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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Puget Sound region of Washington state offers gems of unparalleled ecological beauty. People who live in and around the area, and millions of tourists who travel to this area each year, benefit from this magnificent setting in myriad ways, from simple sightseeing to active recreation such as kayaking, biking, boating, or hiking.

Recreation drives much of our local economy. As our population grows, the pressure on existing facilities is acute and the need for new, accessible public spaces is urgent. The Trust for Public Land continues to identify and buy or conserve shoreline, to get more people to the water and allow them to appreciate the wonders the Sound has to offer.

This update of the Puget Sound Shoreline Strategy presents new data, analysis, and maps representing The Trust for Public Land’s continued vision for a healthy and thriving Puget Sound. It is modeled on the same six sections used in the previous report. All sections have been revised to reflect changes in the environment, economics, partners, and data analysis from the first publication in 2005.

The Trust for Public Land envisions a landscape where everyone is a half-mile walk from a local park. Our Geographic Information Systems team’s analysis of access to public shoreline and the population demographics shows that only 5 percent of the population in the study area is within the half-mile walking distance. While some people in the Puget Sound Basin live too far inland to meet this standard, we can certainly do better. (See maps 1 through 8.)

For the first time the report includes a section on climate change and sea-level rise. Managing the effects of sea-level rise is a challenge facing all coastal communities. Puget Sound has many low-lying areas that will be inundated or altered as the planet warms and functions in the atmosphere and ecology change. (See maps 10 through 16.)

Protected beaches, parks, and unobstructed mountain views enhance the lives of those who live in and visit the Puget Sound region, and are precious resources for present and future generations. The thriving tourist industry,
driven in no small part by the beautiful landscapes that make up the Puget Sound, helps grow the region’s economy.

Open space and healthy greenery help reduce stormwater and air pollution. Community gardens, playgrounds, and other natural outdoor places encourage a sense of social cohesion and, for urban dwellers, a connection to the land and a healthier overall lifestyle. We hope this report will inspire and inform renewed efforts to protect, preserve, and enhance this important and irreplaceable resource.

This update of The Trust for Public Land’s Puget Sound Shoreline Strategy would not have been possible without the philanthropic support of The Boeing Company.
PUGET SOUND OVERVIEW

The shorelines of Puget Sound are where we meet the ecosystem that sustains us, where visitors put in kayaks for a day-long outing, where birders tally flocks of waterfowl, where kids find seashells, and where residents cast their rods in hopes of hooking a salmon. Shorelines may be described by various groups as a favorite picnic place, or an intertidal habitat, a meditation spot, a fishing hole, or a kayak landing. Protection of the shorelines of Puget Sound, and access to them, sustains a high quality of life for residents and provides unique tourism opportunities. The shorelines contribute to our well-being spiritually, morally, and economically throughout the region. This report places the shorelines and the trends influencing their protection, access, and stewardship in the spotlight.

Puget Sound is an essential part of the ecological and economic vitality of Washington state and the Pacific Northwest region. Both residents and visitors come to Puget Sound to play, relax, work, and enjoy a remarkable quality of life. Every day there are opportunities to learn and experience the value of Puget Sound—including ecology, commerce, and recreation activities through museums, professional tours, and interpretive guides.

The Puget Sound landscape covers 16,000 square miles, including land and water, encompassing the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the San Juan archipelago, and Hood Canal. Twelve counties have shoreline in the Puget Sound Basin: Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap, Mason, Thurston, Pierce, King, Snohomish, Skagit, Whatcom, Island, and San Juan. Puget Sound Partnership calculated that this planning area has 2,500 miles of shoreline, supporting human activities and a significant variety of animal species. The shoreline and nearshore environments are home to more than 220 species of fish, 26 kinds of marine mammals, 100 species of birds, and thousands of types of marine invertebrates. The health and biodiversity of the Sound is indivisible from the quality of shoreline habitats. High-quality shoreline habitats provide essential food, cover, migration routes, and breeding and nursery areas for marine life. Additionally, people rely on high-quality habitats to sustain sea- and shore-driven commercial port industries including shellfish growing, fishing, and tourism.

The reciprocal relationship of thriving economics and a healthy Puget Sound is critical to both the local and state economies. Most jobs in Washington are found in the Puget Sound Basin—nearly 71 percent of all jobs and 77 percent of total income. Our port system is physically located on the

Puget Sound Facts: Physical Environment

- Acres: 1.6 million
- Miles of shoreline: 2,500
- Average depth: 450 feet (Deepest part of Puget Sound is just north of Seattle at a depth of 930 feet)
- Number of watersheds: 19
- Number of main rivers: 14
- Number of species:
  - 220 fish species
  - 100 sea bird species
  - 26 types of marine mammals

Source: http://www.psparchives.com/puget_sound/psfacts.htm
shoreline, and maintaining and updating the infrastructure needed for this industry has impacts upon the economy and ecology of Puget Sound. The combined ports of Seattle and Tacoma make the Sound the second largest harbor for container traffic in the United States—which includes approximately $28 billion in state-originated exports as well as 34,000 jobs.4

Fishing and shellfishing rely on water quality, suitable habitat, healthy fish stocks, and resilient marine ecosystems that can sustain regular harvesting. Puget Sound shellfish, crab, and salmon are well-known species throughout the region and the country.

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) manages 63 public fishing piers throughout Puget Sound. Between April 2009 and March 2010, WDFW reported selling 75,633 saltwater fishing licenses, not including shellfish or crab or combination licenses, for a value of $1.2 million. The total value of all sport fishing licenses sold in the same period was more than $20.7 million. These figures show the strength of the recreational fishing industry in Washington.

Tourism in the Puget Sound Basin is comprised of both the urban setting, which has a well-established infrastructure for business and pleasure travel, and rural areas that provide scenic and outdoor recreation with a less robust tourism foundation. The region is a destination for local, national, and international travelers, drawing more than 10 million visitors a year.

Day visitors are predominantly drawn to recreation areas, wilderness areas, lakes, and beaches. The number of day visitors to these areas increases with the proximity to major population centers such as Seattle, Everett, and Bellevue. Coastal communities on the North Olympic Peninsula, including Port Townsend and Port Angeles, are prime examples of areas where day visitors account for a large share of total traveler spending.5

Puget Sound Facts: Economy and Tourism

- Second largest U.S. port (combined) for container traffic (Seattle/Tacoma)
- $3.2 billion annual revenue from commercial fishing in Washington state (includes shellfish)
- $44 million in average annual commercial value for Puget Sound crab, shrimp, mussels, oysters, geoducks and other clams
- $42 million per year as a conservative estimate of the value of recreational shellfishing
- $57 million per year in recreational fishing in Puget Sound, valued conservatively
- 68 state parks and three national parks, as well as wildlife refuges, forests, and other public lands, that border Puget Sound generate approximately $9.5 billion in annual travel spending
- 88,000 tourist-related jobs bring $3 billion in income to the region
- Nearly 77 percent of total income and 71 percent of all jobs in Washington state are found in the Puget Sound Basin

Source: http://www.psparchives.com/puget_sound/psfacts.htm

---

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND IN PUGET SOUND

The Trust for Public Land is a national nonprofit land conservation organization dedicated to saving the lands people love. The Trust for Public Land works to protect land for people to enjoy as parks, greenways, and natural areas. Over the past 35 years, the Washington state team, in partnership with local organizations and communities, has completed more than 35 conservation projects along the shoreline of the Sound, and many more throughout the Puget Sound Basin. (See Map 9.)

Even before a shoreline-specific program was designed, we were committed to protecting shorelines from development and to increasing opportunities for people to connect with the marine environment. Working with other nonprofit partners and local, state, and federal government agencies, The Trust for Public Land continues to save special places across Washington.

