

Silver Beach Neighborhood Sept. 2007 Draft Plan Comment / Response Document

| Plan Element Section – Action Item | Comment Verbatim comment from 9-13-07 Open House | Response How was comment applied in Plan revision? |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Chapter 1: Neighborhood Character Green dots 24 (Indicates approval of entire chapter) Yellow dots 5</p> | | |
| <p>General Comments</p> | <p>Comment 1. Crime has been increasing in the Silver Beach area: home invasion attempt at Mouers, Robbery at Mouers, Home invasion at Dallas residence on Dakin, peeping Tom at Wade/Deb Hendrickson at Northshore. Drug deals at Silver Beach Grocery as Dan who works at store. (Doug Mouers) 2. Change “maintain neighborhood character”, Part 3, p. 5 to “Enhance/promote/neighborhood character” (Doug Mooers) 3. Enforce with education and mailings – no signs on utility poles! We should discuss this! (Susan Edgar) 4. Part 3, pg. 5, “est. environam model for all Lake Whatc” arrow perhaps not within our arena of “character” (Linda Bergsma) 5. Part 2, pg. 5 Strengths & Weakness, please add comment following: “Unfortunately many others continue practices.....Something to the effect that “many others including residents outside Silver Beach neighborhoods continue practices” (Linda Bergsma) 6. Editing pages 3 to 5 as follows: Part 1 Vision Statement add “& Goals” to Silver Beach 2020; Part 2 Past and Present add commas to By the 1970’s “,” From 1980’s to 2000 “,” 7. Question about “eight percent of Lake Whatcom”is this by surface measurements ? 8. Silver Beach population, anyway to get more recent</p> | <p>1. We have made no change to the section on safety. A review of the crime statistics from 2002 to present indicate no clear evidence of an increase of crime in Silver Beach. The home invasion increase, for example (Burglary – residential) for 2007 (Jan. – Sept.) is 6; for all of 2006 was 12, 2005 was 15, 2004 was 7, 2003 was 17, and 2002 was 6. Drug deals for 2007 (Jan.-Sept.) is 1; This does not include the drug bust on Dakin. For all of 2006 were 8, 2005 were 3, 2004 were 3, 2003 were 5, and 2002 was 1. Although individuals who are the victims want more police presence, it is difficult to make a case for more of a police presence in light of the statistics. 2. Replace “maintain” with “Enhance and promote” Part 3, page 5 last sentence. 3. This is an existing ordinance that the city can enforce. 4. What is done for the watershed in Whatcom County will depend upon the actions of the county government.</p> |

| Plan Element Section – Action Item | Comment Verbatim comment from 9-13-07 Open House | Response How was comment applied in Plan revision? |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>stats!!!?</p> <p>9. Using free lunch as an indicator of neighborhood’s relative wealth how defined? Property value? Resident’s income or assets?</p> <p>10. Neighborhood Character pg. 4 change “east” to “west”, add “,” after hilly neighborhood and delete “unique”, add “,” after “web site”, Replace “with” after small sites to “having”</p> <p>11. Question Lots zoned how big? at bottom of page 4.</p> <p>12. Development Patterns, page 5, add “In addition” before “Teardowns”</p> <p>13. Part 3 Broad Goal Statements for the Future, page 5, last line, add “lakeside” before “neighborhood’s” (Joyce Prigot)</p> | <p><i>However, the City can and should address watershed issues within its boundaries.</i></p> <p><i>5. Add “including residents outside Silver Beach neighborhood” after the word “others in the last sentence under Strengths and Weaknesses (Part 2, page 5).</i></p> <p><i>6. Part 1 “& Goals”. The City in its template uses the words “Vision Statement” and we will follow the city guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>7. Yes</i></p> <p><i>8. These are the most recent population numbers we could obtain.</i></p> <p><i>9. This is just one method used to indicate the neighborhood’s relative wealth. It indicates the household income level of the families with children in the neighborhood.</i></p> <p><i>10. Replaced “...Alabama and Barkley hills to the east...” with “...Alabama and Barkley hills to the west... Deleted “unique” on sentence 3. Replaced “with” with “having” on sentence 1, paragraph 3, Neighborhood Character.</i></p> <p><i>11. The details on lot size are described in the Land Use section of the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>12. Sentence adjusted otherwise</i></p> <p><i>13. Add “lakeside” before “neighborhood” last sentence.</i></p> |
| | | |

