

Question: What's working well to improve air, land, and water resource protection and enhancements in the Green-Duwamish watershed?

Answers:

1. Acquisition of natural areas and shoreline along the Green.
2. River cleanup, planting native plants as a budget.
3. More green roofs! develop projects to get more green roofs installed, & require developers to contribute their share
4. Federally mandated orders seem to work
5. The public loves recreating in the Green River and with some open space and trail planning, will be able to access the river and public spaces into the future.
6. Reduction of pollution from some parts of the goods movement system like Port drayage trucks.

Question 2: What are the top three threats impacting healthy land, air, and water in the GDW?

Answers:

1. #1: Development. The #2 threat, in my opinion, is and odd one: Wetland Mitigation. Mitigation projects have destroyed shorebird habitat in the name of "enhancing wetlands". Shorebirds, which migrate through our area in large numbers, need shallow (often seasonal) wetlands that are muddy and free of shrubs and trees.
2. Time and again "Industrial runoff, lack of native plant budgets, runoff from roads"
3. Protection for the Middle Green River watershed. Increased development in Middle watershed. Lack of cohesive community initiative to protect the Middle Green River watershed. Lack of protection for underground springs that cool the temperature of the river as it travels through the Green River Gorge. Too much focus on the lower watershed
4. "Uncontrolled development. Lack of enforcement of state and federal laws. Lack of resources (\$) for Ecology to do their work.
5. Air: old inefficient wood stoves cause air quality problems. Land: development located too close to streams, not enough open space dedicated for habitat & recreation Water: non-point pollution from surface water runoff (oil-based pollution from vehicles, pet & human waste, industrial discharges from past practices), over-use of surface and ground water resources and lack of water conservation actions
6. Transportation emissions affecting public health now and driving climate change now and in the future.
7. Funding - We need to get more federal funding for this clean up. Onondaga River in Syracuse got over \$8 billion from federal agencies to assist with their clean up. This funding opportunity must be tied to contracting and training opportunities for local residents and businesses. Setback requirements - the city must work to establish clear setback limits and runoff standards for new buildings and work with existing building owners to process runoffs on site. Water Quality monitoring - the water must be tested for a variety of pollutants prior to allowing residents to swim in it. There must be trackable efforts to shut off stormwater drains that flow into the river without processing"
8. Community interest, involvement and activism in keeping this topic at the forefront of civic leaders.

Question 3: What and where are the biggest gaps in current plans, policies, and programs that require an integrated focus, to achieve healthy air, land and water for all?

Answers:

1. "So much effort is done piece-meal. Actions taken for flood control hurt fish, and vice versa. Restoring lost estuary function may come at a cost of lost upland riparian habitat. Wetland mitigation can result in conversion of wetlands from one type to another; those species that require one habitat are then replaced by those species who require the other. With a piece-meal approach, it becomes a zero-sum game
2. "True community involvement (it is even a gap in the WAG)
3. Coordinated open space & land use planning among King County and cities potentially provides a strong planning framework for identifying and protecting open space and habitat. How's that working?
4. Overall, lack of coordinated effort to price externalities (current and future air and water pollution) that result cost shifts to Watershed residents and onto public resources. i.e. the polluter pays system is fragmented and incomplete. Specifically, the lack of a price or market signal to drive low or zero carbon transportation fuels
5. First, I second James Rasmussen's comment, meaningful community involvement is a gap. Another gap seems to be a disconnection between efforts to enhance air/land/water quality "for all" and broader social/economic regional issues that will determine who "all" is. If some people cannot earn a decent living wage, afford housing, or have meaningful access to public transportation, then they may not be able to remain or live in Seattle and other areas close to natural attributes of the watershed. Ecosystem enhancements could become societal benefits that disproportionately serve economically privileged populations. Addressing broader issues -- particularly rampant and poorly controlled economic and housing development -- arguably do not directly fall within the scope of this watershed initiative. However, the overarching jurisdictions (eg, King County and City of Seattle) do have responsibility for those broader issues. The watershed initiative will be strengthened by active efforts to identify and create linkages and synergies between the watershed initiative and other city, county or regional initiatives for equitable social enhancements, Finally, attention to equity may be a gap in this watershed initiative. Admittedly, equity received prominent attention at the first advisory meetings. However, there should be no need to discuss whether or not equity should be a critical lens through which all watershed planning is viewed. The G/D watershed initiative is predominantly a King County initiative, conducted in the context of the larger ROSS initiative. King County has made repeated commitments to equity and social justice, including a recent Council-passed motion related to health of communities adjacent to the Lower Duwamish waterway. It should be indisputable that G/D watershed strategizing will use the County Equity Impact Review tool beginning in early scoping and continuing through all later strategy phases
6. The previous responses are thoughtful and seconded. The air quality monitoring and reducing impacts as well as local hiring and training are probably some of the biggest issues that need to be addressed.