With generous funding from The Russell Family Foundation, The Trust for Public Land and CommEn Space, a geographic information systems (GIS) organization, surveyed the shorelines of all 12 counties in the Puget Sound region, analyzed adjacent land use characteristics, and identified publicly owned land and shoreline access points in 2005. This endeavor produced a conservation vision for Puget Sound shorelines. The goal of the 2005 strategy was to identify shoreline to preserve for the beauty of the natural environment, while examining the availability of human activities on the shoreline such as beach walking, shellfish harvesting, scuba diving, picnicking, wildlife watching, and fishing. The strategy also helped identify places for future protection.

The Trust for Public Land’s updated shoreline strategy builds on our previous land conservation transactions, planning work, and partnerships, and examines changes in shoreline protection and use through spatial data analysis.

Our overarching goal remains the same from 2005 to 2013: protect Puget Sound shorelines while enhancing opportunities for the people who live, play, and work in the region.

The Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines

To execute our strategy more effectively, we created The Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines in 2006, a partnership among The Trust for Public Land, The Nature Conservancy, and People For Puget Sound. It leveraged each organization’s strengths to accomplish more than each group could
have done alone. Working with civic and political leaders, corporate partners, nonprofit organizations, and government agencies, The Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines committed to a long-term effort to creating a tangible and lasting difference around Puget Sound.

This successful collaboration produced 11 new parks and natural areas, protected nearly 55 miles of shoreline, raised more than $34 million for Alliance projects, and leveraged nearly twice that amount for Puget Sound conservation. The Alliance has also advocated for more shoreline protection through regulation of more than 1,200 miles of shoreline.

The Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines accomplished significant on-the-ground conservation in a few short years. Since People For Puget Sound closed and funding fell at the height of the Great Recession, The Trust for Public Land and The Nature Conservancy have continued to work closely, particularly around Hood Canal.

Puget Sound Partnership

The work of the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) produced its 2012 Action Agenda, the official government road map for conservation in Puget Sound. The Trust for Public Land uses the Partnership’s criteria to evaluate our potential projects and conservation efforts. While our organizations work at different ends of the conservation spectrum—with the Partnership navigating political alignment and The Trust for Public Land implementing on-the-ground projects—each organization supports the other’s efforts to restore and conserve Puget Sound.

The Puget Sound Partnership was created in 2007 as a state agency to coordinate the regional effort to clean up Puget Sound. The Partnership connects citizens, governments, tribes, scientists, and businesses to set priorities, implement the regional recovery plan, and ensure accountability for results. The Partnership’s Puget Sound Action Agenda, first published in 2008 and updated in 2012, establishes recovery targets and provides a framework for coordination among the various entities. As a result of this regional partnership, some 2,440 acres of habitat have been protected, and 70 miles of streams and rivers has been restored. In 2010, the investment in Puget Sound protection and restoration was in excess of $239 million in funding, which created 6,494 jobs across 434 projects.

The Puget Sound Partnership’s 2012 Action Agenda priorities address the most serious threats to the Sound. Addressing these priorities will improve ecosystem health and human well-being, and support economic development and job creation. Two key aspects of the Action Agenda are to update local Shoreline Master Programs and implement projects identified by the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP). The Washington Department of Ecology will provide funding and, in coordination with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), technical assistance to local jurisdictions to update their local Shoreline Master Programs, with all updates complete by 2014. WDFW and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will advance implementation of projects identified by PSNERP by December 2014.

"[It is our task] to ensure that the Puget Sound forever will be a thriving natural system, with clean marine and freshwaters, healthy and abundant native species, natural shorelines and places for public enjoyment, and a vibrant economy that prospers in productive harmony with a healthy Sound."

—Former governor Christine Gregoire
Public Funding for Conservation

The conservation of Puget Sound is funded through a mix of public and private funding sources. Robust public funding at the federal, state, and local levels is essential for long-term conservation goals in habitat restoration and land acquisition generally, and for The Trust for Public Land’s shoreline acquisition program specifically. Sources including the National Coastal Wetland Conservation program, the Coastal and Estuarine Land Acquisition program, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program are central to our and our partners’ ability to protect Puget Sound shorelines.

Between 2004 and 2012, The Trust for Public Land worked with partners on 13 shoreline conservation projects (some of which had multiple phases or transactions). In the simplest terms, we work with local partners to apply for land acquisition grants from public sources in order to purchase the target property from private landowners willing to sell their property. At times the entire purchase price, as determined by a qualified appraiser, is covered through publicly awarded funds at the federal, state, and local levels—with the majority of funding from state and federal sources. Very often private funds are required to “match” public money, and sometimes conservation can only succeed with substantial private philanthropic support.

The graphs below show how public funding sources have played a significant role in our shoreline program between 2004 and 2012. (See Appendix B for a list of acronyms.)

At the state level, the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) contributed the greatest amount of funding, with nearly one-half of the funding dedicated to three projects. The Salmon Recovery Funding Board (administered through the Washington Recreation and Conservation Office) has also contributed significantly to six projects. Funding from the Washington Department of Commerce in the Community, Trade, and Economic Development
program was awarded to two separate phases of a single project, Pritchard Park on Bainbridge Island.

We have relied on two sources of federal funding for shoreline protection: the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program (CELCP) and the National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program (NCWCG). Unfortunately, CELCP did not invite new applications in federal fiscal year 2013, and it is unknown if this program will be funded again in the future. The Trust for Public Land and Mason County received stateside Land and Water Conservation (LWCF) funding for our Sunset Bluff project. Overall, the majority of funding for our shoreline conservation projects has come through the National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant program. CELCP funded five acquisition projects, and NCWCG funded six, between 2004 and 2012.
Federal funding programs often mandate a match from non-federal sources. Strong state and federal funding sources in this time frame created a good funding environment for Puget Sound shoreline protection. That said, The Trust for Public Land used an internal land acquisition fund to bridge gaps in public funding for at least three projects, or used a “buy-and-hold” process to secure properties under immediate risk. Looking ahead, federal and state funding sources are more competitive than ever as all levels of government scrutinize and cut funding to get through tough economic times. The Trust for Public Land and partners will seek new and innovative funding streams to continue our important work on the shorelines.

Voter support for conservation has remained strong throughout the recession, with communities using their voting power to approve bonds and levies that fund new parks and open spaces across the state. The Puget Sound region demonstrates the same trends in voter approval on conservation funding through local measures. Through The Conservation Campaign (an affiliate of The Trust for Public Land), local communities and entire states can shape the way money is spent on conservation by voting to approve conservation funding measures.

