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Chapter 1: Introduction

Food is one of the most basic needs of humans, and since our earliest history, we have sought better and more efficient ways to acquire and produce the food we need to survive. This is especially true in times of crisis, whether it be war, economic turmoil, or widespread urban disinvestment. While we have historical records of traditional agriculture dating back millennia, U.S. population shifts during the late 19th century created increasingly industrial and dense urban areas, that, when faced with economic crisis, struggled to cope with increasing demands on the food supply. Faced with food shortages and idle citizens, civic groups began promoting urban agriculture as an important relief strategy (Bassett, 1981).

Urban gardening has a long history both in the U.S. and Europe. The American tradition, while similar to the European institution of allotment gardening, has its own distinct history and organization. The historical roots of American urban gardening can be traced to the end of the 19th century, where gardens were first proposed as relief gardens, both to supplement income and food intake of unemployed workers and to help address the increasingly poor conditions of dense inner cities (Bassett, 1981, p. 1-2). Since that time, interest in urban gardens has waxed and waned, and although a handful of gardens nationwide have been successful in becoming semi-permanent fixtures in large cities, scholars argue that urban gardening is predominately seen as a short term response to the dominant economic and social issues of the times, including depression, wartime rationing, ecological restoration and preservation, and the desire for affordable, organic food (Bassett, 1981, Lawson, 2005). Unlike the more institutionalized European version, U.S. urban gardening is largely a loosely woven system of individual gardens, communities, and
aims. While some cities and states have adopted official programs or frameworks, the social and political reformers, civic and community groups, who often find success in the short term, but waning support when economic or social conditions improve (Bassett, 1981; Lawson, 2005).

In recent years, urban gardening has again received renewed attention as a powerful tool to help alleviate social ills. The most recent incarnation of the urban gardening movement is largely focused on community development and reinvestment, and has been propelled by issues of ecological degradation, food safety, community capacity development, rising food and energy costs.

Increased attention has also been given to urban gardening in the academic literature over the past decade. Much of the literature focuses on ethnographic studies of gardens and their participants, and details the experiences and of individual participants and the meanings they attach to those activities (Armstrong, 2000; Schmelzkopf, 1995; Baker, 2004; Twiss et al, 2003; Wakefield, Yeudall, Taron, Reynolds, and Skinner, 2007). Other researchers have focused on the outcomes of gardening and their effects on individual participants, specifically nutrition (Patel, 1991; Brown and Jameton, 2000; Blair, Giesecke, and Sherman, 2001; Irvine, 1999; Armstrong, 2000), physical activity (Park, Shoemaker, and Haubn, 2009; Twiss, et al, 2003), mental health outcomes (Wakefield, 2007; Lewis, 1996; Elings, 2006), and changes in community involvement (Tieg et al, 2009; Sempik and Aldridge, 2005). Still others have focused on urban gardening and its effects on perceptions of place and place attachment (Armstrong, 2000). While the literature on the subject of urban gardening has increased substantially in recent years, there is still work to be done. Much of the research to date is confined to narrow disciplines, and does not
address the usefulness of urban gardening overall. While specific studies allow planners and researchers to better understand specific outcomes, it may prove useful to bring these elements together, so that planners can better evaluate gardening projects and their outcomes on participants and communities in a more holistic way, as these outcomes do not exist in absence of each other.

Further, while there have been several recent attempts to bring together comprehensive documentation of the history of the urban gardening movement, there is still much work to be done, especially in regards to specific areas and communities. There are several broad histories available that describe historical urban gardening movements from a national perspective (Bassett, 1991; Lawson, 2005), as well as some detailed historical work that describes urban gardening throughout the last century in Seattle (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009). While those sources are helpful in understanding urban gardening as a historical movement, there has been little work done to capture and document this history in the Tacoma region to date.

This thesis seeks to address this gap in the academic literature. While there is certainly more bits of history left to be un-earthed about Tacoma’s urban gardening past, this thesis provides a framework by which we can better understand the current state of urban gardening in Tacoma. The purpose of this thesis is twofold: first, to define a clear understanding of the urban gardening movement today. Urban gardens come in many forms, and even the term urban garden can be constrictive in describing the topic at hand. This thesis will define the concept of urban gardening as well as describe why urban gardening is important, and the reported benefits it has on individuals and communities.
Second, this thesis gives an account of the historical roots of urban gardening in America, based on previous research and historical documentation, so we might better understand the movement’s evolution, current iterations, and possible future. Additionally, this thesis captures the history of urban gardening in the Tacoma area. Much of this local history has been lost, or left un-captured, as is true of many parts of our legacy, as the history of common people is frequently not recorded in our historical texts. This thesis seeks to capture what little documentation does still exist about Tacoma's gardening past, and use it, within the larger story of nation wide gardening, to understand both our gardening history, as well as discuss how we may use urban gardens in the future. While the early history is largely based on newspaper accounts from nearby areas, the more recent history is captured through the oral history of one well known and influential gardener who has worked in the Tacoma area since the 1990s to reinvigorate the urban gardening movement. Her story is important to both document and preserve our local history, as well as to offer insight into the capacity and possibilities that urban gardening can offer us as we move into a new era.

Finally, there is discussion about the current state of urban gardening in Tacoma, and how it is situated into the larger context of the historical urban gardening movement. It details where the movement has been successful, how it has echoed the movements of similar periods in history, and where it is going. It also discusses the limitations of urban gardening as a relief strategy, and suggests that while the current gardening movement offers promise in dealing with a myriad of pressing social and community issues, it is by no means set apart from previous attempts to imbed gardening into our infrastructure. Further, without careful study and understanding of the factors that have precipitated
earlier declines in urban gardening, it is likely this current momentum could too be just a phase in the larger story of urban gardening. Planners interested in the urban gardening movement might benefit from a deeper understanding of the historical urban gardening movements, and what has contributed to rise, and decline of gardening projects, if they wish to utilize urban gardens and green spaces as a long term part of urban planning programs.
Chapter 2: Defining urban gardening

In understanding what an urban garden is, it is important to understand the terminology as well. This thesis suggests using the term urban gardening as a broad and inclusive term that can include community gardens, school gardens, donation gardens, and other iterations, better describes the movement as a whole. Further, this section uses the garden sites currently in the Tacoma area to describe the various iterations an urban garden can take.

The term urban garden is often used to describe a multitude of different activities but is generally thought of to be an activity that falls within the understanding of the urban food system and urban agriculture (Brown and Jameson, 2000, 21); it is assigned to many of the garden sites we see in cities today, and is often used to describe garden movements we have experienced in the past. While the current popular iteration is the community garden, this term is largely descriptive and based on the current aims of many urban garden projects, and does not adequately capture the activity discussed in this thesis. The previous gardening movements have largely been defined and thus, named based on their motivations and historical context. For example, early incarnations of urban gardens were described as potato patches, vacant lot gardens, and school gardens, based on their application. Gardens during the first and second World Wars took on patriotic names, liberty and victory gardens. The current moniker, community garden, reflects the aims and focus of these gardens, mainly on community building and restoration (Bassett, 1981, p 1). Each historical movement has had slightly different aims, and the names generally followed suite. For the purposes of this analysis, a more inclusive and appropriate term for these efforts is the urban garden. Here the urban garden definition includes varying types of community gardens, urban farms, victory and liberty gardens, school gardens, and vacant lot gardens. Hou, Johnson,
and Lawson (2009) define a community garden as, "a defined area of tillable land made available to groups of individuals, households, classes, and others to garden." This definition is quite broad and includes all manner of gardens including allotment gardens, pea-patch programs, rented gardens, and victory gardens (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 11) that would fit under the urban garden umbrella. The American Community Garden Association describes community gardening as simply "any piece of land gardened by a group of people." It can include vegetables, flowers, individual or group plots, and its products can be used for individual consumption, or sold at local markets (American Community Garden Association, 2011). Additionally, some gardeners also participate in animal husbandry, raising small animals like chickens, ducks, and rabbits (Schmelzkopf, 1995, p. 369; Saldivar-Tanaka and Krasney, 2004, p. 406).

Just as the names vary, so do the gardens themselves. Urban gardens vary widely in terms of size, location, and physical structure, organizational structure and rules, ownership issues, purpose and function, and amenities offered. Even among gardens that are part of larger centralized city or community organization, each garden is highly specialized, and highly dependant on the membership, size, and funding of the garden. By examining the differences in Tacoma’s gardens, one can get a sense of the immense diversity in the urban gardening movement.

Some of Tacoma’s gardens are quite small, with only a few plots, while others occupy several acres of land. The gardens at Stewart Middle School and McCarver Elementary cover just a small area and have only a few raised beds. Many of the gardens occupy empty residential lots within the city, like the Hilltop House Garden and the 48th and Yakima Garden (Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce County, n.d.a.). One of the larger gardens in the city, the Proctor Garden, is nearly half an acre in size (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2012), and Mother Earth Farm covers eight acres of
tillable land (Mother Earth Farm, n.d.).

Arrangement also varies among the Tacoma gardens. Most are set up with individual plots within one large garden (Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce County, n.d.a.; Metro Parks Tacoma, 2012), with the exception of the Curran Orchard, which, although functionally runs much like other gardens, has apple established apple trees in place of garden beds (Curran Apple Orchard Park, 2011), Hilltop House garden, which has both individual garden beds as well as commonly used fruit orchard (Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce County, n.d.a), and Mother Earth Farm, which utilizes volunteer labor to till and harvest larger plots of land (Mother Earth Farm, n.d.).

Tacoma’s gardens also vary widely in terms of land ownership and organizational structure. As is true for many cities, the gardens in Tacoma do not have any central ownership or organizational structure. Several are managed by Metro Parks Tacoma, or partnerships between Metro Parks and other private organizations, but many are privately organized either by community or neighborhood groups or non-profit organizations (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2012; Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce County, n.d.a). Over the past several years, the city of Tacoma, in partnership with Cascade Land Conservancy have been working to identify and secure land for additional gardens within the city. In addition to the six gardens owned and managed by Metro Parks Tacoma, the city has helped establish five additional gardens since 2010, and three more are in the planning stages (City of Tacoma, n.d.; Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce County, n.d.b; Metro Parks Tacoma, 2012). Both the McCarver and McKinley gardens inhabit space at local school and are on land owned by the school district, and at least two of the Tacoma gardens are part of city owned parks (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2012; Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce County, n.d.a). While Tacoma’s local government has taken proactive steps to legally acquire the land for many of its garden sites, this is not true in all communities. Several researchers have found that in cities across the country,
many gardens are established on vacant land either as squatters or with the landowner’s consent, but with no legal right to continued use or ownership of the land (Schmelzkopf, 1995).

The organizational structure of individual gardens is also varied among the Tacoma gardens. For the gardens under the Metro Parks Tacoma umbrella (Proctor, Kandle, Swan Creek, Franklin, McCarver Elementary, and Rogers), administration is handled by Metro Parks employees, and each garden has its own volunteer garden coordinator to help with communication and management of the garden on-site. They have a common set of rules gardeners must abide by and common practices for registration (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2012). Although several gardens are free of charge to participate, and nearly all welcome volunteers to help with projects in the garden, most of the gardens charge a nominal fee to use the garden or be assigned a plot; most of the gardens charge between twenty and thirty dollars annually for a garden plot and some also limit the number of plots that any single gardener can cultivate (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2012; Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce, n.d.a). While most of Tacoma's gardens are open to the public, there are also gardens that are only open to specific groups. The Golden Hemlock garden is only open to residents of the Golden Hemlock senior apartment complex, and part of the Good Medicine Garden is only open to tribal members (Grow Local Tacoma-Pierce, n.d. a).

Tacoma's gardens also differ in the services and amenities they have on site. The Gallucci Learning garden, Junnett Garden, and La Grande garden all have shared open spaces for gardeners to gather and host community events. Many gardens also incorporate some form of children's gardening space, either as a communal bed, or individual plots. Some gardens are specifically utilized for food production, while others have designated areas for flowers, shrubs, ornamental or fruit trees, and perennial plants such as raspberries (Grow Local Tacoma, n.d.a). Most are intended for individual use and gardeners keep what they grow, however, many include plots that
are grown specifically for food bank donation, and others, including the University of Washington Giving Garden, the Pacific Lutheran University garden, and Mother Earth Farm donate all of the produce to local food banks or the Emergency Food Network (Grow Local Tacoma, n.d.a). Some include raised plots for elderly and disabled gardeners, and many have onsite composting, shared tools and storage, and rainwater capture and storage (Grow Local Tacoma, n.d.a). Another popular feature is shared seating areas and prep kitchens for gardeners to use. While only the Gallucci Learning Garden in Tacoma features a shared prep kitchen, other projects have documented them in gardens across the country (Schmelzkopf, 1995, p. 369; Saldivar-Tanaka and Krasney, 2004, p. 406).

Funding for the Tacoma gardens varies and is largely dependent on ownership of the land and garden. The Metro Parks gardens are largely funded by Tacoma’s general fund and city bonds, as well as private donations (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2010, p. 17). One of the major concerns for gardens is funding and land ownership, and several studies suggest that because many gardens are cultivated on vacant land, the gardens are put at risk as the gardeners have no control over the land and could be expected to vacate at any time (Wakefield, 2007, p. 98; Schmelzkopf, 1995, p. 377; C. Little, interview, 2011). Tacoma’s gardens are somewhat unique in that many of them are on land specifically purchased by the city for gardens, or as in the case of several of the Hilltop neighborhood gardens, have been purchased by the Guadalupe Land Trust to prevent sale of the land and disruption of the gardens (Howser, 2000, p. B4).

Although multiple terms abound for the activity discussed in this thesis, the term urban gardening is a more comprehensive and inclusive description of the activity that will be discussed here and includes all manner of communally tended gardens and small urban farms. Further, the description of the various gardens found in the Tacoma area demonstrates that the gardens
covered in the project vary widely in terms of physical size, structure, organization and management, funding, and aims.
Chapter 3: Benefits of Urban Gardening

Over the years, urban gardening has been suggested as a remedy to many social ills. During the great depression and both World Wars, gardening was promoted both to produce food, as well as keep citizens occupied and keep their spirits up (Lawson, 2005; Bassett, 1981). Today, too, the motivations for urban garden promotion are as varied as the gardens themselves and are based on perceived benefits for both individual participants as well as the communities that they serve. While some gardeners may garden just for the sake of gardening, it is important for activists, supporters and planners to understand this activity in terms of how it can be used in our communities today, to combat social disinvestment, and build healthier communities. Urban gardening can be understood in terms of both individual benefits such as improved health, nutrition, as well as increased physical and mental health, and also in terms of social and community benefits like increased sense of place, social inclusion and building of social networks and capacity, increased sense of neighborhood pride and maintenance, and increased opportunity for place-based political participation.

Individual Benefits

Impacts on hunger and nutrition

The United States spends more on health care per capita than any other nation in the world, (World Health Organization, 2009) and yet, the rates of life style related illness among the population continues to rise. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, more than 30% of American men and women are overweight, and nearly 25 million people have been diagnosed with diabetes (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.). Further, nutrition and health scholars argue that to better cope with these
health issues, we must first better understand the relationship between food environments and health outcomes (Story et al, 2008) and re-examine our current commercial food system and focus efforts on agricultural models that foster closer relationships between people and their food (Berry, 1996). In fact, some scholars argue that improved health outcomes are just one of many potential benefits of "relocalizing the food system", and "reinforcing the place-food-body relationship" (Delind, 2006, p. 134, 137).

