

KEEPING THE GREEN IN SEATTLE 2000

“It’s not easy staying green!”



STUDY COMMITTEE

Alexandra Pye, Chair
Catherine Anstett, Editor
Judy Buchan
Lynn Ferguson
Don Harris, Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation
Eleanor Laxdall
Cliff Marks, Department of Design, Construction and Land Use, City of Seattle
T.J. Moore, Strategic Planning Office, City of Seattle
Patricia Stambor
Ethel Williams

READING COMMITTEE

Betty Sullivan, Chair
Marguerite Kuhns
Jan O'Connor

OTHER READERS

Lynn Moen, Writer and Editor
Peggy Tlapak

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SEATTLE

Sandy Barney, Co-President
Barbara Guptill, Co-President
Russell Batten, Administrative Manager

Reprints of this report are available for a nominal fee from:

League of Women Voters of Seattle
1402 Eighteenth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98122-4126

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	R-3
II.	Overview of Public and Private Land in Seattle	R-3
	What is Green Space?	R-3
	Seattle Land -- What Exists and Who Owns It?	R-4
	Procedures for the Use and Disposal of the City of Seattle's Real Property	R-5
III.	Governance	R-5
IV.	Public Open Space Gained Since 1990	R-8
V.	Overall Development in Seattle	R-13
VI.	Voluntary Efforts in Keeping the Green	R-14
VII.	Related Issues	R-16
	Salmon Recovery	R-16
	Port of Seattle	R-17
VIII.	Funding Efforts	R-17
IX.	Summary	R-18
X.	Recommendations	R-19
XI.	Appendix	R-21
	Endnotes	R-21
	Glossary	R-22
	Acronyms	R-23
	Contributors to <i>Keeping the Green 2000</i>	R-23
	A Partial List of Environmental Groups in Seattle	R-24



Introduction



In 1991 the League of Women Voters of Seattle produced a study, *Keeping the Green in Seattle*, which reported on open space. Since then there have been significant changes in open space in Seattle. The 1990's was a decade of public open space land purchases through the 1989 King County Open Space and Trails Bond Issue and the Shoreline Parks Improvement Fund. The 1989 bond funds leveraged monies from the King County Conservation Futures Tax, and from some state funds. The mid-1990's were also marked by an increased focus on existing public land. Policies were developed to encourage efforts to "green" these areas and increase public access to the shoreline. The 1988 open space policies laid out the framework for policies adopted in the 1990's, including the green streets and water-related street end policies. (1)

During this time, Seattle experienced a major economic boom. Many people moved here for the plentiful jobs. They also heard that Seattle was a beautiful city with mountain views, surrounded by water and close to recreational activities both at the ocean and in the mountains. Seattle was named to many national and international "most livable cities" lists. As the need for housing increased with willing buyers, developers began to build on the few remaining vacant sites in Seattle, including forested hillsides and riparian corridors.

This report originally intended to compare what the city had gained and lost in green space in the 1990's. It is not possible to make comparisons because of changes in the past decade in databases, search instruments, government personnel and departments, and reliable data. However, we can indicate what public open space we have gained in the 1990's with some indication of land preserved, through both private and public efforts. We are also able to use some reliable measurements to show development in green and open spaces.

To remain consistent with our earlier study, we will define terms and compare land ownership in 1990 and 2000, divided into public and private land. Public land can be further divided into park department holdings, street rights-of-way and ownership by other public agencies. Since government policies and regulations have a great impact on public open space, the report will look at policy and changes since 1990.

Volunteer efforts will be addressed. Since the 1989 open space bond funds and many other public funding sources are now nearly depleted, we will look at the efforts of private individuals and organizations to purchase or preserve green space.

In the past decade, some issues emerged that could have a bearing on public open space, including the

endangered species act relating to salmon, the city's public/private partnership policies, and Port of Seattle expansion in the Duwamish area. The report also looks at the history of attempts to secure public funding for open space acquisition since 1990.

At the conclusion of the 1991 study, issues that can lead to conflict and tension regarding the preservation of open space were mentioned. This report examines whether these issues are the same, if they have changed, or if new issues have emerged.

We finish with a summary and recommendations for action or study. Also included is an appendix to help the reader investigate further, since this report can merely touch the surface of this complex but important topic.



Overview of Public and Private Land in Seattle



"The most crying need . . . is for parks, breathing spaces for the people—spots of green. . . Strange as it seems, these popular oases . . . are the most difficult of all civic features to obtain." (2)

"These are the things we learn. If the land is unlivable, we'll be gone. Every time an animal or a plant goes extinct, people get closer to extinction, too." (3)

What is Green Space?

There are probably as many definitions of green space as there are areas of green. For purposes of this report, "green space is an area with green vegetation on it. It covers large areas such as parks, golf courses and cemeteries, as well as small ones, such as roof top gardens and vegetable or flower gardens in parking/planting strips." (4) There are also big areas of green at some of the private/public educational institutions.

Open space refers to areas that are largely undeveloped and without structures, and that provide light, air, and a sense of openness in a built-up urban area. (5) Following the pattern of the Open Space Policies of 1988, open space covers greenbelts and natural areas (now referred to as greenspaces), boulevards, trails, waterfront street ends, pea patches, view corridors, parkland, pocket parks, green streets and public waterfront.

Much of the green lies in the officially designated greenspaces (formerly called greenbelts and natural areas). **Greenspaces** “shall be identified as important natural or ecological features to be preserved through acquisition or voluntary conservation efforts, and shall include those areas previously identified as greenbelts and natural areas.” (6) The adoption of a greenspaces policy mapped the natural areas together with the greenbelts for acquisition targeting. **Greenbelts** are linear stretches of green space, often located along steep hillsides. **Natural areas** are small pockets of greenery, which have natural or ecological features. They are often wooded ravines or drainage areas, which are only visible from the surrounding neighborhood. (7)

Rights-of-Way	26%
	14,814 acres (approx.)
SDPR Jurisdiction	10.3%
	6,000 acres (approx.)
Other government ownership	9.9%
	5,322 acres (approx.)

There has been a gain of about 13% (5,200 acres) in land under the jurisdiction of the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation since 1990. About 5,000 acres was under SDPR jurisdiction in 1990. Of the land under SDPR jurisdiction today, about 87.2% is categorized as parks/playgrounds/viewpoints; 12.5% is greenspaces; 3% is p-patches, and the rest is landscaping. (9) Other governmental departments own the rest of the public land, with the Port of Seattle owning approximately 2% of the city’s land area. (See accompanying circle graphs.)

Seattle Land—What Exists and Who Owns It?

Is the Emerald City’s luster fading with development? How much land is green space and open space? We need to know something about the ownership of land in Seattle. The acreage within the City of Seattle is 56,253 acres, or 87.9 square miles. (8)

One of the big changes in the 1990’s was the complete turnover of Sand Point Naval Air Station to the city of approximately 164 acres, adding to the land under SDPR jurisdiction. The federal government had already turned over approximately 190 acres in the 1970’s for Magnuson Park. (See sidebar on page R-10.)

In 2000, land ownership in Seattle consisted of:

Private Ownership	54%
	30,115 acres
Public Ownership	46%
	26,138 acres

About 1.6% of Seattle’s acreage is in designated greenbelts. (10) According to Shannon and Wilson, a geo-tech company, 1% of the land in Seattle is on slide-prone slopes, with much of this land in greenbelts. (11)

Property Ownership Profile for Seattle, Washington

1990

2000

We take for granted that all greenbelts are publicly owned. Actually, about half of the mapped greenbelts targeted for purchase were privately owned in 1990. In 2000, because of open space purchase in these greenbelts, the private ownership decreased to 21%, with public ownership increasing to 79%. (12) Land is not protected from development unless it is already public or it is subject to some legal agreement, such as a conservation easement.

Procedures for the use and disposal of the City of Seattle's real property (13)

The procedure for the use and disposal of the city's real property follows the State Accountancy Act, which requires city departments and other governmental agencies to receive a fair market value for the surplus properties. The city council has the final say in the disposition of property. The Executive Services Department (ESD) is the coordinator for the management of the city's real property.

Each department has the authority to declare that its property is excess (i.e. that the department no longer needs the property in question). This information is sent to all departments and government entities to determine their interest. If no interest is expressed by any party, the property may be offered for sale to a private party at fair market value. If one or more departments express an interest, ESD develops a recommendation for the reuse and sale of the property, keeping public benefit (such as affordable housing, open space, transit, community gardens) as the highest priority.

Public input is based on the specific land issues involved, the size and value of the property, and the breadth of community relevance—is it a city-wide issue or one that involves only a specific neighborhood? The ESD is sensitive to issues of neighborhood planning and gets neighborhood input when city property is being proposed for sale.



Governance



Many policies, resolutions, ordinances, and regulations of the city relating to the land use code have a bearing on green space and open space. The city has responsibility for the public good, which includes the health, welfare, and safety of its citizens. In land use issues, the property rights of the landowner must be considered as well. There are other factors such as political bias and citizen participation, which affect the decisions of the elected officials. Of course, every city action must be consistent with the comprehensive plan and the land use code.

This section will discuss those city governance items that have a bearing on green and open space, with changes that have occurred since 1990.

City of Seattle Open Space Policies of 1987. The Open Space Policies of 1987 had a large effect on the implementation of public open space plans in the 1990's. These policies guided the bike/pedestrian system, the scenic designated boulevards, green streets, water-related street ends, and the targeting of priority areas in the city for funding from 1989 through the 1990's. Priority areas included the mapped greenbelts and natural areas, with special emphasis on Longfellow Creek, Lake Union, and Leschi. The open space policies were the background for inclusion as environmental priorities both in the Seattle comprehensive plan and the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation comprehensive plans. (14)

Growth Management Act. Planning strategies and regulations that affect open space are administered at several jurisdictional levels. At the state level, the Growth Management Act (RCW 36 70A, WAC 197-11) passed in 1990, mandated that counties in western Washington expecting a 20% growth from 1990-2000 develop a comprehensive plan. Since Seattle was part of King County's growth management plan, Seattle needed to develop its own plan for growth or increased density so that the area outside the urban boundary would remain rural. In Seattle, it was determined by the city that density would be concentrated in urban villages and urban centers.

