YOUR 2¢ WORTH--MEETING # 2

URBAN STREAMS--A HARD LOOK

1. In your opinion, what would be the effect of such a traditional solution on the atwer balence? What might happen to streams lakes, wells, and vegetation?

The traditional solution would be disastrous. Now is our opportunity to save our streams, not destroy them. People do not live happily or productively surrounded by asphalt lots, concrete waterways, pounding noise. We need the lakes and streams to offset other blights of civilization (not yet solved.)

MARVISTA:
No meeting;

RIVERTON HEIGHTS:
Only aware if it concerns us. Summer water levels go down, taking water off wouldn't help. Covered storm sewers in the city, leave them open in the country.

DES MOINES:
Some edge erosion on some property. What would be the result of quick run-off via culvert and storm sewer? No fish (one person remembered when salmon came up Des Moines Creek.) Creek has both improved and deteriated, no suds now. Sewer right of way has changed character of stream (aesthically terrible, a dump.)

NORTH HILL:
Dried up areas look terrible, no filtering of impurities, dust problem, lowering of natural water, erosion, high outflow at peak water flow could cause damage to surrounding land. Aestheically--we should consider the quaility of life and be capable of a better solution.

SHOREWOOD:
We would lose the streams for what ever purpose--lose vegetation organisma and wild life. It is necessary to retain all of these. There would be a loss of aesethic and recreational facilities.

AIR TRANSPORTATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT:
Not recorded

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Water levels of wells, lakes, streams in summer would be down. negative balence in the water cycle. Transferring the problem to Puget Sound.

YOUR 2¢ WORTH--MEETING # 2

URBAN STREAMS--A HARD LOOK

QUESTION # 2

What values or nuisances do streams have for a urban community? Which of these are most important to you, as a group? Why?
(economic, aesthetic, recreational, commerical, health, safty, etc.)

VALLEY VIEW:

Nuisance, Have to provide rain for them; bridges necessary. Values recreational, aestheic. Each property owner should have gravel sump or something similar to take care of his storm drainage--using storm sewere only for over-flow.

RIVERTON HEIGHTS:

Nuisance if they flood.

DES MOINES:

Could be lovely, a natural drain, recreational area, part of trail system, mushroom hunting area, for fishing, birds, place to play "mess around". Best would be a clear-water natural stream. Nuisanees, swamp, mosquitos, commerical draiage, car-body dump.

NORTH HILL:

Assets, lovely to look (should be accessible), fish, recreational value, maintains balance of nature, educational value.
Nuisances, floods, health factor (pollution, mosquitos etc.) safety (small children)

SHOREWOOD:

Any nuisances are tolerable nuisances.
Recreationally, parks are greatly lacking in Highline, we feel a real need to use our streams for small walk-to-type parks. Possibly this could be in cooperation with the building of holding ponds and developing the immediate shore area. They could be used for kid's (those under licensing age) fishing. Commerically, streams could be used for fish breeding facilities. Recreational fishing could benefit commerce of the area. If the atmosphere for fish was improved the streams would then attract more possibilities for fishing, Therefore the mouths of streams could serve boat rental businesses and also would create a demand for fishing supplies.

AIR TRANSPORTATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:

Pollution, drainage values. Important for urban naturalism, put to a use to enjoy, park areas, such as in Des Moines. Streams should be kept as natural streams with no concrete and gravel, no man intervention. Natural streams and natural settings.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

Aesthetic values are very important--makes a better place to live for everyone, including fish.
Recreation and economic value.

YOUR 2 ¢ WORTH--MEETIN # 2

URBAN STREAMS--A HARD LOOK

QUESTION #3
How accessible should urban streams and waterways be to the general public? Why?

VALLEY VIEW:
They should be available to public for limited use. To have the entire area available would be impractial, but this should be the aim. Overuse would present other problems.
Streams should be accessible to public as they are paying for the cleaning up

RIVERTION HEIGHTS:

As parks, pathways, etc. Goal-- keep it natural state--adequate property for use as holding ponds, apartment house, business etc., should be responsible for on site holding. Water should be treated--no oil, detergents etc. collecting.

DES MOINES:
Private owners adjacent to streams object to public access, the "public" seems to be a threat to some people. Grass to stream, few paths to streams, need trash cans and maintenance, worries expressed for picnic areas, worries that public use is carless, private property owners suffer from the mess.

