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**Neighborhood Plan Status Report | Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake**

**Part of each neighborhood plan is a detailed implementation work plan called the “Approval and Adoption Matrix.” The matrix has served as the primary tool to help the City and community implement the neighborhood plan. Most matrices are divided into two sections:**

- **Key strategies** are usually complex projects or related activities that the neighborhood considers critical to the successful implementation of its plan.
- **Additional activities** for implementation are activities not directly associated with a key strategy, ranging from high to low priority and from immediate to long-range in anticipated timing.

The matrix includes descriptions of activity, priority, time frame, cost estimate, and implementor. The City response column reflects City department comments to the recommended activities. City departments initially filled in the column and the narrative response to each key strategy and then City Council reviewed, changed if appropriate, and finalized the responses. Staff from almost every City department participated in these planning efforts and in preparation of the matrices. Ultimately, the City Council approved the matrices, including the City responses, and recognized each neighborhood plan by resolution.

The Department of Neighborhoods (DON) solicited comments from departments and community members as each worked to implement the work plan. DON recorded this feedback in a database that they maintained through 2008. An excel spreadsheet ([www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/npi/matrices/pdf/Broadview.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/npi/matrices/pdf/Broadview.pdf)) tabulates that data and summarizes progress toward implementing the neighborhood plan. The following are examples of implementation projects and activities.

- **Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)** completed drainage basin plans for Densmore and Thornton Creek Basins to identify problems and to develop solutions to broader drainage problems in the area. Council adopted the resulting comprehensive drainage plan in 2005. SPU has constructed a number of spot improvements resulting from the plan:
  - SPU Natural Drainage Systems Program implemented several projects that created demonstrations of natural drainage system and sidewalk alternatives.
- SPU’s Street Edge Alternatives Project (SEA Streets) implemented pilot projects to provide drainage that mimics the natural landscape more closely than traditional piped systems.

- SPU replaced a ditch and culvert system along four blocks of NW 110th St, between Greenwood Ave N and 3rd Ave NW in the Piper’s Creek Watershed with a model natural drainage system.

- SPU partnered with Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to provide neighborhood improvements as part of the Broadview Green Grid Project including integrating landscaping, calming traffic, and adding a sidewalk on each north-south street into the natural drainage system involving 15 city blocks. The project manages stormwater flow from approximately 32 acres, and is almost an entire sub-basin of the Pipers Creek watershed.

- SDOT completed the Interurban Trail between North 110th Street and North 128th Street in March, 2006. This project includes: a 12 foot asphalt trail with gravel shoulders from N 110th to N 128th Streets in the Seattle City Light transmission line just west of the Evergreen-Washelli Cemetery; Landscaped trailheads at N 110th and N 128th Streets and a secondary entrance at the N. 117th street end.

- SPU, SDOT, and the Department of Neighborhoods worked with Seattle Parks and Recreation to design and construct improvements to the Bitter Lake Reservoir site that integrates development of open space with drainage and future street improvements. Design elements include: relocation of the reservoir fence; graded berm with trees, lawn, drainage structures, pipe, and swale; site for future P-patch; and concrete sidewalk with curb stops on 143rd St; pedestrian plaza at northeast corner of Linden and 143rd with curb, gutter, concrete sidewalk, seating walls, decorative pavers, reintegrated artwork at entry, plantings and lawn, and water oriented focal point; graded berm with trees, plantings, lawn, drainage structures, pipe, swale-pond, and concrete sidewalk with curb stops on Linden Ave; seating wall, graded berm with trees, plantings, and lawn; asphalt walkway; and storm drainage pipe and structures tied to 138th St.

- The taxpayer-supported “Libraries for All” program funded expansion of the Broadview Branch Library. The project, completed in the fall of 2007, includes a children’s area, a section for teens, comfortable seating, meeting rooms, and 40 computers for the public. Two study rooms provide space for tutoring and other uses and a quiet room as an alternative to the activity of the main reading room. Overall, the branch grew from 8,405 square feet to 15,000 square feet. The City funded and constructed street and drainage improvements in coordination with the project.
Community Initiated Projects

- Neighborhood Plan projects funded through the Neighborhood Matching Fund
- Volunteer hours, services and materials donated
- Neighborhood Matching Funds awarded

From Plan to Reality: Examples of Community Action achieving goals in partnership with the City of Seattle.

**Llandover Woods Restoration and Community Outreach**

Friends of Llandover Woods developed a management plan, resource maps, educational materials for the community and acquired tools for further restoration.