Urban Villages and Urban Centers. The areas where most growth was anticipated, called urban villages or urban centers, covered approximately 67% of the city. These areas were asked to develop neighborhood plans. Beginning in 1995, approximately 20,000 citizens participated in the four-year planning process. Of the 38 neighborhood plans, 18 specifically requested acquisition of open space. (15) Some of the other neighborhoods requested open space but did not specify sites.

Seattle Comprehensive Plan. The comprehensive plan was adopted in 1994, and will have its five-year review and update in 2000. It has been amended yearly since its beginning, with one amendment on tree preservation relating to open space. (Amendment dated November 25, 1997)

The environmental stewardship portion of the comprehensive plan states that the city will work toward "increases in preserved open space." (16) Goals and policies relating to increasing open space are in sections on land use, transportation, and neighborhood planning. Some follow the 1987 open space policies.

The land use section refers to tree preservation (17), patches (18), green streets (19), shoreline street ends (20), and stream protection affecting salmon recovery. (21)

Wildlife and aquatic protection are mentioned in the conservation portion of this section. (22)

The transportation section refers to pedestrians and bicycles (23) with a map of pedestrian/bikeway trails. (24) This map was updated in January 2000.

The section on urban villages and urban centers which precedes the section on neighborhood planning states, (The city should) "provide open space to enhance the village environment." (25) The plan uses numerical benchmarks to identify these goals. The open space network section states specific goals and policies for open space in the urban villages. (26) For example, the plan sets a goal of one acre of open space recommended for every 1,000 households, and it recommends that a community garden should be available for every 2,500 residents. Priority for open space is given to areas having the greatest density and the least open space. For increasing open space, the policies encourage using existing public lands, incorporating open space in major public projects, and providing incentives for open space preservation by private owners. This can be done through current use assessment and conservation easements. (27)

The neighborhood planning element of the comprehensive plan "maintains consistency between neighborhood plans and the comprehensive plan." (28)

The shoreline policies are now incorporated into the land use element of the comprehensive plan (29) with the regulations still in the land use code. (30) No major changes have been made to the regulations since 1991. Public hearings were held throughout the state by the Department of Ecology during the summer of 2000 relating to proposed changes in the Shoreline Management Act.

Public Trust Doctrine. The Public Trust Doctrine ties in with the Shoreline Management Program and adds some protection of submerged land for public use. This doctrine "entrusts the State to maintain the public's right of navigation and access to fisheries along fresh and saltwater banks and shorelines, regardless of ownership of surrounding lands." For example, a person may own waterfront land, but according to the Public Trust Doctrine, the public has a right to walk along the beach, within the constraints of the tidelands. (32)

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and Seattle's SEPA Ordinance (SMC 25.05.355, Ordinance 114090, 1988). The city was required to follow the State Environmental Policy Act, the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 43.21C, 1971, and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 365-190 to deal with environmental impacts on large and small projects in environmentally sensitive areas such as steep slopes, potential slide areas, flood prone areas, land fills, etc. The Seattle Environmental Critical Policies and Regulations were approved by the city council in 1991, subject to review in 2000. Some of these

environmentally critical areas, particularly the steep slopes and wetlands, are experiencing extreme pressure for development as Seattle experiences an economic boom.

Although development takes place under the environmental critical regulations, land is not protected

Marriott Hotel Example

In 1999, the City of Seattle granted a permit to build a Marriott Hotel in Seattle's central waterfront on Alaskan Way between the World Trade Center and the Waterfront Landing Condominiums. Approximately half of the projected structure lay within the shoreline zone. Irene Wall and the Allegra Company appealed this use separately to the Shoreline Hearings Board.

Irene Wall's appeal was based on the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU) decision not to require adequate mitigation to protect public views as provided in the city's shoreline master program, under Seattle's Environmental Protection Act ordinance, and in other adopted policies for development in shoreline areas. At a hearing in August, the board reversed DCLU's permit, requesting that DCLU, in a future permit, scale down the bulk of the building to protect public views from the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Steinbrueck Park. The Port of Seattle and Wright Hotels, however, appealed the board's decision to King County Superior Court and asked for answers to the following questions:

- Does the Seattle Shoreline Management Program (SSMP) apply to a structure that is partly in and partly out of the shoreline zone?
- Did the city or the board correctly apply the SSMP to the hotel permit decision?
- Does a manmade bulkhead which has been filled render waterfront property outside the Shoreline Management Act's protection?

At the court hearing the judge found that a trial was needed, and it was set for May 2000. The judge gave credence to the city's interpretation of its master program, but she also gave credence to the board's interpretation. The test and question here, as a precedent for future shoreline decisions, are what takes precedence: the city's interpretation of the Shoreline Master Program, or the Shoreline Management Board's interpretation of the program and the act.

Prior to the case going to Superior Court on May 12, 2000, it was settled with a redesign of the hotel, preserving views of the waterfront. Irene Wall believed that this outcome supported the shoreline board's judgment that development in shoreline areas must seek a balance between public interest and private development, particularly in areas such as Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, and the Duwamish River where protection of views of statewide significance are needed. (31)

from being developed unless it is already public or subject to some legal agreement that prohibits development. The development map on page R-12 shows that West Seattle has more development—probably because it had much greenbelt area. Since 1991 SEPA review has not been required for building one single-family home under Environmental Critical Area Regulations. (City amendment, 1991)

With the increasing need for housing and the frustration of developers in the length of time to get a permit, the state (in 1996) and then the city (in 1998) passed some regulatory reform measures to streamline the process. They are:

- 120 day maximum turn around time for all project permitting;
- Under SEPA review, 14 days instead of 15 days for public review;
- Except for big public projects, appeals relating to SEPA, lost at the Hearing Examiner level, go directly to the Superior Court. (See Westcrest Park sidebar.)
- Although there are provisions for early review for public projects in the SEPA ordinance and city code, the early review determination of non-significance was used much more in the middle to late 1990's. This provision allowed any city department to issue a declaration of non-significance when that department believed that DCLU had a "reasonable basis to believe that significant impacts were unlikely." (33) (See Environmental Critical Areas map in the appendix on page R-25.)

Shoreline Management Act and Program. The Washington State Shoreline Management Act of 1971, (RCW 90.58) required regulation of development on shorelines of the state, consistent with Department of Ecology guidelines. Development is regulated on designated shorelines within 200 feet of the highwater mark and by abutting streams with a minimum flow. The corresponding Seattle Shoreline Program was adopted in 1976 and revised in 1982. Some of the creeks designated as natural areas in the Open Space bond issue are not included as they do not meet the minimum required stream flow. (34)

Seattle Parks and Recreation Plans: Park Comprehensive Plan. In 1993, Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation published a comprehensive plan. It has been reviewed and updated in 2000, with three public meetings held in the Spring, and a review by the Parks Commission. The city council adopted the 2000 comprehensive plan in May 2000.

The major change in the comprehensive plan of 2000 is the inclusion of the 38 neighborhood plans. As indicated previously, some of the plans ask for acquisition of land. This comprehensive plan continues to address environmental and open space needs, including acquisition and stewardship of park land. This plan follows the city's comprehensive plan in quantifying "breathable" room for the whole city, in identifying high

and low density areas of green spaces and shoreline public access. (35)

Urban Wildlife and Management Plan. In 1994, the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation published the *Urban Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan*, prepared by wildlife biologist Greg Miller. (36) With urban pressure on the wildlife habitat areas, Mr. Miller set forth some management goals which include:

- continue and increase wildlife habitat protection and enhancement efforts;
- develop and maintain a wildlife resource inventory;
- provide environmental education, using wildlife resources;
- promote volunteer involvement in wildlife and habitat protection and enhancement;
- promote interdepartmental and interagency cooperation to protect wildlife.

The inventory and mapping of the urban wildlife report, which is being funded by a private foundation, is almost completed but has not yet been released. It will include a data base of wildlife and vegetation in parks and green spaces, comparison between native and exotic species, and the Audubon Society's Bird Survey. (37)

Non-park uses of public lands policy (Resolution 29475, October 1996, City of Seattle). In the early 1990's the encroachment on Viretta Park from an adjacent property owner triggered the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation to hire a real estate manager to look at the SDPR's real estate, develop policies on non-park uses and begin to implement them. These policies were developed to provide measures to eliminate and prevent unauthorized non-park uses.

The guidelines cover four main purposes:

1. Public information and education on the role of the park department as custodian of park lands.
2. Identifying park boundaries. As of November 1999, this was 80% completed, with data maps and a survey. Before 1994, this was not done evenly.
3. Establishing a process including notification, opportunity for voluntary compliance, and enforcement tools.
4. Documentation (reliable property records to identify non-park uses of park lands), regulation and control of allowable non-park uses by fair, legal and appropriate means.

The city council has the final authority regarding management or disposition of properties. The guidelines also allow for limited non-park use by revocable use permits for a certain time period. (See number 3 and 4 above.)

Two areas of the city are being used as demonstration areas to look into non-park uses. They are the Queen Anne Boulevard/Bigelow Avenue project and Carkeek Park. At Carkeek Park, some homeowners were using Carkeek Park as their backyard. The SDPR, surveying during one year, found 44 encroachments. To date, all

but four have been eliminated. On Bigelow Avenue, there were 80 encroachments of the 100 properties surveyed. To date, the encroachments are down to 50.

