

# HISTORY OF SEATTLE'S CITY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL AND THE DISTRICT COUNCIL SYSTEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
Preface	1
Antecedents	2
Founding and Early Development, 1987-92	3
Reorganization, 1993-96	3
City staffing of CNC and the District Councils	6
Establishing the District Councils and their boundaries	7
CNC meeting speakers	10
Other events CNC has organized	10
CNC policy positions and activities	11
Neighborhood Matching Fund	11
Neighborhood Street Fund	12
Neighborhood Park and Street Fund	14
City budget	14
Neighborhood Planning	15
Land use and the Comprehensive Plan	17
Transportation	18
Customer Service Bureau	19
Volunteer training	19
Schools and Education	19
Other City programs and issues	19
State and Federal issues	20
Bibliographic sources	20
Author and contact information	21

## PREFACE

Seattle's City Neighborhood Council and the 13 District Councils are official City advisory bodies created by 1987 legislation. They are a nationally significant model of grassroots democracy, being Seattle's only advisory committees whose members are entirely selected at the grass roots, rather than appointed top-down by elected officials or City agencies. Following is a historical overview of their founding, development, and activities. Policies and practices can, of course, always be revisited and often are. But changes should be made consciously, with full knowledge of policies and practices and the reasoning behind them.

The focus of this history is on the City Neighborhood Council and the District Council system. There is a need for a detailed story of each District Council, but that is not within the scope of the current document. The present history, which is current as of February 2013, is a work in progress. The author (contact information at end) welcomes suggestions for its expansion and comments for its revision.

## ANTECEDENTS

The City Neighborhood Council, the District Councils, the Department of Neighborhoods, and Seattle's neighborhood planning and assistance programs were not created in a vacuum. From early in the 20th century, community clubs and councils had flourished in Seattle, some with their own clubhouses such as Mount Baker and Seward Park. In part because political party machines were not as strong here as elsewhere, City government welcomed and fostered these neighborhood organizations.

Neighborhood organizations were historically strong also because Seattle grew by annexing towns like Ballard and Georgetown that previously had their own local governments and identities. Also, Seattle annexed previously unincorporated areas that of necessity had developed their own community organizations (again, some with their own clubhouses, like Haller Lake and Sunset Hill).

Neighborhood organizations cooperated with one another across neighborhood boundaries, such as two 1920s-era coalitions, the Associated Improvement Clubs of the North End and the Associated Improvement Clubs of the South End. Also, the Northeast Regional Council, a non-profit coalition of community clubs and councils, was formed in the 1970s long before anyone had thought of a City government-sponsored Northeast District Council.

Reinforcing Seattle's history of receptiveness to grassroots organizations were the environmental and civil rights of the 1960s as well as the community action philosophy within government. With federal "Model Cities" funds, the City of Seattle in 1972 began to employ community organizers who helped neighborhoods identify their needs and press the City for help. Also influential within government was a national movement to decentralize, leading Seattle to establish "little city halls" (ancestors of today's Neighborhood Service Centers, then called Community Service Centers) in 1972.

## FOUNDING AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT, 1987-1992

Legislation. City Council Res. 27709 (October 26, 1987) and its Attachment A created Seattle's Neighborhood District Councils, City Neighborhood Council, Office of Neighborhoods, and Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program (a term that included the Neighborhood Matching Fund and the neighborhood planning program). Ordinance 115345 (passed in 1990) re-established the Office of Neighborhoods as the Department of Neighborhoods (DON).

Res. 27709 was largely written by City Councilmember Jim Street and his staff, in close cooperation with several neighborhood residential and business leaders from throughout Seattle. Passed unanimously by the City Council, the resolution went into effect without the signature of an initially skeptical Mayor Charles Royer. However, two years later Royer did sign the unanimously passed Res. 28115 (December 18, 1989), which repeated the same Attachment A from Res. 27709, while adding to it a Downtown District Council and new powers and responsibilities for District Councils and the City Neighborhood Council.

Res. 27709 and Res. 28115 both have the same Attachment A language stating that “District Councils shall provide a forum for consideration of common concerns including physical planning, budget allocations and service delivery and for sharing of ideas for solutions to common problems.” Each resolution’s Attachment A also states that “The District Councils shall be staffed by the community service centers” and that the City Neighborhood Council “shall be staffed by the City’s Office of Neighborhoods” (later DON).

Res. 27709 and Res. 28115 are also similar in their Attachment A language regarding the City Neighborhood Council, with the exception that Res. 28115 added the following: “Additional positions may be added by the City Neighborhood Council, as needed, in order to make the membership reflective of the City’s diverse population.” Also, because the version of Attachment A in Res. 27709 referred to the “first year” of the program, those words were dropped, so it was revised for Res. 28115 to read as follows: “The responsibilities of the City Neighborhood Council shall include: i) review and recommendations regarding City budget issues including the general fund, capital and block grant budgets and the Neighborhood Matching Fund; ii) advice on policies necessary to the effective and equitable implementation of the Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program.”

Jim Diers, who served as the first Director of the Office of Neighborhoods and its successor the Department of Neighborhoods, wrote in his book, *Neighbor Power* (pp. 49-50):

Neighborhood leaders were suspicious that the district councils would take away power from their grassroots organizations. They were concerned lest community and government attention shift to the district councils, detracting from neighborhood groups and creating a layer of bureaucracy between them and city government. Having observed district council systems in other cities and seen that government-sponsored entities could indeed undermine the existing organizations that belonged to the community, I sympathized with the communities’ concerns. Some municipal governments, in the course of bestowing funding and authority on their district-level organizations, had also set boundaries for neighborhoods and standards for neighborhood organizations, determining which ones to recognize for membership at the district level. That system, while possibly making sense in a city lacking strong grassroots organizations, didn’t seem like a good model for Seattle. Seattle had a long history of such organizations, and more that were up-and-coming. ... It seemed to me that district councils could make sense only if they contributed to the independent power of the neighborhood organizations. Mayor Royer and Councilmember Street shared this belief, so district councils were granted no authority other than a role in rating Neighborhood Matching Fund projects. Unlike the grassroots organizations, the district councils cannot apply for project funding. The district councils serve primarily as a forum for neighborhood organizations to share information and ideas and, if member groups so desire, to work together on common issues.

## REORGANIZATION, 1993-96

Change from two to one in each District Council’s positions on CNC. The initial structure of the City Neighborhood Council included one residential and one business representative from each of the District Councils. Over the years, attendance by the business representatives was often low, such that quorum problems were chronic. In 1993, CNC appointed a committee to explore the

future of the CNC, and after looking at various options, the committee recommended “that the City Neighborhood Council dissolve itself by 1994 and alternative methods of implementing City Council Resolution 27709 be considered.”

