/ potential risk/ immediate risk) based on numerous indicators, including:

- Community Risk Factors
  - Demographics: race, income, education attainment, household type
  - Housing: tenure, cost burden
- Indicators of Change
  - Recent demographic change (median income, education attainment, non-family households)
  - Market strength
### Opportunity Distribution in South Corridor

- **Overall Opportunity:** Low
- **Opportunity Categories**
  - **Education:** Low
  - **Economic Health:** Moderate-High
  - **Housing & Neighborhood:** Low
  - **Mobility & Transportation:** High in Seattle and Tacoma
  - **Health & Environment:** High – Very High between Seattle and Tacoma

### Opportunity Distribution in East Corridor

- **Opportunity and Impact**
- Education, Economic Health, Housing & Neighborhood, Mobility & Transportation, and Health & Environment are mostly high opportunity in station areas.

### Opportunity Distribution in North Corridor

- **Overall Opportunity:** Mixed
- **Opportunity Categories**
  - **Education:** Low near Everett
  - **Economic Health:** Low-Moderate
  - **Housing & Neighborhood:** High – King County, Low – Snohomish
  - **Mobility & Transportation:** High
  - **Health & Environment:** Moderate - High

---

**PEOPLE PROFILE: Example Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE/ ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITY</th>
<th>CHANGE/DISPLACEMENT RISK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Opportunity Distribution** in South Corridor
- **Opportunity Distribution** in East Corridor
- **Opportunity Distribution** in North Corridor
Making Places of Opportunity

Tools for Including Equity in Planning and Investment Decisions

Introductions

- Matt Martin
  - Research Associate
- Tim Parham
  - Real Estate Development Associate
- Rachel Miller
  - Associate Planner/Urban Designer

Session outline

- Equity, Opportunity, and Place
- Overview of Opportunity Mapping
- SCI and Growing Transit Communities
- Measuring Equity with the STAR Rating System
- Case Study: Development Without Displacement

What do we mean by “equity”? 

- Inter-generational environmental stewardship
- Basic human rights and opportunities for people living today
- Investing in human capital for regional equity, competitiveness, and sustainability

The components of place

Place Matters: space, race, and opportunity

- Opportunity is a situation or condition that places individuals in a position to be more likely to succeed or excel
- Opportunity structures are vital to combating the impact of poverty, creating strong neighborhoods and an environment in which children can become successful adults.
Place and equity

Using mapping to understand place and opportunity

- The Kirwan Institute pioneered “Opportunity Mapping” 10 years ago
- Multi-dimensional index at the neighborhood level
- Relative measure of opportunity across cities, regions, and states
- Vividly illustrates community inequities
- Valuable tool for informing place-based initiatives as well as mobility programs

How opportunity mapping is being used in regional equity planning

- Mississippi Gulf Coast
- Houston
- Austin

SCI and Growing Transit Communities

- The Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI)
- HUDs new approach to affirmatively furthering fair housing: FHEA and RAI
- The process of developing a Puget Sound opportunity index
- Ways opportunity mapping is being used to build equity into the region
- Lessons learned and future opportunity initiatives

Implementation of regional plans

Regional initiative housed at PSRC
- $5 million grant from Partnership for Sustainable Communities

Diverse coalition to promote thriving and equitable transit communities
Opportunity Defined

• “Opportunity” is a situation or condition that places individuals in a position to be more likely to succeed or excel.

• Opportunity structures are critical to opening pathways to success:
  - High-quality education
  - Healthy and safe environment
  - Stable housing
  - Sustainable employment
  - Political empowerment
  - Outlets for wealth-building
  - Positive social networks

Central Puget Sound Indicators of Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Economic-Health</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Neighborhood Quality</th>
<th>Mobility/Transportation</th>
<th>Health &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Test Scores (4th Grade)</td>
<td>Access to Living Wage Jobs</td>
<td>Housing Vacancy Rates</td>
<td>Transportation Cost, Cost per commute</td>
<td>Distance to nearest park or open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Test Scores (5th Grade)</td>
<td>Job Growth Trends, % Change in Jobs from 2000-2010</td>
<td>Housing Stock Conditions</td>
<td>Transit access, Proximity to Express Buses</td>
<td>Toxic waste, Proximity to Toxic Waste Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Poverty</td>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Foreclosure Rate</td>
<td>Average Transit Fare Cost</td>
<td>Access to healthy food, percent of tract in food desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher qualifications</td>
<td>Access to Living Wage Jobs</td>
<td>High Cost Loan Rate</td>
<td>Mortality, % of commutes by walking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Eco index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Increase accessibility of low opportunity neighborhoods to higher opportunity neighborhoods.
   For example, Transit investments and funding should seek to connect high and low opportunity neighborhoods.