Initiative 42. Initiative 42 states that no land held by the city for park and recreation purposes can be sold, transferred or used for another purpose. If there must be a transaction because there is no alternative, then the city should find a piece of land or facility equal or better in size, value, and usefulness in the vicinity, to serve the same community.

Initiative 42, entitled Protect Our Parks, was drafted by citizens involved in preventing Bradner Park in southeast Seattle from being sold to housing developers. Bradner Park was home for neighborhood p-patches. Volunteers collected 124,000 signatures from registered Seattle voters in 1996. In January of 1997, the Seattle city council unanimously adopted Initiative 42 by ordinance, (Ordinance number 118477) subject to review in two years. In addition to the p-patches, Bradner Park also has a demonstration garden managed by the master gardeners of the agricultural extension service.

Other City Directives Relating to Open Space

Director's Rule 20-93 in downtown zoned areas. In Westcrest Park Example

In 1997, Initiative 42 was challenged relating to Westcrest Park. DCLU approved the Executive Services Department application to take about two acres of Westcrest Park for the police department horse patrol, in addition to the area they were planning to use under SeaTran's jurisdiction. The patrol had to move from Discovery Park, and the city council approved this transfer.

In March 1999, neighbors and other interested parties in the city appealed DCLU's decision to use part of Westcrest Park for the horse patrol. They lost this appeal. However they filed this case with the superior court to challenge the city's interpretation of Initiative 42. By the winter of 2000, the city had determined that the park land was not needed for the horse patrol so the case was dropped, and the horse patrol will stay next to Westcrest Park in the SeaTran area. This process took about two years, many volunteer hours, city staff hours and litigation monies both from the city and from citizens.

general, according to this rule, the director of the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU) can permit additional floor area to be built when certain public benefits are provided or there is a transfer of development rights. Modifications in the code are allowed only to provide a public benefit such as a parcel park, roof garden, green street, harbor front open space, urban plaza, or other benefits. All of these have

significant guidelines and requirements.

Clustered Housing. There is a provision for greater density, which allows for an increase in number of units that can be built on two acres or more in exchange for more open space. (38) City Lights Condominiums on Harbor Avenue Southwest is an example.

The Comprehensive Public Access Plan for the Duwamish Waterway. This plan adopted by the city council in 1994 follows the requirement of the Shoreline Management Act, which states that public agencies must provide public access for all developments in the shoreline area. This plan looks at the port's development in the Duwamish Waterway in a more comprehensive way. The plan sets forth standards by which the city will allow additional streets abutting the river to be vacated when needed to promote maritime commerce.

Public/Private Partnership Policies. In an attempt to leverage public funds available for the city to move ahead with development projects, city officials are looking to the private sector for financing while providing public benefits. A report from a citizen task force in November 1999 outlined the process the city is to follow when looking toward a public/private partnership.

In brief, the task force decided that the partnership should be focused on development of physical space, with agreement between the city and a private partner. The project must have \$5 million or more of city investment, in kind or cash, with both the financial interest of the city and the private partner included in the project. There are two projects currently being considered under these procedures: the Aquarium, and development at Lake Union. Of these two, the Aquarium project focuses concern on open space.

 **Public Open Space Gained Since 1990** 

The most open space gained since 1990 was from the Open Space Bond Issue and Shoreline Park and Improvement Fund (SPIF) acquisitions. Together they totaled about 390 acres. Of the 390 acres, about 212 acres were purchased in the mapped, targeted greenbelts. There has been a 44% increase in public open space in these greenbelts since 1990. 94 acres were purchased in the natural areas, eight acres in neighborhoods from the opportunity funds, and 76 acres in other areas, including public shoreline and shoreline improvements. The public shoreline acquisitions were two acres on Beach Drive Southwest (Cormorant Park, West Seattle), 16 acres on Marginal Way Southwest (on the Duwamish Waterway) for purchase of the

Seaboard Lumber Company site, and one-half acre on the northeast shore of Lake Union to increase the size of Fairmont Olmsted Park. The Naval Reserve Armory on Lake Union was just recently bought with SPIF funds. (39)

In addition, another 57 acres came from an I-90 turn-back program, which consisted of parcels given back to the public in mitigation for land lost during construction of the west approach clearing for the I-90 bridge over Lake Washington. About 200 acres of greenspace properties was also transferred to the SDPR from other governmental agencies, mostly from the city. Approximately 164 acres from Sand Point Naval Base was turned over to the city in this decade, with about 95 acres for park and recreation purposes. (40) In the 1970's, about 190 acres had already been turned over to the city for Magnuson Park. (41) Approximately 16.2 acres of shoreline public access in the central waterfront, Terminal 5, and in the Duwamish Waterway (42) came from the Port of Seattle. Public agencies are required to provide shoreline access for all developments on public property in the shoreline area. (See explanation in Section III, paragraph titled "Comprehensive Public Access Plan for the Duwamish Waterway," page R-8.)

In the mid- to late-1990's, there were other gains in green and open space, augmenting the 1988 open space policies, and the city park comprehensive plans. The gains were mostly in areas already public such as streets, but some private land became public through the efforts of the Trust for Public Land and Land Conservancy. (See Volunteer Efforts, page R-20.)

Open space gained as a result of the open space policies and comprehensive plan.

Bike and Pedestrian Trails. The goal of the bike/pedestrian trail system in Seattle is to extend an urban trails system throughout Seattle. There are still pieces to be completed, and some funds left to do part of it. The major portion of the bike/pedestrian trail improvements and acquisition came from the open space bond issue. Moreover, this fund was extended by agreements with the Port of Seattle relating to the Terminal 5 expansion and other agreements made by the Transportation Department.

Using 1990 as a baseline (starting with 1970), Seattle had 28.40 miles of bike/pedestrian paths and lanes. In the 1990's, from the impetus of the open space bond issue and \$5.8 million allocated for new trails, 28.78 miles were added. This amounted to a 50.33% gain in bike /pedestrian trails in the 1990's. 1,725 bike racks were installed next to curbs, primarily in downtown Seattle and in outlying business districts and condominiums, at the request of property owners. (43)

Boulevards. Scenic routes described in the Seattle Department of Engineering Traffic Division Ordinance 119673 identified as "protected view rights-of-way" in the mayor's open space policies were part of the Olmsted Plan. Harbor Avenue Southwest, just recently

completed as a boulevard, is an example of the implementation of this policy.

Water Related Street Ends. The Seattle Municipal Code states, "shoreline street ends shall be preserved as public rights-of-way, to allow improvements for public uses and access." (44) There are 149 shoreline street ends in Seattle, located at street ends on lakes, the rivers, and the Sound. Of these, nearly one-half are open to public use. Access to the remaining street ends is limited by one or more encroachments by adjoining property owners. As of May 4, 2000, the city was concerned only about encroachment on 40 street ends. (45)

Because of efforts from community groups, most recently Friends of Water Related Street Ends, the city through a recently-passed ordinance, has placed more responsibility on adjoining property owners who are encroaching on street ends. (46) Through this ordinance, the Street Use Department of SeaTran is adding a new category of the street use fee schedule. In general, fees are collected in relation to the amount of street that is privately occupied, the type of encroachment, and the amount of public access to the water.

Implementation of this ordinance and director's rules are now going into effect, with fee notices to be sent out to about 40 property owners who have known encroachments. They have 30 days to comply or pay the fee assessment. (47) Initial funding for signs and improvements at these street ends came from \$150,000 allocated from the Shoreline Park Improvement Fund. Fees collected from the encroachments will be used for improvements on these water related street ends.

Green Streets. (48) There are four classifications of green streets:

1. Traffic Prohibited (example-Occidental Avenue South in Pioneer Square);
2. Local Access (example-Vine Street in Belltown);
3. Continuous Traffic (example-9th and Terry in the Denny Triangle);
4. Little or no traffic. (example-Franklin Avenue East behind Seward School) A play area can be built on the street for use by the school and the community.

The concept of "street greening" was incorporated in the section on street parks in the open space policies followed in the comprehensive plan. The goal of street greening was to provide a bit of public green space in densely developed areas lacking in open space where there were underutilized or undeveloped street rights-of-way. In the Seattle Engineering Department's director's rule in 1993, green streets were designed to give pedestrians/bicyclists/transit patrons preference over passenger vehicles on designated streets. Designs might include seating areas, planting areas, less space for parking, and other amenities.

Although green streets have been part of the land use code for seven years, lack of funding and a cumbersome

permitting process have impeded much implementation. However in the year 2000 there are 19 streets designated for greening in six downtown areas. The city actively participated in the planning process for Vine Street and for 9th and Terry in the Denny Triangle. Vine Street is being set as a prototype and an example for implementation in other streets.

P-Patches. (49) In the 1991 study, cemeteries, golf courses, and p-patches were included as part of green space. The p-patch program is administered by the Department of Neighborhoods, with 12 sites on park land, 13 sites leased from private owners, 12 sites on other city or county property, and three sites under the jurisdiction of the Friends of P-Patches. The Friends of P-Patches is a non-profit organization with 400 voting members and 12 Board Members.

Since 1990, the p-patch area has increased from 15 acres to 27.5 acres. In the year 2000, there are 1,690 plots and almost 5,000 gardeners located throughout the city. Gardeners pay rental fees according to the size of their lots, and give at least eight hours of volunteer time a season. As a bonus about 15,000 pounds of fresh produce is donated to food banks annually. Neighbors working in p-patches also find it an easy way to get acquainted.

In 1998 at the end of the year, there were 700 people on the waiting list for p-patch space, with the highest demand in the areas with the greatest housing density: Queen Anne, Interbay, Capitol Hill, Wallingford, Fremont, the north half of West Seattle, Lake Union, Belltown, Ballard, and Greenwood.

