

North Green Lake Neighborhood Scorecard

Background for Neighbors Acting to Build Resilience and Sustainability (NABRS)

Sustainable Seattle has long been a leader in establishing regional indicators—measures—of sustainability. (See our regional indicator commons at www.b-sustainable.org). Sustainable Seattle launched a pilot effort, NABRS, in the spring of 2009 to establish neighborhood-level indicators of sustainability. The indicators in this Scorecard were selected as relevant and actionable at the neighborhood level by a diverse set of government, non-profit, and community leaders. The information on this Scorecard represents the best available research from King County, the City of Seattle, and various non-profit organizations.

This Scorecard establishes a baseline sustainability assessment in the neighborhood of North Green Lake. The other neighborhood in this pilot effort is Rainier Beach. As part of the NABRS project, Sustainable Seattle is collaborating with several local Neighborhood Partners to implement a local action project in each neighborhood (see page 5). It is Sustainable Seattle's hope that the Scorecard is used by residents, community organizations, and local government to address local conditions and improve neighborhood-scale sustainability. A mini version of this Scorecard is available at www.sustainableseattle.org.

There are many challenges to collecting information at a neighborhood scale including defining neighborhood boundaries. The North Green Lake Neighborhood in this project is loosely defined as census tracts 27 & 28 (Ravenna to Greenwood & 70th to 85th).

● Natural Environment

Measure	Description	Closest Approximation of N. Green Lake Neighborhood	Seattle/ King County Comparison	Data Source
Habitat Quality	<i>Acres of Habitat</i> - 6.2% of public land in census tracts 27 & 28 were defined as habitat compared with 11.5% in Seattle overall during the Seattle Public Lands Habitat Survey in 1999.	6.2% Habitat	11.5% Habitat (Seattle)	1
	<i>Invasive and Nuisance Species</i> - 20.0% of public land habitat in census tracts 27 & 28 had greater than 50% coverage by invasive species compared with 3.3% in Seattle overall during the Seattle Public Lands Habitat Survey in 1999.	20.0% Invasive Species	3.3% Invasive Species (Seattle)	1
Impervious Surfaces	<i>Impervious Surfaces</i> – 79.8% of the land area in census tracts 27 & 28 was defined as impervious surface compared with 66.9% of the land area overall in Seattle in 2007. The analysis included building footprints, transportation elements such as roadways, sidewalks and driveways, and other measures.	79.8% Impervious Surface	66.9% Impervious Surface (Seattle)	2
Habitat Quantity	<i>Residential Habitat Visual Assessment*</i> - The average score in a visual assessment of habitat quality and diversity of 285 randomly selected residential lots in census tracts 27 & 28 was 2.1 out of 5 in 2009 (a score of 0 provides no habitat and 5 provided excellent habitat).	2.1 Score* (0-5 scale)	Score Not Available	3
	<i>Tree Canopy</i> - 22.0% of all land in Community Reporting Area 9.4 was identified as covered by tree canopy compared with 22.9% for Seattle overall using a Quickbird satellite imagery analysis in 2007. The City of Seattle has a stated goal of 30% tree canopy by 2030.	22.0% Tree Canopy	22.9% Tree Canopy (Seattle)	4
Pollution in Neighborhoods	<i>Pollution in Neighborhoods</i> - Over 290 thousand estimated vehicle miles were driven within census tracts 27 & 28 during an average weekday in 2006. (Vehicle miles contribute to air pollution and I-5 contributes to a large number in the Green Lake area)	290,574 Miles Traveled	Miles Traveled Not Available	5