Chapter 2: LAND USE & ZONING

Green Dots 28 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

Yellow Dots 5

LUZA - 1 Consider a building moratorium to limit further development in the Lake Whatcom Watershed until water quality improvements in Lake Whatcom are verified.

Green dots 2

Yellow dots 13

- 1. You have stated that there are less than 60 homes in the SB Neighborhood. A moratorium would not be an effective solution. A threat of a moratorium would cause me to build sooner than I would. (Ken Bell)**
- 2. I feel land owners (lot owners) should be able to build on their property (lots) so long as approved density limits are followed! (Robert L. Blore)**
- 3. Oppose mandate on individual homeowners. Instead collect water on lakeside of Northshore & Electric and pipe water to a treatment site. Pay with tax on fuel in Whatcom. (Doug Mouers)**
- 4. Why put the burden on those who live in the watershed – everyone drinks from the lake.**
- 5. Why limit good use of space by not allowing 2 stories? Makes no sense. (Linda Colhert)**
- 6. Rather than a moratorium on further building, establish LEED Silver standards for construction of new building. It is then possible to reduce the ecological impact of new structures significantly. Rather than restrictions, allow better methods/design to allow new structures. (Jan Hayes)**

- 1&2. Until water quality improves in the Lake Whatcom watershed, there should be no further development anywhere in the watershed.**
- 3. LWSMA 1 in the Lake Whatcom section addresses this point. Many stormwater solutions involve low technology and low cost such as rain barrels and dry wells. We believe costs for more expensive solutions should be shared or funded completely by City grants such as the Stormwater Retrofit Program.**
- 4. In Bellingham, Silver Beach residents are contributing the most to Lake Whatcom's problems and have a responsibility to address them.**
- 5. Comment does not relate to the action item
These standards are desirable, but do not mitigate water quality concerns**

LUZA – 2 Land use designations should be adjusted in areas where appropriate, including Changing the designation of Areas 3,6,11, and 14 to Residential Single, Low Density; Changing the designation of Area 13 to limit further development; Changing the designation on Section 18 to reflect the current use and decrease

- 1. Don't agree with changing density without compensation for land owners whose property has been devalued. (Bob Bray)**
- 2. I have a 1 story house on Seeley in Cul-de-Sac. If I wanted to build a 2nd story and improve my square footage (upward) would this be possible? (Ruth Ashworth)**
- 3. Changing density would make all existing**

- 1. Vested entitlements will not be altered by a rezone**
- 2. This is a building code issue not addressed in the Plan**
- 3. Only a portion of existing properties would be nonconforming, but vested rights are grandfathered.**
- 4. The plan includes grandfathering**