Further, scholars suggest that community gardening can help alleviate food security issues among urban populations. While the UN’s Millennium Development goals include the eradication of hunger and poverty worldwide by the year 2015 (United Nations, 2008), in the U.S., a country of just over 304 million people in 2008 (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.), 17.1 million people were considered food insecure, nearly 15% of the total population (Economic Research Service, 2008). The United States Department of Agriculture defines a household as food insecure when they are "uncertain of having, or unable to acquire, enough food to meet the needs of all their members because they had insufficient money or other resources for food" (United States Department of Agriculture, 2009). This group also includes those households described as having low food security, which is defined as those who are able to avoid "substantially disrupting eating patterns" by using various coping methods to obtain nutrition, and households with very low food security, where food intake is reduced and often substantially altered due to lack of resources to obtain food (Economic Research Service, 2008). The problem of hunger, like many other social issues, has the greatest impacts on those who are often already exist in a marginalized population. In fact, those with the highest rates of food insecurity were single women with children, blacks, Hispanics, and those who live below the poverty line (Economic Research Service,
Further, not all foods are nutritionally equal, and often those who are food insecure also face decreased access to nutritious, quality foods. Several studies have indicated that low income neighborhoods have fewer supermarkets and sources of fresh foods and even those sources that exist often have lower quality and less selection of fresh foods than do stores in more affluent neighborhoods (Poverty Action Network, 2009; Lopez and Hynes, 2006, Alaimo et al 2008). So, not only are many people just not getting enough food, but quality, nutritious foods are not readily available, only further putting these individuals at greater risk for adverse health outcomes. While the causes for hunger in America are complex and varied, several scholars have suggested that urban gardening could play an important role in helping alleviate hunger among urban populations by providing access to fresh, nutritious foods (Patel, 1991; Brown and Jameton, 2000). Several studies suggest that urban gardens have the capacity to produce significant amounts of fresh produce, with little upfront investment by gardeners. And while yields are dependent on plot size, weather, water, planting intensity and other variables (Brown and Jameton 2000, p. 23, 25-26; Patel, 1991), even modest plots can "measurably supplement dietary intake" (Brown and Jameton, 2000, p. 26; Blair, Giesecke, and Sherman, 2001; Patel 1991; Irvine 1999, p. 40; Baker and Huh, 2003) while also reducing household food costs (Brown and Jameton, 2006, p. 26; Patel, 1991; Wakefield 2007, p. 95-97; Armstrong 2000, p. 320).

Recent studies suggest that not only does urban gardening contribute to access to fresh foods, but also that gardeners may practice healthier eating patterns than their non-gardening counterparts. Several ethnographic studies of urban gardening projects have suggested that gardeners consume more fresh fruits and vegetables as a result of their garden participation (Wakefield, et al 2007, p. 97; Overcoming Barriers 2000, p. 7; Patel

**Impacts on Physical, and Mental Health**

Much research also supports the notion that access to green spaces and contact with natural environments can have measurable positive impacts on physical and mental health.

It is well established that regular physical activity is a key component in modern disease prevention (Miller, Balady, Fletcher, 1997, p. 220-221). And several studies have demonstrated that participation in urban gardens increases physical activity among participants (Park, Shoemaker, and Haub 2009; Blair, et al 1991; Twiss et al 2003). Additionally, studies have shown that regular gardening activities decrease the risk of stress related cardiovascular diseases like cardiac arrest (60 minutes of activity or more a week) (Lemaitre et al., 1999) and type two diabetes (Jeon, Lokken, Hu, Van Dam, 2007, p. 744, 746). Further, access to gardens and green spaces close to one's home has been shown to correspond to a lower likelihood of obesity (Nielsen and Hansen, 2007, p. 839).

Urban gardens have also been praised for their use as a "restorative activity" for both physical and mental wellbeing (Wakefield, 2007, p. 97; Maas et al., 2009, p. 967; Hartig, Evans, Jamner, Davis, and Garling, 2003, p. 119). Participation in urban gardening is useful in promoting calm and relaxation and relieving stress among participants (Wakefield, 2007, p. 97; van den Berg, Maas, Verheij, and Groenwegen, 2010, p. 1203-1204; van den berg and Custers, 2010, p. 6-9), and can lead to feelings of increased self-esteem, self-confidence (Lewis, 1996, p.89-91; Elings, 2006, p. 47), and a sense of personal accomplishment among participants (Wakefield, 2007, p. 97). Other authors have reported
a decreased likelihood for depression when participants engage in 3.5 hours per week or more of physical recreational activities such as gardening (Teychenne, Ball, and Salmon, 2008).

Social and Community Benefits

Sense of place and place meaning

Urban gardening can also be understood in terms of social and community benefits. The concepts of sense of place and place meaning are useful in understanding how community activities like urban gardening at once construct, and are constructed by individual attachments to place and community.

There is a long tradition within the environmental psychology field of developing an understanding of psychological ties to our physical environments. Tuan (1974) suggests that over time, as people inhabit neutral physical spaces, the spaces are transformed into places of deep meaning through the accumulation of experiences and sentiments (p. 33-34). Place here is a multi-dimensional concept based on both physical and tangible qualities, as well as "personal, social and cultural processes" (Pretty, Chipuer and Bramston, 2003, p. 273; Altman and Lowe, 1992, p. 3-5). More recently, urban and community planning scholars have suggested that place meaning is an important component in successful planning and participation activities and should be incorporated into the planning framework to help understand how an individual’s feelings and beliefs about place impact how they interact with these places (Manzo and Perkins, 2006, p. 335-337). While different scholars have described this relationship in various ways, place attachment (Altman and Lowe, 1992, p. 3-5), place identity, whereby the construction of one’s self identity is informed by a specific place (Pretty, Chipuer, and Bramston 2003, p.
and in the ideas of community rootedness (Vitek and Jackson 1996; Berry and Proctor, 2011, p. 122-123), all of these concepts essentially seek to describe the relational nature between person and place and how this relationship has profound effects on involvement in community action (Manzo and Perkins, 2006, p. 337).

The concept of place identity is a strong theme in much of the recent literature regarding urban gardening. Place identity research suggests that urban gardening can help contribute to social inclusion and cohesiveness, place-based political participation, increased neighborhood pride, participation, and maintenance, and improved social networks and community capacity.

Social inclusion, social networks, and community capacity

In several studies, gardeners have reported feeling motivated to participate in garden projects by the social opportunities to meet other community members, form friendships, and feel like part of a larger community (Teig et al, 2009, p. 1117; Sempik and Aldridge, 2005, p. 4; Glover, Parry, and Shinew 2005, p. 459). These social relationships allow participants to both strengthen their own social networks, and simultaneously build community cohesion through mutual trust and reciprocity (Glover, Parry, and Shinew 2005, p. 454). These social bonds serve as potential resources for members of the social group and can be used as a "collective asset that grants members social 'credits' that can be used to facilitate purposive actions" (Bourdeiu, 1986, p. 248).

The availability of this social resource is often tied to improved organizational or community capacity within the community or neighborhood. Chaskin (2001) explains that
community capacity has come include a wide range of potential resources including commitment of participants, skills, resources, problem solving abilities (Goodman et al., 1998, p. 260-262; Mayer, 1994), relationship building, planning, decision making, and action (Chaskin, 2001, p. 292; Goodman et al, 1998). While the literature contains various opinions on the different dimensions that comprise organizational and community capacity, it is generally accepted to be a complex and multidimensional concept that depends heavily on the individual characteristics of the community, and describes a group or organization's ability to mobilize its various resources to achieve a specific mission or goal (Sharpe, 2006, p. 387). Gardens come to offer more that just gardening to the participants; as they work with others in the garden, they form social bonds with other gardeners and neighbors, strengthening their ties to the community around them, which may enable them to take on other social issue. So, as garden participants foster relationships with one another, they create social bonds that collectively can be used as a resource to address a myriad of neighborhood problems (Sharpe, 2006; Chaskin, 2001, p. 295).

**Neighborhood pride, participation, and maintenance**

The strong personal bonds to both neighbors and place may also function as a catalyst for urban renewal and renewed focus on maintaining the aesthetics of a neighborhood (Prevention Institute, 2004). In Armstrong’s (2000) study of urban gardens, the author suggests that the garden place functions as a "symbolic focus" for the neighborhood and the interactions of gardening may increase feelings of pride and an desire to maintain the aesthetic appearance of the gardens and surrounding neighborhoods
(p. 325). And in Wakefield et al. (2007), the authors found that commitment to place not only motivated participation in urban gardening projects, but that same place attachment was simultaneously strengthened through participation in the community project. Further, the gardeners in their study suggested that participation in the garden project created a social network and foundation that served as the impetus to discuss and address broader community concerns (97-100).

**Place-based political participation**

Scholars in the field of place attachment have also suggested that urban gardening presents participants, many of whom are otherwise socially and politically marginalized, the opportunity to participate in decision making processes and place-based political activities and discussions. On a basic level, Baker and Huh (2003) suggest that gardening actively challenges the dominant commercial agricultural industry by increasing biodiversity and allowing participants to grow and access more culturally appropriate foods than they would otherwise have access to in the monoculture driven agriculture industry. Other authors have suggested that in many cities, the act of urban gardening has created politically contested spaces as gardens are often tended on vacant and abandoned lots which often leads to political struggles when the gardener's objectives are at odds with landowners or developers (Schmelzkopf, 1995, p. 364; Smith and Kurtz, 2003). Pudup (2008) suggests that the very act of urban gardening is an act of "collective resistance" that engages the participants in a local, place-based political system (p. 1232).

Because gardens have historically experienced growth during times of social and economic uncertainty (Pudup, 2008) and many are organized on vacant or overgrown lots
(Little, interview, 2011; Schmelzkopf, 1995), the aims of garden organizers are often rooted in the social construction of the participants and citizens (Pudup, 2008). In the 1980s and 1990s, gardens were founded in vacant lots, which, during this time of economic downturn, were of little value to developers or local governments. However, as land and housing prices increased, many garden projects came under increased pressure to move out, so that the lands they tended could be sold or used for development. Schmelzkopf (2001) suggests that this tension "carves out" a politically contested space in the larger "structures of economic and political power" (380). This tension was most obvious in New York City, where several authors documented the rising tensions between gardeners and the city. In one article, Rosenthal (2001) describes a NYU drama production based on the eviction of several urban gardens. Many of the actors were also activists working with the gardeners to try to save their gardens from being bulldozed to make room for housing and retail space. Rosenthal describes the inherent political activity of resistance taken up by the gardeners and activists. Other articles detailing this period describe the sale and destruction of the gardens as a "complex political conflict" (Smith and Kurtz, 2003) where garden participants utilized their social network to push for their own political aims in reaction to the city's decision to sell the garden properties (Smith and Kurtz, 2003).

Urban gardening has received renewed support as a strategy to combat various health and community issues. The literature too, supports the notion that urban gardens have the potential to help promote individual health through improved nutrition and physical activity. Further, studies also suggest that urban gardens can help promote strong place attachment, strengthen community networks, increase pride and encourage maintenance in local communities.
Chapter 4: Methodology

The focus of this thesis is on the historical roots of Tacoma’s urban gardening movement. However, much of this history has been lost to time, left unrecorded, and only bits and pieces remain in the written historical record. In order to capture that lost history, this thesis relies heavily on oral history practices in addition to archival news and media research, as well as research on the current and past gardening organizations and groups to fill in the gaps in the written historical record. This section defines oral history practice, describes why it is an important methodology in historical research and writing, and explains its usefulness and reliability as a historical source of knowledge. It also describes the additional archival and media research done for this thesis. Finally, it discusses the aims of this thesis project to document an important, though often overlooked part of our local history.

Defining Oral History

The term oral history is a broad term that encompasses various types of historical research. Simply put, oral history is a method of historical research that relies on spoken sources of information. Oral history differs from the concept of oral tradition, whereby cultural stories are passed down; oral histories are used to recount historical events or memories that are also verified and placed in context with traditional historical research (Hoopes, 1979, p. 5-8). An oral history can be used to provide an account of an individual’s life or story, or used more broadly to document the stories of groups of people, or to document topical histories (Ritchie, 2003, p. 48). Most oral history projects use both oral
documentation to tell a story, and use traditional document based historical research to both verify the oral account, and provide historical context for the story being captured. However, the oral history methodology is adaptable and largely reflects both the aims of the project, and the resources available (Ritchie, 2003, p. 19).

**Usefulness of Oral History**

While much can be learned from studying the preserved documents of the past, oral history provides an important human element to our past. Oral history is a useful and important methodology in social science research, and is based on the understanding that the historical record is always incomplete (Hoopes, 1979, p. 3). Oral histories provide historical knowledge based on a person's memories, which may not otherwise be saved. It allows researchers to document real people's lives and stories, and seeks to explain not just the facts of the past, but "what the facts meant to the human beings that lived them" (Hoopes, 1979, p. 4). It is a methodology that recognizes the value of personal and localized life stories and knowledge in understanding the past and seeks to construct a history not solely based on the experiences of the elites of society (Field, 2007, p. 1).

**Reliability**

There are scholars who would suggest that oral history is not useful in historical research, due to its subjective nature, notably the late history professor Arthur Marwick (Hilwig, 2001, p. 581-582). However, oral history has again gained considerable traction as a reliable and important historical research methodology. Thompson (2000) argues that it is only recently that the concept of history has come to rely so heavily on written
documents alone. In fact, he argues, oral history was truly the first kind of history; long before societies were documenting their pasts in writing, they handed them down orally, and oral accounts have long been held as important primary resources in recording important events (p. 25-27). Further, history contained in written, so called, factual documents can be just as fallible as human memory, as all documents are "intentional creations," and are frequently full of "prejudices, false inhibitions, and myopias" (Tonkin, 1995, p. 84). And although she describes academics as being charmed with quantitative data, she and other scholars argue that oral history acknowledges the inherent social and political biases of written sources toward the elite and ruling classes, and suggest that oral histories that include both oral documentation as well as written sources are an important break from the traditional conceptualization of the researcher as the expert and allow for the collection and preservation of the interviewee’s life story (Tonkin, 1995, p. 84; Field, 2007, p. 1-3).

**Documenting Tacoma’s past**

Oral history plays an important role in this thesis in helping to document Tacoma’s urban gardening history. While documentation on this topic does exist, it is fragmented and incomplete, and takes much work to bring the story to light. This thesis seeks to tell the story of urban gardening throughout Tacoma’s history through the stories of its residents and placed in a larger historical context as documented in newspapers, magazines, and records of the time. This thesis relies heavily on the oral history interview with Carrie Little, an influential garden organizer in Tacoma as well as two earlier oral histories with Tacoma residents captured by other University of Washington students.
In addition to oral history methods, this thesis relies heavily on archival analysis to tell the story of urban gardening in Tacoma. Archival analysis includes the location, evaluation, interpretation and analysis of documents held in archives, either physically or electronically (Corti, n.d.). Much of the historical data was researched and gathered through Tacoma Public Library system’s historical archives of newspaper and organizational papers and literature. Additional details were gathered on past and current organizations both through electronic sources and organizational websites as well as through local news stories that report on those organizations.

This history is by no means complete, or inclusive of all of the historical incarnations of urban gardening in Tacoma, however it is an important start to bring together a historical narrative of the urban gardening movement in this community. This thesis includes information both on the gardens themselves, but also partner organizations like food banks and distribution organizations whose activities either influence, or are influenced by the activities of the gardens, as well as information about other civic groups and community projects that expand the readers understanding of the urban gardening movement.
Chapter 5: A History of Urban Gardening in the U.S. and Tacoma

This thesis seeks to explore and document the historical origins of Tacoma's urban gardening movement, which is truly part of a broader story of gardening across the nation. The following historical research details both the broader U.S. urban gardening movements, and helps to provide context for Tacoma's urban gardening past. Further, when examining Tacoma's urban gardening past as part of a larger national story, it becomes clear that since the turn of the last century, urban gardening movements in Tacoma have largely mirrored the broader U.S. trends, and Tacoma's story of urban gardening could be used to represent cities just like it across the country.

Early History: 1890s

While Tacoma began as a lumber and railroad town, it quickly industrialized. By 1890, only a year after Washington won its statehood, the population of the city had grown to nearly 36,000 and for the first time, the majority of Americans were living cities rather than on farms (Washington State Department of Financial Management, n.d.). While many settled in Tacoma to take advantage of increasing work opportunities, despite some union activity, workers often suffered harsh working conditions and low pay, throughout the boom in industry and economic growth during this period (Gallacci, 2001, p. 49-52).

But the boom did not last, and when the country entered a deep period of recession in 1893, Tacoma also suffered. The city experienced massive layoffs, bank failures, and corporate bankruptcies (Kingston-Pierce, n.d.). In response, on July 17th, 1893, nearly 3000 Tacoma residents gathered in Tacoma's Fireman's park to rally together to demand work and fair labor
practices (Moore, 2011, p. B11). They not only focused on harsh working conditions, but poor
economic and social conditions as well, and organized several soup kitchens to help sustain their
communities (C. Little, interview, 2011).