At the time that its committee recommended that CNC be disbanded, CNC was not having regular monthly meetings. But several months later, CNC met on Oct. 20, 1993 and voted twice on the committee’s recommendation. Both times, the recommendation failed to get the two-thirds vote that the CNC by-laws required for a policy decision. With a yes vote being for disbanding the CNC, the first vote was Yes--6, No--5, and Abstentions--5. The second vote was Yes--8, No--6, and Abstentions--2. So the CNC survived, but the next few years were to be a period of rebuilding.

After the anticlimactic Oct. 20, 1993 meeting, there were no CNC meetings for a period of ten months, although the District Council chairs continued to meet on an informal basis to share information on City issues and to discuss the future of the CNC. This gathering of District Council chairs asked a second committee to report on the future of the CNC, and this committee recommended that CNC continue but that to be a more effective entity, its membership be composed of the District Council chairs and that there be one voting member per District Council, not two. This proposal was endorsed at a meeting of the District Council chairs.

As a result of this joint action by the District Council chairs, DON Director Jim Diers sent their proposal to the City Council, stating in his June 10, 1994 letter:

The recommended resolution would change representation to the CNC from one residential and one business district representative to a single District Chair (or designated alternate). It is hoped that this change will ensure communication between the citywide organization and the districts and thus, community organizations. Additionally, the smaller number of participants will make meetings more manageable and increase the likelihood of achieving a quorum.

This change in the membership of CNC was embodied in Resolution 28948, which was adopted on July 11, 1994 by the City Council and signed by Mayor Norm Rice on July 14. Attachment A of Res. 27709 and Res. 28115 had stated that “Each District Council Chair shall select one residential and one business district representative to serve on a City Neighborhood Council.” Res. 28948 revised Res. 28115’s Attachment A to state that “Each District Council Chair or a designated alternative, shall serve on a City Neighborhood Council.”

CNC reorganization and new by-laws. The reorganized CNC had its first formal meeting on August 29, 1994, adopting one page of by-laws and one page of operating procedures. The 1994 by-laws provided that the position of chair of the CNC would rotate among the District Councils. The May 22, 1995 CNC meeting changed this arrangement by amending the by-laws to read that “Positions of chair and vice-chair shall be filled by majority vote and shall be for a six-month term that may be renewed.”

Over a period of months in 1996 with the help of a by-laws committee, the CNC thoroughly revised its by-laws, adopting the new by-laws on November 25, 1996. With minor changes, these are the CNC by-laws that are in use today. Two of the most significant by-laws provisions

adopted in 1996 reflected concern by the District Councils that CNC be accountable to them--that CNC's committees not be "loose cannons" taking positions that had not been validated by a CNC vote; and that CNC decisions reflect a genuine consensus process rather than an abrupt and narrow vote.

Committee accountability. The 1996 by-laws introduced several provisions (still present in the by-laws today) to ensure that its committees were accountable to CNC:

Sec. 4.2 includes requirements that "All CNC committee meetings shall be open to the general public and be held at locations accessible to persons with disabilities. Each committee shall meet at least four times a year and each committee's status shall be reviewed annually by the CNC."

Sec. 4.3 provides that the committee chairs "shall be elected annually by the CNC at the same time and in the same manner as the CNC officers," that they "can be replaced at any time by majority vote of the CNC," and that "to maintain committee continuity, committees are encouraged to appoint Vice-Chairs or nominate Co-Chairs."

Sec. 4.4 includes a requirement that at least two members of each committee be CNC members, and that "Other committee voting members shall be approved semi-annually by majority vote of the CNC from a membership list provided to the CNC by the Committee Chair(s)."

Sec. 4.5 states that "A committee's position is only a recommendation to the CNC and subject to CNC approval. All committees may consider such other matters and make such other recommendations pertaining thereto as may fall within the purview of the committee or be assigned by the CNC. Dissent may be presented in the form of a minority report, appended to the majority report, and written by the dissenting members. If no dissenting opinion is provided, the majority report shall specifically state the position or recommendation was not unanimous. Each committee shall submit written semi-annual reports to the CNC. These reports shall include a current list of voting members of such committee."

Sec. 4.6 states that "Publishing the actions or reports of any committee shall be at the discretion of and by majority vote of the CNC. No position on any question, whether a majority or minority view, or public statement shall be taken or made on behalf of the CNC by an individual CNC member or by a CNC committee without the prior approval of the CNC. All published actions or reports of any committee shall specifically state if such actions or reports were unanimous."

Sec. 4.7 states that "All CNC mailings and other issuances, except internal committee matters, must bear the CNC Chair's signature. Committee chair(s) may sign, with the CNC Chair, outgoing CNC mailings only if the communication or correspondence relates directly to the actions or reports of such committee and committee members have been given an opportunity to review and provide input into the proposed mailing. All communications and correspondence shall be on CNC official letterhead."

Consensus decision process. In addition to the above provisions for committee accountability, the 1996 by-laws introduced the following provision (still present in the current by-laws, and quoted here in full) to promote consensus in CNC decisions and to discourage quick and narrow votes:

Sec. 6.1 Decision-making: A goal of the CNC is to reach decision by consensus through a process of open dialogue in which issues are presented, defined, discussed and resolved. The Chair will decide whether representation at the meeting is sufficient to assure a fair and adequate hearing of perspectives and opinions. If, in the opinion of the Chair, consensus cannot be reached, the CNC shall decide on one or more of the following alternatives:

- 1) Continue discussion until consensus is reached;
- 2) Defer to a committee who will be charged with presenting improvements or alternatives to the proposal for future CNC consideration;
- 3) Drop the matter; or
- 4) If a quorum is present, a simple majority (51% of those present and eligible to vote) may decide to vote on the issue. If that vote passes, a simple majority vote, as defined above, will resolve the issue.

This avoidance of quick and narrow votes in favor of more effort to achieve consensus reflects the organizational philosophy and methods best exemplified in the book, *Democracy in Small Groups* by UW professor John Gastil. The minority is not guaranteed against being outvoted, but has faith that such care and time will be taken to reach out to their point of view that they will not walk away from the organization if they lose the argument.