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>density. Green dots 1 Yellow dots 15</p> | <p>properties non conforming. (Ken Bell) 4. Leave existing platted lots alone – grandfather the existing platted legal lots under old plan. They were purchased under that zoning. No problem with restricting the division of lots of establishing new lots. (Ken Bell) 5. Should not be limited – only limited for footprint for same reasons as above. (Why limit good use of space by not allowing 2nd story? Makes no sense. (Linda Colhert) 6. Please notify property owners if they are affected by a downzone in writing to let them know the impact to their property (Ken Bell)</p> | <p><i>vested entitlements.</i> 5. The Plan does not prohibit a 2nd story. 6. Legal processes for a rezone will be followed including public notice and participation.</p> |
| <p>LUZA – 3 Limit house size to 2,500 square feet or 35% of lot size. Green dots 0 Yellow dots 25</p> | <p>1. Oppose size restriction to 2,500 sq.ft. The size limit needs to be discussed in more detail with more people from the neighborhood. Perhaps have in-home meeting. (Doug Mouers) 2. Cannot limit house size to 2,500 sq. ft. Plan must allow for 2 story construction or 2 story with walk out basements as this does not change the non-pervious surface area of the property. (S. Hofer) 3. No limit on home size – Footprint only. (Pete Coy) 4. Area of house is not the issue – it is area of house footprint that matters. However a house not to exceed area is appropriate when combined with footprint limitations. 5. NO downzone! Require people (even people remodeling or adding on) to meet basic “gran roots” requirements (dry wells, etc.) to get the runoff back into the ground on their own lot. I have done this on my lot very easily (trench drain(s)/dry wells... (Kerry Garrett) 6. Don’t create another bureaucracy of snops and informers and ‘certificate’ inspectors – we have enough hypocrts already change the culture, don’t add more laws! 7. Find a way to inspect existing homes to catch</p> | <p><i>We have removed this recommendation, and endorse the current Silver Beach Ordinance limitations on footprint and impervious surface.</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>current homeowners who are adding paved patios, sidewalks, etc. w/o building permits (w/in the watershed. (Vale Hartley)</p> <p>8. Houses should not have a size limit as long as they do not cover more square footage than allowed or block anyone's view. (Tony Carter)</p> <p>9. LUZA 3 is confusing – is the size limit 2,500 SF living space or footprint? If it is living space, then it is an apples to oranges comparison with 35% of lot size. If it is living space, then I completely disagree. (Cris Brueske)</p> | |
| <p>LUZA – 4 Due to watershed location, wildlife, wetlands, trails and proximity to Big Rock Park and the Silver Beach School, further development in Area 1 should be prohibited. Green dots 3 Yellow dots 0</p> | <p>1. Don't create another bureaucracy of snops and informers and 'certificate' inspectors – we have enough hypocrts already change the culture, don't add more laws!</p> | <p>1. <i>Comment is not sufficiently specific for a response.</i></p> |
| <p>LUZA – 5 The City should continue and expand their program to purchase sensitive land areas in the Lake Whatcom watershed. In particular it should purchase the wetlands adjacent to Bloedel Donovan Park and located within Area 13 Green dots 0 Yellow dots 10</p> | <p>1. Don't create another bureaucracy of snops and informers and 'certificate' inspectors – we have enough hypocrts already change the culture, don't add more laws!</p> <p>2. Why not put the burden on those who live in the watershed – everyone drinks from the lake.</p> <p>3. We are already being taxed for storm water. What is being done with increased prop. Tax from the new properties developed over the past 10 years? (Doug Mouers)</p> | <p>1. <i>Comment is not sufficiently specific for a response.</i></p> <p>2 & 3 <i>Everyone in Bellingham is paying for storm water controls and land acquisition in their water bill.</i></p> |
| <p>LUZA – 6 The zoning code should be updated to include landscape treatment adjacent to streams. All year around streams should have a buffer zone consistent with the Shoreline Master Plan. Green dots 0 Yellow dots 2</p> | <p>1. We are concerned with amount of regulations that are being put upon. I think education is good and that with this education good choices are made. Thanks for all your work! (Carrie Donnelly)</p> | <p>1. <i>Comment is not sufficiently specific for a response.</i></p> |