In many cities, local governments and civic organizations began promoting cultivation of
vacant lots in an effort to provide emergency food relief and an alternative to traditional charity
(Lawson, 2005, p. 23; Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 13). In 1894, the mayor of Detroit
helped to organize the Potato Patch Farm that used vacant land that had previously been held for
speculation to be plowed and used as garden space for low-income residents. The participants
were provided seeds and given instruction on farming and gardening techniques. As news of the
success of Detroit’s garden spread, other cities soon followed suite and began organizing their
own vacant lot gardens (Hayden-Smith, 2011). Although the documentation does not suggest that
Tacoma supported any large-scale vacant lot gardens during this time, several documents detail
Seattle’s vacant lot gardens between the years of 1895 and 1897 (Lawson, 2005, p. 43).

**Environmental Determinism and the School Garden Movement**

As the depression waned, so too did interest in gardens as a relief strategy. Some
gardens did continue, though, and found support among various civic groups and garden
clubs. Among these groups, many subscribed to one of the dominant schools of thought of
the time, environmental determinism. As industrialization changed the structure and
aesthetics of many U.S. cities, civic groups responded with calls to improve urban life, and
argued that gardens could be used as one strategy in this fight. Some groups suggested
demolishing existing city centers and replacing them with idealized, park-like suburbs,
while other groups had more modest aims of redesigning tenement areas to include wide
boulevards, updated sewage systems, open paces and parks, and school and private gardens. (Lawson, 2005, p. 95-98). It was argued that by altering and controlling the natural environment, communities could also control and shape the outcomes of the citizens, thereby reducing disease, preventing crime, increasing civility, alleviating overcrowding, and produce more efficient workers (Taylor, 2009, p. 227-228, Carter, 2010). It is unclear what role gardens played in Tacoma during this era. What is known is that Tacoma, like many other U.S. cities during this time, was concerned about controlling the city’s growth to fit social norms of the time. At one point, the city of Tacoma had a program called "Make Tacoma Clean," which aimed at keeping saloons and other undesirable businesses out of residential areas (Gallacci, 2001, p.56). It is likely Tacoma also used gardens to promote these social aims during this period.

In addition to parks and vacant lot gardens, many civic groups and cities also saw school gardens as a viable method to improve urban life. Proponents argued that school gardens helped improve child health, provided industrial training, enhanced "civic mindedness" (Lawson, 2005, p. 52; Bassett, 1981, p. 2), kept children occupied and better behaved (especially with the passage of more stringent child labor laws, which largely kept them from factories), and encouraged parents to keep children in school longer by engaging them in manual training at school rather than pulling the child from school for training in a trade. (Lawson, 2005, p. 52-57). The George Putnam Grammar School garden was one of the earliest and most well known examples of the school garden. It was started in 1891, and news of its success helped fuel interest throughout New England, and later, much of the U.S. in similar garden projects, like the Los Angeles Normal School garden, which was started in 1898 (State Normal School Los Angeles California: catalog for the year
ending June 30, 1903, 1903; Lawson, 2005, p. 60-62). By 1906, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimated that 75 thousand school gardens were in use around the country (Hayden-Smith, 2007), and by 1910, various organizations were promoting school gardens, including the newly formed School Garden Association and the International Children’s School Farm League. And, in 1914, the Federal Bureau of Education had formed the Division of Home and School Gardening which provided teachers and students with curriculum materials to start school gardens and focused on production of food as well as beautification of schools and homes throughout the war years, until it was dismantled after the close of World War I in 1918 (Hayden-Smith, 2006; Lawson, 2005, p. 52; Carson, 2010). Tacoma likely followed these same trends leading up to the First World War, but little documentation could be found on gardens in Tacoma during this time period.

**World War I**

Although the push for gardens as a charity program waned, many gardens continued under a new set of aims. With the outbreak of World War I, much of the domestic food supply was needed for shipment overseas for troops. To compound the problem, many European farmers had been displaced or killed as a result of the fighting, and several years of bad weather conditions further stressed the already tight food supply chain (Lawson, 2005, p. 118-119). In an effort to supplement U.S. food supply, government agencies and civic groups took to task promoting multiple avenues to supplement and conserve food supplies. The USDA was hopeful that small projects within communities could help to meet some of the local demand for food, and allow larger farms and food producers to continue to ship their foodstuffs overseas. Food rationing, substitutions, and "war gardens" were all aimed at both decreasing the domestic need for fresh
foods, as well as helping improve efficiency so that more resources could be devoted to the war effort (Pack, 1919, p. 24-26; Lawson, 2005, p. 119).

Both the U.S. Food Administration and the National War Garden Commission were established in 1917 in an effort to promote the use of vacant lot and home gardening, provide educational materials to gardeners, and help spread the message about the patriotic nature of gardening during war time. To this end, these organizations published newsletters, broadsides, posters, and educational materials to promote gardening at home and in communities, and also helped individual communities established local war garden branches (Pack, 1919, p. 13-15; Lawson, 2005, p. 121-122). As the war garden movement spread, several cities including Chicago and New York organized demonstration gardens under the guidance of their local war garden committee to help encourage home and vacant lot gardens, as well as provide detailed instructions about soil preparations, planting, and harvesting methods. Private companies also took part in these wartime efforts. Some, like DuPont, sponsored their own demonstration gardens, and even offered prizes for the produce grown. Major railroad companies allowed for gardens on right-of-way properties, and unlike previous efforts where the land was only available to railroad workers, land was commonly made available to community members to garden as well as providing seeds, tools, and training to enhance production (Pack, 1919, p. 53-56, 68-70; Lawson, 2005, p. 132-134). The Western Terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad was established in Tacoma in 1873 (Gallacci, 2001, p. 56), and although more research is needed, it is possible that right of way gardens were established on railroad land in Tacoma during this time.

In addition to vacant lot and home gardens, school gardens received renewed focus as an important strategy in increasing food production as well as mobilizing support for the war abroad. The United States School Garden Army was established as part of the Bureau of Education's Office
of School and Home Gardening with the expressed aim of increasing food production, as well as encouraging children to develop a sense of responsibility, community service, work ethic, thrift, and patriotism (Hayden-Smith, 2006). The Garden Army provided funding and teaching materials to help local schools develop gardens and train teachers to oversee the projects. Many teachers also received extra pay to help with the gardens during weekends and summers (Lawson, 2005, p. 127-128).

While many of the wartime programs were started under the auspices of producing more food, they also had another, equally important function, engendering support on the home front for the war effort. School gardens were organized in a military like fashion, and participants were given titles and ranks, captain, lieutenants, based on their roles (Lawson, 2005, p. 127). This patriotic flair is also evident in the broadsides and posters produced by the government as well as civic organizations. Some posters called gardeners “soldiers of the soil” and encouraged gardeners to “sow the seeds of victory” (Bassett, 1981, p. 4-5; Pack, 1919, p. 12). The literature also situated those who did not participate, those who held land idle, gardeners who were seen as uncommitted, and even garden pests as traitors, Huns, or aiding the Kaiser (Lawson, 2005, p. 139). While little documentation remains about Tacoma’s wartime gardens, it is likely the city and local schools contributed to the relative successes of local gardening projects during this time period. It has been estimated that in some U.S. cities, in 1918 alone, the value of wartime crops exceeded one million dollars (Lawson, 2005, p. 141; Bassett, 1981, p. 5).

The Depression Years

As the United States entered the great depression of the 1930s, Tacoma was not spared the hardships of this deep economic slump, and many found themselves out of work.
and with little resources to provide for even their basic needs. Early on, local community groups organized many relief efforts and garden projects, but as the depression continued, several state and federal programs took shape to combat the continued lack of resources many people faced. While they were given various names: self-help, thrift, employment, industrial, and community gardens, most projects fell into two basic categories: small subsistence home or community gardens, or work relief gardens where gardeners were paid to grow on vacant or donated lands (Lawson, 2009, p. 9-10; Lawson, 2005, p. 147-148).

Gardening again was seen a strategy to both help supplement household food supplies while simultaneously preventing idleness in the unemployed. At the federal level, the President’s Emergency Committee for Employment and the President’s Organization on Unemployment Relief promoted the use of gardening in its reports that included community plans detailing subsistence gardening (Tucker, 1993, p. 132; Lawson, 2005, p. 144; Warman, 1999, p. 17).

While many gardens were organized by local governments and civic organizations, several well known corporations also organized garden programs to help support workers who had lost hours and wages due to work shortages and wage reductions. Firestone Tire Company, National Cash Register, The Ford Company, and B.F. Goodrich all organized large scale gardens and cooperative farms to encourage their workers to engage in subsistence farming with land, tools, and seeds provided by the company (Lawson, 2005, p 152-153).

What documentation survives suggests that Washington State supported a vibrant network of gardens and farms. By 1932, Seattle had developed an unemployed garden in its East side neighborhood that, supported by donated land and labor produced an estimated 65 tons of fresh produce that year (Lawson, 2005, p. 145). By the following year, the program had expanded to
both the county and state level with multiple counties distributing seeds thorough the county welfare boards (Lawson, 2005, p. 145). In 1933, Washington was among forty-five states administering large-scale garden programs, and the following year, in Washington State alone, the state reported 8,576 acres of vacant lot, home, and community gardens (Lawson, 2005, p. 161). The MacDonald Act of 1933 established the Washington Emergency Relief Administration to provide public relief though several different programs. One such program, the Garden and Food preservation program, provided people with "seeds, garden plots, canning equipment, and advice to encourage food production for household consumption in order to offset unemployment and poverty" (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 49; Lawson, 2005, p. 162). The program also worked in cooperation with local governments and civic organizations to provide seed packets in state welfare offices and worked with extension offices to develop canning centers in some rural counties (Lawson, 2005, p. 162). In an effort to cope with the lack of employment and food sources, many cities, including Seattle organized work relief gardens, including the Airport farm, a 55 acre site that provided paid employment and donated the produce to the local YMCA and Salvation Army chapters as well as the county welfare board (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009; Lawson, 2005, p. 162). Other local gardens of this time include the gardens at the McNeil Island Prison, which, by 1934, included a newly completed Farm Complex area. The prison’s sixty-seven acres cultivated not only fruits and vegetables, but also milk and a meat packing division that was still in operation until the prison’s recent closure (Washington State Department of Corrections, n.d.).

But, by 1936, priorities, both at the state and federal level had shifted. In Washington, the Emergency Relief Administration was rolled into the State Department of Public Welfare, and terminated its funding for the Garden and Food Preservation Program.
At the federal level, FDRs New Deal targeted programs, and funding away from smaller, local programs and toward larger scale work relief programs (Lawson, 2005, p. 169). Some gardens continued, but as economic conditions began to improve, the gardens were largely used as welfare program only for the very poor, and widespread support of the gardens as a large-scale relief program declined (Warman, 1999, p. 17).

**World War II**

The outbreak of World War II again brought renewed attention to resource preservation and efforts to increase domestic production of a wide array of goods, including fresh food. And while food production was a major theme of the movement, it was largely seen as only one component in a larger campaign aimed at cultivating healthier citizens who, in turn, could better support the war effort (Lawson, 2005, p. 174-175, 185-186; Bassett, 1981, p. 7). Although some gardening and civic groups began calling for organization of large scale gardens soon after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the federal government was reluctant to put much support behind small home and lot gardens, and instead favored larger scale industrial efforts to organize food production and increase production and efficiency (Lawson, 2005, p. 170). However, many thought the victory garden could be useful in promoting healthy citizens, and encouraging compliance with government imposed rationing and price controls. Horticulture experts, business leaders, garden clubs members, and representative from state and federal agencies came together in 1941 for the National Defense Gardening Conference to hammer out a plan to develop a large scale victory garden program with the expressed aim of encouraging city and suburban farms as well as home gardening (Bentley, 1998, p. 117). Posters and
promotional materials of the time encouraged citizens to participate and comply with war efforts. The 1943 federal campaign "Food Fights for Freedom" encouraged compliance with four key activities: share, play fair, conserve, and produce. Posters from this campaign suggest helping work on farms and starting victory gardens as well as canning and preserving homegrown foods (Duke University Library; Bassett, 1981, p. 7). As the war continued, several federal agencies did become more involved in the gardening effort. The Office of Defense, Health, and Welfare Services oversaw the National Advisory Garden Committee, took over administration of some school and subsistence gardens that had previously been managed by the Works Public Administration, and sponsored a National Victory Garden Conference annually during the war years. The Department of Agriculture supported the gardening movement through its extension offices and provided varying levels of support in different areas including distribution of bulletins and educational materials, offering gardening demonstrations and technical support, supporting local canning centers, and helping to organize local garden and 4H clubs. And the Office of Civilian Defense helped organize volunteers to take on volunteer positions in various positions, including garden coordinators (Lawson, 2005, p. 177). To show support for gardening projects, the secretary of the Department of Agriculture began publically setting national goals for the number of victory gardens, which by 1943 was set at 18 million (Lawson, 2005, 175). Further, press releases from this period include letters from President Harry Truman, appealing to citizens to grow "larger and better victory gardens..." and "preserving food at home and in canning centers..." as a way to support the war and larger goals of victory and peace (Truman, 1945).
As they had done during the first war and during the depression, many big businesses also took up the cause of the victory garden. Firestone, Goodyear, General Mills, Standard Oil, and Sears and Roebuck all supported the victory garden movement to varying degrees, some by providing land or establishing farms to supply their cafeterias, and others by encouraging home gardening and providing resources to aid employees. Railroads again offered up right-of-ways for gardens, either for free, or with a nominal fee to participate (Lawson, 2005, p. 177-184; Sears Roebuck Co. will again sponsor 4H victory gardens, 1944).

In Tacoma, members of the Tacoma Garden Club organized an effort to get members to pledge to donate food from their own personal victory gardens to the Children’s Industrial Home. As part of this effort, garden club member Estelle Demerest organized a large victory garden in the Interlaaken neighborhood of Lakewood that produced food solely for donation to the struggling Children’s Home (Tacoma garden club donates produce, 1942; Victory vegetables being given to Children’s Industrial Home, 1942). Additionally, the Children’s Home, started in the 1890s to house the city’s orphans, operated its own small scale farming operations, both harvesting the orchards surrounding the six acre property, as well as running the larger, fifteen acre Jessie Dyslin Ranch for older boys that had opened in 1926. The boys ran the ranch, growing vegetables, harvesting berries, and eventually installing orchards as well (Gateways for Youth and Families, n.d.). The Tacoma News Tribune sponsored a garden school at the Tacoma Masonic Temple. The Garden School, as it was called, operated for at least five years, and served as a vegetable garden to help supplement food production, as well as for ornamental plants that were thought to improve morale and uplift Tacoma residents.
during the war. The garden also hosted educational offerings on vegetable gardening and
hosted nationally known garden speakers during the war (TNT garden display big, 1945;
Fifth TNT garden school, 1944). The Tacoma Metropolitan Park Board also managed a
vegetable garden, and although little documentation remains about this war-time garden,
there are reports that its produce was displayed at the TNT school garden in 1943
(Vegetables will lead at TNT garden show, 1943).

Although it is difficult to accurately quantify, many documents suggest America's
gardeners were huge producers of food during this time, and estimates suggest that in
1944, American gardens produced over forty percent of America’s vegetables (Bassett,

Suburban Growth Mid-Century

Following the war, many of the gardens that had been so successful seemed to
quietly fade as America entered the post war period. Some advocates promoted the
continuation of the gardens as "Freedom Gardens," but there seemed to be little interest,
and most gardens fell by the wayside as economic boom and the exponential growth of
suburbs decreased both the need and interest in urban gardening movements (Lawson,
2009, p. 11). There are a handful of gardens that did survive this shift, and they did so by
reframing their purpose, and shifting their focus from one of civic need and improvement,
to one that promoted the individual desire to garden as a past time or recreational activity,
such as the Fenway garden in Boston, which is still in use today (Lawson, 2005, p. 205; Our
history: how we’ve grown, n.d.).
During the 1950s and 1960s, many cities including Seattle experienced a lull in activity in urban gardening (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 50), while home gardening seems to have grown in popularity, with the rise in movement out of cities, and into suburbs, where families found they had more land available for garden space (Lawson, 2005, p. 205). And although urban gardening was experiencing a decline during this period, the 1960s ushered in a string of social changes that would work to again bring it to the forefront of community advocacy in the years to come. By the mid 1960s, concerns over environmental degradation and pesticide use were growing. Rachel Carson’s 1962 book, Silent Spring, became a New York Times bestseller, and is credited with acting as a catalyst for modern environmentalism (Lutts, 1985). While the book did not directly deal with the topic of urban gardening, it did highlight the dangers of pesticide use, both on wildlife and on humans.

