

CITY OF SEATTLE

RESOLUTION 32135

A RESOLUTION adopting the Seattle Parks and Recreation 2024 Parks Development Plan; authorizing the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation to submit the plan to the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office; and superseding the 2017 Parks Development Plan.

WHEREAS, the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation (SPR) was authorized by Ordinance 114009 in 1988 to initiate the development of a Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan that would address the future direction of The City of Seattle’s (City) open space, parks, and recreation services for the next ten to 20 years; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution 28382 (1991), the Seattle City Council (Council) adopted a review process and schedule to complete Seattle Park and Recreation’s Comprehensive Plan (COMPLAN); and

WHEREAS, by Resolution 28763 (1993), Council adopted the COMPLAN and directed SPR to implement or make substantial progress in meeting stated objectives by the year 2000; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution 30181 (2000), Council adopted Seattle Parks and Recreation’s Plan 2000 (Plan 2000), an update to the COMPLAN, to provide for a new six-year action plan; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution 30868 (2006), Council adopted Seattle Parks and Recreation’s 2006 Development Plan to update the six-year action plan; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution 31336 (2011), Council adopted Seattle Parks and Recreation’s 2011 Development Plan to update the six-year action plan; and

1 WHEREAS, by Resolution 31763 (2017), Council adopted Seattle Parks and Recreation’s 2017
2 Parks and Open Space Plan to update the six-year action plan; and

3 WHEREAS, much of the work outlined in the original COMPLAN, Plan 2000, 2006
4 Development Plan, 2011 Development Plan, and 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan has
5 been accomplished; and

6 WHEREAS, SPR has developed an updated plan that incorporates a new six-year action plan in
7 the form of the Seattle Parks and Recreation 2024 Parks Development Plan, also known
8 as the 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan (“2024 Plan”), that reflects the accomplishments
9 and changing priorities of the City; and

10 WHEREAS, in accordance with RCW 35.61.040, formation of the Seattle Park District became
11 effective and its boundaries established as of August 19, 2014, upon certification of
12 results of the August 5, 2014, election; and

13 WHEREAS, the City entered into an interlocal agreement with the Seattle Park District through
14 Ordinance 124468, which specified a six-year planning cycle for park district funds; and

15 WHEREAS, the City adopted a 2023 budget through Ordinance 126725, including a Capital
16 Improvement Program (CIP); and

17 WHEREAS, the City’s 2023-2028 CIP, in conjunction with the Capital Facilities, Utilities, and
18 Transportation Elements of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, is in accordance with the
19 State Growth Management Act; and

20 WHEREAS, the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) requires that the
21 new plan be developed for parks and recreation, trails, and open space in order for the
22 City to remain eligible for grants-in-aid, and requires that such a plan be submitted to the
23 State of Washington by May 1, 2024; and

1 WHEREAS, the proposed 2024 Plan has been prepared to meet the requirements of the RCO
2 with an updated inventory of parks and recreation resources, a reaffirmation of goals and
3 policies for park development, and the incorporation by reference of the 2024-2029 CIP,
4 previously adopted by Ordinance 126955, and to conduct a thorough public outreach
5 effort; and

6 WHEREAS, as part of the Council review of the CIP, a public process was incorporated into the
7 review process which led to the Council adopting the 2024-2029 CIP and the 2024
8 Adopted Budget; NOW, THEREFORE,

9 **BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THE**
10 **MAYOR CONCURRING, THAT:**

11 Section 1. The Seattle Parks and Recreation 2024 Parks Development Plan, also known
12 as the 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan (“2024 Plan”), Attachment 1 to this resolution, is
13 adopted. Seattle Parks and Recreation is authorized to submit the adopted 2024 Plan to the
14 Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office and is requested to do so no later than
15 May 1, 2024. The 2024 Plan supersedes Seattle Parks and Recreation’s 2017 Parks and Open
16 Space Plan.

1 Adopted by the City Council the 30th day of April, 2024,

2 and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 30th day of

3 April, 2024.

4 

5 President _____ of the City Council

6 The Mayor concurred the 8th day of May, 2024.

7 

8 Bruce A. Harrell, Mayor

9 Filed by me this 8th day of May, 2024.

10 

11 Scheereen Dedman, City Clerk

12 (Seal)

13

14

15

16 Attachments:

17 Attachment 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan

2024 Parks and Open Space Plan

*Adopted:
Resolution:*



Seattle
Parks & Recreation

Acknowledgements

Seattle Parks and Recreation

Kevin Bergsrud, Project Lead

Annie Hindenlang, Planning Manager

Oliver Bazinet, Strategic Advisor

Abhishek Zeley, Management System Analyst

Rodney Young, GIS

Patrick Morgan, GIS

Eric Asp, GIS and City IT

COVER: YESLER TERRACE PARK: COMPLETED 2018

Table of Contents

List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	v
Section 1: Background	1
Section 2: Goals and Policies	5
Section 3: Location and Demographics	13
Section 4: Inventory and System Overview	21
Section 5: Recreation Trends	37
Section 6: Needs Analysis	59
Section 7: Gap Analysis, Walkability Guidelines, and Mapping.....	65
Section 8: Public Engagement.....	73
Section 9: Key Capital Funding Sources and Funded Projects	77
Section 10: Planning for the Future	87
Appendices	
A – Citywide Story Mapping	
B – Park Classification Policy	
C – Public Engagement Notes	
D – Capital Improvement Plan	

List of Figures

- 1 Seattle & Washington State Location
- 2 Seattle & King County Location
- 3 Seattle Population by Decade, 1890-2050
- 4 Seattle Population by Age Group, 2020 & 2050
- 5 Seattle Population Percentage by Age Group, 2020 & 2050
- 6 Seattle Population by Percentage Race, 2020
- 7 Seattle Population & City, Park Area 1880-2020
- 8 Boating Hand Launch Sites
- 9 Boating Ramps & Fishing Pier Sites
- 10 Swimming Pools, Beaches & Spray Features
- 11 Community, Teen Life & Environmental Education Centers
- 12 Dog Off-Leash Areas
- 13 Golf Courses, Tennis Centers & Lawn Bowling Courts
- 14 Outdoor Sports Courts
- 15 Play Areas
- 16 Skateparks, Skatedots & Skatespots
- 17 Sports Fields
- 18 Participation Increase Ages 6+, Five Year Average 2017-2021
- 19 Participation Decrease Ages 6+, Five Year Average 2017-2021
- 20 Participants (Thousands) Ages 6+, Five-Year Average 2017-2021
- 21 Seattle-King County Recreation Participation Rates, 2020
- 22 Seattle-King County Participation Rates 2020– Field, Court, Golf, Bicycle & Wheeled Sports
- 23 Seattle-King County Participation Rates 2020 – General Park Activities, Aquatic Sports
- 24 Seattle King-County Recreation Activity Growth 2020-2050, Wheeled, Court Field Sports
- 25 Seattle-King County Recreation Activity Growth 2020-2050, General Park Activities, Aquatic Sports
- 26 Seattle King-County Recreation Activity Growth Percentage 2020-2050, Wheeled, Court and Field Sports
- 27 Seattle King-County Recreation Activity Growth Percentage 2020-2050 Aquatic Sports, General Park Activities
- 28 Park and Facility Usage - Overall
- 29 Park Facility Improvement Priorities
- 30 Park Facility Maintenance Priorities
- 31 Park Facility Grades
- 32 US Recreation Participation Rates, 2016-2021
- 33 US Recreation Participation by Age & Generation, 2016-2021
- 34 US Recreation Inactivity Rates by Age Group, 2016-2021
- 35 US Recreation Inactivity Rates by Income Group, 2016-2021
- 36 SPR Capital Funding Programs, 2023
- 37 City & Park Land Area 1880-2020
- 38 Capital Funding Programs, 2023
- 39 Capital Funding Sources, 2023
- 40 Operating Fund Programs, 2023
- 41 Operating Fund Sources, 2023
- 42 Relationship Between Useful Life, Lifecycle Management, Park Impact Fee

List of Tables

- 1 Selected Capital Assessment Studies by Year
- 2 SPR Facility Type Inventory
- 3 Park Acres by Classification
- 4 Peer Cities Sorted by Population
- 5 Peer Cities Sorted by Total Park Acres
- 6 Peer Cities Sorted by Percent People within 10-Minute Walk to a Park
- 7 City Comparisons – Seattle Metro Area
- 8 SPR Projects and Potential Grants 2023-2026
- 9 Park Impact Fees – Selected Metro Cities



GREEN LAKE SMALL CRAFT CENTER, CONSTRUCTION 2023
SOURCE: COUNCILMEMBER STRAUSS NEWSLETTER

Section 1: Background

Seattle Parks and Recreation equips employees and the public for well-being with facilities and programming that supports healthy people, a thriving environment and vibrant community. SPR provides safe and accessible spaces for residents and visitors to work, recreate, rejuvenate, and enhance quality of life and wellness for children, teenagers, adults and seniors.

SPR Mission Statement

Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) manages a 6,478-acre park system of over 485 parks, shorelines, marine reserves, and extensive natural areas. SPR provides athletic fields, tennis courts, play areas, specialty gardens, and more than 25 miles of park boulevards, 120 miles of trails, and more than 24 miles of shoreline. SPR also manages many facilities, including 27 community centers, 8 indoor swimming pools, 2 outdoor (summer) swimming pools, 4 environmental education centers, 2 small craft centers, 4 golf courses, and 11 skateparks. The Seattle Aquarium and Woodland Park Zoo are also owned by SPR. The total acreage in this system comprises about 12% of the city's land area.

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The *2024 Parks and Open Space Plan (POSP)* presents a 6-year planning horizon that documents and describes SPR's facilities and lands; reviews changes in the city's demographics, recreation participation and trends; and defines near-term spending priorities. The *POSP* is required by the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) to maintain the City of Seattle's eligibility for state grants and funding programs. Such grants and programs help fund outdoor recreation development and open space acquisition projects. This plan also guides SPR in addressing the future recreation needs of the city and making progress towards achieving our mission. This *POSP* works together with and is informed by other planning documents, including: *2022-2024 Action Plan*, *2021 Statistically Valid Survey*, *Seattle 2035 – the City of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan*, *2014 Parks Legacy Plan*, the *2016 Seattle Recreation Demand Study*, and the *2015 Community Center Strategic Plan*.

PARK AND OPEN SPACE PLANNING HISTORY

The first 6-year *POSP* and service gap analysis were developed in 2000 and 2001 respectively as two separate documents, in response to the state's Growth Management Act (GMA) and the City's first GMA-guided *Comprehensive Plan*. These documents (*POSP* and gap analysis) were updated in 2006, 2011, and 2017. This plan combines and updates the 6-year plan and gap analysis. The *2017 POSP* was influenced by: creation of dedicated funding; adoption of a Parks and Open Space element in the City's *Comprehensive Plan (Seattle 2035)*; use of mapping technology to identify service gaps relative to land acquisition and facility improvements; and implementation of an Asset Management and Work Order (AMWO) system.

In 2014, voters in Seattle approved the creation of the Seattle Park District (SPD). Property taxes collected by the SPD provides funding for city parks and recreation including: maintaining parks; open space, and facilities; operating community centers and recreation programs; and developing new neighborhood parks on previously acquired sites.

The annual budget established from the first park district funding cycle was \$48 million for a 5-year spending plan, which ran from 2015-2020. Due to the 2020 COVID pandemic, planning for and adoption of the next 5-year cycle (Cycle 2) was delayed until the spring of 2022. The *2023-2028 Park District Financial Plan (PDFP)* identified allocations prior to this 2024 update of this *Parks and Open Space Plan*. If this schedule is maintained, there will be a revolving four-year gap between two comprehensive plans that should be developed concurrently: the *2024 POSP* and the *Park District Financial Plan (PDFP)*. This *2024 POSP* is intended as a minor update of the *2017 POSP* to comply with regulatory and funding requirements for two reasons:

1. A major revision of the *2024 POSP* will begin in 2025 that will include the *2023-2028 Cycle 3 PDFP* to align comprehensive planning and asset management for all future park district cycles; and
2. Adoption of the *One Seattle* comprehensive plan update has been delayed until late 2024, after the adoption of the *2024 POSP*. Therefore the *2026 POSP* update can account for any inconsistencies between the City's and SPR's comprehensive planning.

The GMA establishes planning requirements for cities in the state of Washington. The city updates its comprehensive plan on a 6-to-8-year cycle, with the possibility for amendments on an annual basis. *Seattle 2035*, was adopted in 2016 and contained a Parks and Open Space element, which contained goals and polices to guide SPR policies and actions. As with the *2017 POSP* the *2024 POSP* is a separate, but complementary document that is consistent with and elaborates on the *Seattle 2035 plan*. The *2026 POSP* will incorporate any additions or updates from the *One Seattle* Comprehensive Plan scheduled to be adopted in December 2024 and ensure future updates occur after the City's comprehensive planning updates.

SPR routinely develops a variety of strategic plans and feasibility studies for both programmatic and citywide planning efforts (e.g., *Grass Athletic Fields Assessment*, *Restroom Structures Condition Assessment*, *Parks Legacy Plan*, *Community Center Strategic Plan*) and site-specific project plans (e.g., Bitter Lake Playfield Play Area Renovation, Be'er Sheva Park Improvements). These plans inform both the *2024 POSP* and the *Park District Financial Plan (PDFP)*.

Since the initiation of the park district, SPR implemented an Asset Management and Work Order system. This system is designed to protect Seattle's investment in the preservation of parks and facilities by using a common inventory and record source for facilities, assets, and grounds maintenance activities as well as capital planning. Having a single system in which to record data on work order activity, asset condition, and project requests has greatly improved SPR's ability to:

- identify, track, and employ life cycles for assets
- prioritize the need for major maintenance projects
- ensure an equitable distribution of services and investment

DESIRED OUTCOMES

The *2024 POSP* provides usable tools for future planning, such as examining parks and recreation resources through the lens of accessibility and equity. It also ties together data from public engagement and input, demographic and population projections, community needs, and recreation trends, to key capital projects and goals that are planned to be funded (**Section 10**)

As with the *2017 POSP*, “story mapping” is a tool used in the *2024* plan that uses GIS mapping technology to illustrate and identify gaps in SPR’s and the City’s open space and recreational facilities. This story mapping is meant to be viewed online and informs SPR’s property acquisition priorities for achieving an interconnected, accessible park system.

The mapping approach, described in **Section 7**, is intended to portray a realistic and accurate picture of how people access parks, park facilities, and open space. SPR uses race, equity, health, poverty, income, and population density mapping to help identify priority areas for acquiring property. The result of such an analysis portrays a more accurate picture of access by measuring how people walk to a park or facility. This plan defines such access as “walkability.”

We believe that this approach will allow SPR to achieve the following desired outcomes:

1. Approach open space and recreation facility distribution that is based upon access, opportunity, and equity.
2. Publish a user-friendly data interface, with real time data, that the public can access via story mapping and other modern technology tools.
3. Identify opportunities to add capacity to existing facilities to meet anticipated recreation demands (e.g., public private partnerships for open space, incentive zoning, grant opportunities, programmatic partnership). This includes consideration for public open space features such as P-patch gardens or urban food system sites, publicly accessible street-ends, and other City-owned property.
4. Develop strategies on how to acquire more parkland to add to the system over time.
5. Increase the capacity of existing facilities to allow expanded use where feasible (e.g., converting grass fields to synthetic turf fields or adding pickleball courts lines to tennis courts for shared play).



DR. BLANCHE LAVIZZO PARK: PLAY AREA RENOVATION 2023, GRAND OPENING

Section 2: Goals and Policies

Numerous existing plans, careful data analysis, and additional public feedback in 2023 have informed the goals for this 2024 POSP update. The 2017 *Parks and Open Space Plan*, 2011 *Development Plan* and the 2014 *Parks Legacy Plan* developed goal statements to embody the values of access, opportunity, and sustainability. Seattle’s *Climate Action Plan* provides a framework for meeting Seattle’s climate protection goals, and urban forest restoration goals are outlined in the *Green Seattle Partnership Strategic Plan*.

The goals and policies listed in this section were selected in part from the Parks and Open Space element of the *Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan* and the *2011 Development Plan to achieve the identified Desired Outcomes*. These goals will be implemented using the below Strategies and Actions Steps.

GOAL 1: PROVIDE A VARIETY OF OUTDOOR AND INDOOR SPACES THROUGHOUT THE CITY FOR ALL PEOPLE TO PLAY, LEARN, CONTEMPLATE, AND BUILD COMMUNITY.

Why this is Important:

Safety, affordability, interconnectedness, and vibrancy, along with access to parks and open space, are all ingredients that help make a city livable. As Seattle rapidly evolves and grows, SPR is playing an important role in contributing to a livable city for our diverse community.

Seattle’s population and tourism visitation is increasing; therefore, it is imperative that SPR look at innovative ways to increase recreational capacity. For example, having sports fields that can accommodate a variety of activities, partnering with other agencies to provide water access and habitat continuity, or identifying improvements that link our facilities to other infrastructure in the community are ways of increasing capacity and identify the need for developing support strategies that will help achieve this goal.

Strategies:

- Continue to increase the City’s park land, facilities, and open space opportunities with an emphasis on serving urban centers and urban villages, areas of Seattle that are home to historically marginalized populations, and areas that have been traditionally underserved.
- Protect, enhance, and expand urban trails, “green streets,” and boulevards in public rights-of-way as recreation and transportation options, and connect SPR assets to each other, to urban centers and villages; and to the regional open space system.
- Protect, enhance, and expand areas that provide important ecological services and allow people access to these spaces where feasible.
- Use cooperative agreements with Seattle Public Schools and other public agencies to link non-SPR owned open spaces to the network of SPR facilities and assets.

- Create healthy places that can be enjoyed by people of all ages and encourage intergenerational play and community building.

Action Steps

- Work with Public Health - Seattle and King County to create a checklist to ensure that places are healthy.
- Continue to collaborate with Seattle Public Schools (SPS) on preschool development at community centers.
- Continue to collaborate with SPS on the Joint Use Agreement for facility and play field use.
- Develop a citywide path, trails and connections master plan that coordinates with the City’s pedestrian, bicycle, and multimodal master plans.
- Work with SDOT on transfer of jurisdiction of undeveloped rights-of-way (ROW) with or adjacent to developed parks and open space areas.
- Partner with City and regional agencies to ensure adequate transit service is available to parks and open space.
- Provide athletic fields that can serve as places where people of diverse ages, backgrounds, and interests can engage in a variety of sports.

Highlights of Planned Capital Projects

Funding Program	Project Examples
Land Acquisition – Seattle Park District	Implementation of a property acquisition priority for Urban Villages and Natural Area/Greenbelts.
Athletic Field Improvement Projects – CIP -- Ballfield Lighting Replacement Program, Synthetic Turf Resurfacing, General Renovations	Delridge Playfield, Garfield Playfield, Georgetown Playfield, Genesee Playfield(s), Hiawatha Playfield, Jefferson Park, Lower Woodland Park Playfield(s), Magnuson Park Playfield(s) (new), Miller Playfield, Montlake Playfield, Soundview Playfield(s), Washington Park Playfield.
Community Center Rehabilitation and Development Program	Jefferson Community Center, Queen Anne Community Center.
Development of 14 New Neighborhood Parks at Land-Banked Sites	Land-banked sites for development include North Rainier, West Seattle Junction, Wedgwood, Denny Triangle, South Park Plaza, and Morgan Junction.
Trails Renovation Program – Seattle Park District	Burke-Gilman, Louisa Boren, SE Queen Anne Greenbelt/Trolley Hill, Viewlands Elementary and North Bluff Trail (Carkeek), Interlaken Park, Lincoln Park, Frink Park, Greg Davis Park, Wolf Tree Trail Boardwalks (Discovery Park), Madrona Woods, Trails Wayfaring Signs (various parks).