Market Gardens. There are four known market gardens in Seattle, in three of the housing projects. At High Point, the market garden is under the auspices of the Delridge Neighborhood Development Association. The other three market gardens are at Holly Park and Rainier Vista.

Gardeners at High Point, who have farming backgrounds from their native countries, grow vegetables and contract with households for a season's worth of fresh vegetables weekly for 22 weeks for \$352, or split with another household. Customers pick up their produce at High Point on a weekly basis. All market gardens are a cooperative effort with Friends of P-Patches through the Department of Neighborhoods. (50)

Tree Planting. (51) To most people, trees are an integral part of greenspace. From 1970-1990, over 20,000 street trees were planted and 50 greenspaces were landscaped through Forward Thrust funds. Tree planting in the city in the new millennium is a high environmental priority of the mayor. According to the city arborist, about 30,000 trees have been planted in the last ten years through the following departments: (Contact information, current as of June 2000, is listed below in parentheses.)

Urban Tree Replacement Program under City Light. Whenever City Light removes a tree under power lines, they are required to replace that tree on a two-to-one basis, and sometimes do three-to-one. Many neighborhood planting projects come from these funds. (Brent Schmidt, 206-386-1902)

"Free Street Tree" projects through the Department of Neighborhoods. Requirements are the involvement of at least three neighbors to plant a minimum of ten trees and a maximum of 40. (Shireen Deboo, 206-684-0547)

Watershed plantings under the Seattle Public Utilities. Planting of native plants and trees in designated watersheds is done to help with water retention. (Pat O'Brien, 206-615-1745)

Landscape element. This is required through DCLU before a permit can be issued in a commercial or multifamily building. (Shane Dewald, 206-684-5041)

Street rebuilding, requiring landscaping through SeaTran. (Shane Dewald, 206-684-5041)

Tree Planting in Park Designated Property. (Duane Pentilla at Park Department)

Many community groups such as TREMENDOUS work with neighborhood groups in planting trees.

(Kim Drury is the chairperson for the Urban Forestry Coalition, Office of Environmental Management, Phone 206-684-3214.)

Case History: Magnuson Park/Sand Point

Sand Point in recent geologic history has been forested wetlands containing two streams and a lake connected to Lake Washington. It became the first Carkeek Park when Mr. Carkeek donated his land to the city to combine with an existing county park in 1918. After sale to the Navy, the Sand Point peninsula's Naval Air Station supported operations in the north Pacific. In the early 1970's the Navy ceased operation of the airfields and transferred 190 acres of land to Seattle for development as Magnuson Park and 100 acres to NOAA for its Western Regional Headquarters. In 1990 the government closed the base and surplused the remaining 164 acres.

During the last ten years plans for the development of this park in Seattle, with 1,000 feet of lakeshore, have been developed by Rich Haag and Jones and Jones. Input has come from the community through the Sand Point Community Liaison Committee and the mayor's blue ribbon committee. Final plans should be ready for approval by the city council in December 2000. The mixed use park of over 280 acres offers unique opportunities to develop a great urban park. Plans include a restored lake for salmonoid spawning, a wetland system developed to build up and drain the approximately 50 acres for ballfields, and an off-leash dog area. Projected to cost approximately \$60 million when completed with some funding expected to come from the fall bond issue recommended by the Pro-Parks Committee, the park will probably be funded by a blend of city, private and federal funds.



Overall Development in Seattle



"It's only half the battle to acquire the land. Keeping it is the chore." (52)

It is almost impossible, with changes in technology, data bases, staff, and department shifts, to measure growth in open space or green spaces. However, with great help from the Strategic Planning Department and DCLU, we arrived at these measures:

- Comparison of permits and units built in critical areas in Seattle since 1990 (Under SEPA review);
- Map overlay of development from 1990-2000 on designated greenbelts that were targeted for open space purchases;
- Changes in tree cover in Seattle from 1972-1986;
- Port of Seattle development.

Some areas not measured include shoreline development and growth in untargeted, unmapped greenbelts.

In the 1991 study, we stated that the city had received building permit applications for about 190 dwelling units per year from 1984-1986 in environmentally critical areas under SEPA review. This figure was later found to be in error. A hand count determined that there were actually about 279 dwelling units per year in these areas. There were about 566 permit applications from 1987-1989.

During the decade of the 1990's the numbers of units in areas under SEPA review are listed below.

Year	Number of units
1990-1992	628
1992-1994	382
1994-1996	207
1996-1998	159
1998-1999	377

The graph shows that the early 1990's, as well as the years 1997 and 1999 were high periods of housing growth, resulting in greater land density, and some loss of green space. It also shows that most of the development was outside the critical areas, greenbelts, and vacant lots. Information from the world-wide web (53) stated that in Seattle 1999 was the highest growth year in number of residential units built. Most residential units built were in urban centers, although growth has taken place throughout the city. From 1994-1999, 78% of the units built were multifamily, mostly over 11 units.

Changes in tree cover. (54) Major findings by Urban Ecosystems Analysis were that areas of heavy tree canopy have declined and areas with little or no canopy have expanded. For example, from 1972-1996, in acres with up to 50% tree cover, there was a loss of 48%. In acres with 20%-49% tree cover, the loss was 67%.

Growth of Port of Seattle holdings. In the 1990's, the Port of Seattle's land jurisdiction grew from 1,148 acres in 1990 to 1,419 acres in 2000, a 19% gain. This is an overall gain of port land in the city of about one half of one percent.





Voluntary Efforts in Keeping the Green

"Non-acquisition options, including donations, land trades, requirement of open spaces as part of major public projects and the donation of conservation easements shall be pursued." (55)

Much of the parkland we have today has been donated by activist citizens of the past. Today, outright donation of property must be accepted by the park department and approved by the city council.

In the early 1990's, the implementation of the open space bond issue was just getting started. One staff person was hired to deal with individuals who wished to preserve their land from development. When this program closed in the late 1990's, with limited staff to assist people, greater reliance was placed on the Land Conservancy, The Trust For Public Land, and the King County Department of Natural Resources to assist individuals through this process.

Current use assessment. At about this time, RCW 84.34 dealing with the taxation of land at its current use, not at its highest and best use, was implemented in King County for open space. In this law there was a section describing a public benefit rating system which was implemented by the county in 1993. Current use assessment provisions could be used as an incentive for individuals to refrain from developing their property, and a tool for conservation organizations, such as the Land Conservancy, Trust For Public Land, and the park department to encourage land preservation. (56)

The administration of the benefit rating system was delegated to the King County Department of Natural Resources. Applications for current use assessment are made through this department. There are opportunities for property tax deductions, depending on the public benefits. To be eligible for this program in an urban area like Seattle, the property owner must have a minimum of 1/2 acre. This can be composed of multiple contiguous properties. The owner needs to agree not to develop his property and to steward it. If, while owning the property, he decides to develop it, he must pay a penalty and back taxes, now based on the highest and best use of his land.

In the 1990's, according to the King County Assessor's Office, 35 property owners in Seattle received tax reductions on a total of 25.02 acres.

Donations of Land and/or Money. Money is usually accepted toward public land purchase or to protect land from development. Donated land is not accepted unless it meets the criteria of the organization seeking land for public use.

Conservation Easements. There are many definitions

of conservation easements, but for this report it is defined as a way by which a property owner can ensure his/her property will never be developed, while he/she or others own it. Tax benefits are available, depending on the public benefits. In any case there must be a legal agreement recorded with the county, stating that the land will never be developed.

Life Estate or Remainder Interest. Under this provision to protect land from being developed, the owner donates or sells the land during his/her lifetime, while retaining lifetime use of the property. Requests for tax deductions are made at the time of donation.

Park Department Efforts. In the 1990's, the park department's open space staff facilitated the donation to the city of about 20 acres, which included a ten-acre donation in the West Duwamish greenbelt, and a 3.6 acre life estate along Puget Sound. The staff assisted with a number of voluntary conservation easement agreements, totaling six acres, which included at least two that permitted full access to the conserved land, and 17 current use assessments, totaling 1.8 acres.

There are two other organizations in Seattle that work toward land protection. They are the Trust for Public Land and the Cascade Land Conservancy. These are private, non-profit organizations which may work with developers, community organizations, and private donors to broker land for public use or to prevent development.

The Cascade Land Conservancy. The Land Conservancy was in its infancy in 1990, with a staff of one. At that time it was called The Seattle-King County Land Trust. Today, with King, Snohomish, and Pierce Counties, it is called the Cascade Land Conservancy. It is a private, non-profit organization that can act as a conduit to preserve threatened and ecologically significant pieces of land from development. Individuals or groups may seek the Land Conservancy for assistance in preventing development on their land, or land in their area. The Conservancy may help the individual or group if the piece of land meets Conservancy criteria, and if the individual or group is willing to work with the Conservancy to raise money for the costs of land preservation, such as the legal and enforcement costs. The Conservancy's assistance is flexible, depending on the land, the need, the motivation of the group, and the financing available. For example, in Seattle, they have worked with the Friends of Ravenna Woods to help acquire funds to protect a 1.1 acre site west of the University Village shopping area. This area, on a steep hillside, is a habitat for urban wildlife and a natural green buffer. Some of the funds came from neighborhood matching grants, from money the group raised, and from other sources. The Conservancy has also helped protect a piece of land on Jacobsen Road in West Seattle.