1970s and 1980s

The social unrest of the late 1960s was only further complicated by a period of economic slump in the early 1970s driven by high energy prices, increased inflation, and rising food costs (Akard, 1992, p. 597). As a result of the economic climate, coupled with years of decreasing attention on the inner cities as more and more people gravitated to the suburbs, communities were left to face urban neighborhoods of vacant lots, high crime rates, disinvestment in urban spaces, and festering race tensions (Lawson, 2005, p. 205-206; Schmelzkopf, 1995, p. 365-366) Several successful and well known urban gardening groups grew out of discontent over such issues: New York’s Green Guerillas, the Boston Urban Gardeners, and the Seattle P-Patch movement. While each group had its own agenda
and organization, most were small groups looking to reclaim their cities, and focused efforts on planting gardens in urban vacant areas (Schmelzkopf, 1995, p. 366; Lawson, 2005, p. 205). These gardens also arose out of a growing concern about the need for open space in urban communities. The open space movement was founded on the idea that healthy, vibrant communities are those that seek to promote and protect open spaces like parks, playgrounds, green spaces, and gardens for all community members (Rome, 1998, p. 261-264). By 1976, the push for urban gardens had again gained momentum, and the USDA began its Urban Garden Program. The program worked to encourage urban gardens and worked though its cooperative extension program to produce and distribute educational materials to community groups interested in garden projects (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 16).

In Seattle, a small group of students and community members worked to organize a garden on the site of the old Picardo Farm, a truck farm that supplied produce to the Puget Sound area starting in the 1920s (Lawson, 2005, p. 213-214). The first years, the garden was maintained by local school children, and the produce donated to local charities. When the owners decided to sell the property, the gardeners worked to convince the city of Seattle to intervene; the city council agreed to lease the land for the garden site, to test the feasibility such a plan. The city determined the garden to be a success, and quickly set out to expand the new P-Patch program, named after the original garden on the Picardo farm site (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 50-51). By 1975, the city of Seattle was managing 13 garden sites though the P-Patch program, and allocated funds to buy the property of the original P-Patch garden (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 51).
Urban Tacoma was also a changing city during this time; as the rise of suburbs and automobiles slowed growth in the city, the focus on urban community gardens lessened. By the 1970s, Tacoma was struggling with widespread urban decay and disinvestment, as well as increasing problems with drugs and crime, especially in its Hilltop neighborhood (Robinson, 2009; Angelou Economics, 2008). However, like Seattle, social tensions of the 1960s and early 1970s again prompted some to advocate for gardening as a viable solution.

It was during this time that a student group at Tacoma Community College established a garden on a half-acre parcel of land on one end of the campus in 1973. The TCC garden was open to the public and free to garden, but asked that gardeners donated at least half of what they grew to local food banks (Rocks give way to food for city's poor, 1973; TCC garden space to aid needy here, 173).

In 1975, Tacoma's Urban League started its Tacoma Urban Agriculture Program as a partnership between the city of Tacoma and the Urban League to establish gardens on vacant lots throughout Tacoma for use by seniors and low-income residents (Anderson, 1982). The city had received funding through the Federal Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, some of which had been used for establishing other urban gardens, and in 1977, when the city held forums to decide how to use the rest of the funds, suggestions were made for additional funding for garden projects (Pugnetti, 1977). In 1979, only four years after the program's inception, program coordinator, Roger Klein reported the gardens produced over 50 thousand pounds of food annually and was the largest garden program in Washington State (There's a garden waiting for you, 1979). The program was funded in part by grant money from the Federal Housing and Urban Development, and the city of Tacoma coordinated leases on vacant lands for gardens on a
yearly basis (Vacant lots transformed from blight to bounty, 1979; Erickson, 1984). By 1984, the program had twenty garden sites throughout the city including gardens on South 56th and East D Street, South 76th and East D Street, 812 South M Street, South Yakima Avenue, adjacent to Franklin Park, at least two sites in central Tacoma, one in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood, and one on North 21st and Proctor (Anderson, 1983, p. G8; Erickson, 1984; Anderson, 1982, p. C10; There's a garden waiting for you, 1979). Each of the gardens had their own garden coordinators to oversee the gardens and communicate with participants. While the gardens were set up as individual plots, gardeners were asked to donate up to ten percent of what they grew to local food banks, and in 1984, it was reported that the gardens collectively donated fifteen of the total fifty four tons of food grown to local food banks (Erickson, 1984). The Tacoma Urban League managed the program until 1988 when the Tacoma Metropolitan Park department took over the program and at least five of the gardens it had been managing (Woo, 1994, p. B4).

It was also during this time that Jesuit priest, Father Bill Bichsell, more commonly known as "Bix," came to Tacoma to work with Hilltop's St. Leo's Parish. While the parish did not have a direct hand in the resurgence of Tacoma's urban gardens, the parish played an important role in reconnecting its members with their community, and helped spawn many of the projects that would lead to the gardens we see in Tacoma today. Some in the parish were initially skeptical of what they saw as a break from the traditional focus of the priest, but many of them joined in his call to serve the poor that surrounded their own neighborhood (Thomas, 1992, p. 2-8). While not directly involved in the urban gardening movement, has had a hand in many of the urban garden projects that exist in Tacoma today (C. Little, interview, 2011). Father Bix came to St. Leos in 1969, and quickly set about
establishing the Martin Luther King Center the same year with other community activists. The Center was established to help acquire stable housing for low-income residents as well as to organize around social issues facing the community (Thomas, 1992, p. 97-99). The Center opened one of the first food banks in Pierce County in the early 1970s, and even operated a small farmers market that operated on Saturdays during the summer behind what is now the Evergreen College campus. During this time, Bix also help organize the Hospitality Kitchen, an outreach program of St. Leo’s that serves hot breakfasts and lunches to individuals and families in need to this day (Thomas, 1992, p. 107-112).

Although by the late 1970s the urban gardening movement seemed to be gaining momentum by advocating for community activism and reinvestment, especially in the poorest areas of inner cities, it still faced challenges brought on by slow economic conditions. Throughout the 1980s, gardens struggled with decreases in city and local funding and budget cuts which resulted in reduction in maintenance services like tilling that had previously been provided, and an increase in fees for use in some gardens (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 52; Thorne, 1983, p. C1). In Tacoma, St. Leo’s was expanding its services as it saw more and more neighbors in need. It was a difficult economic time for the city, there were waves of layoffs, and many of the cities residents were struggling to make ends meet (Thomas, 1992, p. 107-108). The problem was compounded by deep budget cuts to local governments as well as to federal social service agencies. Tacoma was facing financial struggles, rising crime rates, high unemployment, especially among African American youth, and increasing drug problems, as well as an influx of mentally ill residents recently released from Lakewood’s Western State Hospital due to budget cuts (Cudney, 2011, p. 1-2; 21-24).
But St. Leos and its partners continued to give. They developed the Emergency Food Network in cooperation with Associated Ministries during this time, which started as a collection and distribution service for local food banks, and continued to operate the program until it became its own stand alone project in 1991 (Thomas, 1992, p. 65). They also started the St. Leo’s food connection in 1984, which by 1992, was the largest volume food bank in Pierce County (Thomas, 1992, p. 68-69). During this time, Bix started organizing the "G Street Community." Originally started to help acquire transitional housing for mentally ill adults, the community quickly acquired several houses and lots that would become what is now known as the Guadalupe House, and the site of the Guadalupe Garden. The organization was later organized into a Catholic Worker Community in the late 1980s, and the house and the gardens it inspired remain today (Cudney, 2011, p. 19-21).

**1990s and the reinvestment period**

By the early 1990s, urban gardening was again gaining momentum as a way to beautify urban centers and promote reinvestment in decaying urban neighborhoods. Unlike many of the earlier urban gardening movements, the upswing in urban gardening attention started in the early 1990s focused more on establishing gardens as a more permanent community resource that can address multiple social issues (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 15).

Seattle’s P-Patch program continued to grow and expand during the early 1990s. By 1992, the P-Patch was managing 27 gardens throughout the city; totaling 14 acres of total land, and had a waiting list of over 600 people. They had also established a program to gather food from the gardens for donation to local food banks, and were working on a job-
training program for teens and the homeless (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 52). By 1995, Seattle’s P-Patch program was the largest municipally run, organic gardening program in the U.S. (Trainer, 1995). The P-patch program benefitted from Seattle’s inclusion among twenty-three U.S. cities in the USDA’s urban garden program until the program lost funding in 1993. One major benefit to Seattle from this program was the establishment of urban extension offices that produced educational materials for gardeners, and developed demonstration gardens in the county (Hou, Johnson, and Lawson, 2009, p. 54).

Although not as robust as its northern neighbor, Tacoma’s gardens as well as the programs they served were also growing. By 1992, Bix was living in the Guadalupe house, and tending a garden with the residents that lived there. Bix began a farm outside of Chehalis in 1992 with some of the residents of the Catholic Worker Community. The goal was to provide housing for mentally ill and those with drug and alcohol problems, produce fresh food, and teach the participants useful job skills (Thomas, 1992, p. 81). The city gardens were also growing and by 1994, the Tacoma city parks department managed five urban gardens in the city, and for the first time that year, had to institute a waiting list for plots in the gardens (Woo, 1994, p. B4). Even while the city struggled with drugs, disinvestment, and crime (Little, interview, 2011) Tacoma residents were organizing to take back their neighborhoods. By 1995, the city opened an additional garden in the poor Hilltop neighborhood, and privately owned gardens began to spring up around the neighborhood (Castro, 1995, B1).

One of these gardens, established in the vacant lot next to the Guadalupe House, began as a project of some of the house’s temporary residents to use the land for a garden.
But what started as a humble garden quickly grew into a system of highly productive and well established gardens that, with the help of some dedicated volunteers, transformed the Tacoma urban gardening movement to this day (Castro, 1995, B1).

Carrie Little and the Guadalupe Garden

Carrie Little has always been a gardener, but she did not set out to transform the community gardening movement in Tacoma. A chance meeting between Carrie and Father Bix, in the garden outside of the Guadalupe House, changed the course of community gardening history in Tacoma. It helped fuel the movement to restore the Hilltop neighborhood, and led to the expansion of a community food system that provides thousands of pounds of fresh food each year to homeless and needy people in the Tacoma community.

Carrie grew up in suburban Littleton, Colorado, but was exposed to gardening from a young age by her parents, and recalls packing her harvest into her wagon and selling it to the neighbors. "I had cucumbers...little ones, two for five cents. Middle ones, Meddle, M-E-D-D-L-E, meddle . . . five cents each. And then BIG ones, ten cents." It was a realization for Carrie that not only could she produce food, but that it could be a source of income as well.

As an adult, gardening remained a constant part of her life. Her husband Ken’s work as a union carpenter meant the family moved to follow the work. "We were in Texas, we were in California, we were in Colorado, we were in Illinois, and then we finally came out here. We always had gardens." Carrie learned to garden in nearly every growing region in the country for the simple purpose of feeding her family. But she had never been to the Northwest until her arrival in 1992. When she started to learn about the unique growing
conditions of her new home, the long growing season, the diversity of plants that thrive here, and the almost total lack of poisonous snakes and spiders to contend with, she quickly realized the potential for gardens in this area. She knew the house her family was renting in Puyallup did not have sufficient room for a garden so Carrie started her search for a garden "to latch onto..." (C. Little, interview, 2011)

Her hunt ended the next year, when Carrie was helping Ken organize a union rally to commemorate the 1883 "Call to Action" labor union rally in Fireman’s park (Moore, 1993, p. B1). Carrie had been tasked with approaching community organizations, and inviting them to get involved in the celebration, at the urging of those she met, she sought out the help of Father Bill Bichsel. Bix, has worn many hats, as a former pastor at St Leo’s Catholic Parish, a vocal anti-war protestor, an environmental activist, and co-founder of Tacoma’s Catholic Worker Community (Maynard, 2008, p. B1). It was this community that took over operation of Hilltop’s Guadalupe Hospitality House for homeless adults, and still runs the house today. Earlier that year, some of the residents of the Guadalupe House began to form a garden in the lot surrounding the house, inviting the other residents to participate, and slowly fleshed out what would become the original Guadalupe Garden.

Carrie tracked down Bix, and arranged to meet him at the Guadalupe House. As she waited outside the house, she noticed the freshly tilled earth of the garden. "This is serendipitous...," she recalled, and not only convinced Bix to be part of their union rally, but also quickly inherited the fledgling garden (C. Little, interview, 2011).

By 1994, there were several small community gardens in Tacoma, including Gallucci Gardens (not the same as the current Gallucci Learning Garden), Guadalupe Gardens, and Hilltop Garden, as well as five gardens run by Tacoma’s Park District (Woo, 1994, p. B4).
Carrie became a regular at the Guadalupe Garden, bringing along her two sons, and working alongside other volunteer groups from local organizations (Kawada, 2005a, p. B3). One gardener that she met who also came regularly was Kareen Perrin, and unlike many of the other volunteers, who seemed to have little experience gardening, Kareen was a knowledgeable gardener. "She knew her stuff... I’m out there and Kareen Perrin [is] out there, but everybody else kinda disappears. Bix would intercede from time to time but...he’s a very busy man. And, lo and behold, it got to the point where it ended up, we were just caretaking for everything, yet kickin’ out some serious food. I mean, it was just like, you plant one zucchini and you can feed the world, right?" (C. Little, interview, 2011).

Carrie quickly realized the potential for food production from the garden plots and while much of the produce was used to prepare meals for the residents of the house and for donation to the St. Leo’s food connection (a large food pantry) and the Hospitality Kitchen (Howser, 2000, p. B4; Rodrigues, n.d.), they began taking the excess produce to Tacoma’s now two year old farmer’s market. "We were just the most, Beverly Hillbilly style conglomerate. ...we just slapped things in the back of the pickup. We didn’t have a fancy canopy...And we would just hustle our produce and by the end of the season, I think we made 500 bucks" (C. Little, interview, 2011). With Carrie’s leadership as the new program coordinator, the garden continued to grow, and by the mid 1990s, the group had succeeded in negotiating with owners of vacant lots in the neighborhood to use the lots for additional gardens. By 1999, Carrie and her small group of volunteers had expanded to cover nine separate, privately owned lots. They were turning out produce on all but one of the lots due to heavy metal contamination so they only planted flowers there (Howser, 2000, p. B4). Carrie and Bix applied and won, to their astonishment, a thirty thousand dollar grant
through the Urban Resource Partnership to continue their work on the garden. The money allowed Carrie and Bix to focus not only on garden plots but also on the larger and more important issue of poverty and lack of opportunities in the neighborhood. They used the grant money to hire several homeless residents to work on the gardens, to clean the garbage and clear the weeds, and to make the land productive again. At the same time, Carrie had heard of the concept of a CSA, or community supported agriculture program, and applied the concept to the Guadalupe Garden. They quickly found members, and used the additional money to help support the employment of the residents of the house (C. Little, interview, 2011).

As the neighborhood improved, so did the property values. In 2000, prompted by the quick sale of two of the gardened lots to real-estate developers, Carrie began work on forming a land trust out of the remaining properties. She quickly went to work raising funds to purchase the land the gardens occupied. One of the lots, owned by the Hospitality Kitchen, an organization that greatly benefited from food donations from the gardens, donated the land to the forming Trust. The same year, having seen the potential of the gardens, the city of Tacoma donated an additional 120 thousand dollars for the purchase of another large parcel of land. Carrie, Bix, and a handful of the gardeners went to work on creating the Guadalupe Land Trust, a 501C3 non-profit that independently owns and operates the gardens to this day (C. Little, interview, 2011).