GOAL 2: CONTINUE TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL PEOPLE ACROSS SEATTLE TO PARTICIPATE IN A VARIETY OF RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

Why this is Important

As Seattle’s population interests change and evolve, SPR is working to ensure that department programs and facilities meet the needs and trends of all the people who live in and visit Seattle. Additionally, people need to interact with nature for their physical and psychological well-being. Interaction with nature has been shown to reduce stress, depression, aggression, and crime, while improving immune function, eyesight, mental health, and social connectedness within a community.

Strategies:

- Maintain a long-term strategic plan for the preservation and growth of various active and passive recreation activities based on citywide and neighborhood demographics.
- Include more amenities for passive strolling, viewing, and picnicking activities.
- Plan to accommodate a variety of active and passive recreational uses that meet needs and trends, as appropriate.
- Offer fun and safe water experiences through a diverse range of healthy and accessible aquatic programs at outdoor and indoor venues throughout the city.
- Make investments in park facilities and programs that reduce health disparities and provide access to open space and recreational activities for all residents of Seattle, especially historically marginalized populations, seniors, and children.
- Develop partnerships with public and private organizations to supplement programming and assets to increase recreational capacity and support community needs and interests.

ACTION STEPS

- Update the 2024 POSP every 6-years and maintain eligibility for local, state, and federal grants.
- Analyze programmatic needs in relation to capital investments.
- Develop methods to evaluate proposals that increase recreational capacity.

Highlights of Planned Capital Projects

Funding Program	Project Examples
Play Area Renovations and Safety Projects – Goal is to improve seven sites on average per year as listed in the CIP	2023 renovation project locations include: Meridian Playground; Judkins Park; Mayfair Park; University Playground; Westcrest Park (South); Genesee Park (North)
Picnic Shelter Expansion Projects - Funding to be determined	Judkins Park, Magnuson Park, Alki Beach, Ravenna Park, Lincoln Park, and Pratt Park.

GOAL 3: MANAGE THE CITY’S PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES TO PROVIDE SAFE AND WELCOMING PLACES.

Why this is Important

The *Park District Financial Plan (PDFP)* identified a “Fix It First” initiative aimed at reducing a major maintenance backlog. This investment allows SPR to preserve the park system for use well into the future. While boiler replacements (decarbonization) and roof repairs are not always the most compelling of projects, people appreciate them when it’s cold outside and it is raining. The 2023-2028 implementation plan includes major funding for increasing preventative maintenance and providing clean, safe, and welcoming parks.

In addition to built environments and facilities in parks, Seattle’s urban forest is one of the city’s treasures. Not only from a health perspective, but economically, environmentally, and psychologically. The city and SPR are committed to being carbon neutral by 2050 and the urban forest plays an important role in carbon sequestration. The Green Seattle Partnership (GSP) program is well on its way to restoring the natural areas within urban parks and open space by 2025, while also continuing the long-term maintenance for the 2,500 acres of forested parkland and natural habitat by 2030.

Strategies:

- Maintain the long-term viability of park and recreation facilities by regularly addressing major maintenance needs.
- Utilize the Asset Management Work Order System for asset life cycle replacement planning and prioritizing projects during decision-making.
- Look for innovative ways to approach construction and major maintenance activities that limit water and energy use to maximize environmental sustainability.
- Enhance wildlife habitat by restoring forests and expanding the tree canopy on City-owned land.
- Seek opportunities to quantify usage of park assets to account for more frequent replacement of the most used sites and facilities.

Action Steps

- Partner with Seattle City Light and other entities on energy conservation and innovative programs.
- Collaborate with Seattle Public Utilities, the Office of Sustainability and Environment, and other public agencies to explore the benefits of increased nature and open space opportunities that will enhance public health.
- Continue to prioritize and implement the city’s forest restoration and wildlife habitat goals.
- Foster access to public lands and shorelines.
- Continue support for Green Seattle Partnership program and its 20-year restoration goals.
- Fund and maintain facilities to ensure long-term sustainability and climate resiliency.
- Work to make parks, open space, and facilities accessible to all ages and abilities.
- Include equity as a criterion in prioritizing major maintenance projects.

Highlights of Planned Capital Projects

Funding Program	Project Examples
Major Maintenance Projects – Seattle Park District, CIP, AMWO, Golf facilities	See Appendix D for a full list of projects.
Pool Renovations – CIP projects; typical renovations include roof renovations and vapor barriers, floor/bench/locker renovations, bulkhead renovations, and deck replacements.	Southwest Pool, Queen Anne Pool, Ballard Pool, Evers Pool, Madison Pool, and Meadowbrook.
Utility and Conservation Program – CIP projects, implements energy conservation projects in collaboration with Seattle City Light and Puget Sound Energy.	Ongoing project resulting in energy savings and greenhouse gas emissions reductions.
Irrigation Replacement and Outdoor Infrastructure Program – CIP projects replaces and upgrades 350 irrigation systems.	35% of the systems are more than 25 years old. Replacement and upgrades are a key element of managing water efficiently and include weather-based scheduling and leak detection technologies, as well as automating manual systems.
Green Seattle Partnership – CIP projects and Seattle Park District	8-year focus is to restore 1,200 acres of Seattle’s urban parks and open space by 2025, and continuing the long-term maintenance of 2,500 acres of forested parks and open space.

GOAL 4: PLAN AND MAINTAIN SEATTLE’S PARKS AND FACILITIES TO ATTRACT ADDITIONAL PARK USERS AND VISITORS.

Why this is Important

Many of SPR’s parks and open spaces include viewpoints, access to shorelines, and significant ecological features. These provide recreational opportunities that would not otherwise be accessible to the public and attract visitors from near and far.

The core of the park system began from a park designed by the Olmsted Brothers, sons of the first landscape architect in the United States, Frederick Law Olmsted. It is SPR’s responsibility to maintain an awareness of these parks and recreation heritage and embody the Olmsted philosophy that guided the early development of Seattle’s park system. This system included a framework for open space acquisition, park development, and the creation of new or improved boulevards and trails to serve as park connectors.

Strategies:

- Develop plans for selected parks to take advantage of unique natural and cultural features in the city, enhance visitors’ experiences, and nurture partnerships with other public agencies and private organizations.
- Recognize the history, natural beauty, cultural significance, and appeal of the city’s park facilities to local, regional, national, and international visitors and reflect that in our future policies and park improvements.

Action Steps

- Begin discussions with partner organizations for facilities with identified needs.
- Work with Friends of Seattle’s Olmsted Parks (FSOP) to maintain the historic character of Seattle’s park system.
- Engage Seattle’s diverse communities to incorporate culturally relevant programs and experiences in all our parks and facilities.
- Develop a plan and explore partnership opportunities for the improvement of park restrooms.

Highlights of Planned Capital Projects

Funding Program	Project Examples
Major Projects Challenge Fund – Seattle Park District	Kubota Garden north wall and ADA pathway improvements, along with facility assessments at Madrona Bathhouse, Daybreak Star.
Olmsted or Landmarks Projects	Gas Works Park, play area renovation, restroom structure replacements and accessibility improvements.

GOAL 5: ENGAGE WITH COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO DESIGN AND DEVELOP PARKS AND FACILITIES THAT ARE BASED ON THE SPECIFIC NEEDS AND CULTURES OF THE COMMUNITIES THAT THE PARK IS INTENDED TO SERVE.

Why this is Important

A key priority for SPR to successfully implement this goal is to facilitate ongoing outreach and engagement with community members to ensure open spaces reflect what is most important to them. The department also focuses on meeting the needs of unserved and underserved people and communities, including communities with limited access to recreation alternatives. Adapting our goals and policies to meet the needs of new and existing community members adjacent to our facilities can also help alleviate displacement that occurs from people feeling isolated by the ever-changing built environment around them. This can be particularly impactful for senior residents who live in high-displacement areas.

SPR is committed to collaborating with the residents of Seattle utilizing a variety of outreach tools to involve communities in decisions affecting the future of the parks and recreation system. All SPR’s capital projects and land banked site development projects include an extensive public engagement and

participation process in the planning and design phases of projects consistent with SPR's Public Involvement Policy and industry best practices.

Strategies:

- Actively engage Seattle's diverse population, other public and private entities (e.g., Seattle Public Schools, Seattle Housing Authority) and community-based organizations to bring together a range of services in response to neighborhood priorities.
- Tailor public outreach tools and practices to maximize accessibility to and participation by those who live adjacent to or regularly use SPR assets.
- Implement and improve SPR's Language Access Plan annually to increase participation from new groups and those historically missed in the community engagement process.

Action Steps

- Follow SPR's Public Involvement Policy.
- Continue to engage the community by using new and innovative outreach and engagement approaches.
- Invite and encourage direct public involvement in planning efforts.
- Provide early and thorough notification of proposals and projects, through a variety of means, to users, user groups, neighborhoods, neighborhood groups, and other interested people, especially those who have not traditionally participated in park planning efforts, such as immigrant and refugee populations.
- Create simple and straightforward ways for the community to participate in meetings, such as providing translation services, offering hybrid meeting types, inviting all ages to participate, providing Seattle Park District points of contact, and conducting engagement approaches at different times of the day/week.



HING HAY PARK: CENTER CITY CINEMA 2023



Fritz Hedges Waterway Park: Opened 2020

Section 3: Location and Demographics

The city of Seattle is located on the west coast of the United States positioned between Puget Sound and Lake Washington and approximately 100 miles south of the US-Canadian border. It is the largest city in the state of Washington and the Pacific Northwest region. The city is located within western King County. A maritime climate prevails with cool rainy weather from fall through early spring and transitions to warm summers. The Olympic Mountains to the west and the Cascade Mountains to the east shield the Puget Sound area from Pacific Ocean storms and the harsher weather of the nation’s interior.



FIGURE 1: SEATTLE & WASHINGTON STATE LOCATION

SOURCE: NATIONS ONLINE PROJECT




FIGURE 2: SEATTLE & KING COUNTY LOCATION
SOURCE: KING COUNTY GIS

POPULATION SIZE AND GROWTH

The 2024 POSP was developed as significant demographic changes continued in Seattle and the region. The Puget Sound Regional Council reported that “the central Puget Sound region (King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish counties) reached 4,437,100 people in April of 2023 – this is the biggest population gain this century and the highest growth rate in the past 20 years.”. Seattle has the largest population in King County, the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMA), and the state of Washington. Between 2010 and 2020 the decennial census showed that Seattle’s population grew by 1.9 percent per year: significantly higher than previous decades. Since the late 2000s, Seattle has added an average of about 4,000 housing units and 7,000 people each year. Between 2010 and 2023 Seattle’s population increased by 170,540 persons and was estimated to be 779,200. Seattle’s population rose so much between 2010 and 2023, that it went from being the 23rd largest U.S. city in 2010 to being the 18th largest in 2023. Seattle’s population is projected to increase by an additional 230,185 by 2050, or close to 50,000 during the plan’s six-year planning horizon.




FIGURE 3: SEATTLE POPULATION BY DECADE, 1890-2050

SOURCES: US BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, POPULATION ESTIMATES

AGE GROUPS

In 2020, the percent of Seattle’s population in age group 0-19 was 17.3%, ages 20-64 was 68.6% and age 65 and older was 14.1%. If current patterns for age distribution are maintained, then Seattle’s population in age group 0-19 will decline to 16.4%, ages 20-64 will decline to 63.4% and age 65 and older will increase to 20.2%. The projected aging of Seattle’s population will have a significant impact on recreation behavior and the city’s recreation programming and park facility requirements.

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan
V1a




FIGURE 4: SEATTLE POPULATION BY AGE GROUP, 2020 & 2050

SOURCES: US BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, POPULATION ESTIMATES




FIGURE 5: SEATTLE POPULATION PERCENTAGE BY AGE GROUP, 2020 & 2050

SOURCES: US BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, POPULATION ESTIMATES

HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND COMPOSITION

In 2020, Seattle’s average household size was 2.02 persons and the average family size was 2.75 persons—the lowest in Puget Sound (with 2.53 per household and 3.06 per family). Seattle’s percent of all households in families was 44% compared with Puget Sound at 63%. The percentage of all Seattle households in nonfamily households including young and old was 56% compared with 37% in Puget Sound.

Smaller households with more adults may impact recreation behavior and the city’s park facility requirements.

RACE AND ETHNICITY

In 2020, Seattle’s population composition was 62% White and 38% non-white, including: 17% Asian, 6% Black or African American, 1% American Indian and Alaska Native, 2% some other race, and 14% two or more races. In terms of total population, 7% identified as Hispanic or Latino. Race, ethnic background may play a role in an individual’s preferences for recreation. During design projects SPR attempts to engage diverse populations and communities to reflect neighborhood composition.

Citywide, 77% of the population speaks only English at home. The 23% of the population that speak a language other than English at home were as follows: 32% speak English less than very well, 4% speak Spanish of which 24% speak English less than very well, and 19% speak another language of which 34% speak English less than very well. Different language speaking abilities must be recognized and accommodated as the city promotes recreation programs and events.




FIGURE 6: SEATTLE POPULATION BY PERCENTAGE RACE, 2020

SOURCE: US BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

FORECASTED GROWTH

Since 2011, dedicated parkland in Seattle has increased by 214 acres through property purchases, donations, transfers, or lot boundary adjustments.

Since the Olmsted park plans in the early 1900s, property acquisition has generally been opportunity driven. SPR has obtained surplus property from other city departments (SCL, SPU), federal military conveyances (Army, Navy), the Washington Department of Transportation, and Seattle Public Schools. SPR also obtains property through direct acquisition. The gap areas identified in this 2024 POSP depict a need for more intentional and focused efforts to obtain additional land for supporting park access within 10-minute walksheds. In Section 7 a gap analysis defines SPR’s priorities and needs for future acquisition and development projects to meet the projected increase in population. Seattle Park District funding must be allocated for acquisition of additional parkland, even if it cannot be developed immediately.

Figure 7, below illustrates city growth by population, city land area, and park area. Relative to the size of the park system the figure shows that it was less than 10 square miles until the late 1980s, after the city population had declined to a level seen in 1950. This figure also shows that major increases in city land area ceased in the late 1950s.




FIGURE 7: SEATTLE POPULATION & CITY, PARK AREA 1880-2020

SOURCE: US CENSUS, SEATTLE CITY ARCHIVES



BITTER LAKE COMMUNITY CENTER, BASKETBALL CAMP 2023

Section 4: Inventory and System Overview

More than 660 recreation facilities plus work structures, crew quarters, maintenance sheds, outbuildings, pump houses, storage facilities, and administrative offices comprise the SPR facility inventory. These facilities are assigned Park Classifications that characterize aspects relating to use and physical qualities to prioritize maintenance or replacement.

This section provides an overview of SPR facilities by type, location, and the categories and assets associated with the Park Classification Policy. The SPR Asset Management and Work Order system (AMWO) records these classifications (detailed at the end of the section) and the full spectrum of conditions for maintenance and operations.

In addition to new facility development, SPR’s capital investments are focused on immediate facility improvements including major maintenance needs, safety issues, accessibility compliance (ADA), condition assessments, and asset life cycle planning. Between 2018 and 2023, SPR completed more than 200 studies assessing the conditions of facilities and also established developed schematic designs and cost estimates for each project. Below is a list of selected projects by year.

Year	Study
2018	Picnic Shelter Condition Assessments; Olmsted Parks Program Study & Project Prioritization; Synthetic Fields Condition Assessments (22 fields)
2019	Citywide Pools ADA Feasibility Study
2020	Washington Park Graham Visitor Center Condition Assessment
2021	Grass Athletic Fields Condition Assessment & Prioritization, Golf Courses Capital Improvements; Tennis Courts Condition Assessment
2022	Synthetic Fields Maintenance Reports (4 fields); Play Area Renovation Program; Van Asselt, Garfield Community Centers Decarbonization Study
2023	Tennis & Pickleball Court Lighting Upgrades

TABLE 1: SELECTED CAPITAL ASSESSMENT STUDIES BY YEAR

Projects identified in these assessments are included in the 6-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and many are included in the “Highlights of Project Examples” in **Section 10: Planning for the Future**, of this report. In addition to architectural and engineering assessments, facility projects are identified through demand and needs analysis, balancing the system citywide, scheduling demands, new and emerging sports, and Seattle’s changing climate and demographics.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES BY TYPE

Number of Facilities	Facility Type
Aquatics – Boating/Fishing	
38	Boating – Hand Launch Sites
11	Boat Ramps
10	Fishing Piers
3	Rowing, sailing, and small craft centers
Aquatics – Swimming	
10	Indoor Swimming Pools (8), Outdoor Swimming Pools (2)
9	Swimming Beach
31	Wading Pool / Spray Feature
Community Centers	
27	Community Centers
5	Environmental Education Centers
3	Teen Life Centers
Dog Off-Leash Areas	
14	Dog Off-Leash Areas
Golf and Tennis Centers	
5	Golf Courses, including 3 Driving Ranges (3), Green Lake Pitch/Putt (1)
2	Lawn Bowling
2	Indoor tennis centers (Amy Yee, Tennis Center Sand Point)
Outdoor Sports Courts	
90+	Basketball (59 locations)
2	Bocce Ball
	Pickleball (90 blended striping on tennis courts)
150+	Tennis (56 locations)
5	Volleyball – Outdoor (five locations)
Play Areas	
156	Play Areas
Skateparks	
11	Skateparks, comprised of district parks, skatespots, and skatedots
Sports Fields	
207	Sports Fields, fully synthetic playing surfaces (33), lighted (66)
13	Track and Field Tracks (West Seattle Stadium, Lower Woodland)

TABLE 2: SPR FACILITY TYPE INVENTORY

Number of Facilities	Facility Type
Community Cultural	
2	Museums (Seattle Asian Art Museum, MOHAI)
1	Seattle Aquarium
1	Woodland Park Zoo, 45 major exhibits, 145 buildings and structures (92 acres)
9	Bathhouses (repurposed for other uses, Green Lake Theatre, Madrona Dance Studio)
6	Performing and Visual Art Facilities
5	Amphitheaters
Park Amenities	
123	Public Restrooms (94), Shelter Houses (29), restrooms attached to other buildings (5)
47	Picnic Shelters (rentable)
SPR Facilities	
20	Administrative offices, crew quarters and maintenance shops

(CONTINUED) TABLE 2: SPR FACILITY TYPE INVENTORY

FACILITY DISTRIBUTION MAPS

The following maps show SPR recreation facility distribution citywide. Any new facility development will take into consideration demand, equity, health, income, poverty, density, and opportunity. The maps are organized as listed below:

1. Aquatics – Boating
 - a. Hand Launch Sites
 - b. Basketball
 - c. Bocce Ball
2. Aquatics – Boating/Fishing
 - a. Small Craft Centers
 - b. Boat Ramps
 - c. Fishing Piers
 - d. Tennis
 - e. Volleyball
3. Aquatics – Swimming
 - a. Swimming Beaches
 - b. Wading Pools/Spray Parks
 - c. Indoor and Outdoor Swimming Pools
 8. Play Areas
 9. Skateparks
4. Community Centers
 - a. Community Centers
 - b. Teen Life Centers
 - c. Environmental Education Centers
 10. Sports Fields – with and without lighting
 - a. Baseball/Softball
 - b. Football
 - c. Lacrosse
 - d. Rugby
 - e. Soccer
 - f. Track and Field
 - g. Ultimate Frisbee
5. Dog Off-Leash Areas
6. Golf and Tennis Centers
 - a. Golf Courses
 - b. Tennis Centers
 - c. Lawn Bowling
7. Outdoor Sports Courts – some of these courts also double for bike polo, dodgeball, futsal, and pickleball play.