Location: NW. 143rd and 3rd Ave. NW.

**Haller Lake Community Club Accessibility improvements**

The Haller Lake Community Club designed and installed a lift suitable for persons with disabilities.

Location: 12579 Densmore Ave. N.

**Broadview Thomson Elementary Playground**

The PTSA helped develop a neighborhood asset by installing a play structure, amphitheater and retaining wall decorated with art tiles, benches and stepping stone path, creating a park like setting for students and families in the greater Broadview area.

Location: 13052 Greenwood Ave. N.
Neighborhood Matching Fund Projects that furthered the goals of the Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>NMF Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadview Thompson Elementary Playground</td>
<td>Broadview Thompson Elementary PTSA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$86,094</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haller Lake P-Patch Improvement Project</td>
<td>Haller Lake P-Patchers</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$5,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haller Lake Community Club Accessibility Improvements</td>
<td>Haller Lake Community Club</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>$74,890</td>
<td>$74,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haller Lake Street End Park Design</td>
<td>Haller Lake Community Club</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>$6,015</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandover Woods Restoration and Community Outreach</td>
<td>Friends of Llandover Woods</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>$6,370</td>
<td>$6,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadview Trip Reduction Plan</td>
<td>Broadview Thompson Elementary PTSA</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>$18,250</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps to Stay Involved and to Build a Vibrant Community for All.

Neighborhood Matching Fund
- Applicants must be neighborhood-based organizations or organizations whose primary focus is race relations and/or social justice.
- Neighborhood must provide 1/2:1 match for non-physical projects and 1:1 match for physical improvement projects. Match may be donated volunteer time, professional services, materials and/or cash. Volunteer time is valued at $20 per hour.
- Funds support self-help projects that directly involve neighbors in developing and carrying out the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Projects Fund</th>
<th>Awards up to $100,000. Applications accepted once a year, Reviewed by Citywide Review Team (CRT) &amp; District Councils. Notice of award within 3 months, Project length up to 1 year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small &amp; Simple Projects Fund</td>
<td>Awards up to $20,000. Applications accepted 2 times a year, Applications reviewed by a team of DON staff. Notice of award within 5 weeks. Project length up to 1 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sparks</td>
<td>Awards up to $1,000. Open to groups (two people or more) with creative ideas for engaging their neighbors. Applications are accepted at any time, reviewed by NMF Project Managers. Notice of award within 1-2 weeks, Project length 4 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Fund</td>
<td>Awards of 10-40 trees per group. Groups of five households or more on a street. Individual applications are not eligible. Applications accepted once a year (August), Notice of award within 5 weeks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NMF TIPS
Connect with a NMF Project Manager early in the project development phase. Please contact Danielle Calloway, 206-233-6619 or danielle.calloway@seattle.gov to be introduced to a Project Manager who will work with you on developing strong project ideas. For more information about the Department of Neighborhoods go to www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods
CURRENT NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS AND PRIORITIES

The responses from the public meetings and on-line survey indicate that although numerous positive changes have occurred to the joint neighborhoods, there remain significant un-met infrastructure needs and too few of the 1999 neighborhood plan policy actions have been met.

Some of the positive changes include an expanded Broadview Branch library, the Interurban Trail between North 110th and 128th Streets, park-like improvements around the Bitter Lake reservoir, a P-Patch site at the reservoir in the planning stages, and select drainage projects. But the surveys commented that most of the priority infrastructure improvements identified in the neighborhood plan have not been implemented. For example, sidewalk, drainage and traffic calming improvements have not been made to coincide with the increased density that has occurred primarily through property subdivision. However, segments of these types of infrastructure improvements have occurred with some new residential and commercial development, primarily along Greenwood and Linden Avenues North. These developments, however, also give rise to a perception of increased parking problems.

Along with concerns about not achieving many neighborhood plan policy actions, there was disappointment that the Hub Urban Village hasn’t been realized. This may partially be due to the challenge of creating a higher density mixed use area - a village centered on a transportation hub - in an area divided by Aurora Avenue North, a state highway.

The community provided feedback at two open house meetings and via an online questionnaire (as part of the City’s process to ‘check in’ on the perceived usefulness and status of the individual neighborhood plans). The neighborhood discussion groups and the online questionnaire asked three questions about change, current issues and how well the neighborhood plan addresses these issues.