With the development of the Land Trust, Carrie not only preserved the land and the gardens, but her work became part of a larger movement to restore the Hilltop and restore a sense of safety and community to the neighborhood. The gardens thrived in the middle of what had become, by the early nineties, a very rough neighborhood of Tacoma.
with "Drug deals at every corner, and...drive-by shootings goin’ on. It’s just chaos." Carrie remembered two particular neighbors, both elderly women who had grown increasingly frightened, and unwilling to go out into the neighborhood. She recalls taking them both out into the gardens, to see how the neighborhood had transformed, "We all walked in and then I said, ‘I just want you to see the neighborhood right now.’ ...and they’re like, ‘Oh, my God....‘Look at this; there’s grapes growin’ on the fence.’ And, there’s flowers in what was a parking lot." The sight of the women brought tears to Bix’s eyes, and Carrie’s as she recalled the moment (C. Little, interview, 2011). One of the women was Jean Shimoishumau, who was by this time an elderly woman living in the Hilltop neighborhood. Jean had lived in the house long enough to see hard times hit her neighborhood. When Jean passed, the Catholic Worker Community worked out a deal with Jean’s family to purchase the home to be used as more transitional housing. The group still owns and operates the house as Jean’s house of Prayer and has kept all of Jean’s furnishings as a tribute of sorts to the Japanese citizens that were forced from their Hilltop homes and sent to internment camps during World War II (Cudney, 2011, p. 25-26)

Community gardening had been in Tacoma long before Carrie had arrived. But by 2000 not only were her gardens thriving, thanks in part to a renewed focus by the city to invest in gardens, parks, and community redevelopment, additional gardens had sprung up in nearly every neighborhood of the city. Some gardens focused solely on private plots, while others grew specifically for donation (Metro Parks Tacoma, n.d.a). The partner organizations that benefited from these gardens were also growing.

**Mother Earth Farm**
One such organization is the Emergency Food Network. The non-profit manages several individual projects including large scale gleaning projects, grow-a-row programs, and managing the donation and distribution of food to local food banks. David Ottey, executive director for the EFN at the time, had been approached in 1998 by Orting landowner Doreen Johnson with the idea of using her farmland to produce food specifically for the EFN (Kawada, 2005, p. B3). David was familiar with what Carrie had done at the Guadalupe house, and approached her with the idea of turning the eight-acre parcel into a running farm. "I went and looked at it and fell in love...One piece of land...Flat, soil that goes forever, and it's black... And I just loved the idea of just growing for the hungry, that was just so exciting" (C. Little, interview, 2011).

Carrie was excited about the opportunity to make the farm a reality, and agreed to take on the project, and transition out of the twelve-member board of the Guadalupe Land trust she had helped to create. Doreen would allow her land to be farmed, in exchange for payment on the taxes for the land. David would organize the funds to start and run the farm, and Carrie would run the farm. Carrie estimated it would take her seven years to get the farm up to speed and the land producing at it's true potential. Although the land was prime farmland of the rich Orting valley, it had been neglected and over harvested for years, leaving the soil devoid of organic matter and biologic diversity. Doreen Johnson was born on the farm, and inherited the farm from her mother, and from her mother before that, so to commemorate the deep family history of the land, they named it Mother Earth Farm.

Carrie went to work getting the farm up and running. All of the labor at the farm is provided by volunteers; from school groups, to local businesses, to incarcerated women.
Carrie estimates that it takes nearly 800 volunteers a year to run the farm. Although the main goal of the farm is to produce food for local food banks, Carrie has a bigger purpose that is not just about food production, "it's plugging those volunteers who perhaps have never gardened in their lives...But that's so important. They don't get that, and they don't realize what it takes to grow food, and...and then, to see something accomplished at the end of the day" (C. Little, interview, 2011). By the end of the first year, Carrie and her volunteers had produced over sixty thousand pounds of food. They installed an irrigation system, built beehives, and worked with a local draft-horse team to arrange for the fields to be plowed by horses, rather than tractors for the following season (Hutchens, 2002, B1). Carrie and her team accomplished what they set out to do in seven years, in five. By 2007, the farm was donating nearly 150 thousand pounds of fresh produce to various soup kitchens and food banks throughout Pierce County. When she first started at Mother Earth, there was not a worm to be found. Thanks to several years of hard work, following strictly organic farming methods, and returning nutrients to the soil each year with cover crops, Carrie says, the land quickly recovered. "I'm happy to report, you can go anywhere on that land now and take a shovel and find a worm" (C. Little, interview, 2011).

**Urban Gardens in Tacoma Today**

In the years since Carrie left the Guadalupe Land Trust, gardens all over the city have continued to thrive. With renewed focus from the city government, metro parks and local groups have opened a handful of new gardens throughout the city (Grow Local Tacoma, n.d.b). At one recent city council meeting, Mayor Marilyn Strickland proclaimed March 20th to be "Community Gardening Day" in Tacoma, and announced plans to open
several additional gardens throughout the Tacoma on city owned properties (City of Tacoma, 2010). In addition, a Community Garden Coordinator for the city of Tacoma was recently hired through a partnership among the city of Tacoma, Tacoma Pierce County Health Department, and the Pierce County Conservation District to both maintain existing community gardens as well as act as a resource for those interested in creating additional gardens in the city and Pierce County (Merryman, 2010, B1). Renewed interest in community gardening is taking place at the federal level as well. In 2009, Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack proclaimed the week of August 23rd, 2009 to be National Community Gardening Week and sponsored work projects in two highly publicized gardens, the USDA’s People’s Kitchen located on the National Mall, and the White House Garden (Brandon, 2009).

As for Carrie and her work at Mother Earth Farm, the future looks bright. Over the years, as surrounding areas became developed, and the land passed down through the generations, the land had become considered residential for tax purposes, meaning that the non-profit farm had to come up with the money to pay taxes at a much higher rate. Carrie worked with the state to amend the tax laws to allow the farm to again qualify as agricultural land, and a much lower tax bill. The farm now produces on average, 150 thousand pounds of food each year for donation, which far exceeds the average eight thousand pounds per acre most organic farms produce each year (C. Little, interview, 2011).

After coming in second in an online bid to become the White House Gardener, largely a publicity campaign started by an Illinois farmer and his family, Carrie saw a dream come true with the purchase of her own farm, Little Earth Farm in 2010. There, in addition
to her work at Mother Earth, Carrie farms and manages the thirty five acre farm for
production of CSA shares, as well as raising livestock. Managing two fully functional farms
is a tremendous amount of work, and while she says it will not happen right away, Carrie
imagines she will transition out of Mother Earth to care for her own farm full time. Her son,
who has been her assistant for the last several years, will take over the operation of the
farm. Carrie remains confident in the farm and the mission they serve, "to provide that
fresh produce . . . is monumental as far as addressing, not just hunger, but . . . malnutrition
on a scale that, handing people a bunch of carrots at the food bank [doesn't solve]... to be
closer to the earth to be more involved with what it takes to grow the food, to nurture the
soil, to absorb the food comin’ out of it, and to teach people that it’s really OK to get dirt
under your nails I think... is how we’re gonna survive as a species" (C. Little, interview,
2011).
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion

In recent years, the city of Tacoma has approached the idea of urban gardening with increased fervor, both developing new gardens, as well as allocating resources to their management and construction. Further, it seems that urban gardens do offer a promising, community based activity that seems to not only substantially increase fresh food production locally, especially to low income populations, but also strengthens community ties and improves neighborhoods through strengthened bonds to place.

However, when we look at the story of Tacoma’s urban gardening past, we do see that its current incarnation is really part of a larger history. While boosters of urban gardening today are optimistic about the future of their movement, they may be better served by a more nuanced view of the current gardening movement as part of a larger historical evolution. And while gardens have continued to receive increased support over the past several years, they face many challenges in this difficult economy. By understanding Tacoma’s urban gardens as part of a larger historical movement, it is apparent they are have continually faced threats and decline due to inadequate organizational structure, uncertain economic conditions, and a lack of compelling and well articulated data on quantitative outcomes. It is important for both planning professionals and garden supporters to understand and respond to these challenges in order to better withstand changing conditions and maintain permanence in the communities that they serve.
One of the biggest challenges facing urban garden supporters today is the lack of consistent organizational structure. While some cities have done a better job of coordinating this, many cities across the U.S. have little or no larger body of oversight or management for their gardens. In some ways, this is a result of the community and informal nature of the gardens themselves, as they are often organized by neighborhood groups and activists, and are not managed by government or bureaucratic process. However, this lack of consistent organization leaves the gardens without a strong voice or leadership structure to advocate for them. Like the Tacoma gardens, many gardens rely heavily on local governments and civic groups for at least some of their basic supplies, funding, and even the property they garden, but have little ownership or control of the land, and little recourse if the land is sold, or funds are diverted to other projects. That is not to say that all gardens would be better off being run by the city government, but rather, to suggest that garden groups may find more strength in numbers and a better organized system of support, whether that is through the local government, or other umbrella organizations that can better articulate the benefits of gardens, and better advocate for continued funding and support from the communities they serve.

Further, based on historical research, declining economic conditions have served as both the impetus for increasing garden programs, but also a key factor in previous declines. Earlier movements seemed to have sustained through difficult times by seeking funding from a variety of sources both public and private. When gardens rely heavily on government funding, and do not actively seek support from other entities like grants and other private funding, they may risk losing funding as budgets get tighter and cuts are deeper.
Finally, the issue of funding is only further compounded by the relative lack of quantitative data on the subject of urban gardening. While the body of academic research on the subject has improved greatly over the past decade, there is still much work to be done. Because of the individual nature of the urban garden experience, much of the existing literature seeks to document individual experiences and meaning of the garden for the participants. While this is useful, and furthers our understanding of the place making concept in the context of the urban garden, more hard data is needed. In the face of budget cuts and serious strains on local budgets, more clear data on the quantitative benefits of urban gardening may offer a stronger argument for continued funding and support from local and state governments for garden projects.

Conclusion

Both through historical research and through Carrie Little's story of urban gardening, one can see the reported benefits of urban gardening come to life. Through her work with the Guadalupe Gardens and Mother Earth Farm, she proved that urban gardens can produce significant amounts of fresh food with minimal investment and on relatively small parcels of land. Further, many of the gardens in Tacoma donate at least a portion of their harvests to local food banks and donation programs, and greatly supplement the amount of healthy, fresh foods that are available for some of the community’s most vulnerable residents. Many of the recipients are homeless, or are families with children, who would otherwise struggle to afford healthy food options in an economy with rapidly rising food costs.
Further, Little’s story brings to life the concept of place attachment (See Manzo and Perkins, 2006; Altman and Lowe, 1992). She describes her desire to find a place to "latch onto" and make her own. When she found the Guadalupe Garden, what she really found was a place to feel rooted to, not only to raise a garden, but to cultivate a community and re-build a struggling neighborhood. Her attachment to that place, the garden, and the neighborhood surrounding it, provided the catalyst to further community revitalization and community organizing. Similar to what Wakefield, Yeudall, Taron, Reynolds, and Skinner (2007) found in their research on Toronto’s urban gardens, Little’s attachment to place and work in the Guadalupe Gardens provided the impetus for other broad neighborhood improvements, and helped the community strengthen its capacity and ability to take on other community projects (96-99).

However, while Tacoma’s urban garden movement continues to grow, and has received increasing support from both the city government as well as many local non-profits, urban garden promoters fail to see this current growth in urban gardening as part of a larger historical pattern of growth and decline. Garden supporters might be better served by seeing the movement as part of a larger historical context in order to understand how changing economic and social forces have either helped or hindered past urban gardening movements.

While urban gardening will likely continue its evolution in cities across the U.S. for years to come, it may be overly optimistic to expect it to continue its current growth indefinitely. The urban gardening movement suffers from several key weaknesses. First, most communities do not have any central organizational structure for their gardens. They frequently are managed by many different and overlapping groups, including city
governments, non-profit organizations, and neighborhood groups, all with different funding, organizational aims, and priorities. Tacoma has done some work to address this issue, and has purchased the land that many gardens occupy, and work is being done to secure more sites with city funds. There are still many sites though, that are owned privately, leaving the gardens permanence in limbo, as there is nothing preventing the land from being sold or developed at any time.

Second, the gardening movement is vulnerable to changing economic conditions. While urban gardens are generally popular in times of economic downturn, economic pressures can also have negative impacts on garden projects. For example, even in Tacoma, whose city government has publicly committed to continued investment in open spaces and gardens and whose parks department lists as its second strategic goal support of "active living that contributes to a healthy community" (Metro Parks, 2010, p. 9), budget shortfalls threaten both the maintenance of existing gardens, as well as the development of new sites. The city of Tacoma is currently facing 12 million dollar budget shortfall, down from 33 million, that was reduced by layoffs, forced retirements, furloughs, and reductions in city services (Kamb, 2012). Metro Parks Tacoma’s funding comes largely from general fund revenues, and private donations, both of which have faced steep declines in the last two years (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2010, p. 17). And while urban gardens are considered to have a relatively good return on investment, as established gardens do not require extensive funding, everything has a cost. Metro Parks budgeted 25 thousand dollars to support the Proctor garden for the next four years (Metro Parks Tacoma, 2010, p. 31), which to some in local government may seem like an easy place to cut when the city is short on funds.
Further complicating matters is the lack of quantitative data on the effects of urban gardens. While literature on the subject has improved, there are still gaps in the academic understanding of how urban gardens contribute to individual and community outcomes. Because of the individual nature of the gardens and the fact that there is no standard plan or practice for urban gardening, it is difficult to draw conclusions based on quantitative data alone. This further compounds the funding problem, as it may be hard for communities to secure funding if they cannot clearly prove return on investment. Qualitative data on urban gardening abounds, and while it is rich with anecdotal evidence, and provides a rich story of the personal experiences with individual gardeners, it is not the kind of hard data that secures funding in a world where social services are facing deep cuts.

This is not to suggest there is not a promising future for Tacoma’s urban gardening movement. But, rather, that urban gardening has a history in Tacoma nearly as old as the city itself, and in order to protect the movement, and facilitate its future success, its organizers would benefit from understanding it as an evolution rather than a static idea. While urban gardening may again see declining support when economic conditions improve, garden programs would benefit from more centralized organizational structure and priorities, in order to continue to secure the land and funding they need to continue to grow. Further research on the history of urban gardening in Tacoma is also needed to uncover the local evolution of this practice and situate the garden movement as part of Tacoma’s larger history. There is still work to be done in uncovering this local history, as what is known about Tacoma’s early garden projects is incomplete, and difficult to find. However, what we do know, from local sources, as well as records from national
movements, is that gardening has been, and continues to be, one powerful tool to combat hunger, improve nutrition, and restore urban communities.
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Appendix A: Transcript of Interview with Carrie Little

Narrator: Carrie Little

Date: May 15th, 2011

Interviewed by: Jessica Dvorak

Place: Orting, Washington

Jessica Dvorak: So basically... my interest is community gardening and urban food security, but just because you're such a big part of that, really your story and how you got to that. ...Everywhere I go I'd hear your name and so I think, you have been really involved in that. So, kind of . . . a bigger story.

So I want know, what’s your background, where you came from. What was it like when you were growing up? Were you involved with gardening?

Carrie Little: OK, OK. Well, basically, I grew up in suburbia Denver, actually, Littleton.

JD: Oh [laughs].

CL: Yeah. Before . . .
Littleton was Littleton. And actually, now what was home for me is now called Centennial, which is really weird because what they call Littleton now is where Littleton became famous, ... and that didn’t even exist when I grew up. So anyway, my connection to gardening begins with my dad, and hangin’ out with my dad and my mom’s there. We always had big gardens and my little brother and I, I just had a brother, and we would literally take the harvest and throw it in our little red wagon and go up and down the streets and sell it. I still have the original little flyer that I printed at age 7, that had cucumbers for-, and it was funny ‘cuz I spelled ... I had little ones . . . little ones, two for five cents. Middle ones, Meddle, M-E-D-D-L-E, meddle . . . five cents each. And then BIG ones, ten cents. That’s just hilarious! So anyway, it’s like, ‘Ooh, you mean you can grow things, and make a nickel? Cool!’

