

Friends of Seattle

- Endorsement Questionnaire for Elizabeth Campbell -

GENERAL

Friends of Seattle's Mission

- How does your candidacy support Friends of Seattle's values, goals, and mission?¹

I believe from a values standpoint that the desire for a proactive neighborhood voice in Seattle affairs, from a deep and abiding love of Seattle standpoint, that I am a compatible candidate with the Friends of Seattle, and it is not that we have wildly divergent interests and goals for Seattle; we have differences that are not irreconcilable, merely ones that could be worked out through a process of education and reconciliation.

Qualifications

Please describe any professional accomplishments that demonstrate your effectiveness as an elected official (if you are an incumbent) or would demonstrate your effectiveness as an elected official (if you have not yet held office).

As a community advocate, I have focused on Seattle's parks, homeless housing, neighborhood planning, preservation of urban wildlife habitat, the Viaduct issue, historical preservation, and the Port of Seattle's expansion plans at Piers 90 and 91. I have also been active in assisting community groups secure Neighborhood Match Fund grants including for the Friends of Ursula Judkins Viewpoint/Smith Cove group which I chair, and for the City View Neighbors.

I served for three years on the board of trustees for the Magnolia Community Club, one term on the Queen Anne Community Council's board, and was the Magnolia community's representative to the 2004 Central Waterfront Charette, to the 2006 Seattle 2100 Green Futures Charette, a member of the City of Seattle's 2007 Re-Imagining Seattle's Streets planning committee, of the 2008 Seattle Neighborhood Forum, was appointed to King County's 2008-2009 Ballard-Uptown Rapid Ride Advisory Panel; and a founder and board member of the Coalition for Effective Transportation Alternatives (CETA), and of the No Tunnel Alliance.

I currently serve as chair of the Magnolia Neighborhood Planning Council and Yes Viaduct! , both organizations which I founded and am a 4-Year Trustee for the Benevolent Protectorate Order of Elks, Ballard Lodge 827, a charitable organization.

At the University of Washington I am a graduate student and active in promoting transparency in the UW's administration, protection for the campus landscape and heritage trees, fiscal conservatism in UW operations and capital projects, and I advocate for rights and programming for the non-traditional (older) students and students with disabilities who attend the UW. I also am involved in documentary production, including one I produced about Ursula Judkins, namesake of one of Seattle's viewpoint parks, and one being produced with fellow students about my run for the Seattle mayor-ship.

Representing Seattle

Seattle is the most populous city in Washington and is the state's economic engine. At the same time, Seattle cannot address many of its problems without working with King County, regional entities (Sound Transit and the PSRC), and the state government. Yet many observers believe that Seattle's interests are represented inadequately at those levels. For example, the Muni League has criticized the 40-20-40 rule for allocating new Metro transit funding.ⁱⁱ Further, transit advocates note that the state's current tax system disadvantages transit.ⁱⁱⁱ And the Legislature refused to allocate federal stimulus dollars for road projects in Seattle.^{iv}

- As an elected official representing Seattle, how would you work with King County, regional governmental entities, the state legislature, and the governor to ensure their budgets and policies address Seattle's needs?

Well, the fact of the matter is Seattle does take a disparate amount of resources from other government entities and their citizens. I do not believe that Seattle loses out as a result of it being inadequately represented either – it has the same constitutionally allocated number of representatives as every other government, the same opportunities to make its case before the legislative and funding bodies that every other government must accede to, therefore to me, some of these claims of being poorly represented or thought of are a result of the failures of those who were elected to represent us, and a failure of them and others to recognize that Seattle is not the center of Washington's universe, that there must be balance in what Seattle needs versus what Seattle wants.

This Alaskan Way tunnel is a good example of this problem – it is not necessary – it is a want, a want by a number of special interests, it fails the efficiency test, and it takes away from other cities and counties in the state that have their own transportation needs, some of them more pressing than ours.

What this means – the answer is in a different attitude – I have a different attitude that is more respectful of others, that is more balanced, and that is more reasonable. I would expect that attitude to inform and infuse the activities undertaken by those who seek to represent Seattle; an important first step!