For more information about specific conservation financing mechanisms, see Appendix A at the end of this report.
## Summary of Public Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA Coastal Programs</td>
<td>Programs are the Coastal Resource Improvements Grant (Section 306A), Administrative Grants, Coastal Zone Enhancement Grants, and Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program.</td>
<td>Brian Lynn Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program <a href="mailto:blyn461@ecy.wa.gov">blyn461@ecy.wa.gov</a> (360) 407-6224 <a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/czm/prgm.html">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/czm/prgm.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program (CELCP)</td>
<td>Protect coastal and estuarine lands with significant ecological, conservation, recreation, historic, and esthetic value. CELCP provides matching funds to purchase property or conservation easements on land from willing sellers. These lands are protected in perpetuity so that they may be enjoyed by future generations.</td>
<td>Chris Hempleman Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program <a href="mailto:christine.hempleman@ecy.wa.gov">christine.hempleman@ecy.wa.gov</a> (360) 407-7258 <a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/stewardship/CELCP.html">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/stewardship/CELCP.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) grants</td>
<td>Matching grants to organizations and individuals for the protection, restoration, or enhancement of wetlands for the benefit of wetlands-dependent migratory bird species. There are two competitive grants programs, Standard and Small Grants.</td>
<td>Lora Lechner Pacific Coast Joint Venture - Washington Coordinator <a href="mailto:Lora_lechner@pcjv.org">Lora_lechner@pcjv.org</a> (360) 831-1905 <a href="http://pcjv.org/washington/">http://pcjv.org/washington/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS National Coastal Wetland Conservation Grants</td>
<td>Acquire, restore, and enhance wetlands for coastal states and trust territories through a competitive grant process.</td>
<td>Chris Hempleman Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program <a href="mailto:christine.hempleman@ecy.wa.gov">christine.hempleman@ecy.wa.gov</a> (360) 407-7258 <a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/stewardship/NCWCGP.html">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/stewardship/NCWCGP.html</a> Ginger Phalen USFWS State Coordinator <a href="mailto:ginger_phalen@fws.gov">ginger_phalen@fws.gov</a> (360) 753-5819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Lands Enhancement Program (ALEA)</td>
<td>Enhancement of public and aquatic lands adjacent to navigable water bodies.</td>
<td>Recreation and Conservation Office (360) 902-3000 <a href="mailto:info@rco.wa.gov">info@rco.wa.gov</a> <a href="http://www.rco.wa.gov">www.rco.wa.gov</a> to find a grants manager for your area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)</td>
<td>Various programs available to acquire, protect, restore, and develop areas for public use and benefit. Programs include: Critical Habitat, Farmland Preservation, Local Parks, Natural Areas, Riparian Protection, State Lands Development and Renovation, State Lands Restoration and Enhancement, State Parks, Trails, Urban Wildlife Habitat, and Water Access.</td>
<td>Recreation and Conservation Office (360) 902-3000 <a href="mailto:info@rco.wa.gov">info@rco.wa.gov</a> <a href="http://www.rco.wa.gov">www.rco.wa.gov</a> to find a grants manager for your area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Conservation Fund &quot;State-side&quot; (Stateside LWCF)</td>
<td>Matching grants to states for planning, developing, and acquiring public outdoor recreation areas and facilities.</td>
<td>Recreation and Conservation Office (360) 902-3000 <a href="mailto:info@rco.wa.gov">info@rco.wa.gov</a> <a href="http://www.rco.wa.gov">www.rco.wa.gov</a> to find a grants manager for your area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVING FORWARD

In the 2005 report, we included a table with the components and actions for The Trust for Public Land’s Puget Sound Shoreline Strategy. Here we present a progress report and an updated table related to those objectives.

The Trust for Public Land has been active in shoreline conservation since its founding in 1972. Projects such as the 1986 Heath Easement with the Whidbey Camano Land Trust, as well as recent conservation transactions including Skagit County icon the Kukutali Preserve (previously known as Kiket Island) in 2010 and the south Puget Sound natural area at Fudge Point in 2012 demonstrate our long-term commitment to protecting shoreline for public access, recreation, working lands, and sustainable living. Despite the changing circumstances surrounding conservation work, we will continue to protect and save this valuable part of Puget Sound.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005 Action Item</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research &amp; Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop inventory of public shoreline access</td>
<td>The Washington Department of Ecology now has a comprehensive shoreline access data set.</td>
<td>This publicly accessible data is the basis for the 2013 update to our shoreline strategy and will be used in future projects; for example, an Internet portal for shoreline information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct GIS analysis to identify high-priority shoreline protection areas</td>
<td>Identifying focus areas.</td>
<td>In 2013, we are incorporating updated data from partner groups and agencies to refresh analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update and refine Sound-wide analysis and conduct more detailed analyses</td>
<td>We are exploring basin-wide and regional analyses with our GIS experts.</td>
<td>Determine timing and scope of analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary evaluation of funding mechanisms, potential funding capacity, and public support for new funding sources to support acquisition of priority areas</td>
<td>From 2006-2009, funding for shoreline conservation was strong, and this analysis allowed us to access multiple funding sources. Funding is an increasing challenge due to reduced federal and state budgets.</td>
<td>The WA team is examining alternative, and often creative, ways to fund transactions and planning around the Sound. Working with counties and cities on conservation finance options for future sources of revenue for acquisition, planning, and operations and maintenance or shoreline resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct extensive public outreach through meetings with tribal representatives, local and county government officials, conservation organizations, and community groups</td>
<td>We held meetings around the Sound with agencies, local land trusts, tribes, and other government staff. From that outreach a list of priority projects was created to inform our potential conservation planning.</td>
<td>Community input is now fundamental to the planning and implementation of our work in Puget Sound and nationwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Internet-based mapping engine that allows the public to easily access and analyze shoreline data</td>
<td>An Internet site was available from 2006 to 2010.</td>
<td>The obsolete mapping engine will be replaced with an updated tool in 2014 (based on the Washington Department of Ecology data and analysis of our new report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication &amp; Relationship Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop communication materials that summarize our shoreline strategy and articulate how and where The Trust for Public Land will pursue future projects</td>
<td>With our partner groups in the The Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines, we developed materials including a website that articulated our group goals and the contributions of each partner.</td>
<td>The Trust for Public Land actively markets our work through print and digital media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build relationships with tribal governments and communities through communication and information sharing</td>
<td>Local tribes played an active role in acquisitions (most notably Kukutali Preserve) and planning (with recent work in south Puget Sound).</td>
<td>The Trust for Public Land is committed to involving tribal governments and communities whenever possible in our work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Acquisition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively work with partners to pursue acquisition of high-priority properties</td>
<td>The Trust for Public Land has actively engaged many partners on land acquisitions, including Washington State Parks, Washington Department of Ecology, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Recreation and Conservation Office, Kitsap County, Mason County, Pierce County, Skagit County, San Juan County Land Bank, Key Peninsula Metropolitan Parks District, Swinomish Tribal Government, The Nature Conservancy, People For Puget Sound, Jefferson Land Trust, and Capitol Land Trust.</td>
<td>Our success is founded on the belief that conservation does not happen without support and collaboration between private, local, state, and federal partners. We will continue to collaborate with partners to further our conservation work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and secure necessary funds for acquisition</td>
<td>In the period between 2005 and 2013, we have had success at the state and federal level to secure public funding for many of our shoreline acquisitions.</td>
<td>Today, there is greater competition for dwindling or insufficient dollars to accomplish all the projects seeking funds. The Trust for Public Land continues to engage counties interested in discussion and informational sessions about public finance options or to set aside local funding for conservation through bonds and levies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIGNIFICANT PUGET SOUND TRENDS

The beauty of Puget Sound masks the effects of constant stresses that threaten ecosystem health, public access, and commercial viability of the basin. Our increasing population, changing land-use patterns, climate change, and decreasing ecosystem functions all have a direct effect on Puget Sound—its health and our quality of life. The opportunity for residents and visitors to enjoy the beach and the water is an integral part of that life. Extensive, easy access and increased opportunities to engage in activities along the shoreline foster love and respect for Puget Sound. Building respect is the basis for educating the public about the issues surrounding the health and vitality of the Sound as a natural wonder and economic driver.