And when ... oh, next transitional moment for me probably would have been my seventh grade biology teacher, and he was really a nutcase because, he’s the kind of guy who had his pants up to his underarms, and he’s the biggest nerd of all. And when you’re in seventh grade, anything remotely nerdy was just, I couldn’t handle it. And he would have the gall to pack us up, and he lived nearby the school, and we’d walk to his house and go into his backyard and work in his garden. And he had this compost pile and he had beautiful, lush gardens. And everybody’s like, ‘Oh, my God, can you believe this?’ And I’m secretly going, ‘This is so COOL.’ You know? [laughs]

So ... fast forward to meeting my husband and having children and wherever we lived we had a garden to feed us. He’s a union carpenter and ... so we would go
basically from state to state. We lived in a number of states before the kids were really-, well, before we moved here and they were probably seven and nine by the time we moved here. But it was really a case of: OK. This is where the work is. We were in Texas, we were in California, we were in Colorado, we were in Illinois, and then we finally came out here. We always had gardens. Some states we [inaudible] than others. But when I got here, and I had no idea, I’d never been to the Northwest. I was, Colorado but never came across at that, the [inaudible] states [inaudible]. And started learning about what you could grow here and how long the growing season was, and . . . and no poisonous snakes and spiders. I’m like, Wow.

JD: No bugs here at all.

CL: I know. I’m like, ‘You’ve got to be kidding! Why are people growing limes?’ I was like, ‘Oh, this is insane.’ So automatically just fell in love with the whole concept of gardening. We rented a house in Puyallup, and it had no space for a garden, . . . so I was kind of on the hunt for a garden, to latch on to it. And we moved here in like . . . ’92, summer of ’92.

And the following spring, my husband, Ken, had learned about an event that had taken place, and he had kinda mentioned it, To Live in Dignity. And what that was, there was a gathering of the community in Tacoma, a hundred years prior, down at what’s known as Fireman’s Park. And basically, back then they were in the depths of a deep depression. It was overwhelming, the hunger and the homelessness and
so forth. And . . . somebody spearheaded putting an event together down there at
the park, and everybody gathered, and were like, ‘You know, this is ridiculous, we
can take care of each other. We can come together. Let’s develop soup kitchens,
let’s get people to work, and let’s get this momentum going.’

And it really kinda kicked things in gear, and it was really kind of the impetus for the
start of the union movement in this region. Unions were starting to take hold on the
east coast, but not so much here, and people were becoming aware of, ‘Yeah, if we
come together, we control a lot of power.’

So that was a very pivotal moment to celebrate and Ken had learned about that and
wanted to honor it with a hundredth anniversary. ...and we had never done stuff like
this before. We were just raisin’ our kids, and trying to survive. But he wanted to
take on this project, and his goal was to reach out to all the unions, and get them to
come and participate in some way. And he asked me, being somebody, and I’m just,
bein’ mom, but lookin’ for work, and tryin’ to figure out, where am I gonna garden?
Ha!

He said, ‘If you could go around and just find community organizations and invite
them to participate in it, that would be cool.’ So I was like, ‘I can do that.’ And you
know, I would talk to people and kind of, everybody kind of kept pointing me in—, ‘Go
find Bill Bichsel. Go find Bill Bichsel. And I don’t know if you know him.
JD: I don’t know him. I know of him, but I don’t know him.

CL: OK. Sure. Well, he’s a Jesuit priest that has been quite a . . . a star. A stellar star to organize people, to welcome people. And I called him up and he set a date and I show up, and I’m a little bit early for our appointment, and I’m to meet him on the side of the house where a garden was. I don’t know, like-, this is serendipitous, you know? And I get there a little bit early, and . . . I’m just kinda going, ooh, they’d just tilled everything, and I’m like, ‘Wow, I wonder if they could use some help.’ And this black man . . . kind of confronts me. And he’s like, ‘Who are you?’ And, ‘What are you doin’?’ And, ‘Why are you here?’ And this and that, and so I’m tryin’ to answer his questions, and he’s just really kinda-, I think he’s . . . wondering, ‘What’s this white woman doin’ in my neighborhood, scoutin’ out the garden? What do you want with Bill Bichsel kinda thing, and I’m tryin’ to reassure him. ‘I’m just here to invite him to be a part of this and that.

This man and I become very good friends over it. His name is Kevin Putney and Bix finally shows and I tell him why I’m there, and he’s like, ‘Oh, my God. That is perfect. Yeah, we’re all about that. This is who you need to connect with, that also would be good people to try and enlist. And I’m like, ‘Oh, and by the way, do you need help with this garden?’ And he’s just like, ‘Here. Here you go.’ And I’m like, ‘Really?’ And he’s like, ‘Yeah, we’re kinda loose, community garden style. But yeah, fill in. Feel free.’
And so I did and it was, some place . . . and this is on the hilltop, and it during this period, I mean, you've got drug deals at every corner, and you've got drive-by shootings goin’ on. It’s just chaos. But in the midst of this little garden area, it’s like heaven.

So I started bringin’ my kids and we start bringin’ seeds and tools and this and that and . . . and there were other folks that would come. There was a group of people, there’s a mental health center just down below us, and they would bring small groups, and then there were other individuals from the neighborhoods, and they’d be pluggin’ in their little square plot or whatever.

And another dear lady that I met, her name is Kareen Perrin and she was doin’ stuff, and she was a gardener, too. Some of these others, I think they like to just, place seeds but she knew her stuff. So things start hummin’ along. And pretty soon, when weeds start happening, I’m out there and Kareen Perrin [is] out there, but everybody else kinda disappears. Bix would intercede from time to time but he was a very-, he’s a very busy man. And . . . lo and behold, it got to the point where it ended up, we were just caretaking for everything, yet kickin’ out some serious food. I mean, it was just like, you plant one zucchini and you can feed the world, right?

JD: Mm-hmm. And until Bill and [inaudible]
CL: ... And we’re looking at this abundance and ... and I knew what the scoop was with Guadalupe House. I don’t know if you’re familiar with them, but they are a Catholic worker community and they’re all about helping homeless people and, God knows they could always use an extra, buck or two. And so ... 

JD And so were these-, there were the gardens, the Guadalupe gardens attached to the house?

CL: ... This was just a garden. This is just the original.

JD: So, the first one, OK.

CL: And ... so, there was discussion about, ‘Let’s head on down to the Farmers Market,’ ‘cuz there was this new formed Farmers Market. It was like two years old, down there in Tacoma, and we talked to them, and they were like, ‘Oh, we would love it if you guys would come.’ And so we would start bringin’ some of our excess produce, and we were just the most, Beverly Hillbilly style conglomerate. I mean, we just slapped things in the back of the pickup. We didn’t have a fancy canopy. But we had crazy hats, and my two crazy kids and Carrie would bring her banjo and Bix would come and sing. I mean, we were a show [laughs]. And we would just hustle, our produce and by the end of the season, I think we made 500 bucks, and we were like, ‘We’re rich! Oh, my God, this is awesome!’
So we gave it to Guadalupe House, to help pay for the water or whatever, and we did it again the next year, and again, invited people to participate in any way they could. And again, it was more or less boiled down to Carrie and Kareen and the kids and Bix and a couple other assorted folks. And ... so that was kinda cool. But there was, again, you're this little island, but you got chaos surrounding you.

And we see all these vacant lots and we're like, 'You know? I wonder if the person that owns that land would mind if we took over their land.' And so the first one was an easy sell. It was actually owned by Hospitality Kitchen. And they were like, 'Oh, yeah.' You know, 'How 'bout it?' And so we poured the biggest load of chicken manure. Now, I don't know where we scored it, but you know, we scored chicken manure. And man, that was the ripest field ... Ha! It was so funny, and everybody was just ... mad as hell, but we're like, 'OK, but now it's gonna grow stuff.' And boy, did it ever. We had the most amazing garlic out of that.

And so that was cool. And that added to the collectiveness. So that second year, I think we maybe made like $1500, and it was kinda goin' up exponentially. And again, we donated a bunch to the House, but then we bought seed. Now we gotta seed start. And we could kinda dabble into things that we've never tried before. And so it was really kind of a vehicle that ... kind of experiment and learn and understand. I took classes on seed saving and that sort of thing.
And then goin’ into that third year . . . we had heard about a grant, and it was offered through . . . Urban Resources Partnership, U.R.P. It no longer exists, but it was kind of a coming together of the feds, the state and the county, pooling their money together, and making it available for groups to do environmental projects. And . . . Bix and I sat down and I said, ‘You know? There are three more lots goin’ that way that we should take over.’ And he was like, ‘You know? Let’s do that.’ And so we just threw together a grant, never written a grant in our lives. And submitted it . . . and we asked for the max, 30 grand . . . and we got it. Which was astonishing, Ha! And not only that, I mean, we weren’t a 501 C3. You know, we’re a bunch of gardeners. We had to get a bank account, and do things official.

But one of the concepts behind what we wanted to do, besides taking over the vacant lots, was to create employment opportunities for homeless people ‘cuz again, we’re in the midst of a lot of homelessness and . . . So we picked, about five people and assigned them each a garden, and we literally had to part ‘em out. One particular lot, a man had died of a drug overdose, and it was really kind of an impetus to take over the neighborhood with gardens. And when that occurred, it was like, ‘OK. So let’s really make this happen.’ And just to carve that out, it was like . . . 20 truckloads of beer bottles alone. It was insane. I mean, it was just a nightmare.

But we kept putting together work parties that involved a much greater outreach in the neighborhood. It was St. Leo’s Church, but it was district courts, working with
people who had to do community service. It was school groups in the area, and then I really tied in with PLU and UPS at the time. Just anybody and everybody.

The City had some great departments that were really focused on neighborhood revitalization and so I took ‘em to task. You know, I even had the City Manager out there, pushin’ a wheelbarrow. I’m like, ‘Dude, you’re all talk. Let’s see what you’ve got.’

And so we ended up having by the end of ’95, goin’ into ’96, a total of six separate gardens. And … as you can imagine, but this time, if we had that much produce from the first garden, exponentially it was just going crazy. So we developed a CSA, and we had heard about the concept, and applied it here. But doing it in a way where again, the proceeds would go to employ homeless people. And it was really an amazing partnership between the garden project and then Guadalupe House because they’re about housing homeless people. We were about getting them some work, and revitalizing the neighborhood. So we would secure a room for them at Guadalupe. They had a place to live, they had work outside, and it just … transformed the community. It was just … from one point it was a scary place to go – to the next point, it’s just beauty. On both sides of the alley, goin’ into this lot, it’s just gorgeous. It was just, it’s incredible.

And the one point … where Bix lives now, he’s actually temporarily housed in a jail …
JD: Tennessee, or something, I think, yeah.

CL: The woman who lives in the house below Guadalupe House, Jean Shimoishumau, who had lived in that home since being returned from the internment camps from World War II. Very dear, dear human. Loved, just kinda loved, and raised her children there but because of how the neighborhood turned out, very fearful about going outside.

And then the woman living next door to Guadalupe House, Little Eva, is what we called her. And both were about the same age. Both had raised children back in the ‘50s, into the ‘60s. Quite an active woman, and both of these women were in their 80s at that stage. And but again, fearful of what lurked outside the door. But there was a point and after the gardens were in, in that part of the neighborhood, I went and got both of ‘em. Just, ‘Do come. Come with me.’ And then, ‘Eva, come with me.’ And we all walked in and then I said, ‘I just want you to see the neighborhood right now.’ And we’re just walking up and down the alley there, and they’re like, ‘Oh, my God. ...‘Look at this; there’s grapes growin’ on the fence.’ [laughs] And, there’s flowers in what was a parking lot.

The only site that we had that’s ... we had a partnership with U Dub at the time to soil test for us, to make sure everything was going to be OK. And one location that was not OK, one that had some heavy metals showed up. We only grew flowers
there, and it was just, those metals make things grow good, apparently. Just abundance.

And so we walked that alleyway and then we turn around, we’re slowly walking back, and here comes Bix, running, but just huge coming down the streets. And I’m like, ‘What’s wrong with you?’ And he’s like, “I just can’t believe the sight of the three of you walkin.’ [crying].

JD: Wow. Was the City pretty supportive at that point? Or involved?

CL: They were. And I would say the following year we took on that . . . Urban Resources Partnership had another opportunity for that grant to happen again. And I think the max we could go for that time was $17,000. So we did it again. And they gave it to us. And we took on three more lots, going the other direction. And one lot in particular was half a block in size. And it’s right below St. Joe’s, ironically enough. And the owner of that lot was George Lagerquist. I don’t know if that name rings a bell? But yeah, he and I ended up having a very unique friendship.

Anyway . . . by the time we had a total of nine gardens and we have probably 60 members in our skill side. The City had an opportunity to go after an All-America City Award that they-, I guess they do annually. But anyway, they had invited us to be a part of the contingent going to present ‘em in Mobile, Alabama. And so we went there, giving our piece. And it was really remarkable because they looked at it, the
neighborhood councils were featured, the community gardens were featured, including Bix and I, and Neighbors Park. I mean, it was kinda like looking at all the good gardens that myself and Judy Quackenbush were asked to represent the garden element. But yeah, they were hugely supportive.

And then later, and I became a member of the New Tacoma Neighborhood Council, representing the gardens and Guadalupe House. And there was grant block funding available and that lot that George Lagerquist owned, there was a partnership with Mercy Housing, was buying the other half of the block. And because we had a great thing goin’ on with Mercy Housing, the City... donated $120,000 to us to buy that chunk of land. And it was really at a very pivotal time because if we would have waited a year, of course it wouldn’t have been available, but probably ten times that amount is what you could have got for it.

So that was kind of cool, and at that point, and this is like late ‘90s into 2000, we developed a land trust to take ownership of that particular lot, and then one of the early gardens, the one that Hospitality Kitchen allowed us to use, they wanted to just give it to us, so then we could be an owning entity. And so that land trust was formed, and that still exists. It’s still in-, those two exist.

JD: And is the leadership of that separate from the Guadalupe House? It’s... the Guadalupe land trust...
CL: It is.

JD: ... so that’s ...

CL: Yeah.

JD: ... separately operated ...

CL: It’s a 501 C3 and it’s whole mission is just to keep those gardens thriving, and they are now set up, [inaudible] style. I think, and then we call it the Gallucci Garden now. They’re developing all kinds of new things with that so ... 

JD: Were the neighbors, during that time when it just started to take off, were the neighbors supportive and involved? I mean, aside from the two ladies, I mean, was it ... 

CL: They were. They were, and the thing that was so fascinating about developing the gardens, it just brought people out. And there was no common language. None. I mean, there was like six languages, and I’m talkin’ about from like 19th and G, all the way to 13th and [inaudible] and kind of like, that checkerboard pattern with the lots that we took care of, and so, like a six-block area, but I would say there’s probably six distinct languages spoken. Korean, Cambodian, Vietnamese, English, ... Spanish, and I would even add Russian or Ukrainian.
But anyway, we’d be out there workin’ and people-, and they were so cute. ‘Cuz I’m hustlin’, haulin’ out weeds, and they’re just hustlin’ right behind me, pickin’ up my weeds. And I’m like, ‘Really?’ And they’re like telling me, ‘Yeah, dumb ass. Why have you been growing, whatever you think you’re growin’ when this is the good stuff?’ And we would just laugh and laugh and laugh, and I’m just thinkin’, ‘I know what they’re sayin’.’ And they just had great smiles and they were just, right there. Even though they’re not, helpin’ us unload truckloads of compost, but they are the ones who were attending to those gardens now. Really.

JD: Did you live in the neighborhood at the time?

R: I did not. I commuted from . . . We bought a house in Tacoma but on the east side, kind of off Waller Road, in ’97. Yeah

JD: Have you been involved at all with some of the . . . I know, kind of like in the last couple of years, a lot of south Tacoma and east Tacoma have started a lot of garden projects and they have a Farmers Market now. I don’t know if you . . . been involved in any of that?

CL: I have not. And it’s not that I . . . don’t want to be. It’s just I physically can’t not be everywhere.

JD: It’s kind of hard.
CL: Yeah, ‘cuz I ... I have another farm, too.

JD: So how did that transition take place?

CL: ... at the end of the ‘90s, how that kind of evolved and worked into what it became, the land trust is developing. I also partnered with Tahoma Food System, which is another non-profit that was really looking at dealing with food security issues. And they wanted to support me. I needed a job. I was doin’ all-, I was still goin’ to school back in the ‘90s.

JD: Oh.