NORTH HILL:
Very, BUT no highways or concrete parking lots adjacent, should be left natural, county should be encouraged to purchase water accessible areas and perserve for public use, favor extension of the Shoreline Management Act to preserve water fronts.

SHOREWOOD:
Areas available now should remain available. It is our understandiing that the water courses themselves are already public property and available for general use. Forcing property owners to donate passageway along the stream bank would be unfair and unreasonalbe for land already held but possible for new development might be considered.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

"Accessible as possible, considering private property and ecologically fragile of streams. Allow streams for fishing educational uses, no camping, access only by walking. Lakes and holding ponds, boating depending on size, skiing swimming, no power boats, fishing picnicing.

YOUR 2¢ WORHTH--MEETING # 2

URBAN STREAMS--A HARD LOOK

QUESTION # 4
Of all the solutions proposed for stream and drainage problems, which ones would you guess might be the most expensive? Who would pay?

VALLEY VIEW:
Probally the correct solution would be the most expensive--that's the way it usually goes. We pay always, The taxpayers. We also benefit. How much to provide flood and erosien control? Balence of nature, stream and swamps needed for birds and animals, can help to keep the streams and lakes clean. Pay attention to flloding and clean up, adequate space allowed for holding ponds.

DES MOINES:
Probally cheatpest is run creek thru pipes. Expensive water handling might be individual owners requirement to handle run-off via french drain tile. Natural landscaping would be lovely. Dept of Ecology has classified "A" Septic tanks--run-off. Sewers are a solution. There are many solutions--would have to cost money.

NORTH HILL:
Concrete but preferred more natural state even if it was more expensive, favored holding ponds. Who pays? probally taxpayer although perhaps should be system of taxation on amount of impervious surfaces.

SHOREWOOD:
Most costly in all ways is channelization. Developer should pay his share but we beleive in the final analysis its the consumer who pays.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

Amassive and complete storm sewer system would be both monetarily and aesethically more expensive. The people always pay.

YOUR 2¢ WORTH--MEETIN # 2

URBAN STREAMS--A HARD LOOK

QUESTION # 5

Of all the solutions proposed, which ones, do you feel would most nearly produce the kind of stream and drainage condition of the group decided upon in the previous question?

VALLEY VIEW:

Future plans should reflect responsibility of changes to overall enviornment (If you build at the top of the hill, your responsibility should take in what happens to the land at the bottom of the hill.) Would not buing land for holding ponds be less expensive that a concrete channel?

RIVERTON HEIGHTS:

Not recoreded.

DES MOINES:

Private development (apartments) seems to favor quick solutions land fill etc. A controlled system with no pollution up stream. Retrun salmon hatcheries, bird feeding or game sanctuaries.

NORTH HILL:

Prefer holding ponds, county control, don't build on natural drainage areas, recognize mistakes that have been made. Make certain that new land use of noise impaceted areas that are acquired does not add to drainage problems by more imprevious sufraces etc.

SHOREWOOD:

Seee question # 4.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

A combination of the solutions mentioned on "what have we done to improve streams". Remove excess run-off, leave natural courses alone, create pool and riffle effect. Planting for shading.

YOUR 2¢ WORTH--MEETING # 2

URBAN STREAMS--A HARD LOOK

QUESTION # 6

What changes might have to be made to put your preffered solution into action? What obstacles whould be the hardest to overcome? (governmantal, economic, jurisdictional, regulations, etc.)

VALLEY VIEW:

Obstacles--selfish businessmen, apathetic citizens (We all fall into that group occassionally.)

RIVERTON HEIGHTS:

Not recoreded.

DES MOINES:

Need to make lanktes like Tub lake public--many have become purchased by private ownership--great need for recreational, artifical lakes. Information obstacle hardest to overcome. Obstacles to improvement, Apathy of public, Lack of county response.

NORTH HILL:

Economics, public conscience, minimizing impervious surfaces education.

SHOREWOOD:

Stream problems can be solved engineeringwise rather easily but the obstacles hardest to overcome are jurisdictional and governmental Somewhere in the decision making process there must be one authority in complete control.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

Economics, making the public aware of problems.