The Trust for Public Land. The Trust for Public Land,

Neighbors Protect Green Space on Jacobsen Road in West Seattle

In 1995 following a decision by DCLU that eight single family homes could be built on a steep hillside (a designated environmentally critical area, at the top of Jacobsen Road), about 100 neighbors joined to form Mee-Kwa-Mooks/Jacobsen Alliance. The Alliance hired an attorney who twice appealed DCLU's decision to allow the owner to build. The group held garage sales and organized an Alki/Beach Drive historical tour to raise some of the \$20,000 lawyer fees for the appeal. In 1997 there were two or three slides on or close to Jacobsen Road. In 1996 the green space property on Jacobsen Road was one of the high priorities for acquisition in the Fields and Streams countywide bond issue for some of the following reasons:

- The property adjoined Mee-Kwa-Mooks Park, a natural area targeted for the 1989 open space bond money. Although the targeted purchase was 5.9 acres, only 2.8 acres were in fact purchased, due to funding limitations;
- Consistent support and lobbying from the Mee-Kwa-Mooks/Jacobsen Alliance;
- Support from the park department which wished to acquire both pieces of green space property along Jacobsen Road (approximately four acres in all);
- Availability of \$200,000 from the Alki Improvement Fund vote by the Alki residents for land purchase in the lower property;
- Support from the county councilman for the district, the Alki Community Council, the city council, and environmental groups.

In 1998 the Land Conservancy of King County, along with members of the executive committee of the Mee-Kwa-Mooks/Jacobsen Alliance, agreed to negotiate with the owners for purchase of the property. The conservancy utilized its knowledge to structure a temporary purchase of the property, preserving green space and providing funds for the purchase. Terms included the building of one or two single-family homes within an area of 20% of the property, while donating the remainder in a conservation easement, allowing tax benefits to the buyer. The property is currently for sale.

The lower half of the Jacobsen Road property, adjacent to Mee-Kwa-Mooks Park, remains of concern to the neighbors. The 2.48 acres is privately owned, and has potential for 12 homes. It is noted that additions to the Mee-Kwa-Mooks natural area are one of the targets for acquisition recommended by the Pro-Parks committee as of April 2000. (57)

a nationwide organization with an office in Seattle, is also a broker with organizations, developers, and community groups to hold land until there is money available to turn the land over to the park department for public use. Since 1991 the trust has completed six land conservation projects within the city limits for a total of 10.9 acres. By far the largest and most spectacular is the Olympic Sculpture Park on the waterfront and near Myrtle Edwards Park. Part of this land was a former

Unical site. The trust partnered with the Seattle Art Museum to acquire 7.3 acres of properties. As of spring 2000, "the project has already raised two-thirds of the \$37 million needed. In addition to art museum contributors, residents and businesses, contributions come from surrounding high-tech firms." (58)

E. B. Dunn Historic Trust. The E.B. Dunn Historic Trust is an example of a private land trust in Seattle. It is now a combination of properties in the Broadview area of almost eight acres. The original Arthur Dunn family owned five acres and hired the Olmsted Brothers to design their garden in 1915. Later this land was divided among three children. When Edward B. Dunn died, he left an endowment of \$300,000 to create a land trust to hold his 2.7 acre property in perpetuity. Subsequently the other two children donated conservation easements. Since 1992, many other individuals and groups have helped with the Dunn Gardens. They include the Seattle Foundation, Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks, neighbors, and volunteers. This garden meets most of the criteria for a low property tax rate through the current use assessment provision.

Dunn Gardens represents the first Washington State historic preservation of a garden. The board of directors, which oversees the gardens, hopes to use the garden as a model to help preserve other significant gardens. Public tours are conducted seasonally by appointment and a fee charged to help defray some of the expense.

Donating land or money to protect land. At this time, the park department is very limited in staff and money resources. The department can help donors in only a very limited way, perhaps by directing inquiries.

The Trust for Public Land and the Land Conservancy can be recipients for land, money, and conservation easements. The King County Department of Natural Resources offers some guidance and help for potential donors inquiring about conservation easements, current use assessment, donations, tax benefits and other guidelines. Hopefully within this year, the Seattle Parks Foundation will be in operation and ready to help individuals or groups wanting to preserve land for public use rather than for development.

Stewardship of the Public Space. In the 1990's, because of the limited funding for land acquisition and park maintenance, a number of local stewardship groups formed. Friends of Thornton Creek began to work on preventing by litigation any development over that creek. This work continues. Groups supporting Longfellow Creek, Schmitz Park, Ravenna Woods, Carkeek Park, Piper's Creek, as well as other groups such as Treemendus and Adopt-a-Park recruited citizens for work parties in Seattle's parks, streams and waterfront areas.

The Native Plant Society has partnered with the Master Garden Foundation in providing educational courses and then volunteer pay-back in parks. Other groups

such as the Audubon Society, Sierra Club, People for Puget Sound, Mountaineers, and Open Space Advocates have been around a long time. There are also foundations, such as the Bullitt Foundation that give money for educational and restorative efforts to other organizations.

In this report, four voluntary groups that have been concerned about open space acquisition and conservation in the city will be described.

Open Space Advocates

Open Space Advocates is an informal group of citizens from all over Seattle interested in acquisition and preservation of open space. It started in about 1986, as a spin-off from the Seattle Community Council Federation and a Seattle neighborhood coalition. The open space policies, formulated under Mayor Royer, have spearheaded most of the work of this group for the last 14 years. They have worked on the water-related street end policies, green streets, and open space funding issues, along with city staff and elected officials who implement the policies.

Although there is a chairman, there is no formal organization. They meet periodically when there is a need. With the availability of new technology, much of the action takes place with e-mail and occasional meetings.

Audubon Society of Seattle

The Audubon Society of Seattle partners with other groups on conservation efforts. Work parties have enhanced Pritchard Beach, Genesee Park and Montlake fill. Currently they are helping to organize work parties in south Magnuson Park to remove invasive species on 15 acres. That neighborhood has a \$100,000 matching grant from the Department of Neighborhoods. (Contact phone number as of June 2000 is 206-523-4483.)

Groundswell Northwest, Inc.

Groundswell Northwest, Inc. has done the following in stewardship efforts over the last ten years:

- Worked with the Seattle School District and park department to transform part of a parking lot into Webster Park.
- Adopt-a-Park group for Webster Park monitors the park. Volunteers sweep the walks, pull weeds, and tend flower pots.
- Worked with the Ballard Open Space Committee, the Ballard district council and with the Sunset Hill Community Association in inventorying every block in Ballard listing each undeveloped lot.
- With the advocacy and physical help of Groundswell Northwest and other neighborhood groups, Baker Park and the soon-to-be "Plumis Park" have been purchased by the Department of Neighborhoods and landscaped under the

direction of the Seattle parks department.

Groundswell Northwest has now incorporated as a non-profit group so it can contract as the fiscal agent for these other Ballard neighborhood groups.

Friends of Olmsted Parks

"The friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks was formed in 1983 in response to the growing recognition of the national significance of the Olmsted legacy and the national as well as local, importance of Seattle's own Olmsted park and boulevard system. The purpose of the Friends of Olmsted Parks is to promote awareness, enjoyment, and care of our Olmsted Parks and landscapes both public and private." (59) Friends of Olmsted Parks may be reached at PO Box 9884, Seattle, WA 98109.



Related Issues



Salmon Recovery. The listing of the Chinook salmon as an endangered species was the impetus for the city salmon recovery program. This listing has brought more attention to the city's waterways and watersheds and the need to clean, protect, and restore streams, lakes, and Puget Sound.

In the Seattle area, efforts are directed towards restoration and/or preservation of riparian and near-shore habitat. For example, at the old Seaboard Lumber site at Terminal 105, land is being converted to an estuarine side channel, native plant species are being added along creek banks, and the work of reconnecting side channels with the main river continues.

The Seattle Public Utilities Department is taking the lead in the salmon recovery program in Seattle. They are working with many other departments of city government, including SeaTran, Parks, Intergovernmental Relations, DCLU, Strategic Planning, and the Law Department. Non-profit organizations like the Bullitt Foundation, and volunteers from other environmental groups in Seattle are assisting with funds for educational programs, and with encouraging creek restoration. There is some direction from the city to use best environmental practices on city land, such as using fewer pesticides which find their way into waterways and have a harmful effect on fish habitat. There may be further opportunities for land acquisition along if the Pro-Parks Levy is passed. Land acquisition for Fauntleroy Creek in West Seattle came about through the opportunity fund of the open space bond issue. Now salmon are returning to the Fauntleroy

Creek.

Money for restoration and education on salmon recovery is coming from the department of utilities budget, which includes money from the charges for water and sewer rate payers. There have been no federal or state funds for salmon restoration as yet. (60)

Port of Seattle. Inadvertently, the Port of Seattle was not considered in the League's 1991 *Keeping the Green* study. The port owns about 2% of the land in Seattle, and in the 1990's has bought and developed land for their marine business and has also provided more public access to its properties.

One of the port's biggest developments in the 1990's was the Terminal 5 expansion in West Seattle on the Duwamish Waterway, as the headquarters for the American President Lines. Because of the environmental impact, the port was required to do an environmental impact study. Under the requirements of the Shoreline Management Act requiring public access in exchange for shoreline development, the port was required to provide about 5.2 acres of shoreline access on or parallel to the north side of Terminal 5. This was accomplished under the scrutiny of Harbor 2000, a citizens' group in West Seattle, and concerted action from the broader community, such as the League of Women Voters of Seattle, Open Space Advocates and others. The port provided a good part of the bike/pedestrian trail and landscaping along Harbor Avenue Southwest from Florida Avenue Southwest to Marginal Way Southwest. This project was done in conjunction with the widening of Harbor Avenue Southwest, Metro's laying of the connection pipe to the sewerage plant at Discovery Park, and the bike and pedestrian link funded by the Open Space bond issue.

Pier I, lying on the Duwamish shoreline just south of Salty's Restaurant and north of Terminal 5, is privately owned but is the missing link in the public shoreline along Alki Avenue Southwest and Harbor Avenue Southwest. This area is used heavily by tourists from all over the region and the world. It has been recommended since 1991 for at least a public shoreline or a public park. Several studies by the city were done in the 1990's relating to the use of this land, including potential sites for the water taxi. The Pier I/II study, done in 1996, looked at the Bronson Street/Pier I/Pier II in a holistic manner, siting the water taxi, public shoreline, and some mixed use. Currently there is no conclusion to the community support for a continuous public shoreline along Pier I. Both Piers I and II remain zoned industrial.