## CITY STAFFING OF CNC AND THE DISTRICT COUNCILS

Res. 27709 (1987) and Res. 28115 (1989) both provided in their Attachment A that the City Neighborhood Council “shall be staffed by the City’s Office of Neighborhoods” and that the District Councils “shall be staffed by the community service centers.” This Attachment A was revised by Res. 28948 (1994) to state as follows: “The Council shall be staffed by the Department of Neighborhoods, with responsibilities as designated for District Councils. Actions of the City Neighborhood Council shall be documented in an official public record and maintained at the Department of Neighborhoods.”

At their founding in 1972, the Community Service Centers were located in the Mayor’s office, but the following year were moved to the Department of Human Resources. As a part of the 1987 Res. 27709, their number was increased from the existing 9 to 12, they were renamed as Neighborhood Service Centers or NSCs, and then with the 1989 Res. 28115, one more was added for a total of 13. They were brought into DON when it was set up in 1990.

After 2000 in a succession of decisions in different years, the number of Neighborhood Services Centers was reduced, and although some of the closures were later reversed, further closures leave their number at 6 as of 2013. In 2012, responsibility for managing the Neighborhood Service Centers was transferred from the Department of Neighborhoods to the Department of

Finance and Administrative Services. Still housed in the NSCs are the Neighborhood District Coordinators, which continue to be DON employees.

Neighborhood District Coordinators The NDCs have been integral to the success of their District Councils, publicizing and recording the meetings and often participating actively in them. Staffing of the CNC has involved two roles—a Department of Neighborhoods deputy director or other senior official who has been DON’s official liaison to the CNC, and another staff person who has tended to CNC’s administrative needs, such as agendas, minutes, e-mail announcements and the web site.

Staffing the direct administrative needs of the District Councils and the CNC requires DON employees to set aside their allegiances to the Department for those cases where a District Council or the CNC may be taking a position on a policy issue (such as on the City budget) that DON, in deference to the Mayor, must avoid; and for those cases where District Council or the CNC may have to disagree with the Department of Neighborhoods director or with some staff. The people who have had this role have carried out this assignment brilliantly. They are hugely important to the success of CNC and District Councils, and are deeply respected and appreciated by the volunteers.

## ESTABLISHING THE DISTRICT COUNCILS AND THEIR BOUNDARIES

In expanding the then nine community service centers to twelve, Res. 27709 and Res. 28115 directed that “The boundaries of community service center catchment areas shall be redrawn to correspond more closely to community needs, in consultation with neighborhood organizations. These boundaries shall be subject to revision by the City Council after review by the Office Neighborhoods, the City Neighborhood Council, the District Councils and neighborhood organizations.” Res. 27709 also directed that “Each of the community service center catchment areas shall be designated as a neighborhood district,” and that “Each neighborhood district shall have a District Council consisting of representatives of all community councils and neighborhood business organizations within the district who wish to participate.”

In 1987 there was no downtown community service center, and so Res. 27709 left the downtown neighborhoods without a District Council or a seat on the CNC. There was immediate protest from downtown residents and businesses, who were successful in persuading the City Council to declare, via the 1989 Res. 28115’s amendment of Attachment A, that “A downtown neighborhood district shall also be established.” This effort was led in part by Jan Drago, who soon became a chair of the City Neighborhood Council and was later elected to the City Council.

In a few cases the boundaries between District Councils overlap (see the map on at <http://seattle.gov/neighborhoods>). Jim Diers, who headed the Office of Neighborhoods and then the Department of Neighborhoods when the boundaries were first established, wrote in *Neighbor Power* (p. 49) “Notwithstanding city planners’ fears that it would be difficult to get an accurate count of widgets per district if boundaries were allowed to overlap, neighborhood leaders insisted that the overlaps be retained. They wanted the city to respect how each neighborhood had identified itself and to understand that the overlapping boundaries documented areas of shared

interest. Some district boundary overlaps have been negotiated away over time, but a few still remain.”

In 1991 (prompted by the Southwest/Delridge situation described below), the City Neighborhood Council created a Boundary Guidelines committee, which developed a process for resolving boundary disputes, and CNC adopted this Dispute Resolution Process at its October 23, 1991 meeting:

- (1) The City Neighborhood Council is recognized as “the appropriate body to establish policies and procedures to address boundary issues”;
- (2) “All disputes involving the creation, elimination, or change of district boundaries” should first be addressed by this process, before going to the Mayor and City Council;
- (3) “All disputes regarding credentials should be resolved through the Dispute Resolution Process before other issues, if any, are addressed”;
- (4) “The Chair of the CNC may designate a member of CNC to be a Dispute Resolution Information Officer, and “may designate himself or herself” for that position;
- (5) “When informal meetings do not resolve all differences between the parties or when parties refuse to meet together, the parties should engage in mediation utilizing a neutral mediator,” who “should be chosen by mutual agreement of all the parties with the assistance of the Dispute Resolution Information Officer”;
- (6) If the mediated talks are at an impasse, a “formal arbitration panel of three to five persons would be selected by the chair of the City Neighborhood Council”;
- (7) “The decision of the arbitration panel would not be binding”;
- (8) “Once an agreement between disputing parties has been reached...the CNC should formally request the Mayor and City Council—through the Department of Neighborhoods—to create, eliminate or change a Neighborhood District in accordance with that agreement”;
- (9) “If the disputing parties fail to reach an agreement through the dispute resolution process, then the parties may appeal to the Mayor and City Council for some remedy.”

Southwest/Delridge, 1991-93. When the District Councils were first established in 1988, the Southwest District Council was created to represent all of West Seattle, including Delridge, and in recognition of its size, was given two residential and two business seats—twice the seats of the other District Councils. Many residents and businesses in Delridge were not happy with this arrangement, and began meeting informally as the Delridge Neighborhood District Council and sending a representative to the City Neighborhood Council. At the CNC’s April 17, 1991 meeting, Charlie Chong (who later was elected to the City Council) made a presentation on behalf of the residential and business groups in the Southwest District Council, protesting the efforts of the Delridge group to secede. Also at that meeting, CNC voted unanimously to seat the Delridge District Council as an “interim, non-voting member” until the issue of recognizing them as a separate, voting District Council could be settled. Petitions of more than 1200 signatures eventually endorsed the Southwest District Council’s opposition to establishment of a Delridge District Council.

As CNC did not have a process in place for resolving boundary disputes, it adopted one at its Oct. 23, 1991 meeting (see above). In accordance with its recently adopted policy for resolving boundary disputes (see above), CNC obtained agreement of both parties to engage the services of the King County Dispute Resolution Center to serve as a mediator, who met jointly six times with

representatives of both sides, at which point the Delridge Neighborhoods District Council voted on Oct. 13, 1992 to “declare the boundary mediation at an impasse,” and to “request that CNC seat DNDC with full voting rights.” The Southwest District Council representatives disagreed and urged that the mediation continue. The Oct. 21, 1992 CNC meeting decided to move on to the arbitration stage of CNC’s Dispute Resolution Process.