North Green Lake Neighborhood Scorecard

Built Environment

Measure	Description	Closest Approximation of N. Green Lake Neighborhood	Seattle/ King County Comparison	Data Source
Walkability	<i>Walkability</i> - Green Lake received a score of 84 out of 100 using Walkscore.com's definition of walkability and neighborhood boundary and compares to a score of 72 for Seattle overall in 2009 (A score of 0 was not walkable and 100 was extremely pedestrian friendly. It was calculated considering the number of amenities within 1 mile of a point in the center of the neighborhood).	84 Walkscore	72 Walkscore (Seattle)	6
Neighborhood Gathering Places (emerging)	<i>Neighborhood Gathering Places*</i> - 44 parks, community centers, coffee shops and other places where neighbors can play, meet, and organize themselves for projects and activities were identified by residents in census tracts 27 & 28 through an online survey in 2009.	44 Gathering Places*	Gathering Places Not Available	7
Index of Household Resource Consumption	<i>Water</i> —The average Seattle Public Utilities residential customer used 94 gallons of water per day in 2008.	Average Gallons of Water Not Available	94 Gallons of Water (Seattle)	8
	<i>Carbon Emissions</i> —The average household in census tracts 27 & 28 produced an estimated 4.6 tons of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions in 2009. Estimates were based on demographics, travel behavior, land use, transit proximity, regional location, and several other variables. These estimates compared to 5.1 tons of GHG emissions for the average Seattle household.	4.6 Tons of GHG Emissions	5.1 Tons of GHG Emissions (Seattle)	9
	<i>Electrical Energy Use</i> — According to a 5% sample of household electrical utility data, the average single-family households in zip code 98103 consumed 25 kilowatt hours per day in 2009. compared to a 26 kilowatt hours per day overall average in Seattle.	25 KWh/day	26 KWh/day (Seattle)	10
	<i>Consumer Environmental Behavior Survey*</i> —In a survey about yard care and environmental purchasing behaviors distributed to randomly selected households in census tracts 27 & 28 in 2009, residents identified many positive behaviors. 45.2% responded that they buy food directly from farms and 87.5% had replaced an incandescent light bulb with an energy-efficient compact florescent bulb.	45.2% Buy Food Directly from Farms*	Not Available (King County produces a similar but incomparable report)	11
	<i>Household Waste</i> —The average single-family household in census tracts 27 & 28 produced 30.3 gallons of waste per week in 2009 based on average waste container size compared with 31.5 gallons in Seattle overall.	30.3 Average Gallons/ week	31.5 Average Gallons/ week (Seattle)	12
Access and Use of Alternative Transportation	<i>Transit Access Route Data</i> — Residents in census tracts 27 & 28 had access to an average of 785 transit trips per weekday in spring 2009.	785 Trips/weekday	Not Available	13
	<i>Bike Access</i> — Residents in census tracts 27 & 28 had to travel an average of .20 miles to reach a bicycle route in 2008 compared with .57 miles for the average Seattle resident.	.20 Miles to Bike Route	.57 Miles to Bike Route (Seattle)	14
	<i>Transit Usage</i> — The average number of people whom rode a bus in census tracts 27 & 28 per 1000 residents during one service period in 2009 was 730 compared with 536 in Seattle overall.	730 Average Trips in One Service Period	536 Average Trips in One Service Period (Seattle)	15
	<i>Bike Usage</i> — 1.1% of residents in census tracts 27 & 28 commute to work by bicycle according to the 2000 census compared to 1.8% in Seattle overall.	1.1% Commute by Bicycle	1.9% Commute by Bicycle (Seattle)	16
	<i>Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) data</i> —63.0% of residents in census tracts 27 & 28 commute to work by driving alone according to the 2000 census compared to 56.5% in Seattle overall.	63.0% Commute by Car	56.5% Commute by Car (Seattle)	17
Food Production	<i>Private Residential Food Gardens*</i> — 7.7% of a random sample of single-family lots in census tracts 27 & 28 were visually assessed to have food gardens in May 2009.	7.7% Grow Food*	Not Available	18
	<i>Public Food Gardens</i> — There were 9,175 residents living within census tracts 27 & 28 that had access to a P-patch within ¼ mile of the census tract 27 & 28 boundaries in 2009 compared with 8,285 residents per p-patch in Seattle overall.	9,175 Residents near P-Patch	8,285 Residents near P-Patch (Seattle)	19