2. Direct affordable housing investments to higher opportunity areas.
   For example, Section 8 voucher holders receive a higher value voucher for use in high opportunity neighborhoods.

3. Direct investments in education, health, and safety to lower opportunity neighborhoods.
   For example, Focus regional public health effort on low opportunity neighborhoods.

Opportunity Distribution by Demographic Group

- Total population
- Disabled population
- Foreign born population
- Whites and Asians are more concentrated in high opportunity areas.
- African Americans, Latinos, and American/Alaskan Natives are more concentrated in low opportunity areas.

Opportunity Distribution by Poverty

- Half of people in poverty live in low opportunity areas.
- 75% of households receiving public assistance are in low opportunity areas.
Opportunity Distribution and Housing Affordability

Total housing units, cost-burdened households, and HUD units are all distributed fairly evenly across the opportunity spectrum.

Over half of Section 8 vouchers were used in very low and low opportunity areas.

Kirwan

Background analysis of HUD Site-Based Affordable Housing

Use the Map to Help Advise Voucher Holders to Move towards Opportunity

Fair and Affordable Housing

- Results will be incorporated into a regional Fair Housing & Equity Assessment (FHEA)
- Housing authorities promote ‘move to opportunity’ for Section 8 voucher holders
- Prioritize housing resources in high opportunity areas

Regional Planning

- Transportation project prioritization
- Bicycle route prioritization
- Prioritize recommendations for transit communities (i.e. station area typology)

Lessons Learned from mapping opportunity

- Regional map works as a conversation starter about social equity
- Important to break down the ‘comprehensive index’ into meaningful information (online maps work great)
- Calling neighborhoods low and high opportunity areas creates controversy. Be ready to back it up with data.

For More Information

Maps online at:
psrc.org ➔ Growing Transit Communities ➔ Social Equity

More information about Central Puget Sound maps:
Michael Hubner, 206-971-3278 or MHubner@psrc.org

More information about Typology/Displacement Index:
Sara Schott Nikolic, 206-971-3288 or snikolic@psrc.org

EXTRA SLIDES
King County Housing Authority

- Resolution 5382. May 9, 2012
  The Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority of the County of King hereby directs the staff to give strong consideration to Opportunity Neighborhood indicators, such as education, employment, access to food, parks and transportation, when acquiring new properties, placing project-based Section 8 subsidies and developing mobility counseling and other programs and to integrate these criteria into the decision making on these programs to the maximum extent possible.

- Currently 1/3 of KCHA’s housing investments are located in high or very high-opportunity neighborhoods, and over half are in low or low-quality neighborhoods
- Consideration of neighborhood quality when acquiring new properties and placing project-based vouchers

Based on UC-Berkeley Center for Community Innovation framework for measuring susceptibility to gentrification

Nominal categories (low/ potential risk/ immediate risk) based on numerous indicators, including:

- Community Risk Factors
  - Demographics: race, income, education attainment, household type
  - Housing: tenure, cost burden
- Indications of Change
  - Recent demographic change (median income, education attainment, non-family households)
  - Market strength

Opportunity Distribution in South

Overall Opportunity: Low
- Education: Low
- Economy: Moderate
- Health: High
- Environment: Low
- Mobility & Transportation: High in Seattle and Tacoma
- Low south of Rainier Beach

Opportunity by and Lightrail Service (South Corridor)
Opportunity Distribution in East

Education, Economic Health, Housing & Neighborhood, Mobility & Transportation, and Health & Environment are notably high opportunity in station areas.

Opportunity Distribution in North Corridor

Overall Opportunity: Mixed

Opportunity Categories:
- Economic Health: Low-Moderate
- Housing & Neighborhood: Low - King, Low - Snohomish
- Mobility & Transportation: High
- Health & Environment: Moderate - High

Using STAR to measure equity

- What can data tell us about equity and the built environment?
- The STAR rating system
- Equitable land use and access
- Case Studies:
  - Capitol Hill
  - Shoreline
  - Tukwila

Case Study: Weinland Park

- Engage the community from the beginning: WPCCA
- Build a strong network of partners: The Collaborative
- Lock down affordable housing from the beginning: Broad Street Portfolio
- Be strategic about creating affordable housing at all intervals: LIHTC, Habitat, NSP, CLT, etc

Case Study: Weinland Park

- Work on multiple fronts simultaneously:
  - Housing
  - Food and Health
  - Youth Engagement
  - Education
- Prepare the community in advance for the opportunities that will develop:
  - shovel-ready sites/areas and the need for job-ready workers
  - Lower income housing and the need for credit-qualified renters
  - The new future of neighborhood employment and workforce
- Be able to adjust to the changing impacts of equity
- Don’t let failures derail the vision of equity and inclusion

Conclusion

- Successful and sustained equity planning requires focused, intentional commitment
- Planning for development without displacement is a challenging and ongoing endeavor