ISSUES

Waste Reduction

Rather than build an expensive new transfer in Georgetown to handle the growing volume of trash generated in Seattle, the City of Seattle adopted a "Zero Waste Strategy" centered on reducing waste.^v As part of that strategy, the City Council adopted a 20-cent "green fee" for disposable shopping bags.^{vi}

- Do you support the green fee? No
- Why or why not?

There are other priorities that are much more momentous and enduring than this – truth be told the retailers on their own have sought to be proactive in this matter and are doing a good job of

reducing the use of plastic bags – perhaps the manufacturers of such should be targeted, encouraged to come up with alternatives, and then the public encouraged to change their desires in the marketplace – the grocers were not alone in getting the initiative on the ballot – it was the public that had a large part in that.

Alaskan Way Viaduct

Governor Gregoire signed a bill ordering the Washington State Department of Transportation to design a bored tunnel to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct.^{vii} This bill contains language allocating cost overruns to Seattle citizens, although some question whether the language has legal significance. Notwithstanding that provision, the City of Seattle committed \$930 million and the Port of Seattle \$300 million to finance the tunnel.^{viii} Although the exact tax consequences of these commitments are not totally clear, it is safe to assume that the Port's contribution would result in higher property taxes for Seattle property owners, and the City's pledge would be funded with increases in property taxes, City Light utility rates, and possibly other taxes and fees.

- Do you support the plan to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct with a bored tunnel? Why or why not?

As a long time advocate for an elevated solution – which in translation means preserving the capacity of the Alaskan Way corridor, I cannot support the bored tunnel as it is the bypass tunnel that was discredited in 2004 and in 2007 due to the fact that it reduced capacity so much that the negative effects of it could not be accommodated through alternatives such as even an expanded, six-lane Alaskan Way (which this latest version only calls for a four-lane Alaskan Way), through increased bus services, and through reconfigured Downtown thoroughfares. Furthermore, this was brought about not through honest deliberations and facts, and is four times the cost of an elevated solution.

- If you support the tunnel, what would you do to address the cost-overruns issue?
- If you oppose the tunnel, what would you do to prevent its implementation?

Personally – everything in my power – I already have started an initiative drive, I-99 No Tunnel, I will pursue every administrative opportunity that the EIS process will have to allow for objective discussion about this, and legal action such as what I pursued through the Magnolia Neighborhood Planning Council, seeking to halt the project as was done when the City tried to put a 180 high-end luxury home housing development at Discovery Park – in that instance done in the name of “homeless housing”. The tunnel project is being hawked under the claims about its safety, but as has been every facet of this project – the numbers and claims get “arranged” so that they fit the narrative that the proponents of this tunnel have successfully at this point been able to use to get what they want.

Transit

The City of Seattle already contributes to local transit. The City put together the financing package to construct the South Lake Union streetcar line, and the City and King County Metro share the ongoing operating costs for that line.^{ix} Further, the Bridging the Gap tax package

finances some Metro bus service within Seattle, and Bridging the Gap also pays for street improvements designed to expedite bus travel.^x

- If elected, how do you intend to improve the in-city transit system?

One of the major issues facing transit use is not that the routes and service offered are so poor, but the image and functionality is so poor. Rather than necessarily pouring more money into an already over-subsidized system, greater attention and resources should perhaps go into additional alternatives to transit, including private transit systems and more ride-sharing programs and opportunities.

Bicycle Infrastructure

The City of Seattle has adopted a Bicycle Master Plan, which provides a vision for improving bicycling facilities in Seattle.^{xi}

- Do you support the Bicycle Master Plan? [Yes/No only please] No
- If you support it, do you have ideas for improving the plan?
- If you support it, how do you suggest the City fund the plan?

Pedestrian Infrastructure

The City Council is considering whether to adopt a draft Pedestrian Master Plan.^{xii}

- Do you support the Pedestrian Master Plan? [Yes/No only please]

Have reservations about it

- If you support it, do you have ideas for improving the plan?
- If you support it, how do you suggest the City fund the plan?