| <p>LUZA – 7 The neighborhoods of the city shall work together to improve the height</p> | <p>1. We are concerned with amount of regulations that are being put upon. I think education is good and that</p> | <p><i>Note: We have agonized over the issue of height and bulk. It is clear</i></p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>restriction code. Green dots 0 Yellow dots 3</p> | <p>with this education good choices are made. Thanks for all your work! (Carrie Donnelly) 2. Any discussion about changes to height restriction should be presented to the voters in Silver Beach area (by ballot). 3. Home height in a given neighborhood radius should serve as a standard for homeowners who wish to change their height. (Doug Mouers)</p> | <p><i>the current regulation (35 foot to mid roofline) is excessive in many situations in our neighborhood. If the issue of height and bulk and views are not addressed in a city wide comprehensive ordinance, we suggest a 25 foot maximum to mid roof line be adopted in the Silver Beach neighborhood.</i></p> <p><i>1. Comment is not sufficiently specific for a response. 2. Change in height restrictions will go through the ordinance change process which will include the opportunity for public comment. 3. .Interesting idea but beyond the scope of the plan</i></p> |
| <p>LUZA – 8 Existing property owners on the lakeshore should be encouraged to participate in the storm water retrofit program. Green dots 0 Yellow dots 8</p> | <p>1. Do not force retrofit, rather seek alternative solutions such as capture of water runoff at road edge & pipe to city treatment site. Fund w/ Whatcom County fuel tax. 2. Who bears the ongoing liability for these installations? If a person is injured who is responsible. 3. Stipulate city compensation to cooperating property owners for participate in a storm water retrofit programs.</p> | <p><i>1,2&3. This item encourages a volunteer program. Many stormwater solutions involve low technology and low cost such as rain barrels and dry wells. We believe costs for more expensive solutions should be shared or funded completely by City grants such as the Stormwater Retrofit Program.</i> <i>Finished projects have features that are no different from a normal yard and would not be expected to increase liability.</i></p> |
| <p>LUZA – 9 All requests for building permits should include a landscaping plan that includes retaining as much natural vegetation as possible. New plantings should be designed to protect existing</p> | <p>1. We need height restrictions on vegetation. The only people allowed to have protected views are those directly on the lake, not those of us around the lake. We are losing our views. (Laurel Ayling) 2. We are concerned with amount of regulations that</p> | <p><i>1. Eliminating trees for view protection needs to be balanced with their value in intercepting storm water and processing CO2.</i> <i>2. Comment is not sufficiently</i></p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>views where possible. Green dots 0 Yellow dots 10</p> | <p>are being put upon. I think education is good and that with this education good choices are made. Thanks for all your work! (Carrie Donnelly) 3. Replace “retaining” with “requiring”.</p> | <p><i>specific for a response.</i> 3. We don’t believe there is a substantive difference between these two words.</p> |
| <p>LUZA – 10 Update the zoning code to include regulations regarding the size of docks and other marine facilities. The size and number of these facilities should be reduced so as not to degrade the quality of the Lake. Green dots 1 Yellow dots 13</p> | <p>1. We are concerned with amount of regulations that are being put upon. I think education is good and that with this education good choices are made. Thanks for all your work! (Carrie Donnelly) 2. Isn’t that covered by the Shoreline Management Act? 3. Before reducing docks presently at the lake, perform a study of the impact of these structures on the watershed. Provide the research & findings to specific homeowners. Allow homeowners to decide based on data. Otherwise property rights are encroached. (D. Mouers)</p> | <p><i>1. Comment is not sufficiently specific for a response.</i> <i>2. This may be covered by the Shoreline Management Act but we are creating a neighborhood vision and believe docks on the Lake deserve special attention given that the Lake is a source of drinking water.</i> <i>3. We agree the subject needs to be studied, however the health of the Lake is paramount.</i></p> |
| <p>LUZA – 11 Encourage the continued use and expansion of the commercial facilities in Area 7 to provide a neighborhood retail center and community gathering area that is pedestrian friendly and helps eliminate car travel. The neighborhood would like to see expanded services such as a café, garden area, deli, etc. Green dots 1 Yellow dots 2</p> | <p>1. Add “slight” before “expansion”.</p> | <p><i>Zoning limits the degree of expansion possible.</i></p> |
| <p>LUZA – 12 Create a Design Review process that will insure that the above standards are followed. Green dots 0 Yellow dots 5</p> | <p>1. We are concerned with amount of regulations that are being put upon. I think education is good and that with this education good choices are made. Thanks for all your work! (Carrie Donnelly) 2. Find a way to inspect existing homes to catch current homeowners who are adding paved patios, sidewalks, etc. w/o building permits (w/in the watershed. (Vale Hartley)</p> | <p><i>1..Comment is not sufficiently specific for a response.</i> <i>2. We agree that City ordinances should be enforced.</i></p> |