Subsequently, the CNC co-chairs appointed an arbitration panel consisting of Kristin O’Donnell (Yesler Terrace), Dick Baldwin (Capitol Hill), and Ellen Stewart (Lake City). The arbitration panel solicited and reviewed written statements from the Southwest and Delridge groups and met separately with them. CNC’s arbitration panel also held a public hearing on Nov. 1, 1993 at which official presentations were made by both sides, with an observer present from the Department of Neighborhoods. On Nov. 15, the arbitration panel ruled that the City should recognize the Delridge District Council as independent from the Southwest District Council, and with an equal vote on the CNC; and also ruled that 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue Southwest should be the dividing line, with existing residential and business groups within the Southwest/Delridge area being allowed to join one or both District Councils.

On Dec. 1, the Southwest District Council accepted the arbitration panel’s recommendation, but it appealed to the Mayor and City Council the arbitration panel’s boundary, urging that “there should be no boundary.” This appeal was unsuccessful, and the CNC arbitration panel’s ruling was allowed to stand. The Delridge Neighborhoods District Council was recognized as a thirteenth District Council with equal vote on the CNC. Since that time, the Southwest District Council and the Delridge Neighborhoods District Council have worked closely together on a number of projects, and have held occasional joint meetings.

DON director Diers was wise in turning to CNC address this seemingly intractable boundary dispute. As a volunteer institution, CNC was better equipped than his government agency to address this dispute between volunteer groups. And giving this responsibility to CNC strengthened it as a volunteer institution, empowering its members with the feeling that their efforts mattered. More recently, the Department of Neighborhoods has not brought to CNC some smaller boundary issues, deciding them within the agency. DON thus has missed opportunities to recognize CNCs boundary procedures and, in so doing, to economize on DON staff and strengthen CNC as an institution.

Sectors. In the late 1990s, the City Neighborhood Council and several District Councils opposed Mayor Paul Schell’s proposal to divide the City into six “sectors,” with the boundaries being freeways and the Ship Canal. An October 1, 1998 letter stated that CNC had voted unanimously “to request that the City Council adopt regional subdivisions of the City for neighborhood planning implementation that follow the Neighborhood Service Center areas that the City has developed over the past several years. ... Dividing the City in the way suggested on page 14 of the budget would split several neighborhoods and several Neighborhood Service Centers in half.” The letter also submitted a proposal for six regions that would avoid splitting neighborhoods, and added, “We also hope you choose the word ‘region,’ not the word ‘sector,’ to describe these divisions since ‘sector’ is a term of military occupation (for example, the Socket Sector of Berlin).”

## CNC MEETING SPEAKERS

Mayors Norm Rice, Paul Schell, and Greg Nickels have been guest speakers at the monthly meetings of City Neighborhood Council. Mayor Paul Schell spoke at two monthly CNC meetings, to present his annual budget proposals after having done so earlier that day to the City Council. During his successful campaign for election, Schell also participated in a televised CNC candidate debate. In addition to speaking at a CNC monthly meeting, Mayor Nickels was keynote speaker at CNC's neighborhood summits in January 2007 and October 2008. Mayor McGinn spoke to a monthly CNC meeting during his successful election campaign. Once elected, McGinn keynoted CNC's budget conferences in 2010 and 2012.

Most of the City Councilmembers who have served since 1988 have been CNC guest speakers, some of them several times. In at least two cases, the November CNC meetings have also hosted newly elected City Councilmembers before they had taken office. Occasionally, City Council staff also attend meetings of CNC or its committees. Long after he had left the City Council, Council President Jim Street, author of the legislation that created the Seattle neighborhood program including CNC and the District Councils, was guest at the May 19, 2008 CNC meeting to speak about the program's history.

Directors of almost every City department have been guest speakers at CNC meetings at one time or another--some several times (e.g. Department of Neighborhoods directors, Police chiefs, and directors of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations). Additionally, CNC meetings have featured department speakers from below the director level, such as again the Department of Neighborhoods and the Police Department.

CNC meetings have also featured speakers from other government entities, among them the Seattle School District and the state Liquor Control Board. Speakers have also come from non-profit organizations, such as Reinvesting in Youth.

## OTHER EVENTS CNC HAS ORGANIZED

In addition to its monthly meetings, the City Neighborhood Council and its committees have organized many public events (see list below). Some of the events were recorded by the Seattle Channel and can be viewed on the CNC web site, <http://seattle.gov/neighborhoodcouncil>. Mayors or City Councilmembers have spoken at most of these events.

- Citizens budget conference (biennial since 1989, with the most recent in January 2012)
- City Council candidates forum (1997, 1999 including mayoral candidates, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011)
- Community-building workshop (January 27, 2007)
- Neighborhood Matching Fund volunteer recognition events
- Neighbor planning groups networking event (April 24, 1997)
- Neighborhood planning workshops (2007 and 2008)
- Neighborhood summit (2006 and 2008)

## CNC POLICY POSITIONS AND ACTIVITIES

The rest of this history is about the policies and programs that the City Neighborhood Council has monitored and sought to influence. CNC's web site, [http://seattle.gov/neighborhood\\_council](http://seattle.gov/neighborhood_council) contains many of the primary documents that are described here.

### NEIGHBORHOOD MATCHING FUND

Moreso than with any Seattle program, the Neighborhood Matching Fund was designed by volunteers. In 1987, neighborhood volunteers worked with City Councilmember Jim Street to prepare Res. 27709, which passed that year, creating NMF, CNC, the District Councils, and the Office of Neighborhoods. And in 1988-89, District Council volunteers operating through the City Neighborhood Council and working with new staff in the Office of Neighborhoods (to become the Department of Neighborhoods in 1990) helped implement the legislation by developing the Neighborhood Matching Fund procedures.

Fundamental to NMF's design was that that volunteers did the rating, ranking, and selection among applications, with half the points allocated by the District Councils and the other half allocated by a City Neighborhood Council committee (the Citywide Review Team), and with the awards recommended to the Mayor and City Council by vote of the City Neighborhood Council.

The Department of Neighborhoods departed from this model with the NMF Small and Simple projects fund (which, despite its name, now allows applications for up to \$25,000 in NMF funds, having started with a more modest limit of \$5000 or less). No volunteers either from the District Councils or from the City Neighborhood Council are involved in the review or rating of the Small and Simple applications.