Land Use and Multifamily Housing

According to U.S. Census data cited in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan, about half of Seattle's households live in multifamily housing.^{xiii} Further, according to the Plan, approximately 40% of Seattle's total land area is set aside for residential use—35% for single-family residences but only 5% for multifamily dwellings.^{xiv} That 5% dedicated to multifamily housing tends to be concentrated in “urban villages” or along arterial streets, which are noisy and dirty. However, “backyard cottages” (also known as “detached accessory dwelling units) are also allowed in single-family zones in Southeast Seattle.^{xv}

- Would you support legislation to allow backyard cottages to be built in all single-family zones? [Yes/No only please] Yes

- Would you ever support a contract rezone or a broader rezone allowing for more housing to be built on a site? [Yes/No only please] No/with qualifications
- If you support the basic concept of rezoning, what criteria would you use in deciding on specific locations where more housing should be built?
- If you support the concept of rezoning, what criteria would you use in deciding where more housing should be built?

Combined answer for above two questions:

A couple of years ago I wrote a “manifesto” about housing in Seattle, and this is an example of the type of reasoning and thinking about housing in our neighborhoods:

- No multi-housing developments within established single family neighborhoods shall be approved unless they are cluster housing complexes and the units shall include a mix of 60% affordable and 40% market-rate housing units, or single family units with a minimum of 4,000 SF lot size - in the same ratios of affordability as set out herein.
- There shall be no, or only very limited infilling of single family neighborhood zones with houses on subdivided single family zoned lots.
- Single family projects for homes that are over 30' tall, and/or which cover more than 40% of the lot, and/or which convert two single-family lots into one are not compatible with urban neighborhoods and are especially an anathema to sustainable neighborhoods.
- The conversion of single family lots of any size to other uses is discouraged, and should be actively opposed.

The point is, equity and conservation and preservation of our neighborhoods.

Many newly built townhouses in Seattle are architectural atrocities, and site plans tend to be car-dominated. Most townhouse developments are exempt from the City of Seattle’s Design Review Program.^{xvi} It is also difficult to find attractive new condos and apartment buildings. To address some of these problems, the City Council is considering a package of revisions to the zoning code.^{xvii}

- Do you support the proposed revisions to the multifamily housing zoning code? [Yes/No only please] Yes
- If you support the revisions, do you have ideas for improving the proposed revisions?

The exception I have to this is it will still result in formulaic designs. As a former owner and developer of multi-unit facilities, as someone who has engaged the services of multiple architects and artists, and as someone who has been involved in the design of my projects – psychiatric/medical campus’, nursing homes, and retirement homes, there are only so many versions of design that one can come up with when faced with the need to build a building that is multiple replications of the same unit. It cannot help but be repetitious in design. I would suggest, horrors, less multi-unit construction, spaced further apart, with limited dimensions.

I am opposed to this *Field of Dreams*-like development occurring around town, not to mention, it is well documented that rather than reducing carbon footprints, being sustainable, land use boundaries, “sustainable” development practices and the like, drive up the cost of housing and living in urban areas and cause more dense pollution – most people keep their cars rather than foregoing them.

City Governance

- Do you support the “Vote Clean Seattle” plan,^{xviii} which is supported in principle by the City Council,^{xix} to create a system for publicly funded campaigns in Seattle? [Yes/No only please] Yes

CREATIVE RESPONSE

- If you have additional thoughts on how to improve Seattle’s city government or to make Seattle a more livable and sustainable city, please note them here.



Of all the mayoral candidates – whether you like some of my positions or not, I will tell you that I am the most creative and visionary of them all – and this is based on my past experiences in business and in the public work that I do, and by virtue of the values that I hold in regards to governance and what I believe a city could and should be for its people, the most likely to bring reform and renaissance to Seattle City government.