- How has your neighborhood changed in the last decade since the plan was adopted?
- What changes or aspects of your neighborhood are you most pleased about? What are you most dissatisfied about?
- How well are your Neighborhood Plan vision and key strategies being achieved? Are they still the priority?

The Planning Commission and Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee hosted the meetings. The Planning Commission created summary reports and documented all the comments.

Reports from public meetings hosted by the Planning Commission and Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee (“status checks”) include the following:

- Executive Summary: www.seattle.gov/planningcommission/docs/BBLHLExecSummary.pdf
- Transcript of Questionnaire Responses: www.seattle.gov/planningcommission/docs/Results/BroadviewBitterLakeHallerLake2009.pdf
Housing & Employment Characteristics

Seattle first established growth targets in 1996. Targets are reset at the County and City level every seven years and provide 20-year planning estimates of growth. They represent the City’s commitment to accommodate its share of King County’s projected 20-year population and employment growth. Seattle set the current 2024 targets in 2004 and will adopt new growth targets in 2011, when it adopts required updates to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comp Plan’s urban village strategy directs Seattle’s growth primarily to urban centers and urban villages. The greatest share of residential and job growth will be accommodated in the six urban centers—areas already characterized by enhanced population densities and the greatest access to regional transit. The plan distributes the next largest share of residential and job growth among the hub urban villages, such as Bitter Lake Village, in order to concentrate jobs and services near where people live or where there is future residential capacity. Residential urban villages have housing targets but no employment targets. The two manufacturing/industrial centers will accommodate most of the growth in industrial jobs. Modest growth will also occur in areas outside centers and villages.

### Comprehensive Plan 2024 Growth Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Area in Acres</th>
<th>Households (HH)</th>
<th>Employment (Jobs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing 2004</td>
<td>Growth Target (HH Growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Comprehensive Plan*

### Development Capacity

For planned growth to be feasible, there must be enough development capacity to absorb it. According to the generally accepted methodology used by Seattle and other King County jurisdictions in 2007, a parcel has capacity for development when the assessed value of improvements (generally structures) is less than 50% of the assessed value of the land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Capacity (2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Housing and Employment

The Bitter Lake Hub Urban Village has experienced the construction of two large mixed use projects along the Linden Avenue corridor: the New Haven/Terrace apartments at Linden and 130th, and the Tressa apartments at Linden and 143rd. Taken together, these developments represent 934 new residential apartments in the neighborhood, surpassing the neighborhood’s 2024 target for residential growth. DPD has received plans for about 150 additional residential units, but progress on this application is currently unclear.

New Housing Units and Progress Toward Household Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>864</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>161%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Construction and Permit Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family/Duplex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted and Under Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permitted and Under Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Units*</th>
<th>Under Review**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family/Duplex</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Permit issued, final inspection not completed. May be under construction, pre-construction, or completed awaiting final inspection.

** Application has been accepted and is currently undergoing review.
Housing Units, Owner Versus Renter Occupancy & Household Size

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Household Size</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 Census

Estimated Subsidized Rental Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent &amp; Income Limit (Percent of Area Median Income)</th>
<th>Total Restricted Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80%</td>
<td>178 10 117 744 0 94 1143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 Census
Employment

Employment by Sector

“Covered jobs” are those covered by the Washington State Employment Insurance Program.

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, based on information from the Washington State Employment Security Division

LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Category</th>
<th>Area (Acre)</th>
<th>Tree Cover 2002 (Acre)</th>
<th>Tree Cover 2002 (%)</th>
<th>Tree Cover 2007 (Acre)</th>
<th>Tree Cover 2007 (%)</th>
<th>Tree Cover Change, 02 - 07 (Acre)</th>
<th>Tree Cover Change, 02 - 07 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Mixed Use</td>
<td>222.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park or Boulevard</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Natural Area</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Land Use

Zoned Land Use
Existing Land Use

- Single Family
- Duplex/Triplex
- Other Housing
- Multi-Family
- Office
- Retail/Service
- Hotel/Motel
- Entertainment
- Mixed Use
- Parking
- Industrial
- Warehouse
- Transp/Util/Comm
- Institutions
- Public Facilities
- Schools
- Open Space
- Water Body
- Easement
- Vacant
- Unknown
- Urban Village
- LINK Light Rail Stations
- At-Grade / Aerial
- Tunnel
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NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN STATUS REPORT | BROADVIEW/BITTER LAKE/HALLER LAKE
**Population & Household Characteristics**

**The 2010 Census** will provide updated data on basic demographic characteristics, and will likely release neighborhood-level data in 2012.