In order to salvage for the District Councils some level of disclosure of Small and Simple applications in their vicinity, the CNC at its April 27, 1998 meeting passed a resolution that included this provision: "Resolved, that within one week of the Small and Simple application due date, the Department of Neighborhoods will provide each District Council a list of the Small and Simple applications that have been received for projects within the district boundaries; and upon the district's request will provide a copy of the applications." It is doubtful that any of the District Councils are receiving this level of disclosure regarding projects applied for in their midst.

The Small and Simple Projects Fund became an item of controversy in 2011 when the newly confirmed DON Director announced that for the fall application cycle, emergency preparedness would be a "special designation topic," with applications for other purposes not eligible. After major concerns were expressed by District Council and CNC members, the Director withdrew the restriction, allowing applications for any purpose, including emergency preparedness.

The NMF resolution that CNC adopted on April 27, 1998 also included these provisions:

Resolved, that the City Neighborhood Council requests that the Department of Neighborhoods prepare a list of proposals that have been made over the years by volunteers, staff, or

consultants for improvement of the Neighborhood Matching Fund and related funds. This list should indicate which of the recommendations have been adopted into the program, and when.

Resolved, that policy recommendations to the executive branch and the City Council for implementing the Neighborhood Matching Fund, Small and Simple Fund, and other neighborhood-related City funds will be adopted annually by the City Neighborhood Council based on input from CNC's Neighborhood Matching Fund Review Committee.

DON has not as yet provided CNC the requested list, nor been able to fulfill a more recent request from CNC to provide copies of the one-page exit comments on NMF that those who have just completed a contract are asked to provide as a part of their final report. For its part, CNC has rarely provided to DON the annual policy recommendations regarding NMF scheduled in the 1998 CNC resolution.

In the early years, NMF applicants presented their proposals twice--once to CNC's Citywide Review Team and once to their District Council. In the past ten years, the Department of Neighborhoods replaced the CRT presentation with open houses at which the CRT members view a display about the project and discuss it with the applicant in small groups or one-on-one. In 2009-2010, the Department of Neighborhoods moved to end the District Council-level presentations as well, directing that each District Council designate a District Council Review Team to attend the same open house as the applicants from their District.

DON's termination of the District Council-level applicant presentations proved controversial to District Councils and the CNC, and after these views were widely expressed at the March 30, 2010 CNC meeting, DON withdrew the changes. As in the past, District councils or their Review teams continued to receive the applicant presentations at District Council-level meetings in 2010, 2011, and 2012.

Again in 2013, however, DON moved to end the District Council-level presentations and require District Council Review Team members to attend the same open houses as the Citywide Review Team members, with a shorter presentation and question and answer meeting re-instituted within the open houses. The issue had not been resolved as of this writing.

## NEIGHBORHOOD STREET FUND

After receiving criticisms that a Neighborhood Street Fund (NSF) SDOT had established in the early 1990s had been open to only a few of Seattle's hundreds of neighborhoods, SDOT and the City Neighborhood Council collaborated in 1997 on an entirely equal basis to redesign NSF to invite applications from throughout the City and depend on the District Councils to rate the projects, with the final allocations by SDOT. As with the Neighborhood Matching Fund, the annual District Council-level NSF rating process, inviting as it did involvement by the applicants, publicized and energized the District Councils.

In a series of letters to SDOT, the Mayor, and City Council, CNC expressed concern that the NSF program was underfunded and overly reliant on the Cumulative Reserve Fund, whose real estate excise taxes were limited to neighborhood planning areas, and to major maintenance, not new

projects. In 2000, SDOT proposed that the final Neighborhood Street Fund project recommendations no longer be made by District Councils, but by “sector teams.” At its March 27, 2000 meeting, the City Neighborhood Council resolved that the “NSF and CRF process be handled at the District Council level without Sector Team level meetings.” SDOT dropped its proposal and maintained the central role of the District Councils.

In response to the CNC’s calls for greater and unrestricted funding of the Neighborhood Street Fund, the City Council included it in the nine-year Bridging the Gap transportation levy, which the voters approved in 2006 (section 6 of Ordinance 122232). Not only was \$1.5 million a year in levy proceeds set aside for Neighborhood Street Fund, to be spent exclusively for “pedestrian mobility and safety,” but the ordinance does not allow the spending of any other transportation levy funds each year until at least \$1.5 million has been appropriated for the Neighborhood Street Fund, which the ordinance says must be spent on projects “identified annually by the community” and that “have support of multiple neighborhood plan stewards and/or District Council members.”

Contrary to the past collaboration with CNC in design of the Neighborhood Street Fund, once the levy was passed, Mayor Greg Nickels and SDOT moved toward a very different way of spending the funds. Alerted by a sympathetic City official, CNC wrote expressing concern that despite the levy ordinance requirement that the \$1.5 million/year in levy funds be “identified annually by the community,” these funds were to be put into a “Large Projects Fund” limited to projects \$100,000 and above, and awarded only every three years. SDOT planned also to dispense with the District Council ratings, limiting the District Council role to designating one representative each to a citywide rating committee.

While CNC did not succeed in returning the Neighborhood Street Fund to an annual process and one that could fund small projects, it did convince SDOT to restore to the District Councils their role in rating projects locally, and ensured that SDOT decisions for the 2007 round would be based on advice from a citywide committee with a representative from each District Council. But for the 2010 and 2013 rounds, SDOT eliminated the citywide committee whose membership included District Council representatives, reassigning this role to the Bridging the Gap Citizens Oversight Committee, which lacks District Council representation (and despite its name has voting seats for two City officials).

SDOT also restricted each District Council to requesting only three possible NSF projects for initial SDOT study. The risk in this early limit for the District Councils was that many projects are disqualified early (the cost may turn out to be too low or too high to qualify, the project may not be feasible or may face local opposition, or it may be fundable outside NSF). As a result, some District Councils may end up without an eligible project. Some Districts resisted SDOT’s limit of three, forwarding more than three for possible SDOT study.

## NEIGHBORHOOD PARK AND STREET FUND

With the 2006 Bridging the Gap transportation levy providing new funds for the Neighborhood Street Fund, new channels could be found for spending from the Cumulative Reserve Fund, a volatile source because it comes mainly from real estate excise taxes. Again, SDOT forged ahead without the City Neighborhood Council, its original partner in designing NSF. Initially SDOT

created a separate “Small Projects Fund” within the Neighborhood Street Fund, but the City broadened the fund to include park as well as street uses, so it was soon renamed the Neighborhood Projects Fund, and then in 2013 the Neighborhood Park and Street Fund. District Council-level reviews and ratings remain a feature, but as with NSF, SDOT has sought to restrict each District Council to requesting only three possible NSF projects for initial SDOT study; again, some District Councils have resisted, forwarding more than three.

