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The region’s population is becoming increasingly diverse: 1990
The region’s population is becoming increasingly diverse: 2000
The region’s population is becoming increasingly diverse: 2010
King County Median Household Income by Race/Ethnicity

- Black / AfrAmer: $37,000
- Native Amer.: $47,300
- HISP / LATINO: $67,250
- 2+ race
- Pacif Islander
- Asian
- Non-Hisp white
- ALL HOUSEHOLDS

Income in thousands of 2009 dollars
Numbers of persons below poverty: now primarily in the suburbs
**Health and Equity Systems Change through Comprehensive Planning**

**Outcomes:**
1. Broader engagement informed by data and analysis, focused on underserved community voices.
2. Effective policies that reflect community concerns and advance health and equity outcomes.
3. Comprehensive Plans as a tool of community empowerment and government accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Tools</th>
<th>Established Process</th>
<th>Measurement Empowerment Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; Analysis</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning and Policy Development</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Capacity Building</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation &amp; Measurement</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA

REVEALING THE COMMUNITY’S HEALTH AND EQUITY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES
Seattle’s Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI) seeks to:

- Incorporate a racial equity lens to all citywide initiatives

- **Priority Populations** are defined as areas with lower income & poverty, higher percentage communities of color, and lower English-proficiency

- Identifying these areas helps to evaluate policies, programs and investments through the Comprehensive Plan
Access to Bus Stops in 2000 and 2010

- Less Diverse, Higher Income & More English Proficiency
  - 2000: 90.5%
  - 2010: 91.7%
  - Rate of Change: -1.3%

- Moderate Diversity, Income & English Proficiency
  - 2000: 92.7%
  - 2010: 94.4%
  - Rate of Change: 1.8%

- More Diverse, Lower Income & Less English Proficiency
  - 2000: 95.2%
  - 2010: 96.1%
  - Rate of Change: -1.5%

- City-wide
  - 2000: 96.8%
  - 2010: 95.4%
  - Rate of Change: -1.0%

- More Diverse, Lower Income & Less English Proficiency
  - 2000: 93.6%
  - 2010: 94.3%
  - Rate of Change: -0.8%
Bus Frequency in 2000 and 2010

City-wide

Less Diverse, Higher Income & More English Proficiency

Moderate Diversity, Income & English Proficiency

More Diverse, Lower Income & Less English Proficiency

Rate of Change

75%

49%

158%

85%

175%

110%
Transit Access

What areas of Seattle have access to transit stops?

Legend
Community Characteristics
- Less Diverse, Higher Income, & Higher English Proficiency
- Moderate Diversity, Income, & English Proficiency
- More Diverse, Lower Income, & Lower English Proficiency

Access Area
Buffer Size:
1/4 mile buffer

How many transit trips are taken in different areas in Seattle?

Legend
Community Characteristics
- Less Diverse, Higher Income, & Higher English Proficiency
- Moderate Diversity, Income, & English Proficiency
- More Diverse, Lower Income, & Lower English Proficiency

Transit Trips
Dot = 50 Trips

This map depicts areas within 1/4 mile of a transit stop in 2010 related to diversity, income and English proficiency at the census tract level in Seattle.

This map depicts the distribution of transit trips in 2010 related to diversity, income and English proficiency at the census tract level in Seattle.
Access to Parks 2000 to 2010

Rate of Change
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Access to Parks 2000 to 2010

• Increased park access from 2000 to 2010 for all groups
• Large increase for Priority Populations
% of Adults with no physical activity

Seattle: 11%
Ballard: 12%
Beacon/Georgetown/S. Park: 33%
Capitol Hill/Eastlake: 12%
Central Seattle: 12%
Delridge: 14%
Downtown: 12%
Fremont/Greenlake: 6%
NE Seattle: 8%
North Seattle: 12%
NW Seattle: 8%
Queen Anne/Magnolia: 7%
SE Seattle: 16%
West Seattle: 12%
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

COMMUNITY INFORMING CONDITIONS AND UNDERSTANDING/ SHARING THE DESIRED OUTCOME
Community Engagement & Outreach
COMMUNITY CAPACITY

GROWING THE COMMUNITY’S CAPACITY TO ENGAGE AND PROVIDE SOLUTIONS
PLANNING AND POLICIES

PLANNING AND POLICY STRATEGIES TO REVERSE TRENDS AND CHANGE OUTCOMES
Health and Wellness Element

1. Access to Recreation and Open Space
2. Access to Healthy Foods
3. Access to Medical Services
4. Access to Public Transit and Active Transportation
5. Access to Quality Affordable Housing
6. Access to Economic Opportunity
7. Completeness of Neighborhoods
8. Safe Neighborhoods and Public Spaces
9. Environmental Quality
10. Green and Sustainable Development and Practices
Health and equity can be infused into the Comprehensive Plan through progressive policies tying health to land use, housing, transportation, parks, and economic development.
Growth Scenarios and Comprehensive Plan

How should Seattle address equitable access to housing, economic opportunity, parks and environment, health, and transportation to eliminate disparities?

• Where should growth and investment go?
• What policies are needed to guide this growth and investment into the right places at the right times?
GROWTH SCENARIOS

Planning Alternatives for Study in the Environmental Impact Statement

Alternative 1: Urban Center Focus
Most growth would be encouraged in our urban centers: Northgate, University District, Downtown, Uptown, South Lake Union, and Capitol/First Hill.
- More households and jobs would go in these locations than over the past 20 years.
- Most new households and jobs would be located in buildings 6 or more stories tall.
- Would help advance the regional growth strategy.

Alternative 2: Urban Village Focus
More growth would be encouraged in urban villages, such as Columbia City, Lake City, Crown Hill, Morgan Junction, Fremont, and Eastlake.
- Closest to how household growth has been over past 20 years, but more jobs would go to villages.
- Many new households and jobs would be in mixed-use buildings and apartments about 4-6 stories tall.
- Would help strengthen neighborhood business districts.

Alternative 3: Transit Focus
Growth would be encouraged around our existing and planned light rail stations in the Rainier Valley, Capitol Hill, the University District, Roosevelt, and Northgate.
- New urban villages would be located around the I-90 and NE 130th Street stations.
- Some village boundaries around light rail stations would expand.
- Taller buildings would accommodate households and jobs in urban centers while smaller buildings would be in other locations.
- Would take advantage of regional transit investments.
HEALTH AND EQUITY POLICIES

Land Use
- Single family zoning and access for all to amenity rich areas.
- Growth outside of urban villages.
- Growth distribution.
- Transit focus - directing more growth to places with high-frequency transit.

Transportation
- Safety’s relation to transportation.
- Prioritize Transit-dependent populations.

Housing
- Anti-displacement early warning tool.
- Home ownership shouldn’t be prioritized over renting to avoid stigma.
- Cultural resources should get the same level of importance as traditional amenities like parks and sidewalks.
- Address exclusive nature of certain districts which have access to amenity rich areas.
HEALTH AND EQUITY POLICIES

Economy
• Training and living wage jobs related to growth.
• Racial disparities in unemployment.
• Small business support – currently not given same level of importance

Capital Facilities
• Surplus Property for affordable housing needs or other priorities of low-income communities and communities of color needs to be prioritized over parks
• Broadband and Digital Equity
• Siting and design of public facilities so as not to burden low income communities or communities of color more

Environment
• Environmental justice should be addressed – especially climate resilience
• Forestry goals should address how related to the disparity of tree canopies in lower versus higher income communities or the health implications associated with disparity
Questions & Answers