**The new American Community Survey** (or ACS) annually provides a rich array of data on detailed demographic characteristics. The Census Bureau previously collected this data once every 10 years on the long-form portion of the census questionnaire.

The Census Bureau will make available the neighborhood-level data from the ACS in late in 2010. While these census tract and block group estimates will be released annually (as the city-level data have been since 2005) the neighborhood-level estimates will only be available as five-year period estimates. The City intends to work with neighborhood stakeholders to make strategic use of both the 2010 Census and ACS estimates for neighborhood planning.

You can find additional information from and about the decennial census and ACS at: [http://factfinder.census.gov](http://factfinder.census.gov).

Pie charts (next page) show selected information from 2000, when the Census Bureau conducted the last decennial census. Census Bureau statistics generally provide the most accurate and comprehensive estimates regarding the characteristics of persons and households.


### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007 (estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>4,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Race for all persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian or Alaska Ntv.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other races</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latino/Hispanic ethnicity (of any race): 7.9% of population**

### Age for all persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or older</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Children (<18): 9.2% of pop.**

**Seniors (65+): 21.7% of pop.**

### Household Type for all households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family with child(ren)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families without child(ren)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household living alone</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more unrelated persons</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratio of Income to Poverty Persons for whom poverty status is determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1.00 (i.e., income below poverty level)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 to 1.99</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 and over</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Spoken at Home for persons 5 years and older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken at Home</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English at home</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than English; speak English very well</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than English; speak English less than very well</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total speaking language other than English at home: 21.4%**

### Place of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign born</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Entered U.S. within prior 10 years: 48.4% of foreign born; 10.2% of total population**

**Note: Native includes born in U.S., Puerto Rico and other U.S. island areas, and born abroad to American parents**
TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS

Means of Transportation to Work

for workers 16 years and older

- drove alone: 65.2%
- carpooled: 10.5%
- public transp. (incl. taxicab): 14.3%
- biked: 0.8%
- walked: 6.7%
- other (incl. motorcycle): 0.6%
- worked at home: 2.0%

Other than drove alone: 34.8%

Source: 2000 Census, SF-3 block group estimates

Travel Time to Work in Minutes

for workers 16 years and older not working at home

0% - 90 or more minutes

- 60 to 89 minutes
- 45 to 59 minutes
- 40 to 44 minutes
- 35 to 39 minutes
- 30 to 34 minutes
- 25 to 29 minutes
- 20 to 24 minutes
- 15 to 19 minutes
- 10 to 14 minutes
- 5 to 9 minutes
- Less than 5 minutes

Total workers sampled: 2,187

Source: 2000 Census, SF-3 block group estimates
Existing Bicycle Facilities

- Wide Outside Lane/Paved Shoulder
- Bicycle Boulevard
- Bike Lanes
- Sharrow
- Multi-use Trail
- Shared Roadway
- Climbing Lane
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CRIME CHARACTERISTICS

The Seattle Police Department (SPD) reports on criminal activity by Census tract and Police Beat. Because these areas do not reflect neighborhood boundaries, and the information can be viewed in a number of formats, readers are encouraged to go directly to the SPD website www.seattle.gov/police/crime/.

The Seattle Police Department cautions against using crime and/or other police data to make decisions/comparisons regarding the safety of an area or the amount of crime. Data provided represents only police services where a report was made and does not include other calls for police service.

- This data does not reflect or certify “safe” or “unsafe” areas. When looking at crime statistics, it is important to consider geography (business vs. residential), and major institutions that exist within the boundaries (i.e. hospitals, schools, parks, etc.) of the reporting areas.
- Data will sometimes reflect where the crime was reported versus where the crime occurred.
- Areas with a high volume of foot traffic, or that is more densely populated may have more reported crime. This does not necessarily mean more crime occurs there, but that more crime is reported there.
# Parks & Recreation