Population Growth

The growing population in the counties around Puget Sound puts intense pressure on available public land and access to public shorelines. More than 4.5 million people live in the 12 counties in Puget Sound Basin. In counties such as San Juan, Island, and Kitsap, 100 percent of the county population lives within 10 miles of the shoreline. However, only 5 percent of all residents in Puget Sound counties live within a half mile of easy access to the shore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clallam County</td>
<td>64,525</td>
<td>71,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island County</td>
<td>71,558</td>
<td>81,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>25,953</td>
<td>30,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>1,737,034</td>
<td>1,936,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>231,969</td>
<td>247,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason County</td>
<td>49,405</td>
<td>58,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>700,820</td>
<td>812,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>14,077</td>
<td>16,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit County</td>
<td>102,979</td>
<td>121,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>606,024</td>
<td>712,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td>207,355</td>
<td>253,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom County</td>
<td>166,814</td>
<td>200,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Area Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,978,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,542,396</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every county in the Puget Sound Basin experienced an increase in population between 2005 and 2010, although the Puget Sound Regional Council analysis states that growth rates for this period were lower than preceding periods, showing a lower level of net migration. Lower net migration most likely resulted from two recessions and the bursting of the housing bubble, creating more difficulty in relocating or changing jobs. As the recession eases, we expect net growth to increase to pre-2005 levels.

---

7 Ibid.
Climate Change—Sea-Level Rise and Other Impacts

Climate change will have significant implications for people of the Puget Sound region and the natural resources that they treasure. Sea-level rise is a real threat to public access to the shoreline and the ability to maintain shoreline recreation sites for public use. In Seattle, sea levels have risen 0.08 inches per year based on monthly mean sea-level data from 1898 to 2006. This is equivalent to 0.68 feet of sea-level rise over 100 years.\(^8\) Looking forward, sea-level rise will continue, with an additional projected increase of 0.5 feet by year 2050, and two feet by year 2100 (see table below).\(^9\) This level of change will begin to reshape Puget Sound as we know it today. (See Maps 10 through 16.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sea-Level Rise Projections Relative to Year 2000 - Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2.6 inches ± 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>6.5 inches ± 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>24.3 inches ± 11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Areas with a low near-shore gradient, which include many of Puget Sound’s most popular areas for public access and recreation, will be particularly affected.\(^10\) Without proper planning to accommodate sea-level rise, this change will limit public access to beaches and shorelines and reduce recreational opportunities in the region. Additionally, losing wetlands along the shoreline to sea-level rise has the potential to destabilize the shoreline through loss of water storage and absorption areas.\(^11\) This will create new challenges for public land managers and private landowners alike.

In order to help understand these anticipated changes, and to adapt our shoreline conservation strategy accordingly, this report includes a map series showing sea-level rise at a county level and projections with respect to the impact of this change on shoreline access points. Because of the relatively coarse nature of this data, we cannot use these maps to confidently predict sea-level rise impacts on specific parcels of land. Nevertheless, the series illustrates the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s most relevant sea-level rise modeling to date and broadly identifies shoreline areas that are vulnerable.\(^12\) These maps are an essential addition to our traditional planning for shoreline access.

It is also important to begin anticipating other climate-change-driven shifts that will impact the features of Puget Sound that people cherish most. Some of the most important activities along the Puget Sound shoreline are based on its aquatic life—activities including fishing, shellfish harvesting, and wildlife viewing. Sea-level rise will combine with other climate stressors to impact fish, shellfish, and wildlife by moving or destroying marshes and other habitats, shifting

---

\(^8\) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. CO-OPS Tides and Currents, Mean Sea Level Trend for Seattle, WA (http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?stnid=9447130)


\(^10\) National Climate Assessment. A Workshop in Risk-based Framing of Climate Impacts in the Northwest – Technical Input to the National Climate Assessment (March 2012)


\(^12\) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. To access a web viewer of this NOAA climate data, visit http://www.csc.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/tools/slrviewer
underwater currents, and altering the timing of seasonal events such as upwelling (when deep, cold water rises to the surface due to shifts in currents).\textsuperscript{13}

As a specific example of potential change, a National Wildlife Federation study\textsuperscript{14} showed the potential effects of sea-level rise on coastal habitats in the Pacific Northwest using the Sea Level Affecting Marshes Model (SLAMM), “which simulates the dominant processes involved in wetland conversions and shoreline modifications during long-term sea-level rise.” The projected habitat changes revealed in the study vary considerably by site across the Puget Sound. While most developed areas appear to have enough elevation to escape effects, the study predicts that Puget Sound will lose considerable estuarine beaches across all regions—most notably in the South Sound around Olympia and also in the Everett and Snohomish estuary region.\textsuperscript{15}

It is important to address these threats to the natural edge of Puget Sound with strategic shoreline conservation and adaptive management that allows beaches, marshes, and other systems to migrate landward, in order to enable people to continue enjoying public access as well as fish- and wildlife-related activities on Puget Sound. Further, this attention to Puget Sound’s natural resources will help head off conflicts that could potentially force public land managers to choose between allowing public recreation access and meeting legal requirements to conserve species protected on both state and federal levels.

**Waterfront Real Estate Demand**

Waterfront property remains in demand. Coastal living with access to views and the shoreline still attracts buyers for primary residences and second or vacation homes; the price of land per acre has not fallen during the economic downturn. The Trust for Public Land continues to see high prices on coastal properties. However, the actual conversion of and demand for coastal properties is variable given the current economic climate and slow recovery of housing and employment markets, making it possible to conserve important stretches of shoreline.

The National Association of Realtors (NAR) report based on their 2013 *Investment and Vacation Home Buyers Survey* demonstrates that sales for vacation homes remain on an upward trajectory nationally. In 2012, vacation-home sales rose 10.1 percent from 2011 (553,000 homes in 2012, versus 502,000 in 2011) and sold for a higher median price ($150,000 in 2012, compared to $121,300 in 2011). Twenty-five percent of all vacation homes were sold in the West. Many homes,

\textsuperscript{13} National Climate Assessment. Chapter 25. The Coastal Zone. 2013.


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
(34 percent), were purchased within 100 miles of the owner’s primary residence. NAR cites that the recovering economy and favorable economic conditions are fueling the second-home market.16

Across Washington state, the housing market continues to bounce back. The 12 counties in the Puget Sound basin are seeing renewed growth, as the table below demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Resales % change from a year ago</th>
<th>Building permits % change from a year ago</th>
<th>Median sale price Q1 2013 ($)</th>
<th>Median sale price % change from a year ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>184,000.00</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>249,200.00</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>253,300.00</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>384,300.00</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>233,300.00</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td>123,600.00</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>199,400.00</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>412,500.00</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>207,200.00</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>280,000.00</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>243,600.00</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>76.40</td>
<td>245,600.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puget Sound</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>$249,241.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>$237,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Trust for Public Land has maintained a strong record of conserving shorelines throughout the recession. As the economy recovers, we expect to see more opportunities to protect shoreline properties as landowners look to the new corps of prospective buyers.

**Demand for Shoreline Recreation**

As the population of the Puget Sound region grows, so does the demand for recreation opportunities. Playing on beaches, swimming in the Sound, picnicking, and wildlife watching are a few of the activities that will see increased demand as the region becomes more crowded. Public access to shoreline is a key factor in meeting the need for recreation.

Our region has an active core of recreationists who express interest in shoreline access and recreation, including water access for swimming, wading, wildlife watching, photography, and walking at the water’s edge. In 2006, the Recreation and Conservation Office worked with Clearwater Research Inc. to perform a population-based research study on outdoor recreation. The 2007 report shows the value people place on water activities, nature activities, and walking or hiking. In comparison to results from 2002, walking and hiking held the top spot for participation, while nature activities remained third and water activities jumped from eighth to sixth place. When respondents were asked what activities they would like to do more of, 28.4 percent answered that they would like to go swimming or wading at a beach.

A 2006 update to the Washington Department of Ecology’s Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program determined that the amount and quality of public access to the shoreline in Puget Sound must grow to meet the needs of local communities. To meet the continued demand for shoreline recreation, efforts to protect the health of Puget Sound and provide access to the shoreline must continue. The ability for residents across the state to enjoy the iconic Puget Sound shoreline is a key part of the state’s proud, vibrant environmental and economic communities.