## CITY BUDGET

CNC and the District Councils assigned central role in budget review. A Planning Commission study of neighborhood programs in other cities helped convince Jim Street and other City Councilmembers to establish the District Councils and the City Neighborhood Council. The study expected CNC’s and the District Councils’ most important role to participation in the City budget process. Thus Attachment A to Res. 27709 (1987) and Res. 28115 (1989), which sets out the role of CNC and the District Councils, includes the following:

### 5. Budget Review

- a. Opportunities for neighborhood involvement in the City budget process shall be created and maintained. The City shall provide budget information by district and, if practical, by neighborhoods.
- b. Procedures for budget review and comment by neighborhood organizations and District Councils shall be developed for Council approval. Neighborhood organizations and District Councils shall be provided the opportunity to initiate budget proposals for neighborhood projects. The Mayor’s budget recommendations to the Council shall include a report containing departmental responses to neighborhood budget initiatives and to the City Neighborhood Council’s budget recommendations.
- c. The City Council shall consider the recommendations of the City Neighborhood Council and the comments of neighborhood organizations and District Councils in its review and actions on the City budget.

Attachment A in both Res. 27709 and Res. 28115 also states in the section on the District Councils: “The City shall work to provide planning and budget information by neighborhood districts and, to the extent practical, by neighborhood.” Attachment A’s section on the City Neighborhood Council states that CNC’s responsibilities shall include “review and recommendations regarding City budget issues including the general fund, capital and block grant budgets and the Neighborhood Matching Fund.” And Attachment A’s section on the Office of Neighborhoods (later renamed the Department of Neighborhoods) gives it responsibility for “cooperation with the Office of Management and Budget in the development of budget information organized by neighborhood districts.”

Budget conference. For many years, CNC has organized a Budget Conference in collaboration with the City Department of Finance (or under previous names, such as Budget Office, or Office of Management and Budget). This event was held annually beginning in 1989, and then made biennial in the 1990s when the City moved to a biennial budget. It was called the Citizens Budget Conference until 2012, when the Department of Neighborhoods informed CNC that it would not

participate in, support or publicize the conference unless the word “citizen” was dropped, so the event was renamed the Community Budget Conference.

Budget recommendations. Each year, CNC has made recommendations on the City budget by writing to the Mayor and City Council, with one going in early summer when the Mayor’s budget is being put together, and the letter to the City Council going in October after late September release of the Mayor’s budget proposals. The initial drafts of these letters have been developed by CNC’s budget committee and circulated to the District Councils for input before being revised and adopted by CNC; in most cases, the CNC budget letter has been adopted without opposition or abstention from any District Council. Some of the District Councils have also written their budget recommendations directly to the Mayor and/or City Councilmembers.

Although budget results are generally the result of many factors, CNC’s budget recommendations have had undeniable results. CNC and the District Councils together have been a major support for the Neighborhood Service Centers and the Neighborhood District Coordinators. There seems little doubt that without their intervention, cuts proposed by mayors would have been larger, and the City Council would not have resisted the mayors as strongly and would have cut the NSCs and NDCs more than they did.

CNC intervention has also contributed to growth in the Neighborhood Matching Fund in good financial times. In times of budgetary stringency, CNC intervention has helped limit the cuts proposed by mayors and helped convince the City Council to cut the program less than mayors have proposed. The Neighborhood Matching Fund today would undoubtedly be substantially less, had not the CNC consistently advocated on its behalf.

The CNC singlehandedly produced a budget result with its successful campaign to restore the City Demographer position in the Department of Planning and Development, a few years after the Mayor and City Council defunded the position. No one else than CNC was advocating for this result.

Budget transparency. CNC has helped to open up the budget process to broader public scrutiny. In a May 22, 2006 letter entitled “Opportunity for improved citizen access to budget information,” and a July 29, 2008 letter entitled “Need for timely web access to budget decision documents,” CNC urged the Mayor and City Council to improve public access to budget proposals and analyses that arise in the hectic two months after the Mayor has presented his budget proposals but before the Council makes its final budget decisions. In the ensuing years, the City has made major improvements toward this end, although a 2013 nationwide study rated Seattle still behind many other cities in budget transparency.

## NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

Achieving grassroots neighborhood planning. The need for neighborhood planning was central to Res. 27709’s creation in 1987 of the neighborhood programs that included CNC, as reflected in the overall title of Neighborhood Planning and Assistance Program. However, little action on neighborhood planning at first took place, and for years the City devoted to it only a fraction of a personnel position. Almost immediately after its first meeting in 1988, the City Neighborhood

Council and its neighborhood planning committee (chaired by Sherry Harris, who later was elected to the City Council) began a years-long effort to ensure that neighborhood planning occurred and lived up to its promise.

Initially, CNC helped the City develop a published guide to *Neighborhood Needs Assessment*, but other than the Neighborhood Matching Fund, there was no public money to help neighborhoods get started. The opportunity arose in 1994 for more resources to be put into neighborhood planning when Mayor Norm Rice's Comprehensive Plan proposals for growth in "urban villages" met controversy. CNC worked with Rice and City Council President Jim Street on a resolution assigning to neighborhood planning the task of addressing possible changes in the urban villages.

CNC was extensively involved in dialogue with the City Council and executive branch in developing the neighborhood planning process in which 37 neighborhood plans were funded, contracted for with grassroots organizations, and adopted by the City between 1996 and 1999. CNC pressed for and strongly supported having the City contract with neighborhoods to do their own planning in preference to having City staff do neighborhood planning for them. A June 1, 1995 CNC letter to the Mayor and City Council stated: "The essence of neighborhood planning is grassroots citizen participation. Thus neighborhood planning efforts, and the design of the process itself, should especially stem from citizen involvement."

CNC closely monitored the neighborhood planning process and frequently intervened to help make it practical and empowering for the neighborhoods involved. The 37 grassroots neighborhood plans that the City funded had the benefit of local energy and sweat equity, and lived up to high standards of outreach and inclusion that the City insisted on as a conditions for its support. The story is well told in chapters in Jim Diers' *Neighbor Power* (2004) and Carmen Sirianni's *Investing in Democracy* (2009).