CL: And raising my kids, but at that point I really needed to start makin’ money. And that seemed to be the best vehicle goin’. And together, we wrote another grant, and went after some funding from USDA, and we won ... oh, gosh, I wanna say 120,000 from that, which was awesome because that set me up with a salary for a couple of years ... and benefits and things I had not had. Ha! Which was cool.

But ... that ended up fizzling out ... when I ... left, and it wasn’t because it was a breach in anything. Their direction seemed to go more towards gleaning. And when the transition happened with me switching over to the gardeners who were-, and it was really kind of a collective that kind of came together, that was gonna continue
things. And we worked for six months. I didn’t just leave them. They had a six-month notice of sorts. But that was because David Ottey, the Director of the Emergency Food Network at the time, came to me and said, ‘Look, this woman offered us a piece of land down in the Shaw [Puyallup] Valley to grow food for food banks. Would you be interested?’ And I’m like, ‘Well, you know, I’ll go look at it.’ And I went and looked at it and fell in love. I said, ‘You’ve gotta be kidding me.’ I was just like, ‘One piece of land?’ [laughs] Versus all these checkerboard things. Flat, soil that goes forever, and it’s black [laughs]. No rocks? It’ was like, cool. And I just loved the idea of just growing for the hungry, that was just so exciting. So I just,

‘This is what I’m gonna do, and this is how we’re gonna transition.’

I stayed with the Board for Guadalupe Land Trust for about another year, and then I resigned from that. And things have kind of morphed in the way things do, but, yeah, I think, for the most part . . . were good.

JD: Was the transition from kind of that gardener sort of collective mentality to farming a big change? Or . . .

CL: It was and it wasn’t. The basics remained true. And . . . and it was nice to see even that follow-through here. There’s still that hands-on, take the time to make a difference, with even a square foot, even though you’ve got 500 million of those square feet out here. I think all that matters. Everything worth doing takes time and matters. What I learned from all those experiences was how to invite others to join
me. And I think that's what I'm good at. I'm not necessarily good at remembering everything. How to grow things, and I have to re-learn it every year. But I'm pretty good at being the Tom Sawyer of gardeners. I'm having too much fun. Why don't you come out?

JD: And organizing, I would imagine it's probably a pretty, monumental effort, too. 'Cuz there's ... if I understand correctly, it's mostly volunteers, so there's a lot of the ...

CL: It is all volunteers. It's bout 800 people a year to do Mother Earth.

JD: Wow, that' why I would assume that's a ... full time job.

CL: It is. It's really another full time job, yeah.

JD: What's the organizational structure? How is it managed?

CL: As loose as possible. We are a project of Emergency Food Network, and again, when I partner with David Ottey on that, the woman who owns the land, Doreen Johnson and myself, we all came together and said 'Look, you know, this is what we can do. This is what it'll take to pull it off.' And we decided to kind of break things up. Doreen would just kind of get out of the way, but we would always keep her informed on how things were developing. David would raise the money to pull off what I needed to do. And I said, 'I need seven years.' Even though, gorgeous piece of
land, it had been over-farmed for decades. And when I first went out there and took a shovel, I could not find a single earthworm.

And that’s kind of another piece to the work that we do down there; You have some of the most gorgeous topsoil on the planet, here. But it’s unloved. It’s so unappreciated, and so that, I feel is like one of the most important key features of the project now. Yeah, we’re growin’ a lot of food that feeds a lot of people. But it’s plugging those volunteers who perhaps have never gardened in their lives. In fact, I had a whole bunch of ‘em yesterday, about 50 people out there yesterday. And they’re like, ‘Really?’ You know, ‘That’s what rhubarb is?’ Ha. It’s like, Oh, wow.

But that’s so important. They don’t get that, and they don’t realize what it takes to grow food, and … and then, to see something accomplished at the end of the day. So many of us don’t have that ability to see something done. And when people can stand back and go, ‘Wow, I did that?’ And I’m like, ‘Yeah, and then you’re gonna be back in a month and you’re gonna help weed that. And then you’re gonna be back in a month and you’re gonna help harvest that, and then you’re gonna say what?’ Because that’s … the circle, right there.

**JD:** Is Doreen very involved in the farm at all?

**CL:** She’s not. She’s in her 80s and has health issues. But I know she’s very jazzed about what’s occurred. And she’s an interesting person on so many levels, but she was
actually born on that property. She grew up on that land. And the reason it’s named Mother Earth Farm is because the land had been passed down through the generations, through the women. The women always out-survived the men, and it was grandmother to mother to daughter, and now will go to the granddaughters. And it’s just really powerful.

She’s very suspicious of non-profits. Interesting. Her reason for partnering with EFN was because of David. David’s gone now. There’s another person in that place and I feel very strongly that she’s very suspicious of this person, as well. Not that she was suspicious of David. She loved David, but this one, you gotta kinda watch. And . . . I have seen other non-profits and I know she has. She was really quite involved in salmon restoration work. Where land is turned over to a non-profit and then sold to support other causes or whatever. So she’s not at all interested in entertaining going into a land trust or anything of that nature. . . . But she renewed, we have a ten-year renewable lease, and she did renew it. And she just loves what we’re doing so . . .

JD: And so what has been the outcome? I’ve heard in different news stories, of course, have different things. How successful has it been as far as producing food? Do you know offhand any . . .

CL: Oh, I do. Remember that seven-year mark? It took five. But, you know, even that first year we produced 60,000 some odd . . .
CL: ... Our average, in the last five years, is probably 150,000 pounds a year. A ... a piece of land qualifies to be a farm if they can show receipts for goods sold in the value of $200 per year per acre. Not that we sell things, and we actually had to go get a law changed to recognize us as a farm.

Because before Doreen and her brother, they had to fight it out, who got what piece of land after their mom died. But during that period, it had fallen into the zoning qualification of housing. So it was property taxes was like $3,000 a year back then. And it's now $500.

JD: Wow.

CL: Yeah.

JD: Big difference.

CL: Big difference. Let's see, what was the other problem I wanted to go to? [pause]

JD: That's all right. Well, is it because it's agricultural ... assessed at agricultural land rates?
CL: The potential of that land, so $200 per year per acre. If we're selling even whatever for a dollar a pound, we're well over that. And we-, all we had to show was $1600 for it? Yeah. $1600 for it, so we're at the $150,000 mark, if you go a dollar a pound. But there's nothing a dollar a pound.

Also, if you look in like soil surveys in conservation districts data and that sort of thing, a very productive farm can average maybe 8,000 pounds per acre. So even that, we're way off the charts on that.

But it's because of the way we grow. We're very intensive planted. We're totally organic. And in some areas, I'm getting three crops out of an area per year. Some, just one. But everything goes back in the cover crop in the Fall. So it's rejuvenated and the love is given back to the soil. And I'm happy to report, you can go anywhere on that land now and take a shovel and find a worm [laughs].

JD: Wow. So what are your plans as far as continuing? Doing other things? What?

CL: Well . . . the coming together of this farm [her own farm, not Mother Earth farm] was really, seeing a dream come true. That would be the ultimate, I could buy my own farm. And it happened because the state and the county came together and bought the development rights to this land. And it was a 100-acre farm altogether. We're only 35 acres, but there's two other farms associated with the original piece.
And because that allowed poor folks like us, to buy a piece of land, it happened. And . . . long term? This is where I will die. I will never move again. I can safely report that [laughs]. ‘Cuz moving’s awful. This is where I will, finish my growing up days and continue growing.

I would suspect I will be transitioning out of Mother Earth at some point in the future. It’s not right now. But we’re getting to that point where that will probably happen in the next couple of years. And my son, interestingly enough, looks like he’s gonna be the one taking over the reins.

CL: He’s been my assistant for . . . the last two years and has just really enjoyed learning everything. He . . . graduated from Western with a Business degree, and then went to U Dub and got an Environmental studies Degree. Couldn’t find work, at all, and I needed an assistant and he’s like, ‘I would love to apply for the job.’ And we’re like, ‘OK.’ My boss really struggled with it, ‘Well, you know, it’s just, nepotism, blah, blah, blah.’ I’m like, but you know, ‘This is somebody who can learn it and wants to learn it, and I really can’t think of a better candidate.’ And so it’s just worked out so great.

Plus, what’s so exciting is that, this is his farm [again referring to the family farm, not Mother Earth farm]. He’ll end up with this farm. And he’s getting all that knowledge base to understand how to put things together and what works, what doesn’t, and so that right there is like . . . icing on the cake [laughs].
JD: Mm-hmm, that’s so exciting.

CL: Yeah.

JD: What do you think, as far as . . . one of the things I think is really interesting about this farm and it's certainly a different approach, I think, than we kind of traditionally take in the setting, as far as how to feed people or how to provide for that need. And what do you think? that’s the route we should be taking?

CL: I do. Because the way that the overall food system is, is very corporate oriented. We all need to eat . . . more fruits and vegetables. That husband of mine, who eats organic all the time, that’s all we eat, has a heart attack. So, there we go. We, we’re all on that verge of a health crisis. And . . . to be closer to the earth to be more involved with what it takes to grow the food, to nurture the soil, to absorb the food comin’ out of it, and to teach people that it’s really OK to get dirt under your nails, I think is . . . is how we’re gonna survive as a species.

The other piece to everything else that’s going on besides the corporatism and the ownership of DNA and all of that chaotic nonsense . . . We’ve got a big scare with bees that nobody is really paying attention to. I just lost half my hives over the winter. I lost more than half last year. And . . . unless we figure out what’s really goin’ on with them, we lose honeybees? We, as a species, have five years. So we’ve got to get people reconnected to the earth, to rediscover that you don't need to add
ketchup. We don’t need to add sugar. We don’t need to add … corn syrup. You can just eat food, fresh, and it’s so good for you.

JD: Normal food?

CL: Yeah. So I think, being a part of that, to provide that fresh produce … is monumental as far as addressing, not just hunger, but … malnutrition on a scale that, handing people a bunch of carrots at the food bank. Yeah, that’s groovy. But it was also cool havin’ people weed those carrots and to get a sense of: Oh, OK. That’s why this is so important and maybe, if I could have some seeds, I’ll take ‘em home and plant them. So I love having those kind of exchanges and … and continue spreading that concept and idea out there.

JD: What do you enjoy most about as far as working at the farm? What parts of that are most enjoyable to you?


JD: [laughs]

CL: I know that’s really crazy. But I love doing it.

JD: There’s always lots of that.
CL: I know! I do. I’m crazy about weeding. I am not crazy about planting, and I’m not crazy about harvesting. I love weeding.

I love seeing wildlife embrace what we’re doing. All the birds, it’s awesome. The interchanges with the insects, very cool. I actually have a pest problem here, called ‘elk’, but I try to work it out with them, too. So, this place is magical, to be able to be here after, graduating from Guadalupe to Mother Earth to here.

JD: Was that a scary transition?

CL: No.

JD: I mean, was it uncertain at all?

CL: Not at all. Not at all, no. I like working with my hands, but I also like ... jumpin’ on a tractor, too. So ... yeah. It’s all good. ... you can get overwhelmed if you ... want to. But I don’t go there. It’s like, ‘OK. What can we do now? Well, have we fed the chickens? Well, we better go do that. Got it. OK. So do these guys need watering? No, they’re fine. OK, cool. You wanna go squeeze a lamb? Yeah. I really need a lamb fix.’ So it’s not overwhelming. It could be, I guess, but you just look at it as, you’re one person, and you know what needs to get covered, and you just go to the next. And if you don’t get it all done today, there’s tomorrow.
JD: That’s true [laughs].

CL: [laughs]

JD: I also, so I know that there was, it was 2009, there was like a nomination for White House . . .

CL: True.


CL: Right.

JD: And you were . . .

CL: Number two.

JD: . . . somewhere up at the top.

CL: Yeah.

JD: So what hap-, do you know how that started?
CL: I do. It was kind of an inspiration . . . a family in Illinois put together a website, putting a call out for who could be the White House farmer. And it was after Michael Pollan had put out an op-ed piece about: Wouldn’t it be cool if when Obama goes into office that he says, just put in a farm. Let’s get rid of this White House lawn. [Phone rings: Hey, Ken, Good Can I call you back? Things are good, but I’ll you right back, OK? Love you, bye.]

. . . the idea of nominating a person to do that, I wasn’t looking to do that. My old boss, David Ottey put me into the-, he partnered with Ken [Carrie’s husband] and David’s like, ‘You know, I’m gonna write somethin’ and submit it.’ And . . . so they got it in and they had some nominees, and people could vote. And . . . during that voting period, it was from . . . it was January after Obama had won his election. And . . . I had a very tough year that year with . . . well, my mom died the year before. And it was after a real fast battle with cancer. My dad had pulled more with Alzheimer’s, so I’m trying to deal with getting him situated, and to keep him safe. And then like right after New Year’s Day, I got a call about my uncle, my mom’s youngest brother, and apparently he had brain tumors, and he’s the same age as my husband. And . . . he’s in Denver. And I’m like, ‘OK. What can I do? What do we need to do?’ And we’re workin’ with family and trying to figure stuff out. And as I’m about ready to get there, he dies. Blood clot. So I need to go and help with all that, and that was when the voting started happening. So I’m totally detached from any of that.
And I think Ken and then he has a series of friends that are computer geeks and they just really started getting the word out. So I was really more about, ‘Oh, let’s get the vote out, da-da-da-da-da. Meanwhile, some of the top runners-up, we get together and were like, ‘Let’s put out a statement.’ Because, it was getting a lot of air play. And … we wrote a letter to the Obamas and then with that big emphasis on here’s what the movement is about. This is what we’re hoping to ignite with putting in a garden.’ My big push, of course, was to include everybody. Prisoners and school children and, Supreme Court justices. Mix ‘em up. And get ‘em all out there workin’ and … and everybody else had other pieces that they kind of threw in.

And we really didn’t get any response. But all of a sudden, Michelle [Obama] declares she’s putting in a garden. So we can’t help but feel that it just kind of helps…

JD: Well, so if they had had a garden, would you …

CL: Would I have taken that job?

JD: Yeah?

CL: Perhaps. I’ve lived in Washington, D.C. When I had lived in Colorado, we actually moved in my junior year of high school, to Washington, D.C. And my dad took over a car warranty company. And I resented that move, being in high school and that sort
of thing. . . but I fell in love with the area. I ended up working for a talent agency, of all things, for those years that I was there, before I moved back to Colorado, found my husband, blah, blah, blah. So I had this whole other life and spent those five years in D.C. and knew that town. Knew that town well. Climate-wise? Bug-wise? Would I wanna go? NO!

But to tear things up and to get people excited about growin’ food, oh, I’d do that. I would have been all over that. But funny how things happen.

JD: Yeah.

CL: Now, here I am with my own farm. I would not be here if I went and did that ‘cuz that, it was just no way... I know that.

JD: Looking back, when you first started, you say you kind of just saw this opportunity of volun-, do you expect that this is where it would go? Or has it just been kind of a . . .

CL: You know... Yeah, I’ve always had kind of this... underground feeling that... this is what I’m supposed to do. I think I’ve probably done it in the past. That’s why a lot of things just... second nature. I didn’t go to school for this. I studied anthropology. But a lot of this is innate for me. And... I’m supposed to be here, and I’m supposed to help this piece of land and I will always grow extra food and
give away to food banks. That’s a given. And to invite people to become more aware, of the value of whatever the plant may be. I do a lot of medicinal herbs, too, and don’t need the medicine cabinet, we don’t. We can rely on a lot of things that grow. So if I can pass that along, to kind of help collect that knowledge and share that with as many people as I can, then I’ve done my job.

JD: What is the driving force for you? The motivation? From the early stages of wanting to get involved, what is it that . . . compels you to do that?

CL: I really think . . . if we’re gonna survive as a species, and not take down the planet with us, this is the only way we’re gonna make it. That’s the bottom line. You end up-, do you have kids?

JD: I don’t, no.

CL: OK. Once you have kids, then you get that.

JD: I will say I don’t have kids, but the idea is kind of scary, the things we just continue to do. I mean, the whole idea . . .

CL: Yeah.

JD: . . . it’s a little . . .
CL: Yeah.

JD: ... frightening and it's easy, I think, to kind of insulate yourself from it but ...

CL: Sure.

JD: I garden a lot and I have wonderful neighbors, but sometimes I'm like, 'Can you stop spraying stuff over here?'