**Shoreline Access**

Many Puget Sound residents value the opportunity to walk along the shore, explore tide pools, watch wildlife, and interact with the Sound’s water and marine environment. Approximately 70 percent of the shoreline of Puget Sound is privately owned due to our state’s unique history and ownership patterns, making much of the environment that residents wish to enjoy off-limits to the public. In 2005, the Strategy for Puget Sound Shorelines reported Department of Ecology estimates stating approximately 19 percent (or 425 miles) of the 2,300 miles of Puget Sound shoreline is publicly accessible. Only half of those shores are accessible from upland areas, resulting in real public access to about 10 percent of the marine waters of Puget Sound.17

Funding, maintenance, and competition for shoreline acquisition were cited as obstacles to improving or creating new public access points.18 In the most recent update in 2010, the program reports that budgets and funding for public access is at greater risk than before due to “economic crisis” facing the state.19 The report also includes data on shoreline use from Washington State Parks that confirms marine shorelines as a popular destination and that “of the over 44 million visitors to state parks in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, nearly 54 percent visited parks with marine shorelines.”20

The Washington Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58), passed in 1972, continues to be the primary regulatory mechanism for managing “shorelines of the state” (including Puget Sound) and requiring public access to such shorelines.21 This Act requires certain local governments to prepare

---

20 Ibid.
21 Washington Administrative Code 173-25-221(a) defines public access as “the ability of the public to reach, touch, and enjoy the water’s edge, to travel to the waters of the state, and to view the water and shoreline from adjacent locations.”
and periodically update Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs). The Washington Administrative Code 173-25-221 states that SMPs shall:

1) Promote and enhance the public interest with regard to rights to access waters held in public trust by the state while protecting private property rights and public safety;
2) Protect the rights of navigation and space necessary for water-dependent uses; and
3) Protect the public’s opportunity to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of the shoreline of the state, including views of the water.

All SMPs are required to be updated by 2014. Public access remains a key component to managing publicly owned shorelines.

The Washington Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) also establishes goals related to public access to guide the development of local comprehensive land-use plans:

1) Goal 9: Open space and recreation. Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resources lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities.
2) Goal 10: Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state’s high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.

Despite mechanisms in place to provide sufficient public access and many efforts made by local governments to provide access, private ownership keeps much of the shoreline off-limits to the public.

**Ecosystem Health**

In our 2005 strategy, we reported on the health of the Puget Sound ecosystem based on the *2004 State of the Sound* by the Puget Sound Action Team. At that time, the outlook was not good for the Sound: an increasing number of species were becoming threatened or endangered, toxic contamination was on the rise, and sheer numbers of individual species were declining drastically. Those are just a few broad points about the Sound made in the detailed report.\(^{22}\) The Puget Sound Partnership set ambitious goals in 2009 to recover the Sound by 2020 and reverse the trends causing detrimental changes to the ecosystem and species.

In 2012, the Puget Sound Partnership reported on the state of the Sound. Two indicators showed a positive trend in Sound health: 1,400 acres of shellfish beds were re-opened in Hood Canal, and 2,300 acres of restoration projects were completed in major river deltas.\(^{23}\) However, many other indicators did not show progress toward a healthier Sound, including Chinook salmon, orca, and Pacific herring recovery, as well as eelgrass restoration. For more information and a complete analysis of Puget Sound health, visit the Puget Sound Partnership webpage and *2012 State of the Sound* report at [http://www.psp.wa.gov/sos.php](http://www.psp.wa.gov/sos.php).

---


GIS Analysis

In 2005, The Trust for Public Land and CommEn Space created an analytical data set from the best available information supplied for our analysis by state agencies, cities, and counties. At the time, a systematic and comprehensive catalog of shoreline access points or public access was not available. For this revised and updated report, The Trust for Public Land used new public shoreline data sets available from the Washington Department of Ecology, including a public shoreline shapefile and a public access point shapefile.\(^{24}\) The shapefiles detail the location, length, and degree of public access to Washington state’s marine shoreline.

Using this information, our GIS experts conducted a regional spatial analysis to determine the amount of publicly accessible shoreline and the percentage of the region’s population with access to the shoreline within a half-mile radius of actual access points. (For the entire analysis, publicly accessible shoreline includes only publicly owned shoreline. Private shoreline with public access is not considered in this analysis.)

To perform the public shoreline analysis, we first removed the private and military-owned shoreline from the public shoreline shapefile and, subsequently, shoreline that does not include access. Next, the full shoreline data set was “clipped” by county boundary and tagged with the county name. This data set was summarized at the county level to show total shoreline mileage, public shoreline mileage, and the number of access points per county.

\(^{24}\) Washington Department of Ecology. GIS Data Shore_Pub_line shapefile and the Public_Access_WA point shapefile.
To assess people served by public access opportunities, we incorporated the public access point shapefile. This shows the access points to the shore. First, we “cleaned” the data set to show only those access points for Puget Sound. Next, we created a half-mile buffer around each of the access points. This buffer represents our definition of “walking” access. The buffer areas were examined to make sure they did not include any inlets or rivers that would be major barriers to walking to the access points. We then used a demographic model to extrapolate population totals for each buffer area. These totals are summarized at the county level and for the entire study area.
## Demographic Analysis of Population within a Half Mile of Shoreline Access Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Clallam County</th>
<th>Island County</th>
<th>Jefferson County</th>
<th>King County</th>
<th>Kitsap County</th>
<th>Mason County</th>
<th>Pierce County</th>
<th>San Juan County</th>
<th>Skagit County</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Thurston County</th>
<th>Whatcom County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>232,171</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>14,808</td>
<td>5,277</td>
<td>86,434</td>
<td>35,856</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td>34,147</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>5,821</td>
<td>13,415</td>
<td>11,148</td>
<td>11,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 19 and Younger</td>
<td>44,973</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>3,422</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>13,727</td>
<td>8,661</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>2,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-64 Years Old</td>
<td>147,226</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>58,755</td>
<td>21,114</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>20,982</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>8,241</td>
<td>7,729</td>
<td>7,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 64 Years Old</td>
<td>39,972</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>13,953</td>
<td>6,074</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>6,099</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Clallam County</th>
<th>Island County</th>
<th>Jefferson County</th>
<th>King County</th>
<th>Kitsap County</th>
<th>Mason County</th>
<th>Pierce County</th>
<th>San Juan County</th>
<th>Skagit County</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Thurston County</th>
<th>Whatcom County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>190,568</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>13,059</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>67,006</td>
<td>30,031</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>27,853</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>10,886</td>
<td>9,709</td>
<td>9,908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8,963</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3,319</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12,781</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6,756</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or More Races</td>
<td>9,922</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3,852</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin*</td>
<td>14,593</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6,712</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Clallam County</th>
<th>Island County</th>
<th>Jefferson County</th>
<th>King County</th>
<th>Kitsap County</th>
<th>Mason County</th>
<th>Pierce County</th>
<th>San Juan County</th>
<th>Skagit County</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Thurston County</th>
<th>Whatcom County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>106,942</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>43,961</td>
<td>14,751</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>15,421</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>5,296</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>4,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with income equal to or under $40,000</td>
<td>34,744</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>12,734</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>1,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with income between $40,000 and $60,000</td>
<td>31,440</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>10,772</td>
<td>5,070</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>4,427</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with income over $60,000</td>
<td>40,759</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>20,455</td>
<td>4,859</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census captures Hispanic origin separately from race.