FIGURE 8: BOATING HAND LAUNCH SITES




FIGURE 9: BOATING RAMPS & FISHING PIER SITES




FIGURE 10: SWIMMING POOLS, BEACHES & SPRAY FEATURES




FIGURE 11: COMMUNITY, TEEN LIFE & ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTERS



FIGURE 12: DOG OFF-LEASH AREAS




FIGURE 13: GOLF COURSES, TENNIS CENTERS & LAWN BOWLING COURTS




FIGURE 14: OUTDOOR SPORTS COURTS




FIGURE 15: PLAY AREAS




FIGURE 16: SKATEPARKS, SKATEDOTS & SKATESPOTS




FIGURE 17: SPORTS FIELDS

PARK CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

The purpose of the Park Classification System is to establish a method for classifying the parks in SPR's ownership. The classification categories are driven by park use, purpose, general size, attributes, natural assets, and physical environment. Below is a short summary of the Park Classification categories, the full policy, and detailed descriptions for each can be found in **APPENDIX B**. Table 2 below lists the number of parks and acres by classification with regional parks comprising more than 40% of total acres, greenbelts with 22% and community parks with 11%.

Boulevards, Green Streets, and Greenways are established by a city ordinance and defined as an extension or expansion of a dedicated street which often continues to serve as a right-of-way as well as providing a recreation benefit. This category includes boulevards that are part of the Olmsted park system plan.

Examples: Lake Washington Boulevard, Mount Baker Boulevard, Queen Anne Boulevard.

Community Parks satisfy the recreational needs of multiple neighborhoods and may also preserve unique landscapes. Community parks commonly accommodate group activities and recreational facilities not available at neighborhood parks. Community parks range between 5 and 60 acres.

Examples: Alki Playfield, Bitter Lake Playfield, Genesee Park and Playfield, Matthews Beach Park.

Downtown Parks are typically smaller, developed sites located in Seattle's center. These parks are often of historic significance, provide relief from street traffic, and tend to contain more hardscape elements. Downtown parks are between 0.1 and 5 acres.

Examples: Denny Park, Donnie Chin International Children's Park, Piers 62 & 63, Regrade Park.

Greenbelts and Natural Areas are park sites established for the protection and stewardship of wildlife, habitat and other natural systems support functions. Some natural areas are accessible for low-impact use. Larger natural areas may have small sections developed to serve a community park function. Some Large Natural Area/Greenbelts may be divided into subareas based on vegetation, habitat, restoration status, wildlife area designation, recreation use area, etc. to better differentiate resource needs and use priorities.

Examples: Cheasty Greenbelt, Duwamish Head Greenbelt, Interlaken Park, North Beach Ravine,

Mini Parks and Pocket Parks are small parks that provide a little green in dense areas. They often incorporate small, sometimes difficult spaces to activate and are typically under 0.25 acres.

Examples: Alice Ball Park, Cayton Corner Park, Kinnear Place, York Park.

Neighborhood Parks are substantially larger than pocket parks and may occupy an area equivalent to a city block. Typical park features include play areas, viewpoints, and picnic areas. Neighborhood parks are generally between 0.25 and 9 acres in size.

Examples: Alvin Larkins Park, Columbia Park, Herring's House Park, Sturgus Park.

Regional Parks provide access to significant ecological, cultural, or historical features or unique facilities that attract visitors from throughout the entire region. These parks average over 100 acres in size and

contain a variety of intensive indoor and outdoor active and passive recreation facilities, as well as areas maintained in a natural state. Regional parks range from 10 acres to over 485 acres.
Examples: Cal Anderson Park, Green Lake Park, Seward Park, Volunteer Park.

Special-Use Parks and Specialty Gardens include stand-alone parks designed to serve one use.
Examples: Camp Long, Kubota Garden, Woodland Park Zoo, West Seattle Stadium.

Classification	Acres	Percent
Boulevards, Green Streets, Greenways	393	6.1%
Community Parks	730	11.3%
Downtown Parks	37	0.6%
Greenbelts and Natural Areas	1,470	22.2%
Mini Parks and Pocket Parks	47	0.7%
Neighborhood Parks	602	9.3%
Regional Parks	2,779	43.1%
Special Use and Specialty Gardens	420	6.5%

TABLE 3: PARK ACRES BY CLASSIFICATION



CHRISTIE PARK: RENOVATION 2020



LOWMAN BEACH PARK: SHORELINE RENOVATION, GRAND OPENING 2022

Section 5: Recreation Trends

The composition of neighborhoods, recreational desires versus actual needs, and recreation participation trends is important to determine the demand for future recreational facilities and programming. The *State of Washington 2022 Assessment of Outdoor Recreation Demand Report* documents recreational activities that have significantly increased or decreased in popularity over the last few years. This *2024 POSP* highlights two methodologies for identifying demand and need per the Recreation Conservation Office’s (RCO) Manual 2 - Planning Policies and Guidelines:

- Recreation Participation, and
- Community Satisfaction.

The following sections illustrate and compare sport participation at the nation, state, and county levels, recreation trends, and how Seattle residents value the park system and individual facilities.

The analysis and comparisons incorporate statistically valid survey information gathered during the *State of Washington 2022 Assessment of Outdoor Recreation Demand Report* along with the *2021 Statistically Valid Survey Results*. For the most part, the analysis focuses on trends in Washington State and Seattle/King County. The *State of Washington 2022 Assessment of Outdoor Recreation Demand Report* includes many other, primarily outdoor recreation activities such as hunting, snowboarding, and ice hockey which are not included in this report.

National and state data include information on favorite outdoor activities by frequency, but these are not always applicable to SPR services. For comparison purposes, the following figures show recreation activities that can be done or are available at SPR facilities.

RECREATION DEMAND AND ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION

SPR has completed numerous studies that included extensive citizen input either from public outreach or from targeted surveys. These studies guide SPR on how facilities are used and which future park facilities or programming are important to citizens. The plans referenced are as follows:

- **2021 Statistically Valid Survey Results** – includes statistically valid survey information conducted in November-December of 2021 using Address Based Sampling (ASB) internet and phone surveys in multiple languages weighted by key demographics focused on the use of SPR parks and programs, overall quality of offerings, and general priorities.

In addition to these, the following sources have been used for comparison purposes:

- **Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office – State of Washington 2022 Assessment of Outdoor Recreation Demand Report** - over 6,171 Washingtonians over the age of 18 participated in a large-scale scientific phone survey of 10 regions in the state to assess participation in 889 specific recreation activities. <https://wa-rco-scorp-2023-wa-rco.hub.arcgis.com/documents/3d212cbd61a6459ca5cba3a8feeba8c2/explore>

- **The Outdoor Foundation – 2022 Outdoor Recreation Participation Trends Report** - based on an online statistically controlled survey capturing responses from over 18,000 Americans in 9 regions over the age of 6 for 114 different recreation activities.
<https://outdoorindustry.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/2022-Outdoor-Participation-Trends-Report-1.pdf>
- **Physical Activity Council (PAC) – 2022 Overview Report on US Participation** – produced by a partnership of 8 of the major trade associations in US sports, fitness, and leisure industries involving a total of 18,000 online statistically controlled interviews over the age of 6 for 123 different recreation activities.
https://www.physicalactivitycouncil.org/files/ugd/286de6_5f19558e506b4c1a88b2f010e53d928f.pdf

Participation analysis is based on how people use specific park facilities and how many times a year they use these facilities. The long-term need for each type of recreation/sports facility is calculated in relation to how people currently use facilities and any projected population changes. The quality of a facility is not usually weighted in how much a facility is used, although quality likely has an impact in identifying use. For example, if an athletic field has synthetic turf or field lighting, the length of season or number of players using a field can increase. Figures 16-31 on the following pages highlight how many people play or take part in specific recreation activities.

NATIONAL COMPARISONS

The following three charts show national participation statistics for ages 6-plus for the period 2017-2021. The first two charts show the percent change in participation for selected recreation/sports activities typically found in Seattle Park. Ultimate frisbee showed the highest decrease of 9.6 percent. Other sports which showed decreases between 2 to 5 percent included: volleyball (grass) and slow pitch softball, rugby, snorkeling, track and field and fast pitch softball. The highest increase in average participation was pickleball at 11.5 percent. Other sports which showed increases greater than 4 percent included: basketball, tennis, outdoor climbing, kayaking, day hiking, skateboarding, indoor climbing and trail running.

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan
V1a




FIGURE 18: PARTICIPATION INCREASE AGES 6+, FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE 2017-2021

SOURCE: 2023 OUTDOOR TRENDS REPORT, OUTDOOR FOUNDATION




FIGURE 19: PARTICIPATION DECREASE AGES 6+, FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE (2017-2021)

SOURCE: 2023 OUTDOOR TRENDS REPORT, OUTDOOR FOUNDATION

The following chart shows the average number of annual participants for the period between 2017-2021. Walking has the highest number of average participants with more than 110 million. Rugby has the smallest number of average participants with 1.4 million. Comparing the percent change and number of participant charts show that while pickleball had the highest average participation increase, the number of participants at 3.7 million were only 20 percent of tennis participants at almost 19.5 million.

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan
V1a




FIGURE 20: PARTICIPANTS (THOUSANDS) AGES 6+, FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE 2017-2021

SOURCE: 2023 OUTDOOR TRENDS REPORT, OUTDOOR FOUNDATION

WASHINGTON STATE COMPARISONS

The following graphics illustrate recreation participation rates for Washington State and the Seattle/King County region from the *State of Washington 2022 Assessment of Outdoor Recreation Demand Report (2022 Demand Report)*. The Seattle-King County region participates less in most activities compared to the state totals except for hanging out in parks, community gardens or farmers’ markets, visiting outdoor cultural or historical events and facilities, paddle sports, jogging or running on trails and sidewalks, and walking or using mobility devices on trails and sidewalks.

In Figure 18, Seattle-King County participation rates are shown and the highest were for walking or using mobility devices on trails and sidewalks (95%), wildlife/nature viewing (83%), hanging out in parks (73%), community gardens or farmers’ markets (67%), picnicking (64%), visiting outdoor cultural and historical events and facilities (63%), swimming in a natural setting (59%), and paddle sports (56%). Seattle-King County participation rates were lowest (under 5%) for rugby (1%), lacrosse (1%), paintball (2%), surfing (3%), skateboarding (4%), football (4%), ice sports (5%), and volleyball (5%).

In the 2022 Demand Report, user days were described as the number of times throughout the year that someone participated in the activity. Washington State user days per activity per year (regions were not calculated) were greatest (over 20 times per year) for walking or using mobility devices on roads or sidewalks or trails (34.0 and 27.3 times/year), electric biking (23.4), wildlife/nature viewing (23.4), lacrosse (23.2), football (22.4), track (22.3), windsurfing (21.3), soccer (20.7), and ultimate frisbee (20.3).



MILLER PARK: EAST TENNIS/PICKLEBALL COURTS

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan
V1a




FIGURE 21: SEATTLE-KING COUNTY RECREATION PARTICIPATION RATES 2020




FIGURE 22: SEATTLE-KING COUNTY PARTICIPATION RATES 2020 – FIELD, COURT, GOLF, BICYCLE & WHEELED SPORTS




FIGURE 23: SEATTLE-KING COUNTY PARTICIPATION RATES 2020 – GENERAL PARK ACTIVITIES, AQUATIC SPORTS

Recreation activity volumes are calculated by multiplying the participation rate for the Seattle-King County region by the user days per year for Washington State per activity. Recreation activity volumes are more representatively projected over time by multiplying the participation rates for specific Seattle-King County age groups including age 18-40, 41-64, and 65+ collated in the *State of Washington 2022 Assessment of Outdoor Recreation Demand Report* to determine the impact Seattle’s age specific aging and migration attractions will have.

Seattle’s total recreation activity volume will increase from 155,644,479 in 2020 to 209,350,675 user days in 2050 or by 53,706,195 or 34.5% more user days from 2020 to 2050. The largest projected numerical volume increase from 2020 to 2050 will occur for walking or using mobility devices on roads or sidewalks and trails (7,610,756 and 6,053,833), wildlife/nature viewing (4,587,113), hanging out (2,907,092), jogging or running on roads and sidewalks (2,391,022 and 1,643,357), community gardens and farmers’ markets (1,868,598), paddle sports (1,741,295), and swimming in a natural setting (1,729,949) because of high Seattle-King County region population participation rates and high Washington State user days per year.

The largest projected percentage increase in volume from 2020 to 2050 will occur for walking or using mobility devices on roads or sidewalks and trails (38.2 and 37.9%), wildlife/nature viewing (39.4%), community gardens and farmers’ markets (37.5%), hanging out (35.7%), paddle sports (35.3%), swimming in a natural setting (34.2%), and jogging or running on roads and sidewalks (29.3% and 29.1%).

The *2022 Outdoor Foundation, Outdoor Recreation Participation Trends Report* estimates approximately 164.2 million people or 55% of all Americans, participated in at least one outdoor activity in 2021, the highest number of participants on record even during the second year of COVID-19 vaccines. Following are the key findings from the report.



WARREN G. MAGNUSON PARK: MICKEY MERRIAM ATHLETIC COMPLEX, FIELD #6




FIGURE 24: SEATTLE-KING COUNTY RECREATION ACTIVITY GROWTH, 2020-2050, WHEELED, COURT AND FIELD SPORTS




FIGURE 25: SEATTLE KING-COUNTY RECREATION ACTIVITY GROWTH, 2020-2050, GENERAL PARK ACTIVITIES, AQUATIC SPORTS




FIGURE 26: SEATTLE-KING COUNTY RECREATION ACTIVITY GROWTH PERCENTAGE 2020-2050, WHEELED, COURT AND FIELD SPORTS




FIGURE 27: SEATTLE-KING COUNTY RECREATION ACTIVITY GROWTH PERCENTAGE 2020-2050, AQUATIC SPORTS, GENERAL PARK ACTIVITIES

OUTDOOR PARTICIPATION TRENDS

- The outdoor recreation participant base grew 2.2% in 2021 to 164.2 million participants.
- More than half of Americans aged 6+ participated in at least one outdoor activity in 2021.
- The number of kids participating in outdoor recreation is up, but kids are participating less frequently.
- New outdoor participants are more diverse than the overall participant base and are driving an increased diversity not only for ethnicity but also across all age groups.
- The outdoor recreation “core” participant, who participates 51 times or more in outdoor recreation activities annually declined 71.9% of the total outdoor recreation participant base in 2007 to 58.7% in 2021.

- The number of core participants declined from 99.5 million in 2007 to 96.4 million in 2021.
- The number of participants 55 years and older increased more than 14% since 2019, and senior participants aged 65 and older were in the fastest-growing age category, with 16.9% growth since the pandemic began.
- Despite increases in the number of participants, total outdoor outings are declining significantly over the past decade and the increased number of participants are not stemming the tide.

YOUTH

- America’s children are spending more time outdoors over the past decade, and the COVID pandemic accelerated that trend. Overall, the percentage of America’s kids participating in outdoor recreation was high in 2021, at just over 70%.
- Younger kids (ages 6 to 12) participated at higher rates than older kids (ages 13 to 17).
- Younger kids are more active in the outdoors than teens and adults regardless of ethnicity/race. Kids ages 6 to 17 years who are white have the highest participation rates of any age or ethnic group with nearly 70% participating in outdoor recreation activities. African American/Black kids participate at much lower rates possibly due to lack of access to outdoor spaces.
- Girls ages 13 to 17 have the lowest participation rate in the youth category. Participation rates and counts of girls tend to fall off in correlation with the onset of puberty, but the rate for the group is increasing. The participation rate for teen girls went from 52.7% in 2015 to 59.4% in 2021. Young girls, ages 6 to 12 increased their participation rate from 58.9% in 2015 to 63% in 2021. Boys’ participation rates rose during that period, as well, from about 64% in 2015 to about 67% in 2021.
- The most popular non-outdoor recreation activity for kids who participated in outdoor recreation in 2021 was video games, by a very large margin. Kids have been playing video games for decades, and while it likely has a large impact on the frequency of outdoor recreation, data indicate that video games do not have a negative correlation with casual participation in outdoor recreation.

DIVERSITY

- Despite slight increases in diversity across outdoor recreation, the current participant base is less diverse than the overall population and significantly less diverse across younger age groups.
- Currently 72% of outdoor recreation participants are white. If the outdoor participant base does not become more diverse over the next 30 years, the percentage of outdoor recreation participants in the population could slip from 54% today to under 40% by 2060.
- The outdoor recreation participant base is slowly gaining ethnic diversity, but nearly three in four participants are white. In fact, despite a more diverse group of new participants, the number of white participants grew by more 2 million in 2021, while the number of Hispanic persons participating increased by 1 million.
- Participation rates across ethnicity and race reveal a different view of participation showing the percentage of persons in an ethnic group who participate in outdoor recreation. African American/Black persons have the lowest overall participation rate by ethnicity at 38.6%. Asian persons and Pacific Islanders have the highest participation rate at 58%. 56.6% of white persons participate, and 51.1% of Hispanic persons participate.
- At current level of diversity, the outdoor recreation participant base could lose more than 10% of its current number (164 million) of participants. The total U.S. population is projected to grow from 330 million to 419 million by 2060. Census projections show growth in many aspects of diversity including ethnicity and age.

Notably, the projections show a decline in the number of white persons, and no ethnicity with a majority share of the total population.

ON A LOCAL LEVEL

SPR conducted a statistically valid survey in November-December of 2021 using Address Based Sampling (ASB) internet and phone surveys of 1,366 interviews in English, Spanish, Amharic, Korean, Tagalog, Traditional Chinese, Somali, and Vietnamese languages weighted by key demographics accurate within +/-3.5%.

The survey consisted of 949 citywide respondents from all citywide Census tracts, plus an oversample of 417 interviews in the highest disadvantaged Census tracts defined by the City of Seattle's Racial and Social Equity Composite Index. Following are key findings of the survey:

- Amid the backdrop of the pandemic and larger public safety issues facing the City and region, residents' overall quality of life perceptions continued to decline in 2021.
- Residents rely on Seattle's parks and recreation system even more than before the pandemic, both in usage and perceived importance. Three-quarters consider SPR's system as "extremely important" to quality of life in Seattle. They also report using outdoor parks/facilities like neighborhood parks, walking trails, green spaces, beaches, and playfields more frequently now compared to 2019.
- Broader public safety concerns have likely contributed to lower ratings of the Seattle parks and recreation system, overall, and especially in terms of safety and cleanliness/maintenance. Those issues weigh heavily on residents' perceptions of the system, even as they continue to use many of its parks and facilities more often.
- Residents' general priorities for the Seattle parks and recreation system align with their broader safety and cleanliness concerns. Most prioritize addressing those issues and improving existing parks and facilities over acquiring park lands, building new facilities, and improving recreation programs.