General Comments

1. Limit tree heights to heights of existing roof tops to protect views. (Cheryl Davis)
2. Needs to be worded more strongly –something needs to be done to protect views and keep existing older structures from being torn down. (Wendy Harris)
3. Retirement verses Property Taxes & Land Prices, There is no section on this. Please state something about the land & buildings of retirement residents so the fees and taxes don't evict the older generation.
4. There is no mention of equitable compensation to those affected by re-zoning with just a stroke of a pen – if the city wants to own it, purchase it a fair market value.
5. Editorial comments as follows: Part 1 Existing Stock second paragraph, "However – this may hurt the Reservoir". Part 2 Analysis and Objectives for Housing end of first paragraph, "only if it is permitted". Part 1 Area Descriptions add in first paragraph "each of" prior to "describes". Area 1 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood first paragraph add "," after the word "well". Editorial comment at end of first paragraph, "nor should there be". Area 3 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood editorial comment at end of first paragraph. "These lots should remain vacant!" Area 6 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood editorial comment at end of second paragraph, "It should be Low Density". Area 8 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood editorial comment at end of second paragraph, "should be redesignated lower medium density so no more units are built". Area 9 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood end of second paragraph, "No more condos should be built in this area'. Area 11 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood end of second paragraph, "Should be low density – No more building permitted". Area 13 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood end of second paragraph, "No more building should be done in this area". Area 14 of the Silver Beach Neighborhood end of the second paragraph, "Should be low – moratorium on building". Part 3 Analysis and Objectives for Future Land Use edits on first

*1. Vegetation is addressed under LUZA 9. Eliminating trees needs to be balanced with their value in intercepting storm water and processing CO2.
2. LUZA 7 was modified to address this.
3. Suggestion is outside the scope of the neighborhood plan.
4. Suggestion is outside the scope of the neighborhood plan. In addition, vested entitlements will not be altered by a rezone.
5. Comments are incorporated into the Plan.*

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | sentence. Replace “for the majority” with “some of” and add at the end of the sentence, “and importance as a watershed”. Part 4 Prioritized Implementation Strategy, first paragraph end of first sentence, add “and protect the water supply! | |
| | | |

CHAPTER 3: Transportation

Green Dots 28 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

TA 1: The City will adopt ‘Green Street’ (see Appendix 3) criteria and techniques when redoing and maintaining the streets in the Silver Beach Neighborhood. This approach addresses the issues unique to our neighborhood - assuring that the scale of our streets remain residential and that runoff will be treated using basic natural methods within the street’ right-of-way which will negate the need of large capital intensive, experimental filtering vaults. Green streets criteria and techniques also address safety and multimodal issues of our streets. The Silver Beach Neighborhood and the city need to work together to address the streets in areas 3,4,5 6, 11 and 15 that are prime candidates for green street projects. Silver Beach Avenue would fall into this group and would be an excellent model project.
Green Dots 1
Yellow Dots 1

Comment Card 1: Which Silver Bch Ave does this pertain to? (Laurel Ayling)

Silver Beach Ave from Northshore to Sylvan. Will clarify in TA 1.

TA - 2: Install crosswalks on Barkley Blvd, Britton and Northshore, and Electric Ave. to improve pedestrian safety. People, especially the young and the elderly, need to cross these busy streets to get to school, to catch a bus or for many other reasons.
Green Dots 1
Yellow Dots 1

Comment Card 1: Crosswalks should be well lighted w/warnings to vehicles when crosswalks are occupied. (Doug Moonen)

The City is developing a process for evaluating crosswalk requests and if warranted, determining the level of the standards the crosswalks will be built to.