## Parks & Recreation Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Community Center</th>
<th>Children’s Play Area</th>
<th>Play Fields</th>
<th>Pools &amp; Wading Pools</th>
<th>Tennis Courts</th>
<th>Trails/Paths</th>
<th>Other Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bitter Lake Res Open Space Pk</td>
<td>Linden Ave N and N 143rd St</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitter Lake Playfield</td>
<td>13035 Linden Ave N</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadview Park</td>
<td>Greenwood Ave N and N 122nd St</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carkeek Park</td>
<td>950 NW Carkeek Park Rd</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Madison Pool</td>
<td>13401 Meridian Ave N</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Park Golf Course</td>
<td>1100 NE 135th St</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandover Woods Greenspace</td>
<td>NW 145th St and 3rd Ave NW</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mineral Springs Park</td>
<td>1500 N 105th St</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northacres Park</td>
<td>12718 1st Ave NE</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinehurst Playground</td>
<td>12029 14th Ave NE</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Creek Park</td>
<td>1059 Northgate Way</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Park is adjacent to planning boundary

## Community Investments

### New Usable Open Space Since 2001

- **Bitter Lake Reservoir Open Space Park** — The Pro Parks Levy provided $489,725 project costs for planning, design and construction. The project goal was to develop public open space amenities around Bitter Lake Reservoir, implementing action LU-6-3 of the Broadview - Bitter Lake - Haller Lake Draft Neighborhood Plan.

- **Carkeek Park** — The Pro Parks Levy provided $515,500 project costs of planning, design and construction, allowing for completion of bridge and trail improvement work in late 2004. Trail improvements and community planting efforts will reduce siltation of the creeks. Carkeek visitors now enjoy a solid path leading down into the park at the Eddie Mcabee Entry, and a new bridge, stair and trail additions keep people and pets out of creeks along the South Ridge Trail (Norcross Entry). The first phase of large scale invasive plant species removal took place above the Salmon Slide play area in accordance with the Carkeek Park Forest Management Plan, extending all the way.
up to the north meadow. The community has provided valuable input to help shape these signs as well as new interpretive signs of the Piper Orchard and Salmon Slide play area.

- **Haller Lake Community Street End** — The Pro Parks Levy Opportunity Fund provided $150,000 for this park development project, and a grant from King County provides $75,000. This project improved N 125th Street end. The project includes new pathways, shoreline erosion control, habitat improvements, viewing and picnic areas, and new planting.

- **Mineral Springs Park** — The Pro Parks Levy Opportunity Fund provided $722,000 costs of planning, design and construction. The Friends of Mineral Springs Park, in association with Charles Anderson Landscape Architecture, worked to develop a concept plan for site development. The final concept focused on two features: an art walk and renovated disc golf course.

**Bitter Lake Neighborhood Programs**

**The Bitter Lake Night Program** — The Bitter Lake Late Night Program runs year round on Friday and Saturday evenings from 7pm-12am. The Late Night program averages 50 teens per night, and the teens are a diverse group of boys and girls, ages ranging from 13-19. The Late Night program staff provide a safe and positive place for the teens to participate in activities in a fun environment. The funding and support of this youth lifesaving program allows teens to participate for free and gives them an alternative to the at-risk choices that are presented to them on a daily basis.

**Bitter Lake Teen Program** — Bitter Lake Community Center averages 25-40 teens per day as a result of the Teen Development Leader’s work of establishing positive relationships and the hard work put into creating and implementing programs, using the developmental assets as a guide and tool. The teens are made up of different cultures and races, and range in age from 11-17. The teens participate in weekly activities such as swimming, tutoring, cooking projects, large motor activities, service projects and field trips to various locations across the city. Because of the continued funding, most programs are free for the youth and so they are able to participate in as much as possible. The daily teen program provides the youth with a safe and positive place to make new friends and learn to work together as a team within the community.

**Bitter Lake’s Annual Multi-Cultural Dinner and Concert** — The Bitter Lake Community Center has held an evening of food and music from around the world as a result of Neighborhood Planning and an increase in immigrant populations within the Bitter Lake Neighborhood. The annual special event was created to bring together the different cultures from the community and opened the community center’s doors to the immigrant populations within the neighborhood. Last year’s event brought together over 250 community patrons and opened communication between neighbors and community members alike.