**Shoreline Counties Median Household Income is $56,534.

Data Providers: ESRI 2010 Block Group Forecasts
Using New, Different Data

The improvements in the data used in 2013 compared to 2005 prevent the reports from being used for direct comparison. For example, the Ecology data now shows more shoreline miles because it includes shoreline feet or miles of tidally influenced streams and rivers. When CommEn Space compiled the data set in 2005, the GIS analysts looked at shoreline miles adjacent to Puget Sound waters only. The difference in definition of shoreline miles means that the contribution of conservation efforts may be obscured by (or attributed to) the additional shoreline miles included in the new report.

In addition, certain locations in the Sound that were not designated public shoreline in 2005 now display as publicly accessible in the Ecology data. These need further examination and inquiry to resolve discrepancies and gain an accurate picture of how and through what processes public designations can change.

Washington Marine Shoreline Public Access Project

The Department of Ecology’s Washington Marine Shoreline Public Access Project catalogs geographic information in a database that identifies the location and length of all publicly accessible marine shorelines in the state of Washington. The shapefiles, metadata, and other details are publicly available from Ecology’s GIS Data web page.

What is Public?

Defining public land is trickier than it might seem. Sometimes land owned by public agencies is not open for people to use, and conversely some private land is commonly used or thought of as public because a private owner allows certain activities.

For this study, “public” generally means owned by a public entity and open to the public. The data from the Department of Ecology codes land under a variety of public and private categories. In addition, we excluded land that is technically public but marked as non-accessible, or areas that had no known public access points. Also, no tribal or military land is included even if the public can obtain permission to access the land.

Our analysis includes:

- Federal, state, county, city, or other government-owned parks accessible to anyone
- Federal, state, county, city, or other government-owned land accessible to anyone
- Government-owned tidelands accessible from land
- Boat launches, docks, and piers
- Public land accessible by watercraft only

---

The abstract of the data details the need and purpose of collecting and managing this information:

*The Shoreline Public Access Project is a geographic information systems (GIS) project to identify the location, length, and degree of public access to Washington State’s marine shoreline. Before the project, it was unknown how much of Washington’s 3,068 miles of shoreline was public. The information was scattered throughout various government agencies, and the data quality was variable. Through the Shoreline Public Access Project, the best available information has been summarized into a single data set, used to answer questions about our shoreline’s ownership and public accessibility.*

*The purpose of the Shoreline Public Access Project is: 1) to combine various sources of shoreline data into an organized and comprehensive database, and 2) to create a more accurate data set of publicly accessible shoreline. The ultimate purpose of this data is to give shoreline managers and planners another tool to assist them in making important shoreline decisions.*

Beach ownership data was obtained from primary sources (local, state, and federal agencies) and compiled into a single data set.

The data is limited by the changing ownership of beaches and the availability of reliable accessibility information. Despite a beach or shoreline being classified as public, portions or all of certain properties may be off-limits to protect sensitive habitat or public safety. (Please obey all postings and signs and use designated access points when entering public property.) Due to the evolving nature of this data set, Ecology encourages public participation and asks that updates and corrections to the data be submitted to shorelinepublicaccess@ecy.wa.gov.

**CONTINUED PROTECTION**

Puget Sound has many functions in our landscape—so many that we often forget how much these waters are relied upon by people with interests beyond our own. Land conservation and shoreline protection is one approach to protect such an essential part of our Northwest way of life. The Trust for Public Land will continue our work on Puget Sound, from shoreline protection to upland and coastal forest protection to creating meaningful partnerships with other groups dedicated to saving the Sound.

The Trust for Public Land’s work alone cannot save or restore Puget Sound. Together, through a network of organizations, local government actions, and concerned individuals, we can generate a significant contribution to make Puget Sound healthy again. Investments are being made to clean up the Sound from industrial pollution and protect it from more degradation. What everyone can—and should—do to spur continued investment and interest in this vital work is find a special place on the shoreline and use it as a touchstone for how places like this connect people to our region’s greatest resource.

---
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Map 2: **CLALLAM & JEFFERSON COUNTIES**

**PUBLIC SHORELINE**

**Clallam county**
- Miles of shoreline: 99.5
- Public shoreline: 41% of total shoreline
- Total shoreline: 168.3

**Jefferson county**
- Miles of shoreline: 50.2
- Public shoreline: 25% of total shoreline
- Total shoreline: 201.5
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Map 3: **MASON & THURSTON COUNTIES**

**PUBLIC SHORELINE**

- Public shoreline
- Shoreline with no access
- Completed project
- Urban area

**Mason county**
- Miles of shoreline: 28.9
- Total shoreline: 231.6

**Thurston county**
- Miles of shoreline: 25.8
- Total shoreline: 116.1
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Map 4: **KITSAP COUNTY**

**PUBLIC SHORELINE**

Kitsap county
- Miles of shoreline: 36.3
- Public shoreline: 36.3
- Total shoreline: 254.2

- Public shoreline
- Shoreline with no access
- Completed project
- Urban area
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Map 7: **ISLAND & SKAGIT COUNTIES**

**PUBLIC SHORELINE**

**Skagit county**
- Miles of shoreline: 229
- Public shoreline: 89.4

**Island county**
- Miles of shoreline: 214.2
- Public shoreline: 64.8
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Map 8: SAN JUAN & WHATCOM COUNTIES
PUBLIC SHORELINE

Whatcom county
Miles of shoreline: 36.4
Public shoreline: 25%
Total shoreline: 146.2

San Juan county
Miles of shoreline: 407.9
Public shoreline: 200.9
Total shoreline: 51%
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Map 10: CLALLAM & JEFFERSON COUNTIES
PUBLIC SHORELINE & SEA-LEVEL RISE

Clallam county
Miles of shoreline
Public shoreline: 99.5
Total shoreline: 168.3

Jefferson county
Miles of shoreline
Public shoreline: 50.2
Total shoreline: 201.5
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Map 13: KING & PIERCE COUNTRIES
PUBLIC SHORELINE & SEA-LEVEL RISE

King county
- Miles of shoreline: 29.2
- Public shoreline: 76%
- Total shoreline: 123

Pierce county
- Miles of shoreline: 240.7
- Public shoreline: 21%

THE TRUST for Public Land
CONSERVING LAND FOR PEOPLE

October 9, 2013
Map 14: Snohomish County

Public Shoreline & Sea-Level Rise

Snohomish County

- Miles of shoreline:
  - Public shoreline: 33.7
  - Total shoreline: 132.7

Legend:
- Public shoreline
- Shoreline with no access
- 3 ft sea-level rise
- Completed project
- Urban area
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Map 16: **SAN JUAN & WHATCOM COUNTIES**

**PUBLIC SHORELINE & SEA-LEVEL RISE**

### Whatcom County
- Miles of shoreline: 146.2
- Public shoreline: 36.4
- Total shoreline: 146.2

### San Juan County
- Miles of shoreline: 407.9
- Public shoreline: 200.9
- Total shoreline: 407.9
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APPENDIX A: CONSERVATION FINANCE IN THE 12 PUGET SOUND COUNTIES

Introduction

The Trust for Public Land is a national nonprofit organization dedicated to conserving land for people to enjoy as parks, gardens, and other natural areas places, ensuring livable communities for generations to come. Since 1972, The Trust for Public Land has conserved more than 3.2 million acres of land nationwide. In Washington, our organization has helped protect more than 88,000 acres.

To help state agencies and local governments acquire land, The Trust for Public Land assists communities in identifying and securing public financing. Our Conservation Finance program offers technical assistance to elected officials, public agencies, and community groups to design, pass, and implement public funding measures that reflect popular priorities.

Overall, voter support for local conservation finance measures in Washington has been mixed. Roughly 51 percent (20 of 39) of measures on the ballot between 1998 and 2012 have been approved, though the record has improved in recent years with 77 percent (10 of 13) of measures passing since 2006. Success at the ballot is hampered somewhat in Washington state by the high approval threshold (60 percent of the vote) required for local bond measures. The Trust for Public Land and The Conservation Campaign supported 14 local conservation finance measures in Washington during this time frame, 12 of which were approved (79 percent).