TA - 3: Resurface and improve the design of North Shore Drive to better

Comment Card 1: “Resurface and improve...all modes of traffic...” I think it is important to

1 .Modes of traffic will be clarified in the plan.

accommodate all modes of traffic and improve stormwater runoff treatment. This project is currently scheduled for 2008 and should not be delayed for any reason.
 Green Dots 0
 Yellow Dots 2

clarify/highlight pedestrian traffic. When I read this I interpret “traffic” to mean vehicular traffic. (Sabine Brueske)
Comment Card 2: I would like to see a specific reference to the need for a sidewalk between Silver Beach Store and Alabama. Dangerous w/a stroller or kids with bikes. (Sabine Brueske)
Comment Card 3: Create gridded catch drains that would move road run-off water to water treatment sites. Fund w/small percentage tax on fuel purchased in Whatcom County. (Doug Moonen)
Comment Card 4: The sidewalk & bike lane that is budgeted for FY08 on Northshore should be completed. (Gene Davis)
Comment Card 5: Silver Beach is a “gateway community” that should provide for all reasonable modes of safe transportation. The lack of sidewalk/shoulder from “downtown” Silver Beach to the Southeast extent of the city is absolutely unacceptable and irresponsible. At the very least, a designated shoulder along Northshore Drive so pedestrians can walk along the public roadway should be obvious and should have been implemented by now. Further, the SB plan should address trail linkage from Northshore Drive up Donald to the city-owned properties to the east. NO provision was made for this linkage in the 7 shortplat projects approved by the county and city. This plan should, must, shall address this issue which may be a lost opportunity. Get with it!!!! (Oliver Grah)

2. The City’s design for Northshore from Alabama to Britton calls for bike lanes each direction and a sidewalk on the north/west side of the street..
3. The City budgeted \$650,000 for dealing with runoff on Northshore in FY2006. The project was postponed and the funds carried over until the runoff project could be incorporated into the resurfacing project.
4. Agreed!
5. Yes, we do to that is why we are doing all we can to see that the Northshore project is completed in 2008.

TA - 4: Resurface and improve the design of Electric Avenue. A sidewalk should be included on at least one side to provide separate and safer lanes of travel for pedestrians and bicyclists.
 Green Dots 0
 Yellow Dots 0

Comment Card 1: We want sidewalks on Northshore through Silver Beach from Alabama to Academy – If not available, at least a wider, well paved should – safe for pedestrians + bikes. (Vale Hartley + Jim Tragesser)
Comment Card 2: Also need to add street lights on Northshore – esp. on Chatugua side – dark & curvy

1. Yes, we do to, that is why we are doing all we can to see that the Northshore project is completed in 2008 but Electric is important and needs to be moved forward. One project does not preclude the other.
2. The design has not yet addressed