**Bitter Lake Hub Urban Village**

*Distribution-based Goal: 10,000 square feet within 1/8 mile of all village locations*

Bitter Lake Playfield and the new open space at the Bitter Lake Reservoir provide significant open space for the Bitter Lake Hub Urban Village, specifically at the north end of the village and in areas west of Aurora Avenue North. However, no Village Open Space is accessible to village locations east of Aurora, leaving an open space gap in over half of the hub urban village. It should be noted that most of the southwest portion of the urban village west of Aurora between N 125th and N 115th is fully utilized by the existing Evergreen-Washelli cemetery property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population-Based Goals in Urban Villages</th>
<th>1 Acre Open Space per 1,000 households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usable Open Space needed to meet 2004 Open Space Household Goal</td>
<td>2.01 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Open Space needed to meet 2024 Open Space Household Goal</td>
<td>2.81 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Usable Open Space within Urban Village Boundary</td>
<td>10.36 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Usable Open Space within and abutting Urban Village Boundary</td>
<td>10.36 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-based goal result</td>
<td>Goals Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gaps in Usable Open Space - Bitter Lake

Service Area Criteria for Usable Open Space (UOS)

- **1/4 Mile Service Area of Usable Open Space over 10,000 SF**
  - UOS of 10,000 SF or more for Urban Centers and Hub Urban Villages accessible within 1/4 mile

- **1/8 Mile Service Area of Usable Open Space over 10,000 SF**
  - UOS of 10,000 SF or more for Residential Urban Villages, depending on population density, accessible within 1/8 to 1/4 mile

- **1/2 Mile Service Area of Usable Open Space over 1/2 Acre**
  - UOS of 1/2 Acre or more for Single Family areas accessible within 1/2 mile
**NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN STATUS REPORT | BROADVIEW/BITTER LAKE/HALLER LAKE**

**Northeast Seattle Health Planning Area**

**HEALTH PLANNING AREA**

Community residents can play an important role in planning decisions, such as land use and transportation decisions. Effective, informed and equitable public engagement is essential to promoting healthy environments.

The Northeast Seattle Health Planning Area (HPA) stretches north from the Montlake Cut to Northgate and east from I-5 to Lake Washington. Several Neighborhood Plans fall within it: University Community, University District Northwest, University Community-Ravenna and Roosevelt.

**SNAPSHOT**

Neighborhood planning can help improve and modify decisions about the built environment through zoning, land use, transportation, and other aspects of community design. This planning influences distance and mode of travel to work, the convenience of purchasing healthy, affordable foods and the safety and attractiveness of a community for physical activity. The following health indicators were selected to provide a snapshot of health conditions that can be related to the built environment within your community.

**Overweight/Obesity**

American society has become increasingly overweight. Our environment promotes unhealthy food choices and discourages physical activity. Overweight and obesity are calculated using Body Mass Index (BMI), a ratio of height to weight. In 2008, 21% of King County youth were overweight and 9% were obese. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, Black/African-Americans, and Hispanic/Latinos were more likely to be overweight and obese than white youth.1 Governments and communities can set priorities that encourage change. Available, affordable, and accessible options are effective in decreasing obesity. Examples include improving neighborhood access to full service grocery stores, farmer’s markets and community gardens, as well as farm to school programs.

- 40% of Northeast Seattle adults are overweight or obese, compared to 54% of King County adults.
- Obesity is the second leading cause of preventable death in King County2 and increases risk of heart disease, diabetes, respiratory problems, and some cancers.

---


Physical Activity

Physical activity is vital to overall physical fitness and mental health and helps both children and adults maintain a healthy weight. Being physically active is more than just a matter of personal choice; it is also affected by the built environment. Studies show that the design of our cities, neighborhoods and transportation systems are associated with our level of physical activity. Governments and communities can set priorities that encourage change. Enjoyable, affordable, and convenient options are effective in increasing physical activity. Examples include improving access to transit, safe and inviting parks, trails, sidewalks, and bike lanes, as well as slowing traffic speeds.

The chart represents the percent of adults that meet the Center for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) recommended levels of physical activity (moderate activity at least 150 minutes a week, or vigorous activity at least 75 minutes a week).

- 79% of Northeast Seattle adults get adequate levels of physical activity, compared to 70% of King County adults.
- Physical inactivity increases the risk of heart disease, hypertension, obesity, diabetes and many other health conditions.3

Diabetes Prevalence

Diabetes is caused by a decreased ability to produce insulin (Type 1) or an impaired response to insulin (Type 2). Most diabetics (about 90%) have Type 2 diabetes. 3 Modifiable risk factors include unhealthy weight and a sedentary lifestyle; other risks are genetics, advanced age, and environmental factors.4 In King County, Black/African Americans, Hispanic/Latinos, American Indian/Alaska Natives, and some Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander groups experience greater diabetes-related death and illness rates than whites (data not shown).5 6

- 3% of Northeast Seattle adults are diabetic, compared to 5% of King County adults.
- The chart shows disparities by household income. An adult in a household making less than $15,000 is almost 3 times as likely to be diagnosed with diabetes as an adult in a household with an income of $75,000 or greater.
- Diabetes can lead to increases in vision problems and blindness, kidney damage, nerve damage, and circulation problems. It can also increase the risks of other chronic diseases, such as heart disease and stroke.