The Alki/Harbor/Duwamish Corridor schematic design planning recommendations published in March 1996, with planning done jointly with city departments and Harbor 2000, did lay much of the groundwork for public shoreline improvements in this corridor. Also, in the mid-1990's, the Seaboard Lumber site on Terminal 105 was bought by the city with shoreline park improvement

funds and money from the Duwamish Waterway mitigation restoration funds. This piece of land was developed for an estuary, restoring it to what its condition must have been at an earlier time when there were mud flats and places for fish and wildlife. Although there is limited public access, Terminal 107 is now joined with the south end of Terminal 105 to make a contiguous larger park space for public usage.



Funding Efforts



Brief History. Policy 11 of the open space policies, passed by city council resolution in 1988, was the basis for public funding efforts in the late 1980's and 1990's. In essence, the policy states that the open space program should include the establishment of a regular funding source for land acquisition and maintenance. (61) The funding for maintenance had not been included until the current Pro-Parks Levy.

From 1989 to 2000 the major efforts made to fund land acquisition for public use were the following:

- 1989-Seattle received \$41 million from the open space bond issue. (Measure passed.)
- 1990-Real Estate Excise Tax, (TREE). (Measure failed.)
- 1991-The \$25 million shoreline park improvement funds. This was mitigation to the city from Metro for the secondary treatment plant at Discovery Park. According to the city-Metro agreement the shoreline park improvement funds are to be used for "enhancing public use of, access to, and access along bodies of water." (62)
- 1994-Waterways 2000 Program. A \$17 million King County program which included purchase of land and conservation easements in selected river and stream areas.
- 1996-King County fields and streams or recreation and conservation bond. (Measure failed.)
- 2000-Pro-Parks Levy set for the November 2000 ballot. This measure would provide \$198.2 million to supply more ballfields and open space, better parks maintenance and more programs for children and senior citizens.

The 1989 countywide open space bond and trails issue divided the \$41 million allocation as follows:

- \$23.5 million for acquisition in 14 designated greenbelts;
- \$8.2 million in 14 natural areas;
- \$5.8 million for trails; and
- \$3.5 million for an opportunity fund.

This totaled approximately 286 acres targeted.

The 1989 open space funds provided a local match to leverage additional funds for purchasing a total of 390 acres. Additional funds came from:

- The Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program;

- The 1993 regional conservation futures fund; (Seattle received \$20.2 million of a \$60 million countywide allocation, based on the .06% conservation futures property tax.)
- Real estate excise tax; \$1.4 million targeted for open space near housing developments as part of the city's capital facilities bond.

In addition to these 390 acres, 200 acres were transferred to the park department from other city departments, and 57 acres were acquired for small parks near the I-90 from a turn-back program. (63) Private citizens have also helped through land and money donations and through conservation easements to prevent development. (See Voluntary Efforts, page R-20.)

A 26 member pro-park committee met with park personnel from July 1999 to May 2000, to identify a funding mechanism and recommend dollar allocation for acquisition, development, and maintenance. Their recommendations for priority projects and programs stemmed from 38 neighborhood plans, the Seattle parks and recreation comprehensive plan (now being updated), the joint Sports Park/Athletic Field Development Plan (1997), recommendations from the 1995 Zoo Commission, and some other high priority unfunded plans from previous funding efforts.

The funding allocations in the 2000 Pro-Parks Levy are divided into 3 categories:

- Acquisitions (about 17% of the total);
- Development (about 52% of the total);
- Maintenance, to include the zoo (about 31% of the total).

Other funding efforts.

Neighborhood Matching Funds - Through the help of these funds, several p-patches were acquired in various parts of the city. With a monetary match from Friends of Ravenna Woods, neighborhood matching funds were utilized to acquire this one-plus acre for public use.

Duwamish Restoration Funds - Some of the \$25 million from Metro and the city for restoration efforts in the Duwamish area is being used in the old Seaboard Lumber site at the south end of Terminal 105, for fish and wildlife restoration.



Summary

The 1990's were a decade of rapid change. Public open space was gained, but land was also lost to development pressures. In spite of the excellent technology today, it is still difficult to get reliable information on land use for 2000, and almost impossible for 1990.

The 1990's was a decade when policies planned in the 1980's and before were being carried out:

- A follow-up of policies emphasized in the 1988 open

space policies were carried out and expanded in the city and park department comprehensive plans in the mid-1990's;

- Voter-approved funding directed to the targeted greenbelts and natural areas, waterways, trails, and some neighborhood requests;
- Metro mitigation provided some public shoreline.

In the 1990's, the city focused on available public spaces to implement previous city policies. More water-related street ends were opened, planning for and the greening of streets were beginning to be implemented (particularly in the Belltown area), a large increase in bike and pedestrian trails was evident throughout the city, and p-patches were greening many neighborhoods in the city that had little green space. The street vacation policy was broadened to focus more on public benefits, leading to an increase in public access areas along the Duwamish, as the port expanded its maritime efforts. The Open Space Advocates, a citizens' group partnering with information from the city laid the groundwork and impetus for much of this implementation.

Influenced by the comprehensive plan, the 1990's was also the decade of the city's high priority on neighborhood planning and volunteer neighborhood involvement in restoration and maintenance of waterways and parks. Stimulating this interest could have been the declaration by the federal government of Chinook salmon as an endangered species, with the necessity of the city doing something about it. The park department, public utilities department, other city departments and long-standing environmental organizations became active in the restoration and maintenance of green spaces and waterways. Funding for educational and restoration efforts came through foundations, environmental organizations and through neighborhood matching funds.

This has also been a period of challenges to our public park land and water-related street ends. Although Initiative 42 was created to protect our parks, citizen groups have twice tested city officials' interpretations of it. Private owners have encroached on public space, and several city policies (see Governance section) were either created or strengthened to give some clout to enforcement against encroachment. With the area's economic boom, citizens have seen more development in some of the green spaces they thought were public. There has been a loss of some shoreline and much tree canopy to development. A provision of the permitting system allowed by the 1996 Seattle Regulatory Reform Act of SEPA, enables a city department to issue a designation of non-significance for a project. If DCLU concurs that the environmental impact is not severe or large enough to require an Environmental Impact Statement, no further review will take place. This fast track approach, without further review, has led to some problems. (See the Westcrest example, page R-8.) Refer to the Alki landslide mitigation project (64) for a further example.

Public hearings and/or public meetings have been emphasized more in this decade, involving more citizen participation, as well as more threats of litigation.

With less public funding available in the 1990's, the public and the private sectors have reached out to assist each other in voluntary and creative ways to preserve open space. Both the Trust for Public Land and the Land Conservancy have directed more of their attention to the City of Seattle, partnering with the park department, neighborhoods, other non-profit organizations, and individuals to assist each other in preserving public open space. These joint efforts have resulted in the planned Sculpture Garden near the waterfront, the one acre of Ravenna Woods, some conservation easements and help to those individuals who know how to seek assistance in preventing development on their land or in their area. There has been little effort by the park department or volunteer organizations for outreach because they have not had staff resources to provide this service.

The citizens of Seattle will vote in November 2000 on a \$198.2 million levy of land acquisition, development, and maintenance.

Continuing Issues. In the 1991 study, we listed ongoing issues that continue to arise which have a political effect on how open space is valued. Property rights vs. the common good; economic development vs. preservation of open space; neighborhood needs vs. needs of the whole city have continued to be controversial issues in the 1990's and are continuing in the 21st century. A new factor during this period has been the increase in litigation and the possibility of that increase influencing city officials' decisions. Citizen groups trying to protect open space are at an obvious disadvantage in this process. However, with motivation and concerted action from citizens to elect officials who value the livability of Seattle, the "emerald" in the Emerald City can still retain its sparkle.

Recommendations of the Keeping the Green Committee

Current LWV-Seattle position on open space is quoted below:

Support of preservation, acquisition, and enhancement of open spaces, selected ecosystems and environmentally sensitive areas, and promotion of environmental awareness and sense of stewardship in the public. 1990, 1991, 1999

Committee recommendations fall into two categories:

funding and city governance (which includes planning, decision making, and implementation).

Funding

- The city budget should include funds for land acquisition, ongoing maintenance and stewardship (including help to citizens who wish to donate land, money, or to use other forms of land preservation).
- Support the Pro-Parks Levy which will be on the ballot in November 2000.

City Governance

Planning

- The city and the park department should develop a long-range plan with the following goals in mind: to restore, retain, and increase Seattle's "emerald image" of green, open space, and waterways. Included should be public places for active recreation, quiet places for contemplation, social contact, wildlife and plant observation and learning, emphasizing a diversity of plant and wildlife. In the new millennium, the park department might take the long view of a park Master Plan (with the foresight of the Olmsteds) that could lay the groundwork for the next 100 years of park development.
- A balance should be maintained as a city policy between sports fields, buildings, and quiet places for nature observation. The latter is particularly important in our increased density of buildings and cement.
- Forest management should be a high priority for the park system.
- All of the above need sufficient staff and funding to carry out these plans. To help, partnerships should be continued with citizen volunteer groups, park staff and businesses.

Decision Making

- There needs to be clarification of the role of citizens and of the park department when the city is asking for public comment or working with citizens on a project.
- Stronger leadership from all decision makers is needed, to maintain a balance between areas reserved for active sports programs and areas for non-structured activities, such as nature observation and informal sports, keeping the goal of service to the whole community paramount. Decisions should be made in a deliberative manner with adequate information from a broad range of citizens.
- Planning and city resources should shift back to looking at the city as a whole. The 1990's focused

on neighborhoods, which was important. However 33% of the city is not in the neighborhood planning areas, and a more holistic approach is now needed. Schools and parks should make a greater effort to work together toward common use of the school and park playground and fields. This shift not only brings better use of limited open space, but it is also more fiscally responsible.

