

Feb. 6, 2012

TO: Transportation Commission, City of Bellingham

FROM: Preston Schiller, 1704-6th St., Bellingham, WA 98225; preston.schiller@wwu.edu

RE: Fairhaven Neighborhood Plan Draft; esp. transportation components

Thank you very much for reviewing this matter and for considering my views. Please note that these are my personal views and do not represent those of any institution with which I may be affiliated.

I have been commenting on the transportation element and related matters in communications with the City of Bellingham and the Fairhaven Neighbors since 2007. I have appended earlier comments below this most recent commenting. While minor aspects of a couple of my comments (such as inadequacy of bicycle parking in the commercial district and the need to make the trail crossings of streets more visible to motorists are derived from more detailed and thorough suggestions included below) have found their way into the plan several of the major thrusts of my comments and observations unfortunately have not. One of my major concerns; that motor vehicle traffic levels not be allowed to increase, especially in the mostly residential area, has not been addressed at all. This is unfortunate, especially, since that semi-traffic-calmed aspect of Fairhaven attracts pedestrians and cyclists from within and without the neighborhood and gives the neighborhood an ambience virtually unique to Bellingham. Encouraging more development around this portion of Fairhaven (and not addressing the traffic burdens generated at Fairhaven Middle School by the large volume of dropping off of students who could and should be walking or cycling) while not protecting the residential area from associated traffic will only destroy that aspect of the neighborhood's character. I hope you will read my comments and recommend a revisiting of the transportation-related elements of this draft plan by staff.

The plan Overall has many good ideas and I appreciate the great effort that Nicole Oliver has put into it and in its public and neighborhood vettings. However it should be noted that much of the Bellingham building code and permitting practices work against infill and compact development and that the City prefers to attach bits and patches of small changes (urban village guidelines and the like) rather than address the bigger issues that deter or discourage residents from undertaking small scale developments or housing and lot modifications that promote the goals of infill and compact development. (Note; this is based also on my experience in moving an historic house from one part of Fairhaven to another in order to save it from the developer's wrecking ball, etc, and learning first-hand the pain that occurs in dealing with COB and its codes; please note existing codes and PW/Permitting practices are at war with suggestions such as the proposed Policy 6.8 favoring narrow "unimproved" streets")

Parking or Pedestrianization? I am glad that the City is not advocating rushing into a large parking structure for the Commercial District; it is not needed and better parking management and development planning could prevent the need for such an exorbitantly expensive public facility—if, indeed, there truly is a "need" for more parking. If, however, the Commercial District and future developers wish to pedestrianize some of the district's streets, a well-planned parking structure might be in order—or it may be wiser to incorporate more parking into future developments in exchange for closing certain streets to motor vehicles. This, of course, would make the commercial district even more attractive and valuable—as the case of the popular and

often-extended Pearl St. pedestrian mall in Boulder has shown. It was only a few years ago that City Planning and the Fairhaven business district were militating for the removal of half the signature cherry trees along Old Fairhaven Pkwy/10th to create a few more parking spaces. After several citizens complained, some media paid attention and Schiller and spouse pledged to chain themselves to some of the trees to prevent their destruction, there was a rethinking of that destruction. If pedestrianization is not even going to be seriously looked at in Fairhaven planning just where in Bellingham might it be looked at?

Chap. 5: Trails;

-- Where trails cross streets there should be both x-walk signage and speed tables; it is not sufficient to simply say; "improve trail crossing visibility," let's be more specific. Consider the street and trail connections between Fairhaven and South Hill/Boulevard Park areas; consider a special "walking street" treatment for 10th between Mill and Bayview Dr. (roadway to Boulevard Park) and the closing of 10th and Bayview to cars (often cars come zipping off the Boulevard and zig-zag onto 10th creating hazard for all; there are several other options for motorists who need to be on this stretch of 10th, including Easton)

Chap. 6: Transportation; There are many ideas worthy of support in the transportation chapter (more bicycle parking, better trail-street connections, etc) but its main problem is its mostly Business As Usual (BAU) orientation (rigidly adhering to outmoded hierarchical arterial classifications and using motor vehicle LOS) rather than providing fresh ideas and approaches that could help Bellingham and Fairhaven move further along the path of sustainable transportation.

--Because the residential neighborhood worked hard several years ago to prevent Donovan from becoming a high-speed arterial cut-through it now enjoys continued walking-cycling amenities on its narrow streets that PW and City Code keep wanting to widen. That is one of the reasons for high rates of walking, cycling and transit use in Fairhaven. The plan should address how City planning will maintain, or even decrease, low vehicular traffic on neighborhood streets that resulted from the berming of Donovan at 10th. The plan should also address how City planning will address the need to protect neighborhood streets (such as 4th, 6th, Cowgill), already suffering from gratuitous cut-through traffic from further traffic increases as development.

--The neighborhood and the commercial district already suffers from more traffic and noise than necessary on 12th/Boulevard, Old Fairhaven Parkway (where's the "park" in the "parkway?") and Chuckanut (beloved by noisy motorcycle hogs on weekends) occurs. Where's the plan to diminish this?

A few specific comments in response to reading the most recent version:

-- p.38; overall goal of 75% by 2022 may be insufficient; probably allows for traffic growth?

-- p. 38; the intersection of 12th, Finnegan and Mill is a mess and should be redesigned, perhaps closed to cars.

--see p. 42; good to maintain 10' sidewalk on N. side of Harris, need wider sidewalk on S. side; use far right planting strip for bike lane instead of planting strip on S. side (let developer take care of that) and sharrow; no more 5' sidewalks (betw. 6th and 8th;) we need wider sidewalks on both sides of Harris all the way from the Fairhaven Station to 10th! There are ways of reconfiguring the 80' R.O.W. to allow for trees, wider sidewalks and (perish the thought) a

protected cycleway. Between 6th & 8th there is no need for on-street parking—or it could be provided as part of a development creating such space on developable property on the south side of Harris—or other ways that could be explored. Or does parking always trump walking, cycling and trees?

-- p. 43; where are the ped/bike LOS analyses?

-- p44; WTA; the greatest travel demand is between Fairhaven and WWU; however WTA did the Red GO line because it fit better with their (also outmoded) downtown station pulsing requirements AND it truncated buses from campus that used to go to Fairhaven Station because it did not fit their pulse mode. In other words, the pulsing considerations are driving planning and are an obstacle to designing routes that best serve the greatest demands for transit. I think this section should reflect a better critique and understanding of these issues.

Previous communications about transportation planning for Fairhaven

17 June 2011

TO: City of Bellingham, Attn: Nicole Oliver

FROM: Preston Schiller, 1704-6th St., Bellingham, WA 98225

RE: Fairhaven Neighborhood Plan, Parking Study thoughts

I am pleased to take this opportunity to respond to the ongoing Fairhaven Neighborhood Planning process and to inform you of numerous suggestions I have in regards to it and to the upcoming Transpo work in regards to the development of a Fairhaven Parking Plan. My comments and suggestions about the Fairhaven Parking Plan are also applicable to other parking planning efforts also underway in the city. (Please note that my comments are my own personal comments and do not reflect views of any other institution with which I may be affiliated)

Immediately below are several comments, observations and recommendations about matters addressed in the “FAIRHAVEN NEIGHBORHOOD AND URBAN VILLAGE PLAN Working Draft - March 2011” and the June 8 meeting. Following these I have appended a number of proposals I drafted for the Fairhaven Neighborhood Association in 2007—only a couple of which appear to have surfaced in the current planning document.

I would be glad to discuss these and other matters in my areas of expertise and experience with appropriate planning staff. Specific ideas and examples of how transportation planning and provision can move in the direction of sustainability can be found in my co-authored book, *An Introduction to Sustainable Transportation: Policy, Planning and Implementation* (<http://www.earthscan.co.uk/?TabId=101776&v=512228>), especially Chapters 6-10.

Recent comments, observations and recommendations:

I applaud your efforts at engaging citizens in this effort early on and throughout. There are many excellent features to the proposed plan, however, much, if not most, of the thinking evidenced in the plan in regards to transportation planning and provision exemplifies many of the problems of

business as usual (BAU) approaches lacking the informed perspective and spirit that is needed should Bellingham/Fairhaven truly desire a future with less vehicular traffic, more people traffic, and less environmental impact. There appears to be an emphasis on accommodating motor vehicle traffic with only minor consideration, usually at the margins, of truly promoting and enhancing non-motorized movement and amenities. As in other aspects of life one needs to make clear choices and commitments, among those relevant for Fairhaven are:

- more vehicular traffic OR less vehicular traffic
- a quieter neighborhood OR a noisier one
- more children walking and bicycling to school OR more cars delivering children to school
- more parking OR more public space
- more people density OR more vehicular traffic density
- should traffic counts be taken as a fetishistic indicator of why motor vehicle capacity should be expanded *or* as an indication that some traffic flows are already too large to be compatible with pedestrian amenity and become an indicator of how some should be lowered? (see the work of Don Appleyard for an understanding of how traffic levels, sometimes at moderate levels, interfere with neighborhood sociability, etc)

Traffic is basically a human phenomenon subject to shaping, despite the best efforts of many traffic planners to treat it as an engineering exercise.

Newer Recommendations, Parking:

The document I have received about the scope of services to be delivered by Transpo appears woefully inadequate to the challenge of sustainability. Sustainability would lead towards a capping or reduction of parking in tandem with significant and meaningful pedestrian, cycling and transit improvements. Parking supply, oversupply already in the case of Fairhaven, acts as a motor vehicle magnet. Expanding parking supply is unsustainable. The unsustainable approach is indicated by a considerable interest in the details of a proposed parking structure. It is my contention that:

1. A parking structure is one of the worst public investments conceivable;
2. If parking were so valuable to warrant spending millions of dollars (\$30-50,000/stall) it would/should attract private investment, especially on the part of the merchants and development interests clamoring for it at public expense.
3. That a structure should only be considered as a replacement for on-street parking removed as part of the pedestrianization of a commercial district, as in the case of the highly successful and ever-extending Boulder (CO) Pearl Street pedestrian mall.

The section on “Management Strategies” appears to be covering some of the territory, again, that was presented to the city’s parking group several years ago when I arranged for a meeting for them with parking expert Todd Litman. Where is the institutional memory?

Both Litman (*Parking Management Best Practices*) and Don Shoup (*The High Cost of Free Parking*) have created a basis for parking management which should become the touchstone for

such a plan. Transpo and the City should begin with their findings and recommendations and then work back from them to the City's specific situation.

Transpo and the City should avoid the mistakes of previous parking studies, such as the one done for the waterfront redevelopment and criticized in the following publications:

- [The Benefits of Limited Waterfront Parking](#) *Wes Frysztacki* — October/November/2009 (v18i10)
- [New Whatcom Redevelopment: Unanswered Questions About Vehicle Parking](#) *Wes Frysztacki* — June/2009 (v18i6)

There is, however, one glaring parking deficiency in the Fairhaven Commercial District: bicycle parking is inadequate, not protected for the most part, and some of it, such as that at Fairhaven Green, is inappropriate for locking, etc. Please have this form a major focus of a parking study!

Newer Recommendations, creating a traffic cell for the residential area:

- the Fairhaven residential area (4th/10th & Harris/Cowgill) should become a traffic cell to the extent possible; divert Edgemoor traffic away from 4th and onto Bayside (which has more of an arterial size, better traffic control devices, etc), make Cowgill into a one-way, reinstate neighborhood status to 4th St. and engage in traffic calming; make it virtually impossible for rat-running traffic to infiltrate this most walkable of Bellingham neighborhoods. This would address, somewhat in advance, the traffic infiltration likely to occur with more development in the Harris corridor—some infiltration is already happening. This could then become a model for other Bellingham neighborhoods to follow as they seek to enhance their walkability/bikeability.

Newer Recommendations, height limits along Harris

In order to blend with existing and historic development in and adjacent to the Fairhaven Commercial District, height limits of 54 feet maximum should be imposed upon developable parcels on and along the Harris corridor west from 10th.

Newer Recommendations, noise limiting and monitoring:

- Bellingham's code and practices regarding noise, especially that emanating from industrial areas and affecting adjacent residential areas is inadequate and neither understood nor enforced by the Bellingham Police Dept. The police may be adequate for toning down noisy parties but they are not equipped, nor do they understand, the issues around noise monitoring and infiltration. The Fairhaven Shipyards regularly emits noise levels that are illegal (either in terms of volume or time-of-day) and lead to an unpleasant experience for the adjacent residential areas. Many of these illegal emissions could be curbed through better practices and management.

Newer Recommendations, better trail connections:

- Although not within the Fairhaven Neighborhood, there is an inadequate connection between the Interurban Trail (which goes through Fairhaven) and the segment that goes on southwards across Old Samish to Larrabee St. Park at Arroyo Park. An improved trail accommodating bicycling as well as better signage there is recommended.