For example, I am so tired of a dull, boring Seattle, where there are pockets of areas that are kept up – and I am speaking purely about the common areas of the city right now – and then there are the street right-of-ways, parks, planting strips, and all the fixtures (see lamp post) and appurtenances attached thereto that are the responsibility of the City of Seattle to maintain and improve, that are literally in shambles.

One of the worst of the worst of this is this stretch of Marginal Way (see right). But the fact of the matter is, and the many pictures for the last few years that I have taken of this sort of thing are testament to this, it is not difficult to find multiple and extensive places that have been neglected by the City. Furthermore, that this situation is allowed to



happen by the City is not limited just to City properties, but also on private properties - the City fails miserably to enforce its nuisance laws to make private landowners maintain their property/properties.



Land speculators/developers are particularly some of the more egregious offenders, leaving their blighted vacant land/buildings for the rest of us to suffer the consequences of their neglect. The City could seek to abate this sort of thing, but no, it chooses to pretty much turn a blind eye and as a whole I think the public, at least in Seattle, believes this is the norm – trash, graffiti, water-filled excavation holes, wildly overgrown brush and grasses, buildings and houses in disrepair – all because our City government, a chief offender of this sort of practice, has failed utterly to consider the sensibilities of its citizens and to do its duty.

In general I believe that the City, if you will pardon the expression, has done a blank poor job of keeping this town up. I visit other cities, like Redmond, Kirkland, Bellevue, Shoreline and the like, and their towns are nicely manicured, their parks are immaculate, their fixtures, light standards for example, bridgework, crossing areas, signage – many are well designed, in good repair, and make the town look like a nice place. An example of this is this in Shoreline, at the intersection at 150th and Aurora Ave N.:



That these things are not done in Seattle is due to skewed priorities, a lack of vision, a lack of leadership, a lack of will, and a lack of creative talent at the top and among most of the City's departments. These sort of things are not about a failure of the City to provide its services as many of the other mayoral candidates talk about, it is a failure to do anything past providing basic services and a preoccupation with many pet City projects and with special interest groups' projects and initiatives.

On this one note alone then, as mayor I would see to it that Seattle becomes more than just a blackberry cluttered burg, that some “pop” exists across the city as a whole as opposed to just in favored areas. I would see to it that the lands and fixtures of Seattle are maintained and improved; I will restore civic pride to the list of must haves in City government.

-
- 1 ⁱ <http://www.friendsofseattle.org>
 - 2 ⁱⁱ <http://www.munileague.org/about-us/press-releases/Metro%20Report.pdf>
 - 3 ⁱⁱⁱ <http://seattletransitblog.com/2009/04/19/the-gas-tax-and-the-state-constitution/>
 - 4 ^{iv} <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123578330128898253.html>
 - 5 ^v <http://www.seattle.gov/council/newsdetail.asp?ID=7530&Dept=28>
 - 6 ^{vi} <http://www.seattle.gov/mayor/newsdetail.asp?ID=8695&dept=40>
 - 7 ^{vii} <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?bill=5768>
 - 8 ^{viii} <http://www.seattle.gov/mayor/newsdetail.asp?ID=9257&dept=40>
 - 9 ^{ix} http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/stcar_slu_money.htm
 - 10 ^x http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/btg_transit.htm
 - 11 ^{xi} <http://www.seattle.gov/Transportation/bikemaster.htm>
 - 12 ^{xii} http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/pedestrian_masterplan/
 - 13 ^{xiii} <http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@proj/documents/>
 - 14 [Web_Informational/cos_004508.pdf](#)
 - 15 ^{xiv} <http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@proj/documents/>
 - 16 [Web_Informational/cos_004508.pdf](#)
 - 17 ^{xv} http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Alternative_Housing_Choices/Overview/
 - 18 ^{xvi} http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/planning/design_review_program/Overview/
 - 19 ^{xvii} http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Planning/Multifamily_Code_Update/Overview/
 - 20 ^{xviii} <http://www.voteleanseattle.com/seattle.htm>
 - 21 ^{xix} <http://www.seattle.gov/council/newsdetail.asp?ID=9481&Dept=28>