Given the substantial investment of time and resources required for a successful conservation finance initiative, preliminary research is essential to determine the feasibility of such an effort. There are a number of potential funding options that can be “knit together” to protect land and increase access to public land in a community. While state, federal, local, and private sources all have a role to play in achieving parks and conservation objectives, the most reliable form of funding over the long-term is local funding. State, federal, and private funding often serve as supplements or incentives to local funding due to the competitive funding environment. The objective of this study is to provide an overview of the capacity of the Puget Sound counties to generate additional revenue for conservation using several potential broad-based public finance mechanisms.

Next steps might include more in-depth research for specific counties to match funding options to the conservation needs identified in the county, and testing voter attitudes toward a specific set of funding proposals.

---

28 The Conservation Campaign (TCC) is a nonprofit 501(c)(4) organization affiliated with The Trust for Public Land. TCC mobilizes public support for ballot measures and legislation that create public funds to protect land and water resources.
**County Growth & Tax Base**

Many of the counties in Washington’s Puget Sound area appear to have a combination of factors that could provide the motivation to pursue land conservation funding—e.g., population growth and a sizable tax base.

The table below displays the county population change from 2000 to 2010, maximum bond capacity at $30 per household (a common threshold for voter support for conservation spending), and the current Conservation Futures levy rate. This analysis does not consider the debt capacity of these counties or the capacity to increase taxes to pay debt service.

Mason County stands out with the highest population growth—a 23 percent increase from 2000 to 2010. In addition, Mason County is one of only two counties in the region that has not yet imposed the conservation futures levy (Clallam County also has not imposed this tax). The conservation futures levy is a property tax specifically authorized for land conservation. This levy is described in more detail on the following page. Thurston and Whatcom counties also experienced population growth greater than 20 percent in the past decade. With a relatively large tax base, these counties could issue a considerable amount of debt in the form of municipal bonds to acquire land and conservation easements.

**County Revenue Options for Conservation**

Generally, there are three primary types of revenue sources available to local governments to pay for parks and land conservation: discretionary annual spending, creation of dedicated funding streams, and debt financing. Communities will use financing options based on a variety of factors such as taxing capacity, budgetary resources, voter preferences, and political will.

Nationwide, local jurisdictions have used a range of public financing options to fund parks and open space, including general obligation bonds, local sales taxes, and property taxes. Less frequently used mechanisms have included special assessment districts, real estate transfer taxes, impact fees, and income taxes. The ability of local governments to establish dedicated funding sources depends upon state-enabled authority. In Washington, local government funding options for land conservation have primarily taken the form of budget appropriations, property taxes,
general obligation bonds backed by property taxes, sales taxes, and, less frequently, impact fees and real estate transfer taxes. Many communities also have had success in leveraging local sources with funds from Washington’s state conservation programs and some federal programs.

Property Taxes

The property tax is one of the largest tax revenue sources for many local jurisdictions. Proceeds from this tax may be expended for parks and open space. The property tax accounts for about 30 percent of total state and local taxes. The state property tax primarily supports “common” or K-12 public schools.

Property tax rates consist of the annual levy rates applied to the assessed value of taxable property by the various taxing districts, including the state and various local jurisdictions that have levy authority under state law. Currently, there are 1,842 taxing districts throughout the state. A taxing district’s levy rate must apply uniformly throughout the district boundaries.

Regular property taxes are also subject to three other legal limitations, as follows:

1. **Constitutional Limitation:** Pursuant to Article 7, Section 2 of the Washington Constitution and Section 84.52.050 of the state statutes, the total regular property tax levy may not exceed $10 per $1,000 of the assessed value of property. Should this limitation be exceeded, levies requested by junior taxing districts are proportionally reduced or eliminated according to a prioritized list contained in Section 84.52.010. Taxing entities in Washington rarely approach this constitutional limit.

2. **Aggregate Levy Limit:** Within the $10 per $1,000 limitation, the aggregate levies of junior taxing districts and senior taxing districts may not exceed $5.90 per $1,000 of assessed value (this limitation excludes the Conservation Futures levy). Should this limitation be exceeded, levies requested by junior taxing districts are proportionally reduced or eliminated according to a prioritized list contained in Section 84.52.010.

3. **Revenue Limit (101 percent limit):** Each year regular property taxes are limited to the lesser of 101 percent of the highest levy in the three previous years, plus an additional amount to allow for new construction within the taxing district, or inflation. The limit may not be exceeded without majority voter approval through a levy “lid lift.”

**Levy Lid Lift:** To increase county regular property taxes beyond the restrictions of the constitutional limit and the 101 percent revenue limit, counties may utilize a levy lid lift, which requires majority approval of the electorate. This requires that the county’s current expense property tax levy fall below the statutory maximum, which is $1.80 per $1,000 of assessed

---

30 §84.52.043.
32 §84.52.043.
33 §§84.55.005 to .125.
34 §84.55.050. The ballot for the levy lid lift must specify the dollar rate proposed, any applicable conditions, and use of the funds.
valuation. Any lift may not exceed the maximum $1.80 amount.\footnote{The County Assessor would need to determine if there is capacity to increase taxes within the aggregate $5.90 limit.} A levy lid lift must be approved by a majority of voters in an August primary or November general election.

**Conservation Futures Tax**

Counties are also authorized to levy a Conservation Futures Tax (CFT) in an amount not to exceed $0.0625 per $1,000 of assessed value (or $6.25 per $100,000 value), which does not affect the amount available to other taxing districts.\footnote{§§84.34.220 to .250.} Proceeds of the CFT are utilized to acquire the development rights (or “conservation futures”) and other real property rights and interests of any open-space land, farm and agricultural land, and timber land located within the county. A public vote is not required to impose the CFT, and it is levied outside the aggregate levy limit. The tax is subject to the constitutional 1 percent limit and capped by I-747 after the first year.\footnote{Personal conversation with Harold Smith, Washington Dept. of Revenue, 360/570-5864, Sept. 18, 2007.}

Many counties create a Conservation Futures Fund and administer a nominating program for the expenditure of the CFT revenue. Up to 15 percent of revenue generated by the Conservation Futures Tax may be utilized for maintenance and operations of any property acquired with the funds, but such revenue may not supplant existing maintenance and operation funding.

**Bonds**

To raise funds for capital improvements, such as land acquisition or building construction, counties, cities, and towns in Washington may issue bonds.\footnote{E.g., §36.89.040.} There are two main types of bonds: general obligation (“GO”) bonds, which are guaranteed by the local taxing authority, and revenue bonds that are paid by project-generated revenue or a dedicated revenue stream such as a particular tax or fee. Generally, bond proceeds are limited to capital projects and may not be used for operations and maintenance purposes.\footnote{Federal IRS rules governing the issuance of tax-exempt bonds limit the use of proceeds to capital purposes such that only a small fraction of bond funds may be used for maintenance or operations of facilities.}

**General Obligation Bonds**

Washington has two types of general obligation bonds—limited tax general obligation bonds (LTGO bonds) and unlimited tax general obligation bonds—with the difference being that limited tax general obligation bonds may be issued by the local government’s governing body, while unlimited tax general obligation bonds must be approved by 60 percent of the electorate.

State law limits general obligation (GO) bonded debt for general purposes to 2.5 percent of assessed value of taxable property.\footnote{RCW 39.36.020} This limit applies to voted (unlimited) and non-voted debt (limited). Of this limit, the County Commissioners may, by resolution, authorize the issuance of limited tax general obligation bonds in an amount up to 1.5 percent of assessed value of taxable property without the vote of the people. Limited tax general obligation bonds, also called councilmanic bonds, are payable from general government revenues, which reduces funds...
available for other current operating expenditures and limits the financial flexibility of the county. Hence, limited tax obligation bonds are usually used only for the most pressing capital needs.