FIGURE 28: PARK AND FACILITY USAGE – OVERALL

SOURCE: SEATTLE PARKS AND RECREATION SURVEY, FULL DRAFT REPORT, FEBRUARY 2022

- Beyond those key overarching challenges, there is strong interest for several of the specific maintenance and amenity priorities tested. Strong majorities believe the following improvements would have a high impact on their overall satisfaction with the system:
 - More frequent restroom cleaning
 - More frequent garbage pickup
 - More accessible trails and natural areas
 - Improved lighting
 - More available restrooms

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan
V1a




FIGURE 29: PARK FACILITY IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIES

SOURCE: SEATTLE PARKS AND RECREATION SURVEY, FULL DRAFT REPORT, FEBRUARY 2022




FIGURE 30: PARK FACILITY MAINTENANCE PRIORITIES

SOURCE: SEATTLE PARKS AND RECREATION SURVEY, FULL DRAFT REPORT, FEBRUARY 2022




FIGURE 31: PARK FACILITY GRADES

SOURCE: SEATTLE PARKS AND RECREATION SURVEY, FULL DRAFT REPORT, FEBRUARY 2022

NATIONAL TRENDS

Each year, the *Physical Activity Council (PAC)* conducts the largest single-source research study of sports, recreation, and leisure activity participation in the U.S. The PAC is composed of eight of the leading sports and manufacturer associations who are dedicated to growing participation in their respective sports and activities.

- By recreation category, the highest participation rates in the US in 2020 were for fitness sports (i.e., exercise, cross-training, pilates, walking for fitness, etc. 67.0%), outdoor sports (i.e., bicycling, birdwatching, camping, kayaking, etc. 52.9%), individual sports (i.e. archery, horseback riding, fishing, hunting, etc. 43.3%), team sports (baseball, soccer, cheerleading, etc. 22.1%), racquet sports (tennis, pickleball, table tennis, etc. 13.9%), water sports (windsurfing, sailing, snorkeling, etc. 13.7%), and winter sports (skiing, sledding, snowboarding, etc. 8.3%).
- Participation by recreation category varied by generational group where Millennials (born 1980-1999) were the most active in all categories followed by Gen Z (born 2000+), then Gen X (born 1965-1979), and Boomers (born 1945-1964).
- Inactivity is significantly affected by age with inactivity the highest with age 65 and older (43.0%), followed by ages 55-64 (30.0%), ages 45-54 (27.2%), ages 35-44 (21.3%), ages 25-34 (25.7%), ages 18-24 (26.8%), ages 13-17 (14.9%), and ages 6-12 (13.7%).
- Inactivity is also significantly affected by income with the highest inactivity rates for households under \$25,000 annually (41.4%), followed by \$25,000-49,999 (29.8%), \$50,000-74,999 (22.7%), \$75,000-99,999 (17.8%), and \$100,000+ (14.4%).

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan
V1a




FIGURE 32: US RECREATION PARTICIPATION RATES, 2017-2022
SOURCE: 2022 PHYSICAL ACTIVITY COUNCIL'S OVERVIEW REPORT ON PARTICIPATION




FIGURE 33: US RECREATION PARTICIPATION BY AGE & GENERATION, 2022
SOURCE: 2022 PHYSICAL ACTIVITY COUNCIL'S OVERVIEW REPORT ON PARTICIPATION




FIGURE 34: US RECREATION INACTIVITY RATES BY AGE GROUP, 2017 & 2022
SOURCE: 2022 PHYSICAL ACTIVITY COUNCIL’S OVERVIEW REPORT ON PARTICIPATION




FIGURE 35: US RECREATION INACTIVITY RATES BY INCOME GROUP, 2017 & 2022
SOURCE: 2022 PHYSICAL ACTIVITY COUNCIL’S OVERVIEW REPORT ON PARTICIPATION

The 2022 *Outdoor Foundation, Outdoor Recreation Participation Trends Report* finds outdoor participation is not centered in any age group; people of all ages make up an age-diverse participant base.

- The number of seniors, ages 65 and older, grew by 2.5 million or 16.8% since 2019 - the largest increase by percentage and by count in the entire participant base. The next oldest age group (55 to 64) increased the second most with 2 million new participants for an increase of 11.7%. Increases in participation by persons

older than 55 made up 43% of the total increase in participation since 2019, the period most affected by issues related to the pandemic.

- Most outdoor participants enjoy a wide variety of both indoor and outdoor physical activities though some activities function as gateways between activities. For example, campers most frequently cross participate in other outdoor activities (98.3%), followed by biking (89.1%), hiking (85.0%), running (83.3%), and fishing (78.9%).
- The idea of being physically active outside is enough to spur on 75% of male and 80% of female outdoor recreation participants. Interacting with the natural environment, going to neighborhood parks, and traveling through natural environments are favorite aspects of outdoor recreation activities for participants.

KEY FINDINGS

The following findings affect the policies and strategies contained in the *2024 Seattle Parks and Open Space Plan*:

- Seattle's total recreation activity volume will increase from 155,644,479 in 2020 to 209,350,675 user days in 2050 or by 53,706,195 or 34.5% more user days from 2020 to 2050. The largest projected numerical volume increase from 2020 to 2060 will occur for walking or using mobility devices on roads or sidewalks and trails (7,610,756 and 6,053,833), wildlife/nature viewing (4,587,113), hanging out (2,907,092), jogging or running on roads and sidewalks (2,391,022 and 1,643,357), community gardens and farmers' markets (1,868,598), paddle sports (1,741,295), and swimming in a natural setting (1,729,949) because of high Seattle-King County region population participation rates and high Washington State user days per year.
- New outdoor participants are more diverse than the overall participant base and are driving increasing diversity not only for ethnicity but also across all age groups. Younger kids are more active in the outdoors than teens and adults regardless of ethnicity/race.
- Despite increases in the number of participants, total outdoor outings are declining significantly over the past decade and the increased number of participants are not stemming the tide.
- At current level of diversity, the outdoor recreation participant base could lose more than 10% of its current number (164 million) of participants. The total U.S. population is projected to grow from 330 million to 419 million by 2060. Census projections show growth in many aspects of diversity including ethnicity and age. Notably, the projections show a decline in the number of white persons, and no ethnicity with a majority share of the total population.
- Residents rely on Seattle's parks and recreation system even more than before the pandemic, both in usage and perceived importance. Three-quarters consider SPR's system as "extremely important" to quality of life in Seattle and report using outdoor parks/facilities like neighborhood parks, walking trails, green spaces, beaches, and playfields more frequently now compared to 2019.
- Residents' general priorities for the Seattle parks and recreation system align with broader safety and cleanliness concerns. Most prioritize addressing those issues and improving existing parks and facilities over acquiring park lands, building new facilities, and improving recreation programs.



BE'ER SHEVA PARK: RECONSTRUCTION 2023

Section 6: Needs Analysis

In 2009, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) recommended guidelines based upon park acres and facilities per population for largely suburban municipalities. In 2013 the Washington State Recreation Conservation Office (RCO) proposed that agencies shift away from levels of service calculated by acres per thousand residents to a system-based approach.

This planning approach is a process of assessing the park, recreation, and open space needs of a community and translating that information into a framework for meeting the physical, spatial, and facility requirements to satisfy those needs.

Alternative ways to accomplish a system-based analysis are to:

- Move towards a monetized system that puts a value on the assets per capita, laying groundwork for park impact fees;
- Measure the percentage of individuals that participate in one or more active outdoor activities;
- Analyze walkable access to parks and open space; and
- Evaluate performance-based LOS based on condition of a recreational asset and the current and potential recreation value of an asset, factored by the city population.

The *2017 Parks and Open Space Plan* transitioned to a system-based approach and this is continued in the *2024 POSP*.

PEER CITIES AND PARK DEPARTMENTS

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) collects city and park system data annually for the 100 largest cities in the United States. The following three tables include data of different cities and park systems which are similar in population, city area, park acreage and acres per 1,000 population. Following are three tables which are organized by population, park acres and acres of parkland per 1,000 population. Different cities are included in each table to better illustrate a comparative characteristic. Note that the TPL data primarily includes municipal park system data but may include other public open space entities. For Seattle the data included Port of Seattle parks and in the following tables that acreage total was removed. It was not possible to recalculate the percentage of the population with 10-minute walk to only an SPR park. Walkability and gap analyses conducted for the 2024 POSP show that 95% of the city population is within a 10-minute walk to a park.

Cities and their park systems are defined by geography, adjacent water bodies, population growth, infrastructure funding, etc. Seattle has the largest population and the largest city land area in the state. Seattle also has the largest park system with 6,478 acres, followed by Spokane (3,800 acres), Tacoma (2,905 acres), and Vancouver (2,246).

The three following tables illustrate that two cities, Denver and San Francisco, have similar area characteristics to Seattle. Denver has a slightly smaller population, 40 percent or 33 square miles larger than Seattle, similar percentage of developed versus natural parks, and more than 90 percent of the population within a 10-minute walk to a park. San Francisco has a larger population, is 44 percent or 36 square miles smaller than Seattle, similar percentage of developed versus natural parks, and 100 percent of the population is within a 10-minute walk to a park. For high density cities, the average percentage of park acres per city area was 12% as in Seattle.

Table 4 is sorted by city population and includes cities with populations 100,000 less or more than Seattle. Table 5 is sorted by total park acres and shows that park acres in Seattle are greater than two cities, Boston and San Francisco. Note that in Portland, Forest Park contains 5,188 acres or 35 percent of the entire system. Table 6 is sorted by percent of the population within a 10-minute walk to a park, and shows three cities which are close to Seattle, Minneapolis, Boston, and San Francisco.

City	Population	Adjusted Land Area	Density	Total Acres	% Natural	% Designed	% Population within 10-Minute Walk to Park	Parks as % City Area
Portland, OR	665,438	82,228	Med-High	14,662	74%	26%	90%	18%
Boston, MA	685,476	29,222	High	5,160	36%	64%	100%	18%
Denver, CO	744,729	74,662	High	7,028	38%	62%	92%	9%
Seattle, WA	761,152	52,810	High	6,478	40%	60%	99%	12%
San Francisco, CA	883,822	29,892	High	6,164	42%	58%	100%	21%

TABLE 4: PEER CITIES SORTED BY POPULATION

SOURCE: TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND 2023

City	Population	Adjusted Land Area Acres	Density	Total Acres	% Natural	% Designed	% Population within 10-Minute Walk to Park	Parks as % City Area
Boston, MA	685,476	29,222	High	5,160	36%	64%	100%	18%
Atlanta, GA	515,426	85,564	Med-Low	5,530	27%	73%	77%	6%
Milwaukee, WI	576,366	59,032	Med-High	5,591	48%	52%	91%	9%
San Francisco, CA	883,822	29,892	High	6,164	42%	58%	100%	21%
Seattle, WA	761,152	52,810	High	6,478	40%	60%	99%	12%
Sacramento, CA	534,959	62,439	Med-High	6,747	39%	61%	84%	11%
Denver, CO	744,729	74,662	High	7,028	38%	62%	92%	9%

TABLE 5: PEER CITIES SORTED BY TOTAL PARK ACRES

SOURCE: TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND 2023

City	Population	Adjusted City Land Area Acres	Density	Total Acres	% Natural	% Designed	% People within 10-Minute Walk to Park	Parks as % City Area
Portland, OR	665,438	82,228	Med-High	14,662	74%	26%	90%	18%
Milwaukee, WI	576,366	59,032	Med-High	5,591	48%	52%	91%	9%
Denver, CO	744,729	74,662	High	7,028	38%	62%	92%	9%
Minneapolis, MN	439,124	33,953	High	5,078	11%	89%	98%	15%
Seattle, WA	761,152	52,810	High	6,478	40%	60%	99%	12%
Boston, MA	685,476	29,222	High	5,160	36%	64%	100%	18%
San Francisco, CA	883,822	29,892	High	6,164	42%	58%	100%	21%

TABLE 6: PEER CITIES SORTED BY PERCENT PEOPLE WITHIN 10-MINUTE WALK TO A PARK

SOURCE: TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND 2023

The table below shows data from neighboring cities larger than 20 square miles. Of the cities in this table, Bellevue, Federal Way and Seattle are surrounded by other cities except for a few unincorporated pockets. This indicates that it is unlikely that either city could gain significant park acres in the future. Many other cities in King County are also landlocked and cannot easily gain park acres. Auburn, Renton, Kent are located adjacent to unincorporated areas of King County although growth is restricted by the King County Urban Growth Area Boundary. Seattle has the largest park area of these cities and shows the fourth highest ratio of park acres per 1,000 people.

City	City Population 2020	City Land Area (Square Miles)	Total City Land Area (Acres)	Total Park Acres	Acres per 1,000 People	Parks Percent City Area
Auburn	77,243	29.62	18,957	385	4.98	2%
Renton	106,785	23.37	14,957	445	4.17	3%
Kent	136,588	33.76	21,606	1,400	10.24	6%
Federal Way	101,030	22.27	14,523	1,056	10.45	7%
Seattle	737,015	83.84	53,658	6,478	8.74	12%
Bellevue	151,854	33.48	21,427	2,700	17.78	13%

TABLE 7: CITY COMPARISONS – SEATTLE METRO AREA

SOURCES: SPR, INDIVIDUAL PARKS & OPEN SPACE PLANS

CITYWIDE GUIDELINES AND 2024 LEVEL OF SERVICE

Under the City’s first Comprehensive Plan, the Growth Management Act (referred to as the “Citywide Open Space goal” or “Acceptable Open Space Guideline”) park acres and facilities were recommended based on population. In this plan the city adopted a minimum citywide guideline for open space of 1/3 acre per 100 residents (or approximately 3.33 acres per 1,000 residents). This is the total amount of city-owned open space available to residents citywide and includes all SPR property that is a minimum of 10,000 square feet in size (approximately the same size as two Neighborhood Residential zoned lots). The City also adopted a citywide “desirable” open space goal that was 10 acres per 1,000 residents. However, the City acknowledged that this aspirational goal is largely unattainable in high-density developing American cities such as Seattle, due largely to the high cost of land.

The city changed neither the acceptable nor the desirable goals for open space between 2001 and 2016. With the passage of several park levies containing robust acquisition priorities, SPR had maintained and *exceeded* the acceptable population-based open space goal of 1/3 acre per 100 residents.

SPR currently manages 6,478 acres (10.1 square miles) of parks and open space, which far exceeds the “Acceptable Guideline” adopted in 2001. Although, given the immense value and benefit derived physically, psychologically, and economically from parks and open space, and given the amount of projected growth to occur through the 2035 planning horizon, there is a continuing need for increasing capacity through acquisition of additional park land where feasible. Acquisitions of individual parcels will establish new access points within a 10-minute walk and bring open space to higher density neighborhoods.

Historical statistics show how the size of the park and open space system changed over the past 120 years. From 1910 to 1960 the city land area was relatively static and close to 70 square miles while the percentage of park acreage more than doubled. From the early 1900s through the mid-1970s the ratio of parkland was less than 7.5 acres per 1,000 population. Coupled with the area of the city and city population growth, park acres per 1,000 population reached a historical high in the 1990s through the 2000s. Funding from the Forward Thrust bond program (1968) the King County Open Space and Trail Bond (1989) started property acquisitions for greenbelts and parks. City park levies in the 2000s helped fund additional property acquisitions.

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan
V1a




FIGURE 37: CITY & PARK LAND AREA 1880-2020

SOURCE: CITY OF SEATTLE ARCHIVES, SPR

Growth projections anticipate 230,185 new residents or an increase of 29.5% by 2050. The 2024 POSP proposes to change the Level of Service (LOS) from an acres per 1,000 people standard to providing parks and park facilities within a 10-minute walk. The walkability and gap analysis in the 2017 Plan identified that 94% of all housing units were within a 10-minute walk to a park and that 77% of housing units within an Urban Village were within a 5-minute walk to a park.

In 2023, 699,548 people and approximately 95% of housing units are within a 10-minute walk to park. For areas within Urban Villages a 5-minute walk distance includes 247,661 people and 70% of households.



RAINIER BEACH POOL: AQUA ZUMBA CLASS

Section 7: Gap Analysis

The 2024 POSP reviewed and revised gap mapping developed for the 2017 plan. Then as now, geographic information system mapping provided an accurate picture of how people access park facilities.

Race, social equity, health, poverty, income, and population density data applied to mapping assists SPR in identifying areas where property acquisition should be prioritized. Walkability is defined by the Trust for Public Land (TPL) and the National Park Service (NPS) as the distance covered in a 10-minute walk or approximately a half mile. For the 2024 plan, urban village boundaries and density levels were adjusted to reflect current configurations with available up-to-date information.

WALKABILITY AND STORY MAPPING

Walkability is both an urban design concept, measurement and in this plan the stated Level of Service. As an urban design concept, it is how an area or neighborhood is designed to encourage walking, including factors such as the existence of sidewalks or pedestrian rights-of-way, safety, traffic, road conditions and other public amenities such as open space. For SPR planning purposes, walkability is the length of time a person would need to walk using existing public sidewalks or paths to the nearest park, community center or other SPR facility through a designated entry point. In 2016, SPR GIS staff mapped more than 1,000 entry points from public right-of-way into SPR facilities. These were then linked to the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) walking network map to develop the walkability areas. The walking network considers the street grid, major intersections, constraints such as barriers to access, and key pedestrian and bicycle routes. In addition to park property, SDOT mapping includes information on bicycle and walking trails, other considerations such as public-school property, major institutions and universities, P-patch gardens, publicly accessible street-ends and other non-SPR-owned public property, such as Seattle Center or Hiram M. Chittenden Locks (a.k.a. Ballard Locks).

As in the 2017 *Parks and Open Space Plan* and for the 2024 update, walkability distance is used:


- 10-minute walkability guideline to be applied throughout the city.

When GIS mapping is coordinated with viewable data this is called “story mapping”. This creates opportunities to prioritize the location of future capital funding and projects and where land should be acquired for future park and open space.

Snapshots of the story maps are included on the following pages and focus on different parts of the City as examples. Map images of the entire city are included in **APPENDIX A – Citywide Story Maps**. SPR has used a variety of mapping tools gleaned from the federal census – predominantly the American Community Survey which tends to be the most up to date.


SEATTLE'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

The first layer in the story mapping is an inventory of all SPR parks and open space including natural areas and greenbelts, regional parks, community and neighborhood parks, specialty gardens, and mini/pocket parks. The following pages include snippets of the map layers to illustrate the underlying data. Most parks and open space are developed, some have limited access such as greenbelts, all contribute to the quality of life in Seattle. For the purposes of the analysis, parks and open space that include facilities such as community centers, pools, golf courses, small craft centers, and tennis centers are included.