Evaluation, implementation, retrenchment. CNC participated actively in several evaluations of the neighborhood planning program. A November 26, 1996 letter, adopted unanimously by a CNC meeting the previous day, commented on a draft of the Office of Management and Planning's mid-term evaluation of neighborhood planning. The letter pointed out the importance of ensuring "that there will be adequate funds to carry out the recommendations of the neighborhood plans. Few topics will be more important for City attention in the coming years."

The success of Seattle's grassroots neighborhood planning may have been its undoing. City elected officials and agencies were not comfortable in having to share control with neighborhood entities, and as outlined in Sirianni's book chapter, quickly began to back away from the grassroots model. The neighborhood plans initiated since 2005 have had a much heavier agency hand. Removal of the grassroots volunteer element reduced the plans' practicality and creativity, and local ownership to marshal non-City resources.

In the recent City-led neighborhood plans, outreach and inclusiveness have also suffered. The money cannot go as far with City employees and contractors as when grassroots volunteers and contractors were responsible. The City agencies were much more lax in enforcing on themselves a high standard of outreach and inclusion than they had been in enforcing it on the grassroots organizations they had contracted with earlier.

A right for each neighborhood to plan. Even as the designated urban villages were beginning their neighborhood plans, CNC urged that neighborhood planning not focus only on limited parts of Seattle. A June 1, 1995 letter to the Mayor and City Council pointed out that the 1994 Comprehensive Plan (Ordinance 117221) spoke of responding to those neighborhoods that wanted to plan, and did not restrict neighborhood plans to urban villages, industrial areas or distressed areas. A Nov. 30, 1995 letter presented a ten-point program on neighborhood planning, one point of which was “Recognize that every neighborhood has a right to plan, and that each neighborhood plan contributes to the common good.”

A May 28, 1996 letter stated that “CNC supports a high priority in funding and technical assistance to urban centers and villages, manufacturing and industrial centers, and distressed areas. But because CNC represents all neighborhoods, it also requests that the City Council recognize that all neighborhoods are eligible for Neighborhood Planning Office technical assistance, and for at least a small portion of NPO financial assistance.” CNC ultimately lost this fight, and as of 2013, large parts of the City are still not covered by a neighborhood plan.

## LAND USE AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Comprehensive Plan. CNC has commented many times over the years on proposed updates and amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. In 2011 and 2012, CNC unsuccessfully proposed an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan that would require that changes in the housing growth targets that the Comprehensive Plan ordinance establishes for individual neighborhoods be adopted not administratively, but only by amendment to the Comprehensive Plan ordinance.

In 2013, CNC hosted the Planning Commission officers and staff for a presentation about their “transit communities” amendment for the Comprehensive Plan, and CNC’s neighborhood planning committee hosted Richard Conlin, chair of the relevant City Council committee, for an in-depth discussion. Although the matter was not resolved as of this writing, issues included that the amendment could disempower neighborhood plans, promote upzones by definition in areas deemed to have “frequent” transit service, and disadvantage other areas in getting transportation and park funds.

Zoning and development regulations. CNC has participated actively in debates about changes to the Land Use Code. For example, a July 1, 1998 noted: “In several neighborhoods that are completing their neighborhood plans, the Department of Construction and Land Use is reviewing land use proposals to major properties that are within the Urban Village boundaries. ... We are writing to urge that DCLU do everything it can during this interim period to maintain the options of the neighborhood plans regarding major properties.” A Sept. 3, 1998 letter reported that by unanimous vote at the August 3, 1998 meeting, CNC had responded to an August 11 package of mayoral proposals for changes in the multifamily zone development regulations: “Whereas few of the draft neighborhood plans call for any of the above land use code changes, and few of the areas that are not planning have called for these changes, therefore the CNC calls on the Mayor and City Council not to adopt the abovementioned land use changes citywide, but only in those areas where a neighborhood plan has recommended these changes....”

In 2012 CNC became concerned that Mayor McGinn’s “regulatory reform” proposals upended many features of the neighborhood plans. A May 1 letter to the City Council stated that CNC was “concerned that planning officials are neglecting and diminishing the usefulness and fairness of neighborhood planning in favor of outright changes to development standards that may need to be tempered to reflect the circumstances and character of our diverse neighborhoods and respect the opinions and rights of current residents and businesses.” The letter made eight recommendations, including the following:

- Changes in parking requirements should be made in the context of a neighborhood-based planning process, not citywide without any consultation of area residents and businesses in residential urban villages and urban centers most affected by these changes. This should be a granular, not a global change.
- Respecting changes in parking requirements, a ¼ mile distance to “transit” is far too broad a definition of accessibility in a city of hills, water, rain, and in neighborhoods that lack safe or complete sidewalks even without considering residents with disabilities that limit their walking range. Any distance-to-transit criteria used to modify parking requirements should be made in the context of a neighborhood-based planning process.

Design review. A March 18, 1998 letter to the City Council asked that the boundaries of the Design Review Boards “be made more consistent with the boundaries of the neighborhood district councils.”

## TRANSPORTATION

Throughout its history, CNC has weighed in with City officials about transportation issues. In an August 14, 1995 letter to the Mayor and City Council, CNC urged an update of SDOT’s traffic signal warrants to give greater weight to observed non-collision traffic conflicts rather than just to actual collisions; and to the potential for increased pedestrian traffic if safety were to improve. The letter also urged the City to consider reducing the size of its fire and utility trucks to be more compatible with existing streets.

In an August 15, 2001 letter to the Mayor and City Council, CNC expressed concern that City resurfacing efforts were so concentrated on the 1600 lane miles of arterial streets that the 2400 lane miles of non-arterial streets were being allowed to deteriorate further. The letter also raised concerns about damage to all streets by heavy buses and utility vehicles--a theme it was to return to regularly in its annual letters commenting to the Mayor and City Council on the budget.

In about 2000, CNC created a transportation committee that has greatly increased CNC’s awareness of transportation issues and the frequency of its comment letters on them. CNC even wrote a letter to the King County Council urging a greater Seattle share of Metro bus funds; the letter may well have helped in producing the positive results of recent years.

## CUSTOMER SERVICE BUREAU

The Customer Service Bureau's mission is to "assist customers in accessing City services and to achieve fairness, justice, and exemplary customer service throughout Seattle city government." It received its present name in 2007; prior to that time and since its founding in 1965, it had been called the Citizens Service Bureau. The Bureau was an independent office until 1990, when it was brought into the Department of Neighborhoods via that Department's founding ordinance 115345. In 2012, the Bureau was moved again, this time to the Department of Financial and Administrative Services (FAS). At that time, the City Neighborhood Council had the FAS Director as a guest speaker, receiving from him a commitment that CNC could advise the Bureau as if it were still in DON.