North Green Lake Neighborhood Scorecard

Social Environment

Measure	What's Happening	Closest Approximation of N. Green Lake Neighborhood	Seattle/ King County Comparison	Data Source
Housing	<i>Housing Rental Affordability by Neighborhood</i> —The average rent in Spring 2008 in the Green Lake/Wallingford area was \$1,152 compared with \$1,082 for the city of Seattle. According to Communities Count 2008, a low income family can afford \$838 for monthly rent.	\$1,152 Average Rent	\$1,082 Average Rent (Seattle)	20
	<i>Housing Ownership Affordability by Neighborhood</i> — The median sales price for single-family and townhomes sold between January and June 2008 in the Ballard/Green Lake/Greenwood area was \$455,000 compared with \$469,000 for the city of Seattle. This is well above the \$249,500 price that a household making the median income could afford according to the 2008 Communities Count Report.	\$455,000 Median Price	\$469,000 Median Price (Seattle)	20
Health Insurance	<i>Adults without Health Insurance</i> — According to 2004-2008 combined data, 13.4% of adults (age 18-64) were without health insurance in zip code 98103 compared with 13.8% overall in King County.	13.4% Without Health Insurance	13.8% Without Health Insurance (King)	21
Strength and Diversity of Neighborhood Economy (emerging)	<i>Access to Basic Goods*</i> —There were 3.21 stores that sell basic goods such as groceries, banks, post offices, and hardware stores, etc, per 1000 residents in census tracts 27 & 28 in 2009. Stores were inventoried using internet searches.	3.21 Stores*	Not Available	22
Arts	There was one public art installation from the City of Seattle Fine Arts and Seattle Parks and Recreation Collections within census tract 118 & 119 boundaries in 2009 for every 1,835 residents compared with 1,610 residents for every public art installation in Seattle overall.	1,835 Residents per Public Art Installation	1,610 Residents per Public Art Installation (Seattle)	23
People in Poverty	<i>Income</i> — 6.4% of adults had incomes below the federal poverty level in census tracts 27 & 28 in 2000 compared with 8.4% in King County overall.	6.4% Incomes below Poverty Level	8.4% Incomes below Poverty Level (King)	24
	<i>Free/Reduced Lunch Program</i> — 7.4% of students who lived in Community Reporting Area 9.4 participated in the Free or reduced lunch program in 2007 compared with 38.3% in Seattle schools overall. This measure is based on where students live rather than specific school data since many students do not attend schools in their neighborhoods.	7.4% In Free/Reduced Lunch Program	38.3% In Free/Reduced Lunch Program (Seattle)	25

Personal Environment

Measure	What's Happening	Closest Approximation of N. Green Lake Neighborhood	Seattle/ King County Comparison	Data Source
Neighborhood Involvement in Local Decision-Making	<i>Voter Turnout</i> – 38.6% of registered voters in census tracts 27 & 28 voted in the last five general elections (2004-2008) compared with 67.2% in King County overall.	38.6% Registered Voters who Voted	67.2% Registered Voters who Voted (King)	26
Community Inclusivity (emerging)	<i>Community Inclusivity Survey*</i> — Findings show 88.5% of residents in census tracts 118 & 119 'agreed strongly' or 'agreed somewhat' that "People in the neighborhood are welcoming of households of diverse cultures, backgrounds, sexual orientations and family configurations".	88.5% Welcome Diverse Backgrounds*	Not Available	27
Social	<i>Neighborhood Diversity</i> — 11.9% of residents in census tracts 27 & 28 identified as belonging to a racial demographic other than white in 2000 compared with 24.3% for King County overall.	11.9% Non-White Ethnicity	24.3% Non-White Ethnicity (King)	28