- The Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use should not weaken its role as the gatekeeper and enforcer of regulations and codes of the city. The 1996 State Regulatory Reform Act relating to early review determination should be reevaluated for its effectiveness for the welfare of all citizens in the city. The city should apply the same environmental standards to public lands in environmentally critical areas as it applies to private lands in environmentally critical areas.

Implementation

- Recruit more of the homeless and jobless for use in park restoration and maintenance.
- Encourage flexibility and creativity to achieve the goals of public open space and public shoreline by increasing interaction between public agencies, private non-profits (trusts, conservancies, foundations) and businesses.
- The city needs to improve its tracking system for

open space data so it will be useful in ten, twenty, or thirty years. "The City should improve its real property asset management information system so that it is easier for staff from parks and recreation, Executive Services Department (ESD) Real Estate Services, and other departments to track the city's real properties, measuring change in acquisitions and losses of land in the city. This improved system should be designed so that important trends in green space can be easily and reliably analyzed. The improved system should have input from interested citizens." (65)

Following are additional recommendations from the committee chair.

Volunteer Efforts in Cooperation with the City

- There should be leadership from a non-profit group and/or the city to develop a citywide coalition of environmental groups. The purpose of this coalition might be advocacy for acquisition and stewardship for land preservation. The coalition could exchange information, work together in restoration and maintenance efforts in the parks, and provide educational field trips for children and adults in the parks.
- There is a need for an outreach program and funding for the resources to help citizens who wish to donate land for preservation but need guidance as to how to go about it.

This report is but a summary and a reference for the year 2000. It is hoped that it will stimulate some of the readers to look into sections of this report, dig deeper, and take another look at the subject in 2010 to see what changes have occurred in green space. The following poem is the theme guiding this report.

*"All things are bound together
All things connect
What happens to the Earth
Happens to the children of the Earth
Man has not woven the web of life
He is but one thread
Whatever he does to the web
He does to himself." (66)*

APPENDIX

Endnotes

- 1 Mayor's Recommended Open Space Policies, Long Range Planning, City of Seattle, April 1987.
- 2 Olmsted, A guide to Seattle's Interpretive Exhibit at the Volunteer Park Water Tower, Seattle Post Intelligencer, 1907.
- 3 "Earth Angels," Land and People, Spring 2000, Trust for Public Land.
- 4 LWV-Seattle, Keeping the Green in Seattle study, 1991, page 1
- 5 Mayor's Recommended Open Space Policies 1987, page 104.
- 6 City Council Resolution No. 28653
- 7 LWV-Seattle, Keeping the Green in Seattle, 1991, page 1.
- 8 Strategic Planning Office, City Property Management database, City of Seattle, March 2000.
- 9 Strategic Planning Office and Real Estate Management, Park Department. City of Seattle.
- 10 Strategic Planning Office, City of Seattle.
- 11 West Seattle Herald, April 1999.
- 12 Strategic Planning Office, Park Department and Office of Long Range Planning, City of Seattle.
- 13 Hillary Hamilton et al., ESD and Procedures For the Evaluation of the Reuse and Disposal of the City's Real Property, June 29, 1998 (See also: Lake Union's Neighborhood plans re: recommendation for a sale of government property in their area).
- 14 Draft Comprehensive Plan 1992, SDPR, pages 9, 31, 32, Table 3; Seattle Comprehensive Plan, page 34.
- 15 Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, Alix Ogden December 16, 1999, updated June 2000.
- 16 Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, page vii.
- 17 *ibid*, p. 51.
- 18 *ibid*, p. 36.
- 19 *ibid*. p.42.
- 20 *ibid*. p. 43.
- 21 *ibid*. p. 43.
- 22 *ibid* p. 43.
- 23 *ibid*. p. 68.
- 24 *ibid*. p. 69.
- 25 *ibid*. p. 6.
- 26 *ibid*. p. 34-35.
- 27 *ibid*. pages 36-37.
- 28 *ibid*. p. 115.
- 29 *ibid*. pages 40-44.
- 30 Seattle Municipal Code, Section 23.60
- 31 Irene Wall, e-mail, Spring 2000.
- 32 Washington Weatherwatch, Fall, 1999, Article, "What Exactly Is the Public Trust Doctrine" by Ken Viste and Benella Caminiti.
- 33 See Westcrest Park example, and file on the Alki/Landslide/Mitigation Project, 1999-2000. File available at Permit Counter, DCLU, 710 2nd Ave., Seattle.
- 34 "Keeping the Green in Seattle," page 8, League of Women Voters of Seattle, April 1991.
- 35 District Guidelines, Table 3 from the 1992 Park Comprehensive Plan, pages 31-32.
- 36 Urban Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan, by Greg Miller for SDPR, July, 1994.
- 37 For further information, contact Katie Sauter, 206/522-0334.
- 38 Seattle Municipal Code 23.44.024.
- 39 Real Estate Department, SDPR, Strategic Planning Office and DCLU.
- 40 From Terry Dunning, Real Estate Manager, SDPR and Chip Nevins, Open Space Program.
- 41 Lynn Ferguson, committee member, ProParks, from Park Department.
- 42 George Blomberg, Port of Seattle, e-mail, April 8, 2000.
- 43 Seattle Urban Trails System Map, 1999; e-mails and correspondence from Ywe Eng and Peter Lagerway, Spring 2000.
- 44 Title I5, Ordinances 119673 and 119620
- 45 SeaTran, Street Use Division.
- 46 Ordinance 119673, October 15, 1999.
- 47 SeaTran, Street Use Division.
- 48 Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce, April 20, 2000, page 5.
- 49 P-Patch Fact Sheet, Dept. of Neighborhoods, 700 3rd Ave., 4th Floor, phone (206) 684-0264.

- 50 Department of Neighborhoods, P-Patch Program 684-0264 and Delridge Neighborhood Development Association.
- 51 Nolan Rundquist, City Arborist, e-mail Spring 2000.
- 52 Jim Ellis, Seattle Weekly, April 27, 2000, page 29.
- 53 (www.ci.seattle.wa.us/planning/CompPlan/Pregrowth/htm).
- 54 From American Forests—Urban Ecosystem Analysis of Seattle, Washington, calculating tree cover loss and related values in the City of Seattle, from 1972-1986.
- 55 from Policy 11, page 83, Mayor's Recommended Open Space Policies, April 1997.
- 56 King County Ordinance 93-894.
- 57 Pro-Parks 2000 Citizens' Committee, Recommended Categories and Funding Allocations, listed in the "Greenbelts and Natural Areas" section.
- 58 Land and People, Trust For Public Land magazine, Spring 2000, page 33.
- 59 From brochure on the Olmsted Park-Boulevard design history as part of an interpretive exhibit at the Volunteer Park Water Tower.
- 60 Judith Noble, Public Utilities, 684-8078
- 61 Open Space Policy #11, page 83.
- 62 Shoreline Park Improvement Fund information from the park department, 1992.
- 63 Terry Dunning, Real Estate Manager, SPRD.
- 64 see Alki landslide mitigation project folder at the permit counter, DCLU, 711 2nd Avenue.
- 65 T.J. Moore, Strategic Planning Office, Seattle, and member of this report committee.
- 66 attributed to Chief Seattle, but true author is Ted Perry, a former Hollywood scriptwriter, now a college professor. Source investigated by T.J.Moore.

GLOSSARY

Boulevard - Generally, a broad avenue which provides significant views, architectural features, landscaped medians or planting strips, or linkages, between other space elements.

Code - A body of law that has statutory force.

Comprehensive Plan - A statement of policies and intent.

Easement - An easement is a legal document granting an interest, privilege or advantage to one party or to the general public on the land of another person. Easements are frequently granted for access to property and sometimes for the preservation or conservation of greenery, slopes, view or other environmental purposes.

Former Greenbelt Overlay District - Taken from the greenbelt areas identified in the 1977 Greenbelt Plan. These are the greenbelts targeted for private land purchase in the Open Space Bond Issue. These areas are still used for analytical purposes because they are included in the City's geographic information system, even though they are not part of the city land use code.

Interim zoning - Temporary zoning in an area until the city council passes permanent zone or ordinance; used to hold development at a certain level.

Mitigation - Term used primarily in SEPA process to temper the environmental impact by requiring the developer to do something.

Ordinance - An official action taken by the city council that has the rule of law. From an ordinance come regulations, carried out by DCLU, or some other city agency.

Overlay - Consists of a mapped area that has special requirements in addition to those of the underlying zone. Development within the overlay must conform to the requirements of both the underlying zone and the overlay, or to the more restrictive of the two.

Policy - A statement to guide government actions.

Regulation - A law or rule that is used to govern activities (in this case) of city government.

Resolution - One of two types of official action taken by the city council. A resolution gives general direction but does not have the rule of law as an ordinance does. A resolution is closer to a policy statement.

Right-of-way - An easement on private property for public use, primarily for transportation purposes, and secondarily for utility or open space purposes.

Riparian corridors - Corridors pertaining to the bank of a river, a lake, or of a tidewater.

Street ends - Undeveloped ends of streets such as those streets that run to the edge of a body of water. They are public rights-of-way.

Street park - A street, which, through a variety of treatments, such as sidewalk widening, landscaping, traffic revisions, and special development features, is enhanced for pedestrian and open space use.

Undeveloped land - Land not containing any man-made structures or improvements. It can be either public or privately owned.

Urban trail - An extended and usually continuous strip of land or water, used primarily for recreational travel. Urban trails may serve different user groups, such as pedestrians, bicyclists, and to a more limited extent, canoeists.