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | area. (anonymous) | <i>lighting. The neighborhood will have opportunities for input on this and other issues in meetings with the City engineers working on the design in the coming months.</i> |
| <p>TA - 5: In concert with WTA develop a local loop shuttle bus service that facilitates easy access to Barkley Village and the Sunset Mall for residents of Silver Beach Neighborhood. Additionally, improve access for those residents who live south of Alabama by relocating at least one route so it travels on Electric.</p> <p>Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 3</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: WTA needs to have a bus going by Heath Tecna by 7 AM to support normal work hours. (Barkley Village – S. Beach proposed logs) (Mike Vandehey)</p> | <p><i>See how new shuttle schedule will fit this need. If it is not addressed in current plans, suggest it.</i></p> |
| <p>TA - 6: The project planned to connect Big Rock Garden, the Silver Beach Elementary School and the Klipsun trail is an important link that warrants immediate attention. This would provide a pathway system around the watershed management area connecting the residential areas on either side and allow the center of the area to be returned to its natural state. This also provides safe routes to Silver Beach Elementary School.</p> <p>Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 0</p> | <p>No Comment Cards on TA6</p> | |
| <p>TA - 7: Northshore from Britton southeast to the city's border will be upgraded up to the standards of the other secondary arterials in Silver Beach neighborhood. This is both a watershed quality and safety issue.</p> <p>Green Dots 2 Yellow Dots 2</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: I made a similar comment on open space at mouth of Silver Creek (recreation). This open space needs safe parking, access, lighting, signage, etc. Mike Vanderhey</p> | <p><i>Addressed in the park portion of the plan.</i></p> |
| <p>TA - 8: Academy on both sides of the lake</p> | <p>No Comment Cards on TA8</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>will be upgraded for safety reasons. The road is heavily traveled and in both cases the intersections of Northshore and Academy have poor sight lines. Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 1</p> | | |
| <p>TA - 9: Any city plans for residential streets that are currently being considered for connection with other segments as was done with Haggin will be put on hold and readdressed by the neighborhood. A traffic circle with a rain garden should be considered to slow traffic on Haggin and break up the long straightaway. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 3</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: Feel strongly about making sure other streets (like Huntington + Shepardson) do not become through streets. I would be happy to contribute my efforts/time as needed. (Marsha Strayer)</p> | <p><i>We agree and believe the concerns are appropriate to other streets as well like Sylvan. Some are currently shown on the City's Silver Beach Circulation map as well as other city documents as thru streets. These need to be eliminated from City documents and a public process initiated to change any streets currently not thru into thru streets.</i></p> |
| <p>TA - 10: Existing alleys need to be evaluated and improved when possible. With little work some may provide opportunities as alternative, and safer, bicycle or pedestrian pathways through the neighborhood. They should also be evaluated with regard to their contribution to stormwater runoff and improved if necessary. Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 1</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: Our experience with alley improvement (west of Haggin, east of Hayward) is that it leads to too much extra traffic, some of which moves much too fast for an alley environment. (Alan Kemble)</p> | <p><i>We are suggesting upgrades for pedestrians and bicycles only.</i></p> |
| <p>General Transportation Comments:</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: Public access to Lake Whatcom is very limited. The current use map shows numerous access areas (end on Connecticut, Academy, East North, etc.) these should be marked on both the road and water (kayakers) to show access. (Gene Davis) Comment Card 2: Page 16 – Other Streets – 3rd para. Last sentence Shepardson is short dead end street w/no sidewalk + is not in the “process of becoming a through street” (Stan Snapp)</p> | <p><i>1. Refer for Parks section Action #5. 2. See comment above for TA 9.</i></p> |
| | | |

10/1/07

CHAPTER 4: Housing

No Comments Card for this chapter.

Chapter 5: Capital Facilities

Green Dots 27 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

CFA – 1: The City, Bellingham school district and Silver Beach neighborhood should develop a communication plan and process that allows early neighborhood involvement when updating or changing public facilities in the neighborhood.
Total Green Dots 0
Yellow Dots 0

No Comment Cards on CFA1

CFA – 2: The city and Silver Beach neighborhood will jointly explore the feasibility, vision and funding of Bloedel Donovan park as a centerpiece of Lake Whatcom and a demonstration project for watershed management best practices.
Green Dots 0
Yellow Dots 0

No Comment Cards on CFA2

CFA – 3: The grounds of the Elementary School have large areas of impervious surfaces, which in any future remodels should be designed to treat runoff on-site before it reaches the lake.
Green Dots 1
Yellow Dots 0

No Comment Cards on CFA3

Chapter 6: Utilities & Services

Green Dots – 11 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

Note: Utilities & Services Poster was not received from printer. A hand written poster was posted at about 6:30. This is why there are less dots in this section. Attendees from 6:30 on did review this section and had no negative comments.