ACCESS

In general, people in Seattle like to walk and bicycle, and there are more than 25 miles of boulevards and 120 miles of trails contained within SPR parks and open space. The walking network considers constraints such as the inability to cross a major arterial, or where there is no roadway. It does not factor in sidewalk conditions, bus, and light rail connections, nor topography; important elements but beyond the scope of the story mapping effort.




WALKABILITY

The walkability network reveals constraints and barriers to access as this mapping layer measures the distance in terms of travel time that a person needs to walk from any location within 10 minutes to a park or facility entrance(s). SPR GIS staff mapped over 1,000 park entry points and linked to the SDOT walking network layer to develop the walkability areas. The walking network considers the street grid, major intersections, barriers to access, and key pedestrian and bicycle routes.



GAPS IN WALKABILITY


Parks, open space, recreation facilities, and programs contribute to the physical, mental, psychological, and environmental health of the city’s residents and visitors. While Seattle has a robust park system, SPR’s property acquisition program is important for siting parks and park facilities near higher density housing. Property acquisition is mostly opportunity driven, and the gap areas identified in this mapping help identify areas for future acquisition and development projects.



EQUITY AND HEALTH


SPR’s priorities of encouraging healthy people and strong communities across the city, [this map](#) combines socioeconomic data with health level comparisons, including race data from the American Community Survey, and Public Health – Seattle and King County obesity and diabetes levels.

The equity and health analysis map assesses the socio-economic data (from the 2018- 2021 American Community Survey) and health data (from Public Health–Seattle & King County). The physical activity rates were self-reported. Scores for obesity and diabetes are based on a scale of 0-5 with 5 assigned to those in the top 20% of a category. “0” represents a low occurrence and “5” represents the highest occurrence levels. In the image below, the darker the color, the higher the percentage of people at risk.




INCOME AND POVERTY

The Income and Poverty mapping layer identifies priority areas for future parkland acquisition and/or facility development. In the image below, the darker the color, the higher the percentage of the population whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level.



DENSITY

In the image below, the darker the color, the higher the percentage of population per acre or the darker the color, the more density there is in that block group.



Section 8: Public Engagement

Public engagement for this plan consisted of six in-person events in May and June 2023 at locations throughout Seattle, an online engagement hub for comments, and an online public meeting to present and review the draft *Parks and Open Space Plan*. More than 80 persons attended these meetings and gave input. Additional guidance and public input from previous planning efforts supplemented this data collection.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

In 2018-2019, SPR connected with community and partners to engage in a strategic planning process to reflect on department challenges and successes, the populations SPR was serving, and the populations SPR was missing. These conversations focused on thinking big about what the city might need between 2020 to 2032 and how to establish a strategic direction that would drive SPR's work toward meeting those needs. The result of this two-year planning effort was the 2020-2032 Strategic Plan.

From November 2022 through January 2023 SPR staff attended five in-person public meetings in conjunction with early input for the *One Seattle* comprehensive plan update. Targeted outreach was completed for these meetings to identify and uplift voice of marginalized communities, including compensation for outreach to five community-based organizations. Flyers and press releases were translated into 7 languages (Amharic, Chinese, Korean, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese). Attendees could provide written comments and indicate on district maps where they would want to see park facilities. More than 120 comments were made about parks and park facilities and are documented in Appendix C.

For the 2024 Park and Open Space Plan open houses held in May-June 2023, SPR reached out to community center staff on where interpreters would make sense. For areas of the city with higher language diversity other than English, interpreters were provided at the open houses (Delridge CC, Yesler CC and Van Asselt CC). SPR staff also called and emailed community members who were equity partners in the Strategic Action Plan process (2021). SPR also purchased advertising in the Northwest Asian Weekly and South Seattle Emerald.

An online public meeting was held on May 18, 2023, with 15 attendees. Questions were answered online and recorded for later review. See appendix C for more details. SPR held six in-person public meetings in May and June 2023 at locations throughout Seattle. More than 80 persons attended these meetings and gave input.

See **Appendix C** for a full summary of public comments received from SPR-led public engagement and comments related to parks and recreation from OPCD-led comprehensive plan update engagement.

Planning, and public involvement and engagement is a continuous activity for SPR. Actively engaging and building relationships with Seattle's diverse population, other departments and agencies, and community-based organizations is an on-going, iterative process. This work brings together a range of perspectives and allows SPR opportunities to respond to neighborhood and agency priorities. Citizens are passionate about city parks and open spaces and desire progressive, innovative solutions in expanding and maintaining the park system. SPR is committed to listening to the residents of Seattle and to use a variety of outreach tools to involve communities in decisions affecting the future of the parks and recreation system.

KEY THEMES THAT WERE HEARD

The themes listed below are a consolidation of comments from One Seattle comprehensive plan engagement and the 2024 POSP public engagement process.

Aquatics

Increase the number of swimming pools and swimming instructors.

Athletic Fields

Provide high quality grass sports fields for youth to prevent injuries due to artificial turf.
Provide more athletic fields without synthetic turf.

Community Centers

Provide weight rooms in more community centers.
Consider community centers as shelters during winter months.
Consider community centers as cooling centers, climate resiliency hubs during summer months.
Provide adult programming for connecting with other adults.
Provide more activities, especially for youth so that kids can see that activity and exercise is good.

Exercise Equipment - Outdoor

Provide exercise machines (body weight) and calisthenic equipment areas in parks.
Provide "playground" areas that meet the needs of multigenerational households, such as a calisthenic park to meet the needs of middle-aged adults.

Environment & Nature

Remove paved parking lots and install green infrastructure.
Plant more trees, native plants in parks to combat climate change, especially in downtown and south Seattle.
Develop a native plant policy for all parks.
Provide more shoreline open space.
Need to connect parks and public spaces in a green space network.
Provide more green storm water infrastructure in parks.
Develop pollinator corridors, wildlife habitat corridors between parks.
Create master plans for greenbelts.

Golf Courses

Convert all public golf courses to multi-use parks and open space uses.
Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access.
Consider alternatives that convert all or significant portions of Jackson Park Golf Course to housing due to construction of two light rail stations.

Indigenous Culture

Provide interpretive signage in parks to highlight historical indigenous uses.

Off-Leash Areas

Provide more dog parks, off-leash areas to protect parks, sports fields, and other open areas from damage and overuse by unleashed dogs.

Consider off-leash area for Upper Queen Anne as requested since the late 1990s.

Build 1-acre off-leash area at Smith Cove Park as defined in public design process.

Maintenance

Replace rusted chain link border fences around larger parks (Discover, Jackson Park, etc.).

Prioritize maintenance at parks including the hiring of more maintenance staff.

Park Development

Combine parks and schools for more community connections to nature.

Support the lidding of I-5 in creating more open space per Comprehensive Plan parks policy 1.17 and Resolution 32100.

Lid Aurora Avenue through Woodland Park to create significant open space.

Need to develop smaller and more pocket parks.

Convert tree groves to pocket parks when upzoning an area.

Create a variety of useable community third places, either public or public-private (e.g. beer gardens, cafes in parks, etc.).

Acquire more shoreline properties or street ends for parks and open space.

Pickleball

Develop more dedicated pickleball courts.

Convert Green Lake East tennis courts to dedicated pickleball courts.

Develop more pickleball courts in West Seattle.

Restripe all tennis courts for shared pickleball courts.

P-Patches & Urban Agriculture

Allocate more space P-patches due to multiyear waiting lists.

Create P-Patches in urban villages.

Restrooms

Need more public toilets which are open 24/7.

Retrofit the park restrooms so they can stay open all year, better lighting and security.

Find ways to allow single stall restrooms to be open 24 hours a day.

Safety

Need more animal control staff to enforce existing laws in parks.

Provide more park rangers in parks to enforce rules and provide first aid.

Do not allow parks to be used for camping.

Tennis

Provide better signage on tennis courts to indicate activities which are not allowed (dogs, roller skating, pickleball, basketball, etc.)

Trails

Develop more trails and access to West Duwamish Greenbelts, West Duwamish Greenbelt Trails.

Transportation

Create transportation safe routes to parks for pedestrians & bike lanes for all abilities.

Consider urban greenway connecting Elliott Bay Trail - Magnolia Park - Magnolia Viewpoint - Discovery Park.
Develop better bike connections and bike parking at parks.
Make parks easily and safely accessible by all modes of travel.
Need walkable, accessible (ADA) access to parks via sidewalks.

Zoning & Housing

Provide parks and higher density housing near light rail.
Provide more housing and affordable housing near parks.

Zoning & Open Space

Require and include pocket parks in large apartment, single family, and condo developments.
Provide housing integrated with parks.
Mandate parks in urban villages relative to housing development.



YESLER COMMUNITY CENTER: PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, OPEN HOUSE 2023

Section 9: Key Capital Funding Sources and Funded Projects

SPR’s budget comes from the City’s General Fund, various fees, charges, leases, the Seattle Park District, and other sources. Generally, 10% of the City’s General Fund is allocated to SPR. SPR has one of the largest capital improvement programs in the city, the third largest capital budget by city department. The department manages over 30 capital projects funded from a variety of sources including the Cumulative Reserve Subfund Limited Tax General Obligation (LTGO bonds), King County grants, the Seattle Park District, and many other special fund sources and private donations. Following is a summary of the key funding sources and projects.

SEATTLE PARK DISTRICT CAPITAL FUNDING

Since 2016, the Seattle Park District has grown in revenues from approximately \$31 million in 2018 to \$112 million in 2023 and has funded the following programs:

- Major maintenance projects (could include community center rehabilitation and ADA improvements-discussed in detail later)
- Community center rehabilitation (could also be major maintenance)
- Land acquisitions
- Urban forestry
- Development of land acquired with prior levy funds (land-banked sites)
- Opportunity fund for community-partnered projects
- P-Patch rejuvenation
- Aquarium major maintenance
- Zoo major maintenance
- Major Projects Challenge Fund

The following Figures 38, 39 illustrate capital funding programs and sources for 2023. The two largest funding programs are “Fix it First” and “Building for the Future” and account for 93 percent of all capital funding. Figures 40, 41 illustrate operating funding programs and sources for 2023. The two largest operating fund sources are the General Fund (53%) and the Seattle Park District (29%) and account for 82 percent of all operating funding.




FIGURE 38: SPR CAPITAL FUNDING PROGRAMS (IN THOUSANDS), 2023




FIGURE 39: CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES (IN THOUSANDS), 2023

Overview of Seattle Park District Cycle 2 Planning Process

The Seattle Park District Board’s adoption of the 2023-2028 funding plan in September 2022 was the culmination of an intensive multi-year planning process with input from community members, Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) staff, the Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners, the Mayor’s Office, and the Seattle Park District Board. All these stakeholders played key roles in shaping the suite of Cycle 2 investments that were ultimately approved and continuing to champion the baseline \$58 million (in 2023 dollars) Cycle 1 investment on which these enhancements build.

The timeline below gives a high-level overview of the key activities contributing to adoption of Cycle 2.

- Strategic Planning & Community Engagement: 2018 – 2021
- SPR Proposal Development: Late 2021 – February 2022
- Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners (BPRC) Prioritization: March – May 2022

The BPRC reviewed and prioritized more than 40 funding proposals which were focused into the following categories:

- **Enhancing Access and Services:** Improving access to the existing parks and recreation system and expanding services including ideas like activation and outdoor recreation programs, community center operations and youth development.
- **Restoring Clean, Safe and Welcoming Parks and Facilities:** Restoring clean, safe, and welcoming parks, including enhanced maintenance, safety and regulatory compliance, and continued focus on life-cycle asset management.
- **Investing for the Future:** Investing for future, including responding to climate change, building community capacity and responsiveness through grants and the equity fund, and developing new/enhancing existing parks and recreation facilities

In September 2022, the City Council, acting as the Seattle Park District Board, passed the Park District Financial Plan (PDFP). The financial plan will invest district funds as follows:

\$118M – 2023
\$122M – 2024
\$127M – 2025
\$131M – 2026
\$137M – 2027
\$143M – 2028

REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX (REET)

Between 2018 to 2023 SPR has obtained \$25 to \$40 million in REET funding annually prioritized for:

- Debt service on prior year bond-financed projects
- Ongoing programs (described later)
- Emergent needs or unplanned projects (e.g., roof membrane replacement at Victor Steinbrueck Park, bridge repairs at Lake Union Park)

Att 1 – 2024 Parks and Open Space Plan

V1a

- Projects that have regulatory or contractual obligations with outside partners (e.g., Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections’ requirement to inspect piers with wood piling every 5 years)
- Synthetic turf replacements (each field surface replaced about every 10 years)
- U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) ADA citations




FIGURE 40: OPERATING FUND PROGRAMS (IN THOUSANDS), 2023




FIGURE 41: OPERATING FUND SOURCES, 2023

BOND FUNDS

Bond funds have been used in the past to fund major projects, such as the Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool and the Golf Master Plan (repaid from golf revenue). SPR has also planned to use bond funding to replace or make significant renovations to 3 community centers and a pool, conduct unreinforced masonry retrofits, and fund decarbonization at crew quarters and community centers between 2023 and 2028.

KING COUNTY

King County has a few large grant programs that provide funding for specific types of projects. The Conservation Future Fund grants are often used for acquisitions, including many of SPR’s land-banked sites. King County Levy Program provides funding for capital projects on Aquatic Facilities, Parks and Open Spaces, flood control areas, and the Duwamish River.

WASHINGTON STATE

Washington State has a number of grant programs that support capital development of parks. The Recreation Conservation Office (RCO) manages both state and federal grants specific for park development. Washington State Department of Ecology provides funding that benefits the health of Washington’s land, air, and water. The Washington State Department of Commerce (DoC) provides funding for a wide variety of programs.

Project	Year	RCO-WWRP	RCO-LWCF	RCO_YAF	RCO-Estuary	RCO-LPM	RCO-ALEA	RCO-Salmon	KC Levy-P&OS	KC Levy-AC	KC-CWM	KC Levy-RC	FEMA-BRIC	KC-Flood
Dedicated Pickleball Courts Construction	2023	●	●
Green Lake Community Center and Pool	2023	●
Helene Madison Pool-Plaster Liner, Locker Room, & ADA	2023	●
Hutchinson Playground Field, Play Area, & Courts	2023	●	●	●	●
Jefferson Community Center	2023	●	.
Marra Desimone Park	2023	●	●
Rainier CC Playground	2023	●	●
Rainier CC Playground	2023	●	●
Van Asselt Community	2023	●	.
Herrings House Park	2024	●	.	.	●	.	●	●	.	.	●	●	.	.
Judkins Park Lower	2024	●
Judkins Park Upper	2024	●
Lake City Community	2024
Lake City Community	2024
Smith Cove Playfield Renovation	2024	.	.	●	●

TABLE 8: SPR PROJECTS AND POTENTIAL GRANTS 2023-2026

NOTES:

RECREATION CONSERVATION OFFICE (RCO): WWRP-Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program, YAF-Youth Athletic Facilities, Estuary-Estuary and Salmon Enhancement, LPM-Local Parks Maintenance, ALEA-Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account; Salmon-Salmon Recovery and Restoration Program

KING COUNTY LEVY: P&OS-Parks & Open Space; AC-Aquatic Centers; CWM-Cooperative Watershed Management; RC-River Corridor; KC-King County Flood

FEMA: Federal Emergency Management Agency, BRIC-Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities

Project	Year	RCO-WWRP	RCO-LWCF	RCO_YAF	RCO-Estuary	RCO-LPM	RCO-ALEA	RCO-Salmon	KC Levy-P&OS	KC Levy-AC	KC-CWM	KC Levy-RC	FEMA-BRIC	KC-Flood
Southwest Teen Life Play	2024	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Walt Hundley Playfield	2024	▪	▪	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Arboretum Creek Headwaters	2025	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Arboretum Creek Headwaters	2025	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	●
Arboretum Creek Headwaters	2025	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	●
Arboretum Creek Headwaters	2025	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Judkins Park Play	2025	▪	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
Duwamish Waterway Park - Expansion	2026	●	▪	▪	●	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	●	▪	▪

(CONTINUED) TABLE 8: PROJECTS AND POTENTIAL GRANTS 2023-2026

NOTES:

RECREATION CONSERVATION OFFICE (RCO): WWRP-Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program, YAF-Youth Athletic Facilities, Estuary-Estuary and Salmon Enhancement, LPM-Local Parks Maintenance, ALEA-Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account; Salmon-Salmon Recovery and Restoration Program

KING COUNTY LEVY: P&OS-Parks & Open Space; AC-Aquatic Centers; CWM-Cooperative Watershed Management; RC-River Corridor; KC-King County Flood

FEMA: Federal Emergency Management Agency, BRIC-Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities

OTHER REVENUE

Grants, donations, and facility-related revenue provide leverage for a very select group of CIP projects. These sources include Federal Community Development Block & Building Resilient Infrastructure grants, revenue from field rentals, and revenue from concession agreements. Private donations via the Seattle Parks Foundation, individuals, and others are also provided regularly.

APPROACH TO CAPITAL PLANNING

SPR’s annual capital budget includes hundreds of projects that fall mostly within two lines of business: Asset Management and Life Cycle Program and Capital Development and Improvements. Projects within the Asset Management and Life Cycle program are identified through the development of class-specific plans which are driven primarily by asset condition and serviceable life. Capital Development and Improvement Projects are identified through a combination of planning processes that include the Seattle Park District Planning Process, through the administration of programs like the Park CommUNITY Fund, and through the Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program (in conjunction with Seattle Public Schools).

SPR dedicates most of the capital MPD funding to major maintenance for facilities and land. SPR uses an asset management planning approach to address facility needs. Projects are identified through ongoing condition

assessments, consultant studies, 6-year facility plans, work order analyses (to identify key problem areas), and intradepartmental information sharing of facility maintenance issues and needs. Class-specific plans (for example, play areas, restroom buildings, synthetic turf fields, etc.) are created and updated on an ongoing basis to prioritize assets and scope projects for renewal.

SPR analyzes and prioritizes projects generated in the identification stage using the priority ranking based on SPR management guidance and the City Council’s “Basic Principles Underlying Strategic Capital Planning,” policies established in Resolution 31203 (2010):

- **Policy 1. Preserve and maintain existing Capital Assets.** While building new Capital Projects is often seen as more glamorous, maintaining existing Capital Assets is critical to ensuring the continued function and protection of those assets.
- **Policy 2. Support the goals of the City’s plans.** Capital Commitments will be targeted to support the goals of the Comprehensive Plan; recognized neighborhood plans; adopted facility, department, or sub-area Master Plans; and other adopted City functional plans.
- **Policy 3. Support economic development.** The City’s ability to fund Asset Preservation Projects and other Capital Projects in the long run depends on the strength of the City’s economy and tax base.

Projects in the Asset Management Plan are ranked per the extent they fulfill overarching criteria. SPR uses the following seven criteria to rank the projects:

- **Code Requirements:** The project brings a facility or element up to federal, state, and Seattle code requirements (such as ADA, water quality, and fire suppression), or meets other legal requirements.
- **Life Safety:** The project will eliminate a condition that poses an imminent threat of injury. Examples of safety hazards are lack of seismic elements, failing piling, outdated play equipment, emergency management elements, or a documented environmental health hazard.
- **Facility Integrity:** The project will help keep the facility operational and extend its life cycle by repairing, replacing, and renovating systems and elements of the facility including building envelope (roof, walls, windows), electrical, plumbing, storm and sewer line replacements, and synthetic turf replacement.
- **Improve Operating Efficiency:** The project will result in reduction of operating and maintenance costs, including energy and water savings.
- **Equity:** The project will preserve or enhance an asset which serves a population with fewer options for alternatives (to be applied in 2017 for projects planned for 2018 and beyond).
- **Other:** The project has a unique element (e.g. other leveraged funds), and/or specific need that does not fit the other priorities.