CL: Right.

JD: ... you don't need to like kill everything.'

CL: Right.

JD: But they don't, you know, they don't know.

CL: Right.

JD: They don't know.
CL: They don’t know. And we have to figure out ways to bridge those differences. That’s our job. I find my toughest sell . . . and it’s always Republicans. I don’t know why. But it’s like I’m tryin’ to do this. How can we bridge our differences? And it’s surprising what does that. It may be, with one particular neighbor I have at Mother Earth, and this guy, has his flags flying everywhere and I’m like, ‘Hey, but you know what? You’ve got a big pile of horse manure there. You need some help with that?’ Oh, God, yeah. I don’t know what do to do with this. I’m like, ‘I do.’ And so we’ve entered this exchange, for years, and we’re good friends now. And he gets the fact that I work with all sorts of people, including women in prison, and he’s just like, fired up, always checkin’ in on us, ‘You guys need anything?’ So once you develop that connection, then you got ‘em. [laughs]

You’ve got ‘em, literally . . . eating out of your hands. Yeah.

JD: As far as I know, Father Bichsel is really involved in activism, as well, and activism for homeless people in Tacoma, and obviously, all sorts of other things, too. Is that something you were involved in, as well?

CL: I was. But more from the environmental perspective. And I would say now more of my thing, even though I’m helping feed those in need, I’m really about educating people about GMOs, about the importance of seed saving, the importance of . . . not
being reliant on a safe way to provide what you need, kind of being self-reliant. But do it in a way that’s not independent. Like I’m in a box but to reach out to those neighbors. That’s more of what my activism is. Is to try to encourage those kind of things.

I used to be a protestor.

JD: ... are you just more mod- ... a what?

CL: And I-, I used to be a protestor ... 

JD: [laughs]

CL: ... and I was at WTO, and I was beaten at WTO.

It was bizarre. It was really bizarre.

JD: Is that something you are ... mostly not involved in now, just time-wise? I mean, I think it’s probably a little bit of both.

CL: It’s time-wise and ... looking at efficiency. What is gonna be the most effective way to make change? Is it holding up a sign and shuttin’ down a street? Sometimes. I was very active, pre-Iraq war. I had a big photo of the famous painting called The
Scream? And that was what I would hold and I would stand on the bridge over I-5, holding that. But I think it’s a little more effective being on the ground. Literally [laughs] Doin’ stuff.

JD: In the dirt.

CL: Yeah. So, I’m not really, protest much these days. But they have their place.

JD: . . . competing-, competing interests, I’m sure.

CL: Yeah. And we were only one person. There’s only so many hours in a day.

JD: So what do you think, looking back, your legacy will be and what do you want?

CL: Well, if anything, you know . . . if people could look at a purple beans and red Russian-, black Russian tomatoes and . . . red, outrageous lettuce, and say: ‘Carrie gave me those seeds, and I’ve been savin’ ‘em and I’m sharin’ ‘em,’ then that’s perfect.

[JD thanks CL for the interview and asks if there is anything else that should be included.]

END OF RECORDING
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Bonney Lake Community Garden:
Date established: 2010
Location: 18421 89th St E, Bonney Lake 98391
Details: land owned by city of Bonney Lake, and garden is run in partnership with the Bonney Lake food bank. Plots are available free of charge, and gardeners provide own tools, topsoil, and seeds, and fertilizers. Water is provided by the city of Bonney Lake.
Participants are encouraged to donate extra produce to the food bank.
Website/contact info: http://www.ci.bonney-lake.wa.us/section_community/community_resources/garden.shtml

Resurrection Lutheran Community Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: 4301 Browns Point Boulevard NE, Tacoma, WA, 98422
Details: Garden has 20 beds available, cost is $25 per year; children are welcome, no specific children’s area. There are plots designated for food bank donation. They also host monthly Master Gardener educational offerings on site.
Website/contact info: garden coordinator Cindy Niemi (253)924-1847

Curran Apple Orchard:
Date established: 1951
Location: 93rd Ave W and Rock Way W on Grandview in University Place
Details: Apple orchard is owned by city of University Place and managed by University Place Parks Department; trees are available for adoption on a yearly basis at a cost of $30-$50. The orchard hosts onsite educational offerings. The orchard was originally grown by the Curran family and purchased by the city of University Place in 1993.
Website: curranappleorchard.com

Enabling Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: 1918 N Puget Sound, Tacoma
Details: The Enabling garden is owned and managed on private residential property. The garden utilizes the space as a single communal growing space, with several additional raised beds accessible by wheelchair. There are shared tools and composting available. There is no cost to garden, however, donations are welcome and gardeners are expected to garden at least one hour per week. The garden is open to neighbors and community members with permission from property owner.
Website/contact: property owner, Irene Parry (253)672-4667

Franklin Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: 1201 S. Puget Sound Avenue, Tacoma
Details: Garden is located on outer edges of Franklin Park and is managed by Metro Parks Tacoma. The garden has 84 plots, including one large plot for food bank donation. There are wheelchair accessible plots, and occasional educational offerings in partnership with the Pierce County Master Gardeners. The cost is $30 per plot, per year, and gardeners provide all tools and plants, and are required to use organic materials and fertilizers. website/contact info: garden coordinator Susan Wigley susan2846@msn.com

Gallucci Learning Garden:
Date established: 2010
Location: Corner of S 14th and G St, Tacoma
Details: Garden maintained by Guadalupe Land Trust; educational garden featuring demonstration gardens, and educational offerings. Children's area and shared green house. website/contact info: guadalupelandtrust@gmail.com

Good Medicine Garden:
Date established: 2010
Location: E 32nd and Portland Avenue, Tacoma
Details: Garden is on tribal land and funded jointly by the city of Tacoma, the Puyallup Indian Tribe, and through grant funds awarded to the First Creek Neighborhood group. Half of the garden is available to the public, and the other half is for tribal gardeners. The tribal garden contains native plants and herbs with traditional medicinal uses. Website/contact info: http://firstcreek.blogspot.com/search/label/Community%20Garden; Puyallup Tribe cultural coordinator, Connie McCloud (253)389-8729

Golden Hemlock Community Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: 5939 N 26th St, Tacoma
Details: The garden is owned and operated by the Golden Hemlock apartment complex, a low-income, senior living complex. The garden has 80 beds and requires a one time fee of $60 to garden. The garden is open to Golden Hemlock residents only. Website/contact info: apartment manager, Fran Ortiz (253)752-6491; goldenhemlock@comcast.net

Grace Community Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: N Vassault and N 26th St, Tacoma
Details: Garden built on the property of Grace Baptist Church. The garden has 10 plots and are available to anyone for a yearly fee of $30. Several plots are designated for donation to local food banks. Website/contact info: http://www.gracebaptisttacoma.org/; gracebaptist@harbornet.com; (253)752-6443

Green Thumb Garden:
Date established: 2010
Location: Corner of Portland and Wright Avenue, Tacoma
Details: The garden is located on Puyallup Tribal land and is maintained by a local neighborhood group. The garden is open to the public the cost is $15 per year. The garden hosts regular work parties and educational offerings on site.
Website/contact info: http://www.facebook.com/groups/129893867033700/Paul Stuthman stuthman@yahoo.com

Guadalupe Garden:
Date established: 1994
Location: 1417 S G St, Tacoma
Details: The site of the original Guadalupe garden, now operates several gardens in close vicinity. Gardens on land owned by Guadalupe Land Trust. The gardens have individual plots available to garden at no cost.
Website/contact info: http://www.facebook.com/guadalupelandtrust; guadalupelandtrust@gmail.com

Hilltop House Garden:
Date established: 1994
Location: corner of S. 19th and Yakima, Tacoma; backyard of private home
Details: Garden and small orchard on privately owned land, maintained by Guadalupe Land Trust. Several plots are designated for food bank donation in addition to donations from the fruit orchard. There is no cost to garden, however, gardeners must attend at least three garden events yearly.
Website/contact info: guadalupelandtrust@gmail.com

Ilse’s Garden:
Date established: 2010
Location: N Ainsworth and 5th, Tacoma
Details: Garden has 9 plots; includes children’s area, dedicated plots for food bank donation, and shared raspberry beds. The plots are available at no cost, but the garden frequently has a waiting list. Gardeners are expected to garden organically, and composting and a shared tool shed are on site.
Website/contact info: garden coordinator Steven Garrett geografood@yahoo.com

Junett Community Garden:
Date established: 2011
Location: N 16th and Junnett, Tacoma
Details: Garden established on former site of Tacoma Public Utilities sub-station. Garden includes shared raised beds for fruits, berries and hops, as well as for food bank donation. Participants provide their own tools and plants, and must only use organic materials and fertilizers. The garden has shared areas including a gazebo, and tool shed, as well as composting and drip irrigation.
Website/contact info: junnettgarden.com; junnettgarden@gmail.com

Kandle Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: 2323 N. Shirley, Tacoma
Details: Garden operated by Tacoma Metro Parks and managed by gardeners. The garden has 27 plots available at a cost of $30 per year for plot. There is frequently a waiting list to garden, and the garden does not have any shared plots.
website/contact info: Metro Parks Tacoma administrator, Doreen Odel (253)305-1050

LaGrande Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: South 18th and G St, Tacoma
Details: Garden owned and operated by Guadalupe Land trust. There is no cost to garden and the garden includes rainwater diversion system, outdoor prep kitchen, and regular potlucks. The garden also has some wheelchair accessible plots and a children’s garden. The garden attracts many immigrant gardeners, and has a large and intricate system of trellising established. Gardeners are required to participate in both spring and fall clean up events, as well as attend at least three meetings/potlucks offered.
Website/contact info: guadalupelandtrust@gmail.com; garden coordinator, Travis Walker t.walker.09@hotmail.com

Leo’s Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: S 14th and Yakima, Tacoma; adjacent to St. Leo’s church property
Details: Garden managed by St. Leo’s food connection; goal is to teach food bank recipients how to grow their own food. The garden is a demonstration garden and all produce is donated to St. Leo’s food connection food bank.
Website/contact info: foodconnection.org; Rebecca Goossen jvgleaner@foodconnection.org

Manitou Community Garden:
Date established: 2009
Location: 4806 S. 66th, Tacoma; behind Manitou Community Center
Details: Small garden that donates all produce to the Manitou Presbyterian food bank. Several wheelchair accessible raised beds, greenhouse on site, and regular educational and community events offered. There is no cost to garden, and volunteers are always welcome.
Website/contact info: garden coordinator, Andy Mordhorst (253)475-8416

McCarver/Zina Linnik Community Garden:
Date established: 2011
Location: S 21st and S J Street, Tacoma
Details: Garden is managed as a partnership between McCarver Elementary, Metro Parks Tacoma, and the Greater Metro Parks Foundation. The garden is part of one of the two children’s parks established from the Zina Linnik Project. The project was a partnership between McCarver Elementary students, University of Washington Tacoma students, and University of Puget Sound students to create two new parks to commemorate the life of Zina Linnik, who was murdered in Tacoma in 1983.
Website/contact info:

McKinley Hill Community Garden:
Date established: 2011
Location:
Details: The garden was established by Metro Parks Tacoma as part of Rogers Park. The Dome top neighborhood association maintains the garden which includes individual plots, and a children’s area.
Website/contact info: http://tacomadometop.com/mckinley-hill-community-garden.php; garden coordinator, Lynette Scheidt dometop1@hotmail.com

Mother Earth Farm:
Date established: 2001
Location: 15208 102nd St E, Puyallup
Details: The farm is a project of the Emergency Food Network. It was established on a family farm that is leased by the EFN for the sole purpose of growing food for donation to the EFN food bank. The organic farm is maintained by various community groups and volunteers on eight acres of land in the Puyallup valley.
Website/contact info: http://www.facebook.com/pages/Mother-Earth-Farm/46596853423?sk=info; motherearthfarm@gmail.com

Neighbor's Park Garden:
Date established: park established in 1993, garden unknown
Location: S. 8th and I St, Tacoma
Details: Garden property is owned by Metro parks Tacoma, but managed by 8th and I neighbors group. The garden surrounds South and West sides of Neighbor’s Park. There are 44 plots available at no cost for plots. The garden has shared composting and tool shed, and water is provided by the city of Tacoma.
Website/contact info: NeighborsParkGarden@gmail.com

Northeast Tacoma Community Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: NE 57th and Norpoint Way NE, Tacoma
Details: The garden has 24 plots that are available for $25 per year. The garden has one plot dedicated for food bank donation, and holds regular meetings.
Website/contact info: http://www.facebook.com/groups/131335100227193/; garden chairs Heather and Dave Farrar ourgardencommunity@hotmail.com

Orchard and Vine Community Garden:
Date established: 2010
Location: N 45th and Orchard St, Tacoma
Details: The garden is maintained by a neighborhood group on land owned by the city of Tacoma. There is composting facilities, covered activity space, and the garden hosts regular community activities including potlucks, art classes, and work parties.
Website/contact info: http://www.facebook.com/groups/109256789124497/; orchardandvine@gmail.com

Pacific Lutheran University Garden:
Date established: originally 1997, again in 2006
Location: Pacific Lutheran University Campus, 12180 Park Avenue S, Tacoma
Details: This garden is managed by PLU students, faculty, and community volunteers, and donates an estimated 2 tons of fresh produce to local food banks each year. The garden also has several wheelchair accessible beds as well as several fruit trees. The garden hosts work parties weekly, and also has a shared greenhouse and composting facilities.
Website/contact info: https://sites.google.com/a/plu.edu/community_garden/home; garden@plu.edu

Proctor Community Garden:
Date established: estimated 1975
Location: 3901 N 21st St, Tacoma
Details: The garden is owned and maintained by the city of Tacoma through Metro Parks Tacoma. The garden has 46 individual plots that are rented yearly at a cost of $30. The garden frequently has a waiting list. Gardeners are expected to follow organic gardening rules, and have access to onsite composting and irrigation provided by the city of Tacoma.
Website/contact info: Metro Parks administrator, Doreen Odel (253)305-1050

Pt. Defiance-Ruston Senior Center Enabling Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: 4716 N Baltimore, Tacoma
Details: The enabling garden was developed in partnership between Pierce County Master Gardeners and the Pt. Defiance-Ruston Senior Center as a demonstration garden to specifically address creating gardens that are accessible for older and disabled gardeners. The garden has examples of raised beds, beds designed for sitting while gardening, roll under beds that can allow better access for wheelchair bound gardeners, as well as standing beds. The garden has bi-weekly educational offerings covering various topics.
Website/contact info: Pt. Defiance-Ruston Senior Center (253)756-0601

Stewart Middle School Garden:
Date established: 2010
Location: 5010 Pacific Avenue, Tacoma
Details: The garden was formed in partnership between the Tacoma School of the Arts and Stewart Middle School. The garden is located on school property, but is open to the public by application for plots. The cost is $20 per year, and there are some wheelchair accessible raised beds.
Website/contact info: http://classrooms.tacoma.k12.wa.us/stewart/cgarden/index.php; John Hoover jhoover@tacoma.k12.wa.edu, (253)571-4219

University of Puget Sound Garden:
Date established: unknown
Location: N 17th and Alder, Tacoma
Details: The garden is owned and operated by the University of Puget Sound as part of their sustainability curriculum. The garden is maintained by students, faculty, and alumni and is incorporated into several courses offered by the university.
Website/contact info: upspermaculture@gmail.com

UW Tacoma Giving Garden:
Date established: 2009
Location: Court D, off of S 19th and Fawcett, Tacoma
Details: The garden is located on campus property and is operated by volunteers. The 12 plots and 14 fruit trees are all used to produce fresh foods for donation to the Tacoma Rescue Mission. The garden has composting on site, which incorporates food waste from the campus as well as on campus food vendors, a rain barrel collection system, and a shared tool shed. The garden also has regular educational events at the garden.
Website/contact info: http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/interdisciplinary-arts-sciences/giving-garden-history; garden coordinator, Christina McAllister czinkgraf11@hotmail.com

Yakima Avenue Garden:
Date established: 2011
Location: 4620 S Yakima Avenue, Tacoma
Details: The garden is situated on an old residential lot and is loosely managed by a neighborhood group. The garden has 19 beds including a children's area and two beds for food donation.
Website/contact info: http://www.facebook.com/groups/125940087422074/