North Green Lake Neighborhood Scorecard

Measure	What's Happening	Closest Approximation of N. Green Lake Neighborhood	Seattle/ King County Comparison	Data Source
Richness	<i>Involvement in Community-Building*</i> — In online surveys distributed through a limited number of social networks in 2009, 33% of the respondents do not participate in community building organizations in census tracts 27 & 28 in 2009.	33% Not Involved in Community-Building Organizations*	Not Available	29
	<i>Social Cohesion Metric</i> — The average social cohesion score for adults in Seattle was 37.8 (on a scale 10-50) in 2007 compared to 38.5 for King County overall according to the 2008 Communities Count report (a score of 10 identified low social cohesion and 50 represents high social cohesion).	37.8 Score (Seattle)	38.5 Score (King)	30
Education	<i>On-time High School Graduation Rate</i> — 67.4% of students who live in Community Reporting Area 9.4 graduated on time in 2007 compared with 61.5% in Seattle Schools overall. This measure was based on where students live rather than specific school data since many students do not attend schools in their neighborhoods.	67.4% Graduated	61.5% Graduated (Seattle)	31
Safety	<i>Major crimes</i> —There were 44 major crimes per 1000 residents in census tracts 27 & 28 in 2007 compared with 67 major crimes per 1000 residents in Seattle overall.	44 Major Crimes	67 Major Crimes (Seattle)	32
	<i>Pedestrian Collisions</i> —There were 2.8 documented bicycle or pedestrian collisions in census tracts 27 & 28 from 2001-2004 per 1000 residents compared with 5.5 collisions per 1000 residents in Seattle overall.	2.8 Collisions	5.5 Collisions (Seattle)	33
Personal Health-- Physical Activity	<i>Physical Activity</i> — According to 2004-2008 combined data, 6.4% of adults (age 18-64) reported no physical activity in the past month in zip code 98103 compared with 14.9% overall in King County.	6.4% Report No Physical Activity	14.9% Report No Physical Activity (King)	34

Note: There are many challenges to collecting accurate neighborhood-level data. The data included in this Scorecard comes from a variety of sources using different geographic boundaries and may not accurately represent conditions in the neighborhood across different definitions.

Sources:

1. Seattle Urban Nature. Seattle Public Lands Habitat Survey. Data Analysis. Habitat and Invasive Species. 1999. Prepared by: Christian Rusby, Sustainable Seattle. 2009.
2. King County. Impervious/Impacted Surface Interpretation based on 2007 imagery and 2000-2007 ancillary data sources including building footprints, multispectral orthophotography, and transportation layers such as roadways, sidewalks and driveways. Data request: Impervious Surface totals by census tracts. 2007.
3. Sustainable Seattle. Visual assessment of 285 randomly selected residential properties by census tracts. 2009.
4. City of Seattle. Office of Sustainability & Environment. *Seattle, Washington Urban Tree Canopy Analysis*. Data Request: Tree coverage by Community Reporting Area (CRA). 2009.
5. City of Seattle Department of Transportation. Data request: Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) by block group. 2006. Prepared by: Christian Rusby, Sustainable Seattle. 2009.
6. Walkscore.org. Neighborhood model query based on location query. 2009.
7. Sustainable Seattle. Resident online surveys of neighborhood gathering places distributed through limited existing neighborhood social networks. 2009
8. Seattle Public Utilities. *Saving Water Partnership 2008 Annual Report*. Average water use per capita per day. 2009.
9. King County. King County GIS Center - Client Services Group. Data Request: Household Carbon Emissions for selected Census Blockgroups. 2009. (For more details on transportation-related GHG's in King County, contact Richard.gelb@kingcounty.gov)
10. City of Seattle. Office of Sustainability and the Environment. Data Request: Five percent sample of residential electrical use by zip code. 2008. Prepared by: Christian Rusby, Sustainable Seattle. 2009.
11. Sustainable Seattle. Resident surveys of 285 randomly selected properties of consumer environmental behavior by census tract. 2009
12. Seattle Public Utilities. Query of residential Household waste disposal. 2009
13. City of Seattle. Department of Transportation. Transit Access Route Data. Number of bus stops and bus frequency. 2009
14. King County. Department of Natural Resources and Parks. Bike Access. Distance to bike routes draft analysis. 2008. Prepared by: Christian Rusby, Sustainable Seattle. 2009.
15. City of Seattle. Transportation Department. Data Request: Boarding/Alightings by Census Tract. 2009.
16. US Census Bureau. Decennial Census. Journey to work. Commute mode. 2000.
17. Ibid.
18. Sustainable Seattle. Visual assessment of 285 randomly selected residential properties for food gardening by census tract. 2009
19. City of Seattle. Department of Neighborhoods. P-patch program. 2009.