The application of these criteria on all projects results in a Capital Improvement Program that first addresses the critical needs of code compliance and life safety, but also considers factors that promote facility integrity, environmental sustainability, water and energy savings, and social equity.

EXCEPTIONS

While the criteria and assessment system described above are used to create a list of projects, it is not unusual for the prioritization to be adjusted based on special circumstances. Reasons for such an adjustment may include: the availability of matching funds from a grant for construction within a specified window, an especially urgent facility integrity or life safety issue, or achieving a balanced distribution of projects across the city. There are also instances in which a project may be moved up in the list due to priorities of the Mayor, City Council or

identification and selection by members of the community through the Park CommUNITY Fund or similar participatory budgeting or community grant programs.

PARK COMMUNITY FUND (FUND SOURCE: SEATTLE PARK DISTRICT)

The Park CommUNITY Fund advances park equity in Seattle through a community-led funding process. The fund invests in large and small capital projects using participatory budgeting and equitable grant-making practices. Seattle Park District has allocated \$14.8 million to the Park CommUNITY Fund for investment in Seattle communities between 2023 and 2028. Frontline communities will work alongside Seattle Park and Recreation (SPR) staff through a Project Selection process, which includes three phases.

- Idea Collection: Community members submit ideas for improvements in-person or online.
- Project Development: Ideas are developed into proposals, reviewed for priority, and narrowed to a small list of finalists.
- Final Selection: Finalists undergo a three-part selection process to determine awarded projects, including community selection, selection by the Board of Park and Recreation Commissioners, and Superintendent final approval.

SPR planners and project managers will follow SPR’s park development process to implement awarded projects. Following Project Selection, the program will conduct an Evaluation and Workshop series with communities to gain feedback on improving the program, creating a more equitable park development process, and creating a space for Frontline communities to share/build resources.

ONGOING PROGRAMS (PRIMARY FUND SOURCE: REET AND SEATTLE PARK DISTRICT)

The capital ongoing programs include many smaller/lower-cost projects that affect the performance of individual assets but are not large enough to rank as a high priority and be funded as a stand-alone project. Most of the projects require little design and many projects are done with in-house staff. Ongoing programs include small roofs, tennis and basketball courts, landscape and trail renovations, and irrigation and pavement repair, among others. These programs fund projects that extend the life cycle of assets with a low-cost renovation by deferring a more expensive capital project. SPR funds the ongoing programs with REET each year.

ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FUND SOURCE: REET, CDBG, SEATTLE PARK DISTRICT)

In 2006, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) conducted an audit of many City facilities to assess compliance with ADA guidelines and identified an extensive listing of deficiencies, including many park facilities. These include various parking, accessible route, and fixture installations that need to be modified to make SPR parks, community centers, and swimming pools fully compliant with the federal guidelines.

The City Barrier Removal System (BRS), which is a federal requirement, is a schedule of known ADA deficiencies at various, but not all, SPR facilities. It is comprised of Department of Justice citation from 2011, and barriers identified by a private consultant Meeting The Challenge, who was hired by the City and performed site inspections in 2015 and 2015. Since the BRS was adopted by the City, SPR has made steady progress addressing these items as part of capital projects, and corrective actions by SPR maintenance forces.

In 2011, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) shared the results of an audit of many City of Seattle facilities to assess compliance with accessibility (ADA) guidelines and identified an extensive listing of deficiencies, including many park facilities. These include various parking, accessible route, and fixture installations that need to be modified to make SPR parks, community centers and swimming pools fully compliant with the federal guidelines.

In 2018, the City Barrier Removal Schedule (BRS), documented known ADA deficiencies at a majority, but not all, SPR facilities. It is comprised of both remaining DOJ citations and a more comprehensive list identified by an accessibility consultant who performed site inspections in 2015 and 2017. SPR has 7,765 documented barriers at 106 facilities (56% of all 13,976 documented barriers on the city-wide BRS) Since the BRS was adopted by the City in 2018, SPR has expanded its progress addressing these items as part of dedicated accessibility capital projects and corrective actions by SPR maintenance staff.

In addition to addressing items on the BRS, SPR also incorporates accessibility improvements in other capital projects that are not on the BRS. A combination of REET and Seattle Park District funding have expanded and accelerated the department's accessibility focused projects to resolve barriers.

Section 10: Planning for the Future

The 2024 POSP will guide SPR through the year 2030. Seattle and its Urban Villages will continue to experience growth and will continue to become denser over time.

As in the 2017 plan, a key question is, “how to maintain livability”?

Livability as the sum of the factors that add up to a community’s quality of life including:

- Built and natural environments,
- Economic prosperity,
- Social stability and equity,
- Educational opportunity, and
- Cultural and recreation opportunities.

CITYWIDE LEVEL OF SERVICE

Acceptable Level of Service (LOS) Standard – 10-Minute Walk to a City Park

The walkability and gap analysis in the 2017 *Parks and Open Space Plan* identified that 94% of housing units were within a 10-minute walk to a park; and that 77% of housing units in an Urban Village were within a 5-minute walk to a park. The 2024 POSP gap analysis identified that 95% of housing units were within a 10-minute walk to a park. The percentage of housing units within a walk distance is an aspirational figure. As shown in Section 6, tables 4-6, several variables contribute to walkability to park such as city land area, size (acreage) and location of parks and park facilities.

PROPERTY ACQUISITION PRIORITY

Gap areas visible in story mapping define SPR’s property acquisition priority areas. In previous years SPR was allotted \$2 million per year to acquire properties. Future acquisition funding is undefined at this time and is dependent on county and state grants.

The property acquisition priority is threefold and will focus on:

- 1) the acquisition of parkland in the City’s growing Urban Villages with identified gaps as outlined below;
- 2) the acquisition of Natural Areas and Greenbelts that meet the prioritization criteria listed on the following page, and
- 3) other communities of need with gaps that meet the criteria listed below.

SPR Property Management is pro-active, identifies opportunities, has established relationships over many years with potential property owners and currently has over 200 parcels that they are actively pursuing for natural area/greenbelt acquisition alone. SPR will continue to monitor and report on acres acquired annually. A recent example of this proactive approach was the acquisition of the Greenwood parcel adjacent to Greenwood Park.

A. 10-Minute Walkability

The general focus is on Urban Villages outside of the City Center and Hub Urban Villages (excluding the downtown urban core), representing a balance between opportunity and need; however, other areas of the city may be prioritized based on the criteria below.

Acquisitions will be prioritized based on the following criteria:

- Equity and health
- Income and poverty
- Density
- Opportunity

When applying the walkability guidelines and taking into consideration the gaps which are visible in the story mapping as described in **Section 7**, and the criteria listed above, the following Urban Villages have been identified as being underserved in parklands as compared to other areas of the city. These areas include the following Urban Villages:

- Aurora-Licton Springs
- Bitter Lake
- Northgate
- Ballard
- First Hill
- Fremont
- 12th Avenue
- North Rainier
- North Beacon Hill
- Columbia City
- Othello
- Rainier Beach
- South Park
- West Seattle Junction
- Morgan Junction
- Westwood-Highland Park

However, an exception is in the downtown core, where acquisition is difficult due to availability and cost. As of 2023, underdeveloped parcels containing approximately one-third of acre exist in the Belltown neighborhood but assessor valuations exceed more than \$7 million. This is more than three times the annual SPR acquisition budget.

B. Natural Area/Greenbelt Acquisition

The property acquisition priority will continue to focus on Natural Area/Greenbelt acquisitions. SPR has an ongoing prioritized list of over 200 properties that are within the city's greenspaces. The goal is to acquire as many as possible over time to improve the integrity of the City's open space system.

Acquisition of these properties will be prioritized based on the following criteria:

- Inholdings that interfere with public access and SPR management.
- Gaps in existing SPR holdings.
- Best natural resource value.
- Availability of funds other than Seattle Park District funding.
- Other considerations, such as access to non SPR-owned open space; and
- Availability of land for purchase.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following section discusses policy recommendations within the frame of establishing a new level of service (LOS) standard and expanding an asset management and facility replacement program with the goal of implementing park impact fees.

Many cities within Washington state have developed alternative level of service standards to guide future park and open space planning. Some communities have developed LOS standards based on the condition of parks and park facilities and their relative recreation values. Baseline values are based on like new conditions of site amenities such as play equipment or synthetic turf and their physical conditions over time. Coupled with calculating the monetary value of existing parks and park facilities and their replacement costs, this data is key for determining a park impact fee. The following graphic illustrates the relationship between these elements.




FIGURE 42: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USEFUL LIFE, LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT, PARK IMPACT FEE
SOURCE: ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR FACILITIES, PARKS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION; CITY OF BARRIE (ON), MAY 2023

Level of Service Standards

Nationally accepted standards for calculating the level of service of a parks system have not been published by key park and recreation organizations (e.g. The Trust for Public Land (TPL), National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), etc.). In 1983, level of service guidelines were published by NRPA based upon providing a set number of park acres and park facilities per thousand in population. These guidelines were a suggested model, and local adjustment or customization was encouraged. The guidelines that have been published over the years often fail from being too simplistic to provide useful information at the local level, or on the other end of the spectrum, overly complicated and difficult to manage. In 2009, NRPA developed park metrics which differentiated the number of park amenities, park acreage by city population size.

A significant document influencing local level of service measures in Washington state is the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). This plan is maintained by the Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The SCORP is a requirement for the State to receive federal funds designated for parks and recreation activities. Since municipalities across the state apply to RCO for both state originated and federal-originated funding, local governments must also have in place long-range plans that align with the statewide goals contained in the SCORP. Washington State adopted a new SCORP in January 2023.

Within the SCORP, RCO proposes that all State agencies and local governments shift away from levels of service calculated by acres per thousand residents to a system based upon statistically valid local public opinion and park and trail service area (or accessibility) standards. SPR implemented portions of this approach in the 2017 Parks & Open Space Plan by including data on the following measures:

- Individual Active Participation – measured by the percent of population that participates in one or more active outdoor activities.
- Public Satisfaction – measured by the percent of population satisfied with the condition of existing park and recreation facilities.
- Walkable Access Service Area – measured by the percent of households within 1/2 mile of a park or trail access point.

Alternative Level of Service Standards

As cities in the Seattle metropolitan area have prepared parks, recreation and open space plan updates, many of them have developed alternative levels of service standards. Because many cities in the metropolitan area have developed adjacent to each other, over time they have become landlocked and unable to annex additional lands to increase the size of their city or the park system. This also means that undeveloped land for open space has increased in value to a point where cities do not have enough funds to compete against other purchasers.

Recognizing this issue several cities developed level of service standards based on park facility conditions or recreation value to the community. The City of Edmonds in their 2016 plan included the acreage of other “park” facility providers with the goal of achieving the park per acre standard. Sites included Snohomish County and Edmonds School District properties which raised the existing LOS from 4.83 acres per 1,000 population to 14.08 acres per 1,000 population.

The city of Kent in their 2022 parks and open space plan update defined recreational value as a performance-based level of service. The recreation values (RV) are calculated by measuring the performance of an individual park or the entire park system. The formula accounts for the age and condition of a park and its assets and how these factors impact the quality and quantity of recreational opportunities provided. Newer parks and assets function at a higher level (and provide a higher RV) than older and under maintained parks and assets.

Current recreational value (CRV) is an assessment of how individual parks or the entire park system performs. The CRV is calculated by counting existing recreational amenities in a park and multiplying by a park condition multiplier. Potential recreational value (PRV) is an assessment of how much recreational value a park provides after it is initially constructed or significantly improved. The assessment is completed for each park or park facility by determining the number of recreational amenities that could be provided in each park or park facility given reasonable constraints and funding. CRV shows how a park or park system is currently functioning. PRV shows the maximum potential of existing parks and facilities in the system. When the CRV and PRV are assessed with heat mapping, they can identify where park improvements will have the greatest impact in the system, and where existing parks or park facilities properties are not sufficient to meet park and recreation needs.

Park Impact Fee

Impact fees are charges assessed by local governments which attempt to recover the costs incurred in providing public facilities to serve new residential, commercial, office or other development. Impact fees may only be used to fund facilities, such as roads, schools, and parks, that are directly associated with a new development. The fees may be used to pay the proportionate share of public facilities costs that

benefit the new development. However, impact fees may not be used to correct existing deficiencies in public facilities.

As defined in Washington state law (Revised Code of Washington, RCW) park impact fees must be used for “publicly owned parks, open space, and recreation facilities” that are addressed by a capital facilities plan element as part of a comprehensive plan adopted per the state Growth Management Act (GMA). Most cities and counties in Washington only charge park impact fees on residential development or the residential portion of a mixed-use building or development, but a few include commercial or industrial developments, because employees may directly benefit from nearby parks and recreational facilities.

The following table shows selected cities in the Seattle metropolitan area that levy park impact fees, when fees were implemented, the land use categories included, and current residential unit fees (2023). Note that as of 2023 the city of Bellevue does not have a park impact fee.

Jurisdiction	Effective Year	Impact Fee Categories	Single Family Unit Fee	Multifamily Unit Fee
Redmond	2006	Single-Family Residences (Mobile Homes, Detached Single-Family Manufactured Homes), Multi-Family Residences, Residential Suites, Offices, Retail Trade, Manufacturing	\$4,933	\$3,425
Kirkland	2007	Single-Family, Multi-Family Residential, Residential Suites	\$8,016	\$6,093
Kenmore	2008	Single-Family, Multi-Family Residential; Mobile Homes	\$4,522	\$3,468
Issaquah	2008	Per Residential Dwelling Unit, per Square Foot Retail, Office, Manufacturing	\$6,147	\$5,317
Tukwila	2008	Single Family, Multi-family Residential; Office, Retail, K-12 Educational Facility, Industrial	\$2,859	\$2,490
Auburn	2011	Per Residential Dwelling Unit	\$3,500	\$3,500
Renton	2011	Single-Family, Multi-Family Residential; Mobile Home	\$3,276	\$2,659
Mercer Island	2015	New Residential Dwelling Unit	\$6,316	\$3,933
Shoreline	2018	Single-Family, Multi-Family Residential	\$5,227	\$3,428

TABLE 9: PARK IMPACT FEES - SELECTED METRO CITIES

SOURCES: CITY WEBSITES, SPR

All the jurisdictions listed in Table 9 allow certain exemptions, but not all as listed below:

- Replacement, alteration, enlargement, remodeling, or conversion of an existing dwelling unit where no additional units are created.
- Building permits for a legal accessory dwelling unit approved under the city’s zoning code.
- Miscellaneous improvements, including but not limited to fences, walls, swimming pools, mechanical units, and signs.
- Demolition or moving of a structure.
- Construction or creation of low-income housing per certain affordability criteria.
- Buildings or structures that provide emergency housing for people experiencing homelessness and emergency shelters for victims of domestic violence as defined by state law.

Asset Management

The terms asset management, infrastructure replacement, or life cycle program are used by cities to define project management tasks for the replacement and/or renovation of the aging park system infrastructure.

The Barrie (ON) asset management plan is considered a medium to long range planning document which is used to managing the city’s parks and facilities. It provides a guide to understanding key items such as:

- Size, replacement value, and condition of the park system assets
- Current levels of service and performance
- Identifying future assets that will be needed to support service delivery
- Defining planned activities to sustain current and future assets throughout their lifecycles at minimal cost, while managing risks
- Identifying funding sources for planned lifecycle activities
- Defining steps to improve future iterations of the asset management plan

Implementation of an asset management plan will require SPR to develop an inventory of facilities with “like new”, current and replacement values for individual parks, park facilities and other assets. SPR has defined replacement schedules for some assets, such as play areas, but this would need to occur for all assets.

TARGET GOALS FOR DELIVERING EQUITABLE ACCESS TO KEY FACILITIES

SPR is evaluating how to increase capacity within the system, taking a strategic and cost-effective approach to providing equitable access for all key facilities rather than through the construction of new facilities. By shifting away from single-source distributions-based guidelines and focusing on access, satisfaction and need, SPR should be able to expand the reach and capacity of existing facilities.

Target goals for facility distribution that are based on service areas or distances will take into consideration physical barriers to access and are only a starting point to analyze delivery of equitable access to facilities. The location of other similar providers or facilities will be considered, along with policies and priorities in the City’s adopted Comprehensive Plan, if relevant. In general, priority for increased equitable access will go to adding park amenities in underserved areas of the city, thereby expanding the reach of those served.

Possible Target Goals may Include:

Community Centers	Every household in Seattle should be within 1-2 miles of a community center.
Aquatic Facilities	Every household in Seattle should have access to a swimming pool or swimming beach within 4 miles.
Outdoor Sports Courts and Facilities	80% of all residents will rate their access to desired outdoor facilities, such as tennis and basketball courts, as Good or Excellent.
Sports/Athletic Fields	Every household in Seattle should have access to sports fields within 2 miles.
Greenways	Continue to coordinate with SDOT on preferred routes and connections to enhance access to parks and open space.
Picnic Shelters	All reservable picnic shelters should be accessible.
Play Areas	All play areas should include facilities for a range of age groups.

KEY CAPITAL PROJECTS HIGHLIGHTS 2024-2030

The objective is to include a prioritized list of projects and/or programs (parks and open space acquisition, development, renovation, and restoration projects), anticipated year of implementation, and financing plan and/or fund source. This section provides examples of projects from the capital improvement program (CIP) that will be implemented over the next 6 years in the Action Steps and Highlights sections on the next few pages (the full list of capital projects can be found in Appendix D).

The 2024 POSP identifies capital projects that SPR will achieve over the 6-year timeframe of the plan, but the list is not meant to be exhaustive. The CIP is an ongoing list that undergoes periodic updates and revisions depending on need. For example, if there is a structural emergency with a facility or some other unforeseen maintenance required for life and safety issues, those projects would move to the forefront of the list.

Based on public input, projected population, demographic make-up, key findings, and parks and recreation trends, the consistently ranked top tier, high demand activities for people across all ages are picnicking, walking (with or without a pet), jogging, visiting playgrounds, natural areas, beaches, neighborhood, and community parks. In addition, taking into consideration demographic changes, and the growth and largest demand in 25-34-year-old age-group who are interested in outdoor recreation and fitness, SPR is proposing to invest \$414 million from the approved CIP over the next 6 years in the following planned capital projects, including:

- \$8 million for design and completion of new parks at land-banked sites,
- \$42.7 million for sport field improvements, including conversion to turf and lighting,
- \$14 million for park land acquisition,
- \$5.75 million for play area renovations and safety improvements,
- \$41.8 million for forest restoration, tree replacement, trails and Green Seattle Partnership,
- \$19.98 million for community center rehabilitation and development.