Smoking and Secondhand Smoke

Local environments influence smoking rates and exposure to secondhand smoke. Adolescent smoking is related to the density and proximity of tobacco outlets, as well as retail cigarette advertising near places used by young people. In addition to protecting people from secondhand smoke, smoke-free policies can reduce the number of young people who smoke, as well as increase the number of adult smokers who cut down or try to quit. Examples of successful smoke-free policies include smoking ban campaigns in public areas, schools, and in apartments and condominiums for creating safer and cleaner homes.

The chart illustrates the percentage of adults who smoked cigarettes every day or some days.

- 7% of Northeast Seattle adults smoke some days or every day, compared to 13% of King County adults.
- 9% of King County youth smoke7.
- Tobacco use causes more deaths each year in the US than HIV, illegal drug use, alcohol use, motor vehicle injuries, suicides, and murders combined8.
- Smoking increases the risk of lung cancer, stroke, and heart disease8.

Asthma

Indoor and outdoor air pollution, roaches, rodents and other pests are triggers for people with asthma, as are damp and moist buildings. Communities can take action to reduce asthma triggers; examples include working together with schools to create “no idle zones” to reduce exposure to vehicle emissions, auditing public buildings for deterioration and water damage; supporting building restoration, and investing in rodent-resistant garbage cans.

Hospitalization is a marker for poorly controlled asthma. In addition to environmental triggers, asthma hospitalizations can be related to difficulty accessing medical care, affordable medications and home equipment, or with correct use of medications. In 2003-2007, among Northeast Seattle children, there were 280 hospitalizations (per 100,000 children aged 0-17), compared with 150 hospitalizations (per 100,000 children aged 0-17) among King County children.9

---

8 http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/fact_sheets/health_effects/effects_cig_smoking/index.htm
**Expected Years of Healthy Life**

The measurement of “expected years of healthy life” represents the number of years a newborn can expect to live with good or excellent health if current life expectancy and health status percentages stay the same for his/her entire life.

In King County, a newborn can expect to live 73 years of healthy life (70 for males and 75 for females), out of a total life expectancy of 81 years (79 for males and 83 for females). Reducing the prevalence of chronic conditions such as asthma, diabetes, and overweight/obesity results in increasing expected years of healthy life, and improves quality of life over the life span.

### Expected Years of Healthy Life and Life Expectancy, by Gender, King County, 2003-2007 Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Life</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy: 79 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy: 83 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Death Certificate, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System

### Related Plans and Web Links

- **Healthy Places for Everyone:** [www.kingcounty.gov/health/healthyplaces](http://www.kingcounty.gov/health/healthyplaces)
- **Communities Count 2008: Social and Health Indicators Across King County** [http://communitiescount.org/](http://communitiescount.org/)
- Community Health Indicators: [www.kingcounty.gov/health/indicators](http://www.kingcounty.gov/health/indicators)
- **The Health of King County: 2006:** [www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/data/hokc.aspx](http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/data/hokc.aspx)
- Place Matters: [www.placematters.org/](http://www.placematters.org/)
- **Designing and Building Healthy Places, CDC:** [www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/)

Neighborhood Planning is an excellent way to determine which health concerns related to the built environment exist in your neighborhood and how we can work to change them. For more information, please contact **Kadie Bell**, in the Built Environment and Land Use program at Public Health Seattle-King County. **Kadie.Bell@KingCounty.gov** 206-263-8446
Utilities
Seattle is an urbanized area with a developed infrastructure network through most of the city. The Broadview – Bitter Lake – Haller Lake planning area has an existing network of streets, water and sewer lines, drainage facilities and the electrical grid that have developed over time, beginning with the original land platting before the area was a part of Seattle. Consequently, there are areas without fully developed street improvements (curb, gutter, planting strip and sidewalks) particularly along arterial streets, some areas using septic systems, and areas with inadequate stormwater drainage facilities.

Web Links
- 2010-2015 Adopted Capital Improvement Program:  
  http://www.seattle.gov/financedepartment/1015adoptedcip/default.htm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>SFD 24</td>
<td>401 N 130th St E</td>
<td>EMS: 78% in 4 mins, Fire: 68% in 4 mins, Engine co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>North Precinct</td>
<td>1004 College Way N</td>
<td>32.04 sq.ft. service area, 1990 population 228,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Broadview Branch</td>
<td>12755 Greenwood Ave</td>
<td>8161 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Patch</td>
<td>Haller Lake P-Patch</td>
<td>13045 1st Ave NE</td>
<td>52 Plots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related Plans

For links to electronic versions of these plans, please go to www.seattle.gov/dpd/status_report_links

Housing and Employment Related Plans

- City of Seattle 2002 Housing Levy Administrative & Financial Plan, Program years 2007-2009
  Covers all Levy programs every two years beginning in 2003, and includes information on Levy administration and the funding plan for the 2002 Housing Levy by program area.

- Housing Element from Seattle’s 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan for Housing & Community Development, October 2008
  Summarizes the three important community planning efforts that guide Seattle’s work on housing issues, City of Seattle funding expected to be available in 2009 to implement key affordable housing strategies, and City program activities that address various income segments. A matrix outline of housing strategies is also included.

Housing and Employment Related Websites

- Office of Housing
  http://www.seattle.gov/housing/default.htm

- Seattle Housing Authority
  http://www.seattle.gov/housing

- Office of Economic Development
  http://www.seattle.gov/EconomicDevelopment

- Puget Sound Regional Council
  http://www.psrc.org

Land Use and Zoning Related Plans and Web Links

Built Environment

- Seattle Comprehensive Plan
  http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/planning/compplan/

- Broadview Neighborhood Plan, March, 1999
  http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/npi/plans/broadview/

- Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
  http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/

- DPD Zoning and Building Codes
  http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/resourcecenter/

Growth & Capacity

- Office of Economic Development
  http://www.seattle.gov/EconomicDevelopment/
• Puget Sound Regional Council:  
  http://www.psrc.org/

**Demographics**

• Dept. of Planning & Development Census 2000 Data  

• Puget Sound Regional Council Data  
  http://www.psrc.org/data/index.htm

**Capital Facilities & Utilities**

• 2010-2015 Adopted Capital Improvement Program:  
  http://www.seattle.gov/financedepartment/1015adoptedcip/default.htm

**Transportation Related Plans**

• Seattle Transportation Strategic Plan (TSP) October 2005  
  The Transportation Strategic Plan outlines specific strategies, projects and programs that implement the broader city-wide goals and policies for transportation in Seattle.

• Seattle Transit Plan September 2005  
  The Seattle Transit Plan focuses on Seattle’s regional high and intermediate capacity transit corridors as well as key transit passenger facilities. The purpose of the plan is to get Seattle moving and to support and direct economic growth to the urban villages. Sufficient and reliable transit service provides people with a real mobility choice.

• Seattle Department of Transportation  
  http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/

• SDOT Freight Mobility Action Plan June 2005  
  The SDOT Freight Mobility Action Plan guides efforts to improve freight mobility.

• SDOT Art Plan April 2005  
  The SDOT Art Plan is focused as a plan of action, comprehensively detailing how Seattle can become a national leader in creating a more humane, layered, beautiful and relevant transportation system. Implementation of the plan will contribute significantly to a Seattle whose streets and sidewalks celebrate life, discovery, and creativity.

• SDOT Bicycle Master Plan January 2007  
  The SDOT Bicycle Master Plan defines a set of actions, to be completed with 10 years, to make Seattle the best community for bicycling in the United States. By increasing support for bicycling, the city will make its transportation system more environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable.

• SDOT Pedestrian Master Plan June 2009  
  The SDOT Pedestrian Master Plan strives to make Seattle the most walkable city in the nation. Walking is the oldest, and most efficient, affordable, and environmentally-friendly form of transportation – it’s how transit riders eventually reach their destinations, and how neighbors meet each other and begin to build strong communities.
Parks and Recreation Related Plans

- Strategic Action Plan, September, 2008
  The Strategic Action Plan establishes a vision and guides decisions over the next five years. Public and staff participation were an integral part of this process to ensure the Plan reflects the needs of the Seattle community.
  http://www.seattle.gov/parks/Publications/ParksActionPlan.htm
- Parks and Green Spaces Levy
- Parks Citywide Planning Documents
- Parks Open Spaces GAP Report 2006 Update
- Parks Viewpoints Vegetation Management plan
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