Question 4: How can we connect air, land, and water issues? Where are opportunities for better coordination and partnerships to improve outcomes?

Answers:

1. Where agencies (State, County, Cities) are mandated to do work(because we've let it go for so long) To not look at just the minimum that will satisfy orders
2. King County's environmental benchmark program should be tracking indicators of air, land and water health from their county-wide planning policies.
3. For human health, take a holistic approach and measure the range of environmental stressors on residents, then ensure the residents are the ones who devise strategies to reduce those stressors.
4. Similar to what was initiated for the watershed and river planning for Vancouver BC, either the Puget Sound partnership's should set up a division that plays a role in coordinating all the efforts or a the Duwamish Coalition needs to take on that role and each agency must help fund this

Question 5: What are existing or emerging opportunities to protect, connect or enhance resources in the Green Duwamish?

Answers:

1. Buy up industrial lands to create more backwaters and wetlands
2. Combining social justice issues with habitat needs to recover salmon and effective source control and cleanups
3. Ensure that cities develop to urban densities within their urban growth areas and protect/preserve open space and agricultural lands through tax incentives and purchasing development rights.
4. The connections between the Elliott Bay Trail, Duwamish Trail, Green River Trail and Interurban Trail form impressive north-south spines for recreation and travel in the Green/Duwamish. Missing links should be completed to provide better, safer off-street experiences; and east-west trail linkages to other open space/park destinations could be created (Horsehead Bend Natural Area to Mill Creek. Once again, I second James Rasmussen's comments. The G/D Watershed initiative is already innovative in itself. However, we have the opportunity to integrate or at least actively coordinate efforts that are directed toward social justice issues and ecosystem issues. The environment is more than just land/air/water/trees. People and the social ecosystem are an integral component of our environment. There are almost certainly community members and other stakeholder groups who would identify more -- and become more actively engaged -- with an initiative to enhance an ecosystem and ecosystem "services" if there were more obvious connections with the environment that directly impacts their lives.
5. Work extensively with SPU on their CSO programs and projects to eliminate stormwater runoff through onsite filtering systems. Map underground and buried streams and change site development standards to include their protection
- 6.

Question 6: Tell us what you would add or change to one or more of these draft summary brochures

Answers:

1. All ready commented....
2. Please add WA State Parks & Recreation Commission (WA State Parks) to your list of partners. This agency owns and manages the Green River Gorge recreation area for the public.
3. On Human Health, please add PSCAA Highly Impacted Communities program. On Threats please add- While some forms of air pollution in the area are localized, our region's highest ozone(smog) levels are in the eastern parts of this watershed, but are caused by emissions in lower watershed and areas to the west(in other words, on this pollutant, the airshed runs the opposite direction of the watershed. On Opportunities- a good portion of the region's goods movement system is in the watershed(Port, Kent valley warehouses, etc.) Create a model green goods movement system that reduces and eliminates inequities.
4. Please add "Protect and" to Provide Affordable Housing. We have developed easily measurable yet intricate indicators. The determinants that are listed can affect minimal change if the indicators are poorly formulated. Please provide actionable descriptions of how locally disenfranchised population will have adequate