In addition, in the major maintenance project funding, approximately \$8 million is earmarked for pool renovations. SPR has over \$127.6 million in additional discretionary projects (i.e., additional needs based

on future demands that are not programmed in the 6-year CIP) that focus on community centers, play areas, outdoor fitness equipment and new sports courts, new picnic shelters, and linear street parks and green streets. Project examples that reflect these high-level spending priorities and that align with the needs, priorities and trends outlined earlier in this plan are called out in the “Highlights of Planned Capital Projects” for each goal listed. Combined, the 6-year CIP and discretionary projects will increase the capacity of Seattle’s park system and provide opportunities for multi-generational activities.

Refer to **APPENDIX D** for more information, and a full list of projects beyond those highlighted on the next few pages. The funding allocations listed in this plan are in keeping with the 2024-2030 Adopted Capital Improvement Program. A list of discretionary projects that do not currently have funding are also found on the last page in **APPENDIX D**.




EDWIN T. PRATT PARK: SPRAY PARK RENOVATION 2022



LINCOLN PARK: ART INSTALLATION, NORTHWEST TROLLS – WAY OF THE BIRD KING 2023

Appendices

- A – Citywide Story Mapping**
- B – Park Classification Policy**
- C – Public Engagement Notes**
- D – Capital Improvement Plan**



URBAN TRIANGLE PARK, 2019

Appendix A – Citywide Story Mapping

Story mapping webpage:

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/2576566fd50747eb8a25432380b2f018/page/2023-Gap-Analysis-Map/?views=Seattle-Parks>



SPR Park Boundaries



SEATTLE PARKS



SPR Park Boundaries




Bicycle Trails



Greenways



ACCESS



Urban Villages



SPR Park Boundaries



2023 SPR Gap Analysis

5-minute walk inside Urban Village (1/4 mile)




5-minute walk outside Urban Village (1/4 mile)



10-minute walk outside Urban Village (1/2 mile)



WALKABILITY



Urban Villages



SPR Park Boundaries



2023 SPR Gap Analysis

Service Gaps (inside Urban Villages)



Service Gaps (outside Urban Villages)



5-minute walk inside Urban Village (1/4 mile)




5-minute walk outside Urban Village (1/4 mile)




10-minute walk outside Urban Village (1/2 mile)




GAPS IN WALKABILITY



EQUITY & HEALTH



INCOME & POVERTY



POPULATION DENSITY 2020



PATHWAYS PARK, CONSTRUCTION 2023

Appendix B – Park Classification Policy

Department Policy & Procedure

Subject: Park Classification System		Number 060 P5.11.1
		Effective: January 9, 2015
		Supersedes: December 1, 2009
Approved: January 8, 2015	Department: Seattle Parks & Recreation	Page 1 of 11

1.0 PURPOSE STATEMENT

Seattle Parks and Recreation recognizes the unique nature of each property it owns and is responsible for. The size of each property, its setting within the surrounding neighborhood, the amenities it provides to park visitors, its accessibility to the public, its soil, hydrology, vegetation, and habitat combine to make each property a unique asset. Understanding the uniqueness of each property, there is also a recognized benefit to categorizing park owned properties based on their similarities across a number of characteristics. The purpose of this policy and procedure is to establish a method for classifying the parks in Seattle Parks and Recreation. The classifications are driven by park use, purpose and size. This classification system serves the following purposes:

- These classifications will provide a general guideline for future development options. The combination of descriptors for each park type represents what has generally been successful on a certain sized plot of land located in a certain type of physical environment. These guidelines can help to set community expectations for a given site.
 - These classifications may serve as a basis for policies around appropriate programming and uses in different park types.
 - These classifications may inform functional planting design standards and other design standards.
- This classification scheme is not intended to serve as an inventory of individual assets (e.g. total acres of natural area or total number of athletic fields) because different combinations of the same assets appear in each park type, nor is it intended to be a naming policy. For each park type, the list of desired or optional assets or programming opportunities is not intended to be inclusive of all potential assets or programs. Lastly, this policy is not to be used to supersede Parks approved Master Plans (Strategic Plans) for individual parks, such as Discovery Park, Magnuson Park or Seward Park.

2.0 ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED

2.1 Seattle Parks and Recreation

3.0 POLICY

Seattle Parks and Recreation adopts the following park classifications as defined in Section 4.0 as well as the Parks Classification Assignments List dated October, 2014:

1. Mini Parks/Pocket Parks
2. Neighborhood Parks

3. Community Parks
4. Downtown Parks
5. Regional Parks
6. Special-Use Parks/Specialty Gardens
7. Greenbelts/Natural Areas
8. Boulevards/Green Streets/Greenways

4.0 DEFINITIONS

4.1	MINI PARKS, POCKET PARKS	<p>Mini and pocket parks provide a little green in dense areas. They are small parks transformed from developed, urban land sites acquired by the City. These urban land acquisitions have a wide variety of uses, and are sometimes jointly operated for both recreational and utility/infrastructure purposes.</p> <p>Mini and pocket parks may include ornamental areas, traffic islands, small boulevards, oversized rights-of-way, medians, and minor drainage ways. Plans for mini or pocket parks try to use remnants of old landscaping features or other elements from the site’s prior use to emphasize cultural or historic importance. Plans may also incorporate water towers or other utility infrastructure.</p>
Physical		
Size	Generally under 10,000 sq. ft. (0.25 acre)	
Setting	All zones Can be surrounded by residences, small commercial, non-arterial streets or on unused land between roads	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	No, unless it exceeds 10,000 sq. ft. (0.25 acre)	
Built environment		
Percent developed	70-100%	
Assets (desired – size dependent)	Benches Improved paths	Plaza or grassy area for informal activity (no sports field)
Assets (optional)	Designed Landscape Lighting for safety (rare) Picnic table	Play area Public art Viewpoint
Parking	Street, none	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	No	
Environmental Benefits	Possible green stormwater infrastructure, native plants	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	None	
Programming (optional)	Small community gatherings	
Geographic range of users	Immediate neighborhood – less than ¼ mile in distance	
4.2	NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS	<p>Neighborhood parks are substantially larger than pocket parks and generally occupy an area equivalent to one city block, and serve the surrounding neighborhood for multiple uses. Typical park development may include play areas, small fields, turf, trees, shrubs, irrigation, benches, trash receptacles, picnic tables, paved parking or walkways, signage and lighting. Many Neighborhood Parks contain playgrounds and viewpoints.</p>
Physical		

Size	Between 0.25 and 9 acres	
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages Generally surrounded by residences, small businesses, small or arterial streets	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes	
Built environment		
Percent developed	30-100%	
Assets (desired)	Benches Designed landscape Improved paths	Level grassy area for informal activity Picnic tables Play area
Assets (optional)	Basketball courts Boat launch Comfort station Garden Lighting for safety Picnic shelter or small shelter house	Public art Recreation areas Sports fields Stage Tennis courts Spray park or Wading pool Viewpoint Off-leash Area
Parking	Generally just street parking; may have off-street parking	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	May have natural area, creek, lake	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat (if natural area), CO2 reduction	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	None	
Programming (optional)	Light scheduling for athletic teams, community gatherings, small concerts	
Geographic range of users	Surrounding neighborhood – between ¼ and ½ mile	

4.3 COMMUNITY PARKS	Community parks satisfy the recreational needs of multiple neighborhoods and may also preserve unique landscapes. They generally accommodate group activities and recreational facilities not available at neighborhood parks. They may have athletic fields, large open spaces, paths, benches, natural areas, and restrooms. Community park sites should be accessible by arterial and/or collector streets, and may include off-street parking.	
Physical		
Size	Between 5 and 60 acres	
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages Should be next to an arterial, institution, or natural area rather than surrounded by homes on all sides	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes	
Built environment		
Percent developed	25-100%	
Assets (desired)	Basketball court Benches Comfort station Designed landscape Improved paths Level grassy area for informal activity	Lighting for safety Picnic tables and shelters Play area Sports field(s)
Assets (optional)	Boat launch Community Center Concessions Community or specialty garden Lifeguarded beach Lighting for specific facility use Natural Area Off-leash area Public art	Pool Recreation areas or complexes (lighted sports fields with designated parking away from residences) Skatepark Stage Tennis courts Spray park or Wading pool Viewpoint
Parking	Off-street parking	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	May contain natural areas, creeks, lakes	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat (if natural area), CO2 reduction	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	Community gatherings	
Programming (optional)	Scheduled for athletic teams, small concerts, naturalist activities, food vendors (cart)	
Geographic range of users	Several surrounding neighborhoods – between 1/2 and 3 miles; citywide if park contains a recreation complex	

4.4	DOWNTOWN PARKS	<p>Downtown Parks are typically smaller, developed sites located in Seattle’s center. Many are iconic urban landscapes and provide a respite from busy downtown streets, offer places to sit, and provide space for performers and vendors.</p> <p>Many of these parks have historic significance. Downtown destination parks are signature parks of interest to the broad community and allow the public to enjoy the city’s center.</p>	
Physical			
Size	Between 0.1 and 5 acres		
Setting	<p>The 2006 Downtown Parks & Public Spaces Task Force Report defines “downtown” as the area bounded by South Lake Union Park to the north, the International District to the south and Interstate 5 to the east. This document currently reflects those boundaries, although in the future the area defined “downtown” may shift as the city changes</p> <p>Generally surrounded by commercial buildings</p>		
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Only those over 10,000 square feet		
Built environment			
Percent developed	100%		
Assets (desired)	Benches Improved paths Designed landscapes Lighting for safety	Plaza or level grassy area for informal activity (no sports field)	
Assets (optional)	Picnic tables Play area	Public art Stage Off-leash Area	
Parking	Street, none		
Natural Environment			
Natural Area	None		
Environmental Benefits	Possible green stormwater infrastructure, native plants		
Programs			
Programming (desired)	None		
Programming (optional)	Buskers, food vendors (carts), small concerts, special events		
Geographic range of users	Immediate business community, downtown visitors and residents, tourists		

4.5 REGIONAL PARKS	Regional parks supplement neighborhood and community parks, often serving broader citywide recreation needs. Each of these parks contains various assets, often for active recreation, and is programmed accordingly. Many also have large natural areas of undeveloped land and/or historic or landmarked significance. These parks tend to be destinations, often generate tourism, and have views or water access. Restroom facilities and off-street parking should be provided for facility users. Park lighting should be for security and safety as well as facility use.	
Physical		
Size	The average for this category is over 100 acres, but the range is from approximately 10 acres up to over 500 acres.	
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes	
Built environment		
Percent developed	20-100%	
Assets (desired)	Benches Comfort station Designed landscape Improved paths Level grassy area for informal activity	Lighting for safety Picnic tables and shelters Play area Sports field(s)
Assets (optional)	Boat launch Community Center Concessions Community or specialty garden Lifeguarded beach Lighting for specific facility use Natural Area Off-leash area Public art Basketball court	Golf courses and driving ranges Pool Recreation areas or complexes (lighted sports fields with designated parking away from residences) Skatepark Stage Tennis courts Spray park or Wading pool Viewpoint
Parking	Off-street parking	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	May contain natural areas, creeks, lakes, wetlands, shoreline access	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat (if natural area), CO2 reduction	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	Community gatherings	
Programming (optional)	Scheduled for athletic teams, rentals, small concerts, naturalist activities, food vendors (cart), buskers, special events	
Geographic range of users	Citywide, regional, tourists	

4.6	NATURAL AREA/ GREENBELT	<p>Natural Areas are park sites established for the protection and stewardship of wildlife, habitat and other natural systems support functions. Some natural areas are accessible for low-impact use. Minimal infrastructure may include access and signage, where it will not adversely impact habitat or natural systems functions. Larger natural areas may have small sections developed to serve a community park function. Large Natural Area/Greenbelts may be divided into subareas based on vegetation, habitat, restoration status, wildlife area designation, recreation use area, etc. in order to better differentiate resource needs and use priorities.</p>	
Physical			
Size	Any		
Setting	Where tracts of undeveloped land are available. Natural areas may include, but are not limited to, forest, meadows, riparian areas, beaches, tidelands and wetlands. Non-accessible natural areas are generally found on steep slopes or in riparian zones or wetlands. Natural areas often serve as a buffer between incompatible land uses. See 1993 Greenspaces Policy (Resolution 28653) for details about natural areas.		
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Only parks with usable open space over 10,000 square feet		
Built environment			
Percent developed	Limited to infrastructure for support services		
Assets (desired)	None (Parks Design Standard 02900-01 "Site Restoration of Natural Areas" shall apply)		
Assets (optional)	Comfort station Environmental Learning Center Picnic tables	Play area Signage Trails (internal and connecting with external urban trails) Viewpoint	
Parking	Street parking, off-street parking for natural areas with more amenities		
Natural Environment			
Natural Area	Yes		
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat, riparian corridor (if there is a creek or shoreline), erosion control		
Programs			
Programming (desired)	Environmental education		
Programming (optional)	Plant restoration service projects, research		
Geographic range of users	Citywide, regional, tourists		

4.7	BOULEVARDS/GREEN STREETS/GREENWAYS	Park boulevards are established by City Council Ordinance, SMC 15.02.046 I and defined as an extension or expansion of a dedicated street which continues to serve as a right-of-way in addition to being park land. Many of Seattle’s boulevards are part of the Olmsted plan. Boulevards and green streets often provide safe pedestrian routes as well as recreation opportunities for jogging and bicycling.	
Physical			
Size	Any		
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages Along an arterial road In places with attractive views		
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Those with usable open space over 10,000 square feet		
Built environment			
Percent developed	25-100%		
Assets (desired)	Designed landscape Improved Path	Regular street lighting	
Assets (optional)	Benches Decorative lighting Flat grassy area for informal activity	Play area Public gathering place Viewpoint	
Parking	Street parking, off-street parking		
Natural Environment			
Natural Area	May have shoreline, riparian area		
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, riparian area, CO2 reduction		
Programs			
Programming (desired)	None		
Programming (optional)	None		
Geographic range of users	Citywide, all travelers using the street		

4.8	SPECIAL-USE PARKS/SPECIALITY GARDENS	<p>This category refers generally to stand-alone parks that are designed to serve one particular use. Examples of parks that fit into this category include Woodland Park Zoo, West Seattle Stadium, Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center, Kubota Gardens and Camp Long. Specialty gardens are some of Seattle's most beautiful and inspiring places. They offer respite from the city's noise, quiet places to sit and reflect, and a revival of color and fragrance in the spring.</p> <p>For each special-use park type, the descriptors will differ depending on industry standards and best practices for the intended activity. For each type of special-use park, a more detailed list of descriptors should be developed by a design expert in that particular field.</p>
Physical		
Size	Whatever size is necessary for the intended use	
Setting	Depends on intended use	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	In some cases	
Built environment		
Percent developed	70-100%	
Assets (desired)	Depends on intended use	
Assets (optional)	Depends on intended use	
Parking	Depends on intended use	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	None	
Environmental benefits	Native plants, habitat, and green stormwater infrastructure; environmental benefits of other special-use parks depends on development	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	Depends on intended use	
Programming (optional)	Depends on intended use	
Geographic range of users	Citywide, regional, tourists	

5.0 RESPONSIBILITY

- 5.1 The Planning & Development Division (PDD) will be responsible for reviewing the Parks Classification System as a guideline as park development plans are reviewed for proposed improvements or changes in use.
- 5.2 The Parks Division will be responsible for reviewing the Parks Classification System as new maintenance procedures at a park site are considered.
- 5.3 As policies related to park programming options in different park types are considered, it will be the responsibility of the Recreation Division and Regional Parks and Strategic Outreach Division to review the Parks Classification System for policy guidance.

6.0 PROCEDURE

- 6.1 Revisions to the Parks Classification System may be requested, including revisions to park category definitions and changes to the assigned category of a specific park. Requests should be made in writing to the Parks Superintendent.
- 6.2 The Parks Superintendent may confer with the chair of the Board of Park Commissioners on the revisions and the preferred public review process for requested revisions. The Parks Superintendent shall have final authority on changes to the policy and/or park classification assignments

7.0 REFERENCES Not applicable

Appendix C – Public Engagement Notes

Public engagement for this plan consisted of a round of in-person events in May and June 2023, an online engagement hub for comments, and an online public meeting to present a review of the draft open space plan.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

In 2018-2019, SPR connected with community and partners to engage in a strategic planning process to reflect on department challenges and successes, the populations SPR was serving, and the populations SPR was missing. These conversations focused on thinking big about what the city might need between 2020 to 2032 and how to establish a strategic direction that would drive SPR's work toward meeting those needs. The result of this two-year planning effort was the 2020-2032 Strategic Plan.

More than 10,000 people provided input during this process and public engagement included the following actions:

- Statistically valid survey of 400+ residents
- Over 50 social media discussions
- 8 online surveys reaching over 1,700 people
- Survey kiosks in all community centers and pools
- Tabling at over 20 community events citywide
- Over 20 community listening meetings
- 2 large city-wide engagement events
- Surveys and questions asked in over 12 languages at community-led events and selected survey questions in the top six languages to reach underrepresented populations.

The major themes heard were as follows:

Support Seattle's growth and density by...

- Preserving open space
- Making multi-use spaces in parks and community centers

Support Seattle's transportation growth by...

- Thinking strategically about transit connection opportunities and parking constraints at parks and community centers

Embrace new recreation trends like...

- Pickleball
- Disc Golf
- Bike Tracks
- Roller Derby

Provide more facilities and amenities like...


- Pickleball
- Pools
- Green space
- Volleyball courts
- Trails and walking paths
- Outdoor fitness equipment
- Benches
- Playgrounds
- Restrooms in parks

Keep maintaining and enhancing the existing park and recreation system by...

- Repairing pools and community centers
- Keeping water fountains working
- Providing adequate staff for community centers, pools, and maintenance needs
- Keeping golf courses open to the public
- Repairing and cleaning restrooms
- Maintaining trails and paths
- Protecting wildlife

As a part of implementation of the Strategic Plan, from August to November 2021, SPR conducted a range of community engagement activities to inform the development of the 2022-2024 Action Plan. This included: Partners Meetings with historical SPR institutional partners; Community Engagement Ambassadors surveyed people at 10 community events; Park Ambassadors conducted more than 850 intercept surveys with park visitors at Golden Gardens, Green Lake, Gas Works, Magnuson, Alki, and Seward Parks; SPR hosted an online open house; SPR also hosted a central email address for questions and concerns outside those expressed across these other formats. In total, SPR reached more than 9,300 parks and recreation users through these efforts.

2021 Engagement Approach



2021 Engagement Outcomes | What We Heard



Increase community engagement staffing and focus on building **meaningful relationships with BIPOC community**



Improve **wayfinding** and signage, including **honoring Black and Indigenous history and language access**



Bolster **environmental education** to build real-world connections to climate and nature

Address **impacts of homelessness** in parks



Reduce barriers to partnering with SPR (e.g., volunteer activities, small/WMBE business permits, event scheduling)



Increase **SPR security presence** at parks and in facilities



Prioritize investments in the **urban canopy as a climate change mitigation** strategy; think long-range (70-100 years)



Prioritize recreation services on **weekday evenings and weekends**



Improving **marketing** to increase community awareness of SPR offerings

Improve **recycling and composting** infrastructure



Clarify pathways to implement **community-identified priorities**; train staff in **co-design** practices



Restore and increase access to **pools** and aquatics programming



Hire **staff from within communities** we serve



Increase **access to food and urban agriculture** opportunities



Maximize **pedestrian usability of trails** and natural spaces

High level themes for Capital & Facilities:

- Maximize usability and flexibility of existing park spaces through trail and pathway upgrades and enhancements;
- Make strategic investments to balance climate adaptation and mitigation (adding air conditioning to provide respite from heat while investing in alternative energy and enhancing energy efficiency at facilities); enhance and maintain the existing park system with a focus on enhancements in historically underserved areas.

High level themes for Natural Resource Maintenance:

- Prioritize actions that leverage Seattle's tree canopy in mitigating the impacts of climate change; increase access to food and urban agriculture opportunities; coordinate approaches to citywide planning and trail and natural space maintenance; partner with other departments and institutions to create long-range plans for urban canopy restoration.

From November 2022 through January 2023 SPR staff attended five in-person open houses in conjunction with early input for the *One Seattle* comprehensive plan update. OPCD conducted targeted outreach for these meetings to identify and uplift voice of marginalized communities, including compensation for outreach to five community-based organizations. Attendees could provide written comments and indicate on district maps where they would want to see park facilities. More than 120 comments were made about parks and park facilities. Open houses were held on the following dates and locations:

- 11/14/2022: New Holly Gathering Center (6-8pm)
- 12/1/2022: Langston Center (6-8pm)
- 12/8/2022: South Seattle College (6-8pm)
- 12/12/2022: Loyal Heights Community Center (6-8pm)
- 1/10/2022: Meadowbrook Community Center (6-8pm)

Area	Themes Heard
Community Centers	Climate resiliency hubs in community centers
Environment & Nature	Work to provide 30% tree canopy for city, develop mini-parks and community gardens with trees
Golf	Convert Jackson Park Golf Course into other park and open space, consider housing
Housing	Build more housing near parks and open space, more dense and affordable housing near parks
Park Access	Provide more equitable access to parks, more access in densely populated neighborhoods
Park Development	Lid I-5 to create urban parks, develop smaller pocket parks, convert tree groves to pocket parks when upzoning areas, require pocket parks in large multifamily developments, open year-round restrooms
Safety	Regularly clean parks and restrooms, no camping,
Transportation	Connect parks with green corridors, provide better bike connections and parking

TABLE 1 – SUMMARY COMMENTS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PUBLIC MEETINGS

An online public meeting was held on May 18, 2023 with 15 attendees. Questions were answered online and recorded for later review.

For the *2024 Park and Open Space Plan* open houses, SPR reached out to community center staff about the locations where interpreters would make sense. For areas of the city with higher language diversity other than English, interpreters were provided at the open houses held at Delridge CC, Yesler CC and Van Asselt CC. SPR staff also called and emailed community members who were equity partners in the Strategic Action Plan process in 2021. SPR also purchased advertising in the Northwest Asian Weekly and South Seattle Emerald. More than 80 persons attended open houses at the following sites.

5/22/2023: Bitter Lake Community Center
 5/23/23: Yesler Community Center
 5/25/23: Meadowbrook Community Center
 6/5/23: Queen Anne Community Center
 6/6/23: Delridge Community Center
 6/7/23: Van Asselt Community Center

More than 25 comments were sent via email and more than 120 comments were submitted to the Park Engagement Hub.

Area	Themes Heard
Aquatics	Provide more splash pads, spray parks as a cooling option during summer months
Athletic Fields	Provide more high-quality grass sports fields due to injuries on synthetic turf fields, provide more fields in north Seattle
Community Centers	Provide adult programming as a way for adults to connect, provide more programming for seniors, consider community centers as cooling centers and as winter shelter for homeless people
Environment & Nature	Plant more trees to reduce urban heat island effects, more trees to create expanded canopy and shade.
Exercise Equipment Outdoor	Provide outdoor exercise equipment in parks, like pull up bars, shoulder press, etc.
Land Acquisition	Acquire more parks and open spaces, consider support for constructing a lid over I-5 for open space, connect with churches that may be losing membership for potential land purchases instead of developers.
Off-Leash Areas	Prioritize OLA for Upper Queen Anne need more and larger OLAs due to projected increase of dogs, build OLA at Smith Cove as designed and promised to the community
Pickleball	Want more pickleball courts, dedicated and on existing tennis courts, expand dedicated pickleball play times
P-Patches & Urban Agriculture	Allocate more space for P-Patches
Restrooms	Existing restrooms need to be renovated
Safety	Too much litter in parks, restrooms need more regular maintenance, more enforcement where dogs off-leash in parks
Zoning & Open Space	Provide more parks and higher density near light rail

Table 2 – Summary Comments SPR Public Meetings

A State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist was prepared in November 2023 and published in the county newspaper of record (Daily Journal of Commerce). Six comments were received via email during the comment period.

The Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners (BPRC) were briefed on the 2024 POSP on January 25, 2024. On February 9, 2024 the draft Plan was released to the public via the project webpage. A public comment period

began on February 9th and continued through March 9, 2024. On March 14th, the BPRC discussed the 2024 POSP and recommended to the Superintendent its approval.

During the public comment period more than 100 comments were received via email expressing support for golf courses and especially Jackson Park Golf Course. The main concerns were about preserving the golf courses, not repurposing them for housing or other recreational facilities. More than 20 comments covered the following issues ranging from more facility maintenance, acquiring property near high density areas, establish partnerships with tribal governments to educate the public about historical and cultural significance of park sites,, provide more restrooms in parks, develop a city wide trails plan, include Roxhill Bog Natural Area and Kubota Garden as key capital projects.



GEORGETOWN PLAYFIELD, SYNTHETIC TURF REPLACEMENT 2022

Appendix D – Capital Improvement Plan

Project Title	Starting Year	Asset Management Program
Garfield Playfield Restroom Structure Renovation	2022	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Licton Springs Shelterhouse Replacement	2022	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Colman Pool Facilities Renovation (Access)	2023	Accessibility and Compliance
Genesee Park and Playfield Access Improvements (Playfield - South)	2023	Accessibility and Compliance
Helene Madison Locker Room Renovation (Access)	2023	Accessibility and Compliance
Meadowbrook Pool Facility Stabilization (Accessibility)	2023	Accessibility and Compliance
Mounger Pool Accessibility Improvements	2023	Accessibility and Compliance
West Seattle Stadium Accessibility Upgrade	2023	Accessibility and Compliance
Andrews Bay Buoy Installation	2023	Aquatics
Urban Food Systems Study	2023	Asset Management and Long-Range Planning
Ballfields - Minor Capital Improvements	2023	Athletic Fields Minor Improvements
Amy Yee Tennis Center Renovation Phase 2 (roof & envelope)	2023	Building Preservation and Renovation
Garfield Community Center Decarbonization	2023	Climate Conscious Buildings
Genesee HQ Decarbonization	2023	Climate Conscious Buildings
Jefferson Community Center Decarbonization	2023	Climate Conscious Buildings
Rainier Community Center Decarbonization	2023	Climate Conscious Buildings
Van Asselt Community Center Decarbonization	2023	Climate Conscious Buildings
Dr Jose Rizal Park Restroom Structure Renovation	2023	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Community Center Rehabilitation & Development	2023	Community Centers
Green Lake Community Center & Evans Pool Improvements	2023	Community Centers
Green Lake Community Center & Evans Pool Improvements	2023	Community Centers
Queen Anne CC Facility Renovation	2023	Community Centers
Van Asselt Community Center Re-roof	2023	Community Centers
Colman Park Drainage Renovation	2023	Drainage Restoration
Marra Desimone Park Improvements	2023	Equitable Parks Development Program
Parks CommUNITY Fund	2023	Equitable Parks Development Program
Interbay Golf Accessible Driving Stalls	2023	Golf Capital Improvements

Project Title	Starting Year	Asset Management Program
Pratt Park Play Area Renovation	2023	Golf Capital Improvements
Jefferson Golf Accessible Driving Stalls	2023	Golf Capital Improvements
West Seattle Golf Clubhouse Restroom and Accessibility Renovation	2023	Golf Capital Improvements
Ballard PG Athletic Field Renovation	2023	Grass Fields
Hutchinson Playground Field Renovation	2023	Grass Fields
Matthews Beach Park Irrigation Renovation	2023	Irrigation and Drainage
Sustainable Irrigation Replacement & Upgrade	2023	Irrigation and Drainage
Water Re-Use Partnerships Program	2023	Irrigation and Drainage
Central West District HQ Re-roof	2023	Large Roofs
Large Roof Program	2023	Large Roofs
Cayton Corner Park Development	2023	New Park Development
Gateway Park North Park Development	2023	New Park Development
48th and Charleston Landbanked Site Development	2023	New Park Development (Orig 14)
Morgan Junction Landbanked Site Development	2023	New Park Development (Orig 14)
West Seattle Junction Landbanked Site Development	2023	New Park Development (Orig 14)
New OLA 1 (West Seattle)	2023	Off Leash Area Improvements
New OLA 2	2023	Off Leash Area Improvements
Construction of 1-2 large-scale dedicated pickleball facilities	2023	Outdoor Courts
Hutchinson Playground Sport Court Renovation	2023	Outdoor Courts
Lake Washington Blvd Renovations	2023	Park Improvements
Rainier Beach Skate Park	2023	Park Improvements
Firehouse Mini Park Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
Hutchinson Playground Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
Madrona Park Beach Play Area	2023	Play Area Renovation
Madrona Playground Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
Rainier CC (Genesee Park) Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
T.T. Minor Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
Ward Springs Park Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
Be'er Sheva Park Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
Blanch Lavizzo Park Play Area Renovation	2023	Play Area Renovation
Graham Visitors Center Basement Flooding Improvement	2023	Plumbing and Sewer
Lake Union Park Water Main Replacement	2023	Plumbing and Sewer
Colman Pool Facilities Renovation	2023	Pools
Evans Pool Plaster Liner and Filter Repair	2023	Pools
Helene Madison Locker Room Renovation and ADA	2023	Pools

Project Title	Starting Year	Asset Management Program
Helene Madison Pool Plaster Liner Replacement	2023	Pools
Meadowbrook Pool Facility Stabilization	2023	Pools
Medgar Evers Pool Structural Evaluation	2023	Pools
Mounger Pool Locker Room Renovation and ADA	2023	Pools
Pool Equipment Replacement Program	2023	Pools
Pool Facility Major Maintenance Program	2023	Pools
Rainier Beach Pool HVAC Replacement & Decarbonization	2023	Pools
Genesee PF #1 Synthetic Turf Replacement	2023	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Genesee PF #2 Synthetic Turf Replacement	2023	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Discovery Park South Beach Trail	2023	Trails Major Maintenance
Trails Major Maintenance	2023	Trails Major Maintenance
URM Building Assessments	2023	Unreinforced Masonry Retrofits
Judkins Park Accessibility Improvements	2024	Accessibility and Compliance
Magnuson Park Building 30 and Bathhouse Access Improvements (B-contract)	2024	Accessibility and Compliance
Miller Playfield Accessibility Improvements	2024	Accessibility and Compliance
Athletic Field Lighting Replacement Program	2024	Athletic Field Lighting
Langston Hughes Performing Arts Institute Decarbonization	2024	Climate Conscious Buildings
Judkins Park Upper Shelterhouse Renovation	2024	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Judkins Park Lower Shelterhouse Renovation	2024	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Walt Hundley Playfield Restroom Structure Renovation	2024	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
8th and Mercer Community Center Development	2024	Community Centers
Lake City Community Center Improvements	2024	Community Centers
Langston Hughes Performing Arts Institute Restoration	2024	Community Centers
Jackson Park Golf Course Connectivity Study	2024	Golf Capital Improvements
Jackson Park Golf Maintenance Building Roof Replacement	2024	Large Roofs
New Park Development Program	2024	New Park Development
Smith Cove Park Development (Phase 1)	2024	New Park Development
A.B. Ernst Landbanked Site Development	2024	New Park Development (Orig 14)
Wedgwood Landbanked Site Development	2024	New Park Development (Orig 14)
Duwamish Upland Parks Remediation	2024	Other
Magnuson Pier Restoration	2024	Over-water structures

Project Title	Starting Year	Asset Management Program
Over-water Structures Major Maintenance Program	2024	Over-water structures
Mayfair Park Play Area Renovation	2024	Play Area Renovation
Judkins Park Play Area Renovation	2024	Play Area Renovation
Miller Playfield Play Area Renovation	2024	Play Area Renovation
Southwest Teen Life Center and Pool Play Area Renovation	2024	Play Area Renovation
University Playground Play Area Improvement	2024	Play Area Renovation
Westcrest Park South Play Area Restoration	2024	Play Area Renovation
Lower Woodland PF #1 Accessibility	2024	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Lower Woodland PF #1 Synthetic Turf Replacement	2024	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Walt Hundley PF Athletic Field Accessibility	2024	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Walt Hundley PF Synthetic Turf Replacement	2024	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Kubota Gardens Accessibility Improvements	2025	Accessibility and Compliance
Loyal Heights CC Accessibility Improvements	2025	Accessibility and Compliance
Magnuson Building 138 Accessibility Improvements	2025	Accessibility and Compliance
Magnuson Building 138 Decarbonization	2025	Climate Conscious Buildings
Jackson Park 7th Tee Restroom Structure Rehabilitation	2025	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
West Seattle Golf Course On-course Restroom Structure Renovation	2025	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Delridge Community Center Shower Renovation	2025	Community Centers
Loyal Heights CC Facility Renovation	2025	Community Centers
Loyal Heights CC Facility Renovation	2025	Community Centers
Meadowbrook Community Center Shower / HVAC Renovation	2025	Community Centers
Green Lake Park Alum Treatment 2026	2025	Other
Kubota Gardens Upgrade	2025	Other
East Queen Anne Playground Play Area Renovation	2025	Play Area Renovation
Froula Park Play Area Renovation	2025	Play Area Renovation
Green Lake Park Play Area Renovation	2025	Play Area Renovation
Hiawatha Playfield Illicit Connection Remediation	2025	Plumbing and Sewer
Retaining Walls Bridges Bulkheads and Stairs Program	2025	Retaining Walls, Bulkheads, Bridges and Stairs
Bobby Morris (Cal Anderson) Accessibility	2025	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Bobby Morris (Cal Anderson) Synthetic Turf Replacement 2	2025	Synthetic Turf Replacement
Interbay Stadium Synthetic Turf Replacement	2025	Synthetic Turf Replacement

Project Title	Starting Year	Asset Management Program
Magnuson Building 138 (Gatehouse) Seismic Retrofit	2025	Unreinforced Masonry Retrofits
Dahl Playfield Accessibility Improvements	2026	Accessibility and Compliance
Seward Park Accessibility Improvements	2026	Accessibility and Compliance
Westcrest Park South Accessibility Improvements	2026	Accessibility and Compliance
W Queen Anne PF Athletic Field Renovation & ADA (Queen Anne Turf Field Replacement)	2026	Athletic Field Conversion
Dahl Playfield Lighting Replacement	2026	Athletic Field Lighting
West Seattle Stadium Playfield Lighting Replacement	2026	Athletic Field Lighting
Amy Yee Tennis Center Renovation Phase 3	2026	Building Preservation and Renovation
Graham Visitors Center Trellis Restoration	2026	Building Preservation and Renovation
Seward Park Bathhouse and Clay Studio Renovation	2026	Building Preservation and Renovation
Densmore HQ Decarbonization	2026	Climate Conscious Buildings
High Point Community Center Decarbonization	2026	Climate Conscious Buildings
Dahl Playfield Shelterhouse Renovation	2026	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Gilman Playground Shelterhouse Renovation	2026	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Lakewood Playground Restroom Structure Renovation	2026	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Salmon Bay Playground Restroom Structure Renovation	2026	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Sandel Playground Shelterhouse Renovation	2026	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Seward Park Beach Restroom Structure Renovation	2026	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Westcrest Park South Restroom Structure Renovation	2026	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
High Point Community Center Renovation	2026	Community Centers
Bitter Lake Reservoir Park Development	2026	New Park Development
Duwamish Waterway Park Expansion	2026	New Park Development
New OLA 3 Planning	2026	Off Leash Area Improvements
Densmore HQ Seismic Retrofit (URM)	2026	Unreinforced Masonry Retrofits
Genesee Park (North) Accessibility Improvements	2027	Accessibility and Compliance
Jefferson Park Access Improvements	2027	Accessibility and Compliance
Magnuson Building 47 Accessibility Improvements (Gym/Restroom)	2027	Accessibility and Compliance

Project Title	Starting Year	Asset Management Program
Magnuson Park Accessibility Improvements (East Parking Lots)	2027	Accessibility and Compliance
Magnuson Park Building 30 (PW)	2027	Accessibility and Compliance
Northacres Park Accessibility Improvements	2027	Accessibility and Compliance
Seacrest Park Accessibility Improvements	2027	Accessibility and Compliance
Magnuson Park Athletic Field 12 Conversion	2027	Athletic Field Conversion
Genesee Park (North) Restroom Structure Renovation	2027	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Magnolia Park Restroom Structure Renovation	2027	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Magnuson Park Sports Meadow Restroom Structure Renovation	2027	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Northacres Park Restroom Structure Replacement	2027	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
University Playground Restroom Structure Renovation	2027	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Magnuson Barrier Free Loop Trail Improvements	2027	Magnuson Park Master Plan and Site Improvements
Magnuson Circulation Improvements (Various)	2027	Magnuson Park Master Plan and Site Improvements
1125 Harvard Interim Safety Improvements	2027	New Park Development
Meadowbrook Playfield Tennis Court Renovation	2027	Outdoor Courts
Mount Baker Park Sport Court Renovation	2027	Outdoor Courts
Genesee Park (North) Play Area Renovation	2027	Play Area Renovation
Colman Pool Plaster Liner Replacement	2027	Pools
Meadowbrook Pool Plaster Liner Replacement	2027	Pools
Queen Anne Pool Plaster Liner Replacement	2027	Pools
Rainier Beach Pool Plaster Liner Replacement	2027	Pools
Pratt Fine Arts Center Seismic Retrofit	2027	Unreinforced Masonry Retrofits
Lincoln Park Accessibility Improvements	2028	Accessibility and Compliance
Madrona Bathhouse and Dance Studio Renovation	2028	Building Preservation and Renovation
Lincoln Park Wading Pool Restroom Structure Renovation	2028	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Madrona Park Concession Stand Restroom Structure Renovation	2028	Restroom Structure and Shelterhouse Renovations
Alki Playground Sport Court Renovation	2028	Outdoor Courts
Green Lake Bathhouse Theater Seismic Retrofit	2028	Unreinforced Masonry Retrofits
Greenwood Park Accessibility Improvements	2026-2028	Accessibility and Compliance
Greenwood Park Play Area Renovation	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation
Pratt Park Play Area Renovation	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation

Project Title	Starting Year	Asset Management Program
Riverview Playfield Accessibility Improvements	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation
Riverview Playfield Play Area Renovation	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation
Roanoke Park Play Area Renovation	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation
Rogers Playground Play Area Renovation	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation
Soundview Playfield Play Area Renovation	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation
Trolley Hill Park Play Area Renovation	2026-2028	Play Area Renovation
ADA Compliance Projects-m	On-going	Accessibility and Compliance
ADA Compliance-Parks	On-going	Accessibility and Compliance
Activating and Connecting to Greenways	On-going	Activating and Connecting to Greenways