USA -1: The city will create a long term utility remediation fund to cover costs associated with burying cables, power and telephone lines, restoring trees to streets and removing unneeded structures.
Green Dots 0
Yellow Dots 0

No Comment Cards on USA1

USA - 2: An annual neighborhood review meeting that highlights achievements, lists current and future priorities, evaluates problems and provides recommendations will be presented by all city and private utility providers to the Silver Beach Neighborhood.
Green Dots 0
Yellow Dots 0

No Comment Cards on USA2

USA - 3: The Silver Beach Neighborhood Association will work to expand the Block Watch Program throughout the Neighborhood.
Green Dots 0
Yellow Dots 0

No Comment Cards on USA3

USA - 4: The police will patrol Bloedel Donovan Park and surrounding play areas nightly (particularly in the summer months) to insure noise ordinance compliance.

No Comment Cards on USA4

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 0 | | |
| USA - 5: The city will provide emergency response training to the neighborhood on an annual basis. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 0 | No Comment Cards on USA5 | |
| USA - 6: A transparent, concise communication process that all utility providers would use will be developed by the city in conjunction with MNAC. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 0 | No Comment Cards on USA6 | |
| | | |
| Chapter 7: Neighborhood Design (Not included in this submission) | | |

Chapter 8: Parks, Recreation & Open Space

Green Dots 31 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>PROSA - 1: Existing buildings in Bloedel Donovan Park shall be scheduled for major remodel work or rework in the near future. Future improvements shall make the buildings LEED compliant serving as a model of appropriate watershed construction within the community. The site shall be considered for a watershed education center. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 6</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: Other alternatives to LEEDs certification should be considered. LEEDs does not guarantee that project is based on environmental, sustainable construction methods or materials. LEEDs is not based on life cycle analysis. Please see www.NAHB.com to see alternative certification. (S. Hofer) Comment Card 2: The outside light on the building projects clear across the lake – the parking lot in contrast is well lit, but the lights don’t shine on neighbors – fix the outside lights on the building to be shielded like the parking lot. (anonymous)</p> | <p>1. Added “or built to the National Green Building Standards” to PROSA1. 2. Added PROSA 10 - “Public lighting around the lake should be hooded to minimized light pollution.”</p> |
| <p>PROSA - 2: Develop signage throughout parks and trails to indicate this area is a sensitive watershed management area. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 0</p> | <p>No Comment Cards on PROSA2</p> | |
| <p>PROSA - 3: Develop educational outreach pamphlets to be distributed throughout the neighborhood that promote responsible use of this natural asset. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 2</p> | <p>No Comment Cards on PROSA3</p> | |
| <p>PROSA - 4: A rehabilitation plan shall be developed for the Connecticut Street-end site. Signage shall be placed on site to warn swimmers that this site is polluted. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 3</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: There is a park/open space at the mouth of Silver Creek (Approx Maynard & N. Shore) That is not addressed. This area is a trashy dangerous eyesore, being used as lake access. It needs to be addressed in the plan. (Mike Vandehey) Comment Cards 2: The open space on the lake at the mouth of silver beach creek should be improved as a park, it is currently in a serious state of disrepair with garbage everywhere. (Chris Brueske)</p> | <p>1 & 2. The plan was attempting to address the Silver Beach Creek site based on the map for Open Spaces in the City Parks Plan. After further research, we have identified this site as the “Lake Whatcom Beach Site”, owned by the DNR, specifically located between Silvern and Maynard on N. Shore. The Open</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <i>Space section of the plan was revised based on this research, eliminating the George Street End and clearly labeling the Silver Shores and Maynard Place Beaches as PRIVATE for consistency. We also added photos of each site to further clarify the plan.</i> |
| PROSA - 5: All Open Space sites shall have safe access for pedestrians and bicycles. Small-scale residential pedestrian and bicycle access should be developed for these sites. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 4 | No Comment Cards on PROSA5 | <i>Added verbiage to further clarify based on verbal comments and general comments below: PROSA – 5: All public Open Space sites listed above should have safe access for pedestrians and bicycles and clear signage visible to pedestrians and kayakers. Small scale residential pedestrian and bicycle access should be developed for these sites. Consistent fencing, gates and signage need to be installed for clear identification.</i> |
| PROSA - 6: The boat launch shall be monitored during seasonