



---

History: This message has been replied to.

---

Greetings Nicole,

The Fairhaven Urban Village Plan update meetings have been interesting and informative, thanks for putting together these programs.

Thanks also for considering the following comments addressing the invitation for input on project scope for a study of parking in Fairhaven. Parking requirements provide a valuable public amenity and have direct correlation to city revenues. As mentioned by FVA consultant Geyer, development regulations in portions of Area 2 include an agreement for a Parking District between COB and FVA. The agreement is not published in the Neighborhood Plan or the zoning table, perhaps it could be included as an informational handout at Meeting 5.

The proposed parking study, in my opinion, would benefit by separate, independent study of present and future parking supply within the Parking District boundary. The standard given in BMC for required parking could be used as a benchmark. Study might include an inventory of commercial uses and their square footage within the Parking District boundary, the resultant BMC parking threshold required, then the actual number of permanent parking spaces provided within the Parking District boundary.

A parking inventory that does not differentiate parking supply for properties inside the Parking District boundary and properties outside that boundary might result in number conflation and an arbitrary, unintended and indirect parking subsidy.

It appears that properties eligible for the development regulations possible per the Parking Agreement involve only those that have voluntarily paid an assessment (necessary to provide parking improvements within the Parking District) since formation of the Parking District. This income and expense information within the Parking District, though also unpublished, likely would be helpful for evaluating the purpose and function of the Parking District. Data could include which lots have paid the assessment, how much the assessment was and when it was paid, and how these funds have been allocated for provisioning the required parking within the Parking District.

Area 5 is another possible wrinkle for parking study. The consolidation of the Fairhaven Harbor site with the adjacent vacated portion of McKenzie may have resulted in existing uses that have unclear permanent locations for required parking.

By attending these meetings I have gathered that a small development faction is thinking big to assure maximum exploitation of Fairhaven. In that spirit the suggestion is offered that the parking study also include a build-on and revivification of the remnant trolley track in Harris Avenue that could place a genuine rail trolley in service as shuttle for hypothetical satellite parking lots along Harris.

I apologize if I have provided redundant information. Thank you again for the meetings and the opportunity to comment,

David Carlsen



Transpo input  
Glenn Denkler to: Nicole Oliver

06/14/2011 04:36 PM

---

History: This message has been replied to.

---

Hi, Nicole:

I do have a few comments concerning the Comprehensive Parking Study that will be undertaken by *Transpo*:

To establish a relevant study of Fairhaven the exercise should be in two parts. One with the land area within the Parking Improvement Agreement and the other with all land outside the Agreement area. A viable assessment could then be made of parking in the Fairhaven neighborhood. A City compilation of the current number of parking spaces in each area along with square footage figures of all buildings in each area would be helpful. With these facts it would be salient to note compliance with BMC 20.12.010.B and the Parking Improvement Agreement.

In a Resolution dated 2 May, 1994, the City Council directed that the City and Fairhaven Village Association enter into an agreement to implement a parking plan in Fairhaven. In the package labeled Exhibit A there is a Parking Improvement Agreement proposal. In Section 2.A and B. of that proposal parking requirements are waived except for residential and lodging accommodations on a footprint greater than 5000 square feet. In the final Agreement dated 18 October, 1994 (signed by Douglas and Armitstead), Section 2.A. and B., parking requirements are waived except for residential and lodging accommodations on a footprint greater than 2500 square feet. I assume that the signed final agreement is the one that the City and Fairhaven Village Association are going by.

Perhaps documents showing the FVA actually expended the "minimum of \$300,000" as specified in the Agreement for parking improvements.

Perhaps a listing of all property owners/participants in FVA, their property sizes and the amount assessed for each property would make the group transparent to *Transpo*. Does the City have an up to date certified list as specified in the Agreement (Section 4)?

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Best,

Glenn Denkler

June 17, 2011

To:

Clark Alan Williams

□ Superintendent of Traffic & Communications □

City of Bellingham Public Works

From:

Connie Shannon

Fairhaven Village Inn

1200 10th Street Bellingham

360 510 4563

Regarding: Fairhaven Parking Study

Thank you for your attention to a long debated and critical feature of this urban Tier I designated core. For 8 years I have owned and managed the Fairhaven Village Inn in the “delicate ecosystem” that is Fairhaven. I have some thoughts that I hope give you some additional focus.

The study should include:

1. Parking in Fairhaven core as it is effected by major COB arterials and facilities

Examples such as:

10 and Mill intersecting with major bay trail head.

Note: FVN core provides of free and untimed parking for walkers bikers runners due to extremely limited public parking at Douglas and 10th and Boulevard Park.

12th street parking

Note: This flow affects the viability and visibility of Parking as dense flow traffic to/from Old Fairhaven Parkway, Highway 11, Port of Bellingham Transportation Center and surrounding major neighborhoods

2. Integrate current Parking District in Parking Study Scope

The Parking District Agreement is a major factor in successful economic development in recent past and will be for future development as well.

It should be evaluated as to conditions, viability, effectiveness and responsibilities and updated if necessary to ensure future growth needs and provide clarity for undeveloped lands participating in parking district.

3. Note that if you do parking counts on Wednesday afternoon in the summer, parking density at that time is greatly effected by the Fairhaven Market.

Cc: Jeff Thomas



FW: Fairhaven parking scope of work - Comments - 2nd transmission

Bill Geyer to: Clark Williams

06/17/2011 06:52 PM

Cc: NOliver

---

History: This message has been forwarded.

---

Clark,

The original email did not go through due to the PDF size. I am re-sending with a black x white map so that it will go through, copies to Nicole Oliver in Planning. Thank you,

Bill Geyer, AICP

**From:** Bill Geyer [mailto:billgeyer@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Friday, June 17, 2011 6:22 PM

**To:** 'CWilliams@cob.org'

**Subject:** RE: Fairhaven parking scope of work - Comments

Hi Clark,

Per your request, I am commenting on the draft Parking Study scope of work provided to your office by Transpo Group.

The study should include the following items:

1. Document the status all right-of-ways to determine the supply of existing spaces and potential for any new on-street spaces; note potential conflicts with turning movements, loading zones and driveways.
2. Document all existing off street spaces; delineate among spaces approved with a specific use, spaces available for common uses, spaces with no determination but are functional.
3. Profile all condition of spaces as full standard surface (pavement with drainage), partially developed, gravel or just soil

4. Inventory all other off-street parking that cannot be clearly determined as code compliant.
5. Estimate the total square footage of existing commercial space and calculate required parking per code.
6. Estimate total square footage possible under current zoning and development regulations.
7. Provide sensitivity analysis on #6 for up to three potential land use models to reflect potential buildout.
8. Insure items 6 & 7 coordinate with underlying land use and transportation planning and analysis.
9. Estimate quantity of parking needed to serve market compared to number required by code for item 7.
10. Confirm existing parking district capital structure and participants; document benefits to invested owners.
11. Document private investment to date to create current parking supply.
12. Identify parking use by time periods during 18 hour day; show peak time utilization; short vs. long term use.
13. Document frequency of parking space turnover and length of stay
14. Identify conflict locations – spaces with difficult maneuvering.
15. Identify directional signage problems/opportunities for directing users to parking.
16. Comment on function of parking supporting retail and service businesses – impact on economic viability.
17. Identify loading and bus zones and no parking zones – review conflicts and opportunities.
18. Quantify volume of overnight resident parking; same for resident daytime parking
19. Detail capital costs to build common parking structure as private investment.
20. Analyze proposed parking structure locations on attached draft map.
21. Analyze functional relation of internal Fairhaven bus circulator to link parking structures to commercial core.
22. Present alternative parking management systems linking the merchants marketing system to parking as a service to the customer instead of a penalized system of metered parking with parking tickets.
23. Explore parking zone stickers for residential users or similar system operated by merchants.
24. Analyze cost sharing among commercial property owners to increase the supply using the existing model implemented by the Fairhaven Village Association – privately financed and operated.
25. Explore linkage of WTA passes to parking program operated by the merchants or property owners as customer service.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please do not hesitate to call or email any questions or comments.

Bill Geyer, AICP

Geyer & Associates, Inc.

360.738.2836 office / 360.224.6317 cell

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message, including attachments.

**From:** CWilliams@cob.org [mailto:CWilliams@cob.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:10 AM  
**To:** billgeyer@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Fairhaven parking scope of work

Clark Alan Williams  
Superintendent of Traffic & Communications  
City of Bellingham Public Works  
2221 Pacific Street  
Bellingham, WA 98229  
360.778.7810 office  
360.920.4488 mobile  
360.778.7701 fax



17 June 2011

TO: City of Bellingham, Attn: Nicole Oliver  
FROM: Preston Schiller, 1704-6<sup>th</sup> 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 (4<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> & Harris/Cowgill) should become a traffic cell to the extent possible; divert Edgemoor traffic away from 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 10<sup>th</sup>.

*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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> 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, 4<sup>th</sup>) 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 4<sup>th</sup>.

**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 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, Harris & Padden Creek, and McKenzie/Old Fairhaven Parkway, Mill/10<sup>th</sup>, 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-10<sup>th</sup>-Harris-west of 10<sup>th</sup>; 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 10<sup>th</sup> 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 10<sup>th</sup>/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-12<sup>th</sup>-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 12<sup>th</sup> 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.