The Board of County Commissioners may place a ballot proposition authorizing indebtedness before the voters at any special election or general election. The ballot proposition must include the maximum amount of the indebtedness to be authorized, the maximum term any bonds may have, and a description of the purpose(s) of the bond issue. Notice of the proposed election shall also be published, as required by state statute. All voted bonds require a 60 percent majority approval of the electorate. To validate the election, the total votes cast must equal at least 40 percent of the total votes cast in the last general election.

Real Estate Excise Tax

Washington state, its counties, and its cities may impose a real estate excise tax (“REET”) when real property is conveyed within their jurisdictions. The state imposes a REET of 1.28 percent that funds K-12 education and public works assistance. Counties may impose three types of REETs, to fund capital projects, conservation areas, and affordable housing.

Basic REET

Counties and cities may impose a basic REET rate of 0.25 percent of the selling price, as well as an additional 0.25 percent tax upon adoption of an ordinance after approval by a majority of voters. Counties may only impose these two increments of the REET in their unincorporated areas.

The funds generated by the first 0.25 percent REET may be used only for construction of capital projects as identified in the capital facilities plan element of the comprehensive plan, and includes acquisition of parks, recreational facilities, and trails. Most cities and counties in Washington levy this first REET increment. The revenue from the additional 0.25 percent REET may be expended for a list of more narrowly defined capital projects that do not include the acquisition of parks, recreation facilities, and trails (but does include “planning, construction, reconstruction, repair, rehabilitation, or improvement of parks”). To date, 132 cities and 19 counties implement this additional REET.

---

41 §39.36.050.
42 A special election may be held in conjunction with a general election or primary election. §29A.04.175.
43 §39.36.050
45 §82.45.060.
46 §82.46.010.
47 §82.46.035(2).
48 §82.46.010(6). The revenue may also be utilized for housing relocation assistance.
49 §82.46.035(5).
Conservation Area REET

Counties may also impose an additional REET upon purchasers of real property in unincorporated areas of the county at a rate not to exceed 1 percent of the selling price, for the acquisition and maintenance of conservation areas upon approval of a majority of voters.\textsuperscript{51}

The money generated by the additional 1 percent REET is used exclusively for the acquisition and maintenance of conservation areas, defined as “land and water that has environmental, agricultural, aesthetic, cultural, scientific, historic, scenic, or low-intensity recreational value for existing and future generations, and includes, but is not limited to, open spaces, wetlands, marshes, aquifer recharge areas, shoreline areas, natural areas, and other lands and waters that are important to preserve flora and fauna.”\textsuperscript{52} Only San Juan County has exercised its authority to levy this conservation area REET.

There are several other smaller local revenue sources that could be utilized to support a county parks and conservation program, such as impact fees, donations, bequests, and philanthropic support, but they have not been examined in this report.

\textsuperscript{51} §82.46.070.
\textsuperscript{52} §36.32.570.
## Table: Local Washington Conservation Finance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Funds Approved</th>
<th>Conservation Funds Approved</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>Feb-95</td>
<td>Proposition No. 1, Bond issue for acquisition and development of specified lakefront property</td>
<td>$2,575,000</td>
<td>$1,287,500</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>Nov-01</td>
<td>Proposition 1; Bond for acquisition and preservation of forested areas, open space, wildlife habitat, farms, and trails park creation</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td>0.75 per $1,000 of assessed value levy lift for the purchase of open space and park improvements</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Nov-10</td>
<td>20-year, 12 cents per $1,000 of assessed value property tax levy for parks and open space</td>
<td>$40,500,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Nov-90</td>
<td>Property tax for $7,000,000 for open space</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Nov-97</td>
<td>Property tax for $20,000,000 for open space</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>10-year, 57 cents per $1000 property tax increase to fund the acquisition of greenways, open space, parks, and trails</td>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gig Harbor</td>
<td>Nov-04</td>
<td>Bond to acquire waterfront open space and land for restoration of boatyard for historical, cultural, and recreational purposes</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Clark Parks District</td>
<td>Feb-05</td>
<td>27 cents per $1,000 property tax to create a metropolitan parks district</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Nov-88</td>
<td>Bond to purchase parkland</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
<td>Bond for the purchase of natural areas, parks, and trails, and for park improvements</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>Bond for green space, open space, parks and trail acquisition and improvement</td>
<td>$117,640,000</td>
<td>$117,640,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Aug-07</td>
<td>6-year, 5 cents per $1,000 of assessed valuation for open space and trail acquisitions and for the Woodland Park Zoo</td>
<td>$105,000,000</td>
<td>$84,000,000</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Nov-12</td>
<td>Levy for City Parks Maintenance; Restoration and enhancement.</td>
<td>$46,900,000</td>
<td>$7,691,000</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Nov-02</td>
<td>Levy for Park Safety, Improvements and Maintenance; Bonds for open space, natural areas, wildlife habitat, playgrounds, playfields and parks</td>
<td>$8,400,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Parks Tacoma</td>
<td>Nov-05</td>
<td>Park improvement bond with some funding for land acquisition</td>
<td>$84,300,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Park &amp; Rec District</td>
<td>Nov-10</td>
<td>Property tax levy for a four-year period of $0.10 per $1,000 of assessed valuation to protect water quality, wildlife habitat, and support parks and trails in Blaine and Birch Bay.</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>3% utility tax increase for parks, open space, and sidewalks</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>Nov-97</td>
<td>Proposition No. 1, Bond for Purchase and Development of Bradley Lake Property</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>Nov-11</td>
<td>Land Bank Proposition, 12-year extension, 1 percent real estate excise tax for conservation</td>
<td>$16,320,000</td>
<td>$16,320,000</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>Nov-99</td>
<td>Land Bank Proposition, 12-year, 1 percent real estate excise tax for conservation</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Nov-00</td>
<td>Property tax increase for park maintenance and acquisition</td>
<td>$59,024,000</td>
<td>$31,000,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Nov-10</td>
<td>6-year, 19 cents per $1,000 property tax increase for the preservation of open space, parks, trails and recreational activities</td>
<td>$145,500,000</td>
<td>$50,697,000</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Bond for open space, parks and trails</td>
<td>$18,795,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Nov-97</td>
<td>5-year, 6 mill Property Tax Extension for the Existing Conservation Futures Tax for Parks, Open Space, Agricultural Lands, Water Quality, Wildlife Habitats</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Nov-02</td>
<td>5-year, 6 cents per $1000 property tax extension for open space, water quality, agricultural land</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $879,104,000 | $542,035,500

*Source: The Trust for Public Land; LandVote database.*
## APPENDIX B: ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEA</td>
<td>Aquatic Land Enhancement Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELCP</td>
<td>Coastal Estuarine Land Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTED</td>
<td>Community, Trade, and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRP</td>
<td>Estuarine and Salmon Recovery Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWCF</td>
<td>Land and Water Conservation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR</td>
<td>National Association of Realtors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCWCG</td>
<td>National Coastal Wetland Conservation Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSNERP</td>
<td>Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>Puget Sound Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW</td>
<td>Revised Code of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REET</td>
<td>Real Estate Excise Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAMM</td>
<td>Sea Level Affecting Marshes Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Shoreline Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRFB</td>
<td>Salmon Recovery Funding Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>The Conservation Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDFW</td>
<td>Washington Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWRP</td>
<td>Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Trust for Public Land conserves land for people to enjoy as parks, gardens, and other natural places, ensuring livable communities for generations to come.
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