Vacation of public right-of-way or street vacation - An action by the city council which removes the rights-of-way easement from public use, when it is no longer necessary for transportation or utility purposes, by selling it to abutting property owner(s).

ACRONYMS

DCLU	Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use	SEPA	State Environmental Protection Act
SDPR	Department of Parks and Recreation	SMA	Shoreline Management Act
ECA	Environmental Critical Area	SMC	Seattle Municipal Code
ESD	Executive Services Department	SPO	Strategic Planning Office
RCW	Revised Code of Washington	SPU	Seattle Public Utilities
SEATRAN	Seattle Transportation Department	WAC	Washington Administrative Code

CONTRIBUTORS TO KEEPING THE GREEN 2000

John Barber, Open Space Advocates

Sandy Barney, LWVS Co-President

Russell Batten, LWVS Administrative Manager

George Blomberg, Port of Seattle

Wallis Bolz, Reporter, Seattle Press

Benella Caminiti, authority on the Public Trust Doctrine

Theresa Cherniak, Strategic Planning Dept., City of Seattle

Karen Daubert, Chair. Friends of Water Related Street Ends

Ken Davis, DCLU, City of Seattle

Jim Diers and Laurie Dunlap, Department of Neighborhoods, information on Green Streets and other matters

Terry Dunning, Real Estate Manager, SDPR, City of Seattle

Gene Duvernoy, Director, Cascade Land Conservancy

Ywe Eng, Bike and Pedestrian Trails, SeaTran

Barbara Feasey, Chair of the Park Foundation

Carol Goldenberg, LWVS Board, advisor

Barbara Gupstill, LWVS Co-President

Hillary Hamilton et al., Executive Services Dept., Real Estate Division, City of Seattle

Ed Henderson, Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

Julie Hull, receptionist, DCLU, City of Seattle

Susie King, Co-Chair., Mee-Kwa-Mooks /Jacobsen Road Alliance, helped write the Jacobsen Road example

Ann Knight, former staff with Open Space Program, SDPR

Peter Lagerway, Bike and Pedestrian Trails, SeaTran, City of Seattle

Carsten Lien, telephone interview on his conservation easement

Lizanne Lyons, Strategic Planning Department, Seattle
Doug Mason, Cascade Land Conservancy, for King County

Rich McDonald, P-Patch Program, Department of Neighborhoods, City of Seattle

Vivian McLean, writer of Westcrest Park example

Stacia Miller

Joyce Moty, writer about Initiative #42, member of Pro-Parks Committee and former County Open Space Oversight Committee

Chip Nevins, staff member, SDPR

Judith Noble, Seattle Public Utilities, information about the Salmon Recovery Program.

Alix Ogden, SDPR, re: Neighborhood Plans for Land Acquisition

Jackie and Zake Ramels, computer consultants

Aaron Rose, student, Univ. of Wash., volunteer, Fall quarter 1999

Nolan Rundquist, City Arborist, SeaTran, City of Seattle

Hazel Schiffer, LWVS Member, proofreading

Seattle City Clerk's Office, help in researching city documents

Kate Stannard, Delridge Neighborhood Development Association, Market Gardens

Peter Stekel, Computer consultant

Kevin Stoops, information on Seaboard Lumber purchase, SDPR

David Takami, Public Information, SDPR

Irene Wall, Marriott Hotel Example

West Seattle Herald and Tim St. Clair, information on landslide area in the City of Seattle

West Seattle Unit, LWVS

A PARTIAL LIST OF

ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS IN SEATTLE

- **American Forests**, 910 17th Street, NW, Suite 600, Washington D.C. 20006, (800) 368-5748 www.amfor.org.
- **American Rivers-Northwest Regional Office**, 150 Nickerson Street, Suite 311, Seattle 98109, 213-0330, Web: www.amrivers.org.
- **Audubon Society**, 8050 35th N.E., Seattle 98115, 523-4483, Helen Ross, Conservation Coordinator.
- **Bicycle Alliance of Washington**, P.O. Box 2904, Seattle 98111, 224-9252, Web: www.bicyclealliance.org.
- **Bradner Gardens**, Contact Joyce Moty, 324-2597, e-mail jmoty@nwlink.com.
- **Bullitt Foundation**, 1212 Minor, Seattle 98101, 343-0807.
- **Cascade Land Conservancy**, 615 Second Ave., Suite 525, Seattle, 98104, Gene Duvernoy, Director, e-mail duvernoy@pop.net, Doug Mason, King County Manager, e-mail info@flc-sk.com.
- **Center for Environmental Law and Policy**, 1165 Eastlake East, Suite 400, Seattle, 98109, 223-8454, e-mail: info@celp.org; premier advocacy group for public interest water rights in Washington.
- **E.B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust**, P.O. Box 77126, Seattle 98177, 362-0933, Kathy Black, Administrator.
- **Earth Justice Legal Defense Fund**, 705 Second Ave. Suite 203, Seattle 98104, 343-7340, www.earthjustice.org.
- **Earth Ministry**, 305 N.E. 47th St., Seattle 98105, 6302-2082 FAX: a connector of the earth with ministry.
- **Friends of Discovery Park**, contact Patricia Stambor, 285 5349.
- **Friends of Schmitz Park**, Contacts: Ken Shaw, 937-2718 and Jeff Sifferman, 938-2230.
- **Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks**, P.O. Box 9884, Seattle 98109, Doug Jackson, President.
- **Friends of the Earth-Northwest Regional Office**, 6512 23rd Ave. NW, Suite 320, Seattle 98117, 297-9460, www.foe.org.
- **Friends of Water-Related Street Ends**, Karen Daubert, chair, 726-8919.
- **Friends of Westcrest Park**, Charles Hand, 767-3498.
- **Garden Conservancy**, Rosina McIvor, District Advisor, 242-4040.
- **Greg Davis Park Supporters**, Mike Little, 932-1374.
- **Groundswell Northwest Incorporated**, Chuck Nasziger, President; Contact Lillian Reilly, 784-7468.
- **High Point Market Garden 2000**, Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association, 5411 Delridge Way SW, Seattle, 98106, 923-0917, FAX 923-0920.
- **King County Department of Assessments**, 500 4th Ave., Room 708, Seattle 98104, 296-3969, Susan Monroe, Current Use Evaluation Specialist.
- **King County Department of Natural Resources**, 201 S. Jackson St., Suite 600, Seattle 98104, Ted Sullivan, Program Coordinator, Public Benefit Rating System, Water and Land Resources Division, 296-7802.
- **King County Wildlife Program**, 201 Jackson, Suite 600, Seattle 98104-3854, 296-7266, e-mail, kate.stenberg@metrokc.org.
- **Longfellow Creek Trail Supporters**, Gary Sink, 937-1971.
- **Longfellow Creek**, Contact Sheral Shapiro, 233-2046.
- **Mee-Kwa-Mooks/Jacobsen Alliance**, Contact Susie King, co-chair, 938-1937.
- **Mountaineer Foundation**, P.O. Box 9464, Queen Anne Station, Seattle 98109, (206) 264-5691.
- **Mountaineers**, 300 Third Ave. W., Seattle 98119, 284-6310, FAX 284-4977, e-mail clubmail@mountaineers.org. Web: <http://www.mountaineers.org>.
- **Nature Conservancy**, 217 Pine St., Suite 1100, Seattle 98101, 343-4344.
- **Open Space Advocates**, 3421 E. Superior, Seattle 98122, 324-1548.
- **Partnership for Religion and the Environment** is "a regional collaboration of multi-faith religious, academic, and environmental organizations. We share a common ethical concern for nature's well being and are spiritually nourished by the natural world." (from the group's brochure) Contacts include: The Earth Ministry, People for Puget Sound, The Wilderness Society.
- **People for Puget Sound**, 1402 Third Ave. #1200, Seattle, 382-7007, FAX 382-7006.
- **Plant Amnesty**, 906 NW 97th Street, Seattle 98117, 783-9813, www.plantamnesty.org.
- **P-Patch Program**, Dept. of Neighborhoods, 700 3rd Ave., Seattle 98104, 684-0264.
- **Puget Creek Stewards**, Noel Congden, contact person, 762-7069.
- **Puget Soundkeeper Alliance**, 1415 West Dravus Street, Seattle 98119, 286-1309, www.halcyon.com/pskeeper.
- **Ravenna Creek Alliance**, Kit O-Neil, contact, 523-4523.
- **Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**, 700 3rd Ave., 4th floor, Seattle 98104, 684-0464.
- **Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation**, 100 Dexter N., Seattle 98109, Ken Bounds, Superintendent.
- **Seattle Foundation**, 425 Pike, 622-2294.
- **Seattle Parks Foundation**, Contact Barbara Feasey, 206-523-8636.
- **SeattleOpenSpaces.org**, a group of private citizens from the greater Seattle area who are dedicated to intelligent growth in the City of Seattle particularly in the downtown area. e-mail support@seattleopenspaces.org, Bill Attridge, (206) 374-2481.
- **Thornton Creek Alliance**, Cheryl Klinker, 367-4635.
- **Trust For Public Land**, Northwest Regional Office, 100I Western Ave., Suite 605, Seattle 98104, 587-

- 3447.
 - **Wilderness Society**, 1424 Fourth Ave. #816, Seattle 98101, 624-6430, FAX 624-7101.
 - **Urban Creeks Legacy**, www.ci.seattle.wa.us/util/.
 - **Washington Native Plant Society**, (Central Puget Sound Chapter includes Seattle area), Inquiries
- WNPS Administrator, 7400 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle 98115, 527-3210, e-mail: wnps@wnps.org, Web Site: www.wnps.org.
- **Weatherwatch Park/Cormorant Cove**, Constellation Park, Contact Leslie Jane, work phone 622-8848.