Newer Recommendations, diverting traffic from Chuckanut

- The reinstating of Chuckanut Drive closures for walking and bicycling and road runs could begin to divert some of the excessive traffic (and extremely noisy motorcycles) from Chuckanut.

Older Recommendations, submitted in 2007:

NOTE: Please be aware that extensive research and analysis over recent decades has indicated that most of the traffic standards we labor under are largely wrong, i.e., expanding roads leads to more traffic, wider streets are less safe than narrow streets, expanding parking leads to more driving and less walking and choice of travel options (the success of neighborhood commercial zones such as that of Fairhaven is to a large degree dependent upon walkability; to and through.), etc, so understanding what needs to be done calls for a willingness to explore notions which are often experienced as counter-intuitive or at least counter to conventional wisdom, which in the case of transportation planning and practices, is not wise.

Initializations:

COB (City of Bellingham)
 POB (Port of Bellingham)
 CD (Commercial District)
 FHN (Fairhaven Neighborhood, sometimes also referring to its Association)
 RPZs (Residential Parking Zones)
 WSDOT (Wash. St. Dept. of Transportation)
 WTA (Whatcom Transportation Authority—transit)
 WhatCo (Whatcom County)
 BPS (Bellingham Public Schools)
 FTC (Fairhaven Transportation Center)
 BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)

===== Issues: (numbered but not necessarily prioritized)

I. Neighborhood Streets

Issue: neighborhood street dimensions:

Discussion: our narrow streets are considered sub-standard by COB (which wishes it had the \$\$ to widen them but is too busy widening Sunset, etc.) although there is an extensive literature indicating that wider streets encourage speeding and are, therefore, less safe.

Recommendation: keep them narrow, encourage more walking and bicycling and slow driving, do neighbor education (esp. the new crop of young-uns moving-in each fall, etc.)

Issue: parking

Discussion: there are 2 potential issues here: (1) whether the occasional practice of parking on the pavement of a narrow street is problematic and; (2) whether parking overflow from the commercial district is or will be a problem. The first needs more discussion, especially about whether there is a true problem (safety, aesthetic, or otherwise) or whether on-pavement parking might be seen as a form of traffic calming. The second needs to be addressed by supporting efforts in the city to create RPZs (Residential Parking Zones) when and where they are needed. RPZs limit daytime parking on neighborhood streets to residents with stickers. They do incur costs to the City (Sehome's, I believe, is funded by a fee paid by WWU?) and are not always easy to enforce.

Recommendation: more discussion/study of these issues. Support the notion of RPZs funded by the sources of the problem. Remove the parking area on 4th for the off-leash area, parking should be at the designated park area. Teach dog owners how to walk, give them treats regularly, massages, pats on heads, etc. Charge overnight parkers on 4th, 6th and related streets a fee large enough to make them consider going to Larrabee St. Park or the POB-Amtrak fenced parking

Issue: speeding, stop-sign running and traffic infiltration (maze-running) on neighborhood streets (see newer recommendation regarding "traffic cell" above)

Discussion: anecdote and observation suggests that episodic speeding on neighborhood streets is a problem. This issue needs to be studied (doesn't have to be elaborate). It appears to be more of a problem on some streets (Cowgill, 4th) than others, although a study could establish its prevalence. As more development occurs on Harris, FHN will be subject to higher levels of traffic infiltration. Some is already occurring in conjunction with the off-leash area and the parking mess associated with it on 4th.

Recommendation: more study of this matter, consideration of comprehensive fixes rather than the little itsybitsy one/year site specific fixes suggested by COB's neighborhood traffic calming program (created without citizen input as near as I can tell). For instance, the solution to speeding on Cowgill might be to make the street 1-way or divide it into two 1-way segments or to make parts of it even more narrow (necking-down). Also, FHN should advocate radar-camera enforcement; it is working well in Seattle. Dogs should also teach their owners how to walk so they don't have to drive to the off-leash area. The Donovan Berm should be made permanent by statute—it has been a major reason behind the walkability of many FHN streets.

Issue: Trails: signage, safety, integration with street system, transit, etc.

Discussion: Bellingham and FHN are the beneficiaries of a wonderfully extensive trails, parks, bay access, and greenways system. The trails, parks, bay accesses, and greenways could be much better signed and published in maps (some efforts have only begun in the past couple years and are quite inadequate) and integrated into the transportation system of the city and its neighborhoods. The intersection of trails and neighborhood streets and arterials could be much improved through signage and crosswalk treatments.

Recommendation: Intersections of trails and streets be well signed and local area maps at these intersections should show where the trail goes, how it connects with parks, etc. Crosswalks, including raised crosswalks ("speed tables") should be created at trail crossings on 4th, 6th, Harris & Padden Creek, and McKenzie/Old Fairhaven Parkway, Mill/10th, et al (Others to be identified by those more familiar with specific crossings on Old FH Parkway, etc.). COB to develop citywide standards, etc. WTA should pay more attention to "transit-to-trails," and it should consider creating some bus stops at significant trail crossings and signing them accordingly.

WTA and COB should collaborate on creating marked crosswalks at all bus stops since folks probably won't take the bus if they cannot cross the street.

Issue: Walking/bicycling; general

Discussion: FHN plan recommendations should call attention to the need to preserve good/safe walking and bicycling conditions in our neighborhood.

Recommendation: Education and outreach should encourage persons of all ages to walk and bicycle more. The Neighborhood Watch supporters should note the license plate numbers of speeders/stop sign runners and report them to BPD which should be expected to at least contact such miscreants and make appropriate notations in computer files. (also see "Schools" discussion below). Signs should be posted at neighborhood entry points: "Fairhaven is for Walkers" (and Runners? maybe the Fairhaven Runners shoe store will contribute \$\$?) and educational materials should inform persons that they can walk even if they do not own a dog or a cell phone..

Issue: Arterial Streets; Designations, Safety, Traffic Calming

Discussion: FHN & CD are fortunate to have few arterials. Streets designated as arterials by the authorities (COB, WSDOT, WhatCo) are easier for the authorities to widen. The COB, in its infinite transportation wisdom, has taken traffic calming on arterials off the table (it was never on the table or under the table). Widened arterials mean higher traffic speeds, less walking, crossing the street, bicycling, and more car-oriented development (Sunset Strip, Sam-Ish, UnGuided Merd,) etc.

Recommendation: Remove the proposed arterial designation for Donovan-10th-Harris-west of 10th; the streets are just fine at existing widths; such a designation will "grease the skids" for widening these streets unnecessarily (remember the Cherry Trees near-debacle?); if this paving machine is impossible to stop then they should not go above "collector arterial" status and COB should develop design guidelines for such arterials along with arterial traffic calming standards (in practice elsewhere successfully) so that the ugliness of Old FH Pkwy (continuous middle "suicide lane") is not continued. COB should attempt to take back Old FH Pkwy from WSDOT so that it can be made more of a true parkway with median planter strip, etc. Perhaps Harris west of 10th could have some pocket turn lanes at intersections. The important thing is to resist arterial widening which is being considered for the Boulevard, etc by COB.

Issue: FH Commercial District: Traffic calming, pedestrianization, parking

Discussion: The FHCD is a jewel and residents of FHN are fortunate to have some of its shops and services so closeby. Some of COB's planning efforts have preserved and capitalized on its historic values, unfortunately some aspects of COB planning and policy have undermined its value and created problems (present and future) for FHN. Two cases in point; first, the lack of appropriate buffers between intense development (6-10 story condos/apts along 10th/Harris), natural areas (read "Padden Creek/Lagoon), and FHN (read "6-10 story buildings towering over adjacent residential areas"); second; the truly unwise creation of a FHCD parking district (many of whose prerogatives are unfortunate) without appropriate public input or analysis. The results of the former are apparent to FHN, the results of the second are not so apparent but need to be discussed. The FHCD parking body has consolidated the redesign of many streets with the paramount consideration of cramming more and more street parking into the area. This has interfered somewhat with transit services and, perhaps, with bicycling on certain streets (this should be studied). It has led to a neglect of the pedestrian and transit environment. Now an even

greater disaster is being contemplated; the creation of a costly parking structure (adjacent to and below the Fairhaven Inn) at public expense. Advocates will try to assure us that it will pay for itself or even be a moneymaker. This is extremely unlikely. It is much more likely that it will be a drain on public coffers and be seriously underutilized. It will assuredly not "solve" the parking problems of FHCD. In fact, I would argue, there ultimately is no solution for parking problems beyond better parking management (meters, time limits, enforcement, diversion of some drivers to other modes, RPZs, etc.) Merchants of the sort dominating the parking discussion in FHCD have a great propensity and long history of shooting themselves in their feet (both feet!) through such schemes.

Recommendation: That FHN begin a dialogue with FHCD about enhancing pedestrian conditions, pedestrianization of parts of FHCD, transit improvements, and non-expansion of parking. Win-win solutions should be pursued, i.e., the intersection at Larrabee/12th is very unsafe, poorly marked, poorly constructed, poorly lit, etc, etc. It makes it difficult and unsafe for many pedestrians, especially younger and older, to cross the street to avail themselves of the wonderful Haggens coupon specials, Yorky's pizza by the slice or Wins' cuisine. It also is an impediment to walking safely to Larrabee Elementary (see "Schools" below) This intersection should be treated with, at least, a flashing pedestrian sign crosswalk treatment (island in middle of street, etc.) We should also begin a discussion of planting more cherry trees in FHCD both to make up for the 4-6 which COB recently killed to create a bus stop so that buses would never delay traffic (I tried to get the City not to do that and failed, WTA and the developer were willing and eager to leave the trees alone, but not COB) and to continue street beautification along all the FHCD streets. Also, all new sidewalks in FHCD should be a minimum of 12 feet in width, not the standard skimpy 5 feet.

Issue: Schools

Discussion: Part of the American obesity epidemic of young persons and their parents is related to the growing phenomenon of drive-to/drive-from public education. This appears to be only very weakly related to the distance between residence and school or the walking conditions of the neighborhood. It does appear to be strongly related to parents' lifestyles, media hype and public misunderstandings about "stranger danger," and the retreat of the schools themselves from monitoring walking conditions in their vicinity.

Recommendation: FHN initiate discussions with COB, other neighborhood organizations, and Bellingham Public Schools (BPS) about programs which would teach remedial walking (or bicycling) to parents, teachers, administrators, and students. Intersections near schools and along walking routes should be made more safe (each corner should have a traffic control device; stop sign or signal) and, in the case of messes such as Hawthorn-Chuckanut-12th-Ridge, be redesigned with pedestrian safety foremost in mind. No parking areas around schools should be expanded, etc.

Issue: Transit and Public Transportation Facilities

Discussion: FHN & FHCD are fortunate to be well-served by transit, but connections between modes and major facilities are often weak or in need of improvement. While students form the largest user group of WTA and as significant users of Amtrak and Greyhound, their needs are not always well met. For instance, the bus shelter at Fairhaven Transportation Center (Amtrak-Greyhound Station) needs to be moved a hundred feet or so easterly in order to benefit users of the buses which pass through the station area's back. Many students traveling to and from WWU

and FTC have to walk with luggage to and from FTC and 12th in order to access the bus services to WWU, Sehome and Happy Valley neighborhoods. Recently 50-60 WWU students had to wait outdoors at FTC for several hours for a Greyhound bus because Greyhound would not let them queue in the lobby. Other examples of transportation providers insensitivities to patrons' needs could be cited.

Recommendation: COB, POB (responsible for FTC), WTA and WWU study and implement ways in which users can better and more comfortably access public transportation services.

Issue: Transportation Related Noise

Discussion: There is considerable transportation-related noise affecting FHN, much of which has nothing to do with public transportation or other neighborhood amenities and is, therefore, a burden which should be reduced by COB and the noise polluters. BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe) frequently has work trains stacked on its Fairhaven sidings whose noisy and smelly locomotives and loud radio systems pollute the FHN. Fairhaven Shipyards often creates excessive noise, sometimes late at night, which COB refuses to address despite many citizen complaints. There is considerable ambient traffic noise from I-5 and Old Fairhaven Parkway which is unaddressed by WSDOT.

Recommendation: COB, WSDOT, BNSF, Fairhaven Shipyards, and other neighborhood polluters address ways in which they will reduce the noise burdens of their facilities. These could include industrial noise monitoring by COB (currently has no noise monitoring equipment I am told), better operational oversight by BNSF, and the use of quieter pavement materials by WSDOT.

Issue: Relatively low level of awareness of many of the above-listed issues and how they can be addressed by COB and relevant agencies and facilities as well as by citizens and merchants.

Discussion: Part of the problem of the problems cited above is the lack of awareness of either the problems or possible remedies on the part of various entities, including the citizenry.

Recommendation: COB should take the lead in smoking out these issues and then discussing remedies, including behavior changes (i.e. walking short distances rather than driving) with concerned citizens and institutions. Resources should be directed away from the current Public Relations approach towards engagement in frank dialogue and discussion with institutional and behavioral change as the goal.