## VOLUNTEER TRAINING

Training to volunteers was a major function of the Department of Neighborhoods in its early years, and although more minor in recent years, this function continues. The City Neighborhood Council has occasionally commented on this training effort. In 1998, CNC passed a resolution requesting that DON and the Neighborhood Planning Office "at least twice a year provide a list to and consult with CNC about the training opportunities (e.g. topics, approach, charges, administration) they provide to neighborhoods."

## SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

Shortly after its founding in 1988, CNC established an Education Task Force to explore issues mutually affecting schools and neighborhoods. Although this body was discontinued, CNC in 2007 established a Schools and Education Committee to address similar issues.

A July 6, 2000 CNC letter "discussed and approved by unanimous vote at the June 26 meeting" urged the City and the School District to conduct a public hearing and public comment period regarding the Agreement then under negotiation regarding joint use of schools and park facilities.

CNC hosted School District representatives and a Mayor's representative speak at a 2012 CNC meeting reading the School District's recent cancellation of the Community Nights in Schools Program, which since 1998 had provided non-profit groups meeting space in certain public schools at a much-reduced \$15 fee, and without need for liability insurance. In part as a result of CNC's intervention, the School District reinstated the program, although limiting it to the school libraries, and with a new requirement for liability insurance.

## OTHER CITY PROGRAMS AND ISSUES

Library. In 1998 CNC's budget committee worked closely with City Councilmember Nick Licata in developing a mechanism for strong citizen oversight of the spending of the Libraries for All bond issue that was about to be put before the voters. A September 29, 1998 CNC letter to the City Council stated that "At our September 28 meeting, the City Neighborhood Council voted overwhelmingly to support the concept of a Financial Integrity Panel with representatives selected by Neighborhood District Councils and others to help oversee the implementation of the Library

Bond issue.” Accompanying the 1998 bond issue that was passed by the voters were three City Council resolutions creating a Citizens Implementation Review Panel, half of whose members were appointed by the Library Board and half were confirmed by the City Council based on nominations from the City Neighborhood Council. This Review Panel was among the most active and powerful ever to oversee the spending of bond or levy proceeds.

In its July 13, 2011 budget letter to the City Council, CNC stated: "We support the exploration of new revenue sources as an addition to library funding from the General Fund". In a March 27, 2012 letter specifically on the library levy, CNC wrote that it supported putting a library levy before the voters, provided that “a library levy not displace what now goes to the Library from the General Fund,” and that the levy ordinance create “an oversight committee to ensure public accountability for spending of the levy proceeds similar to the one created via Resolutions 29846, 29952, and 29997 to oversee spending of the Libraries for All bond measure proceeds.” Unlike with the 1998 bond issue, the City Council did not create a citizen oversight body for spending of the levy proceeds.

Arts. In an April 18, 2000 letter that was based on a resolution adopted at its March meeting, CNC urged that City arts funding include a component to implement arts elements that are in neighborhood plans.

Lobbyist registration. In 1997 the Ethics and Elections Commission was considering proposing to the City Council a lobbyist registration ordinance, and a February 20, 1997 CNC letter expressed concern that “lobbying is being defined so broadly with contact and dollar limits at such low points that it will adversely affect most neighborhood organizations in their regular activities.” When in 2008 the City Council adopted a lobby registration ordinance, it defined lobbying narrowly enough that few, if any neighborhood organizations’ activities were subject to it.

Issues in individual neighborhoods. CNC has generally taken positions only on issues that affect all neighborhoods citywide, or at least that affect many neighborhoods in common. In a handful of cases, CNC has voted to take a position regarding a proposal that affects only one district or neighborhood. A December 7, 1999 CNC letter asked the City Council to correct an apparent mistake that placed a single family-zoned area in an area to be rezoned by the Columbia City neighborhood plan. A June 15, 2000 CNC letter supported the Admiral neighborhood’s proposal for construction of parking to serve the historic Admiral Theater and West Seattle Library. And a November 19, 2001 resolution stated that CNC “deplores the recommendation by the Mayor’s office to postpone opening of the new Delridge Branch Library, as being a breach of commitments to operate the new facilities, and expanded facilities, developed under the Libraries for All bond program and urges the City Council not to adopt this recommendation.”

## STATE AND FEDERAL ISSUES

CNC occasionally has taken positions on state or federal issues. A February 25, 1999 CNC letter opposed a state legislative bill to amend the Growth Management Act to withhold from large cities like Seattle certain state transportation funds, sales and use taxes, and other revenues provisions to enforce a series of numerical housing goals. CNC also urged that any goals be

balanced with improvements in livability and affordability. The February 25, 1999 CNC letter also expressed concern that the bill's imposition of targets every five years in succession "would almost immediately invalidate the neighborhood plans that are just being completed, without regard for the consensus that produced these plans the difficulty of amending them with fairness to those who had participated." CNC also expressed concern that the state legislation would make it difficult for the City to maintain balance in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan.

Airplane noise. At the April 14, 1992 meeting, CNC declined to take a position on a suggested resolution opposing the proposed third runway at Sea-Tac airport. When airplane noise came up again at the February 28, 2000 CNC meeting, the minutes state: "The agreement was that this is not a citywide issue, so is not appropriate for the CNC, but rather the District Councils." In 2012, the Greater Duwamish District Council wrote a letter to the Port of Seattle and the Seattle Mayor and City Council, expressing concern about noise caused by a new flying pattern.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCES

A primary source for this history are boxfuls of files of documents from and about the City Neighborhood Council, the District Councils, and the Department of Neighborhoods that are found in the City of Seattle Archives. Some primary sources are also available on the CNC web site, <http://seattle.com/neighborhoodcouncil>.

The following books and articles are referred to in the text:

Jim Diers, *Neighbor Power: Building Community the Seattle Way* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2004)

John Gastil, *Democracy in Small Groups: Participation, Decision Making and Communication*, (Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers, 1993)

Carmen Sirianni, "Neighborhood Empowerment and Planning: Seattle, Washington" Chap. 3 in his *Investing in Democracy: Engaging Citizens in Collaborative Governance* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2009)

## AUTHOR AND CONTACT INFORMATION

This history was researched and written by Chris Leman (Ph.D. in political science, Harvard University), who currently represents the Lake Union District Council on the City Neighborhood Council, and previously served two years as CNC Chair and one as Vice Chair. Any judgments or errors made here are his alone. Suggestions for the document's revision are welcome and needed. Please send them to [cleman@oo.net](mailto:cleman@oo.net) or (206) 322-5463.

2/25/13