North Green Lake Neighborhood Scorecard

20. City of Seattle. Human Services Department. *2009-2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan*. Section 3: Needs Assessment. Data from Northwest Multiple Listings Service and Dupre+Scott Apartment Advisors. 2008.
 21. Public Health—Seattle & King County. Percentage of adults without health insurance by select zip codes. 2004-2008. Prepared by Public Health-Seattle & King County; Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit. 2009.
 22. Sustainable Seattle. Internet inventory of businesses within neighborhood census tracts. 2009
 23. City of Seattle. Office of Arts & Cultural Affairs. Data Request: Number of public art installations by census tract. 2009
 24. US Census Bureau. Census: 2000. Percent of families with income in 1999 below poverty level. 2000
 25. City of Seattle. Department of Neighborhoods. Office of Education. Participation in free or reduced lunch program by residency. 2006-2007
 26. King County. Elections Department. Data Request: Voter records for last five general elections by select census tracts. Prepared by: Christian Rusby, Sustainable Seattle. 2009.
 27. Sustainable Seattle. Resident online surveys of community inclusivity distributed through limited existing neighborhood social networks. 2009
 28. US Census Bureau. Census: 2000. Racial characteristics by census tract. 2000
 29. Sustainable Seattle. Resident survey of participation in formal and informal place-based community-building distributed through limited existing neighborhood social networks. 2009
 30. Communities Count. *Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Average Level of Neighborhood Social Cohesion, King County, 2001, 2004, 2007. 2008
 31. City of Seattle. Department of Neighborhoods. Office of Education. On-time graduation rates by residency. 2006-2007
 32. City of Seattle. Police Department. Major crimes. 2007
 33. Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Transportation Data Office (TDO). Collision Data and Analysis Branch. Data request: Pedestrian collisions, all streets (2001-2004). 2007
 34. Public Health—Seattle & King County. Percentage of adults 18 years of age or older with no physical activity in the past month. 2004-2008. Prepared by: Public Health-Seattle & King County; Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit. 2009
- * *Sustainable Seattle NABRS Project Team. Sustainable Seattle developed these metrics and related figures, 2009. It is hoped that improved data will be available in the future.*

Approximate North Green Lake Geographic Definitions:

- a. Census Tracts 27 & 28: Ravenna to Greenwood & 85th to 70th
- b. Zip Code 98103
- c. Community Planning Area 9.4: Roosevelt to Aurora & 85th to 45th
- d. Green Lake/Wallingford area: I-5 to Greenwood & 85th to Ship Canal
- e. Ballard/Green Lake/Greenwood area: I-5 to Sound & Shoreline to Ship Canal
- f. Walkscore Neighborhood: I-5 to Aurora & 85th to 65th

Neighborhood Action Project

Aurora Mural Project

The North Green Lake neighborhood has chosen to make improvements to the pedestrian environment along Aurora Avenue for their action project. Currently, the street is dominated by automobiles, lacking in pedestrian amenities and neighborhood destinations, and has many empty storefronts that detract from the incentive to walk along Aurora Avenue. Inspired by a similar successful initiative in Columbia City, local project leaders believe the installation of community art, including murals by local artists and artwork created by Bagley elementary students, on vacant storefront windows along the highway will make this area more attractive. The hope for Aurora, as demonstrated in Columbia City, is that the murals will attract new storeowners to the street, resulting in a stronger business district with more gathering places and stores selling goods. The improved Aurora Avenue will be attractive to visitors arriving by foot or bicycle.



The program was developed at the end of the summer in 2009 and is expected to continue through the spring of 2010. Several scorecard indicators were identified in the development of this project to address community needs including Walkability, Neighborhood Gathering Places, Strength and Diversity of Neighborhood Economy, Arts and Safety.

* The NABRS project is funded by a Small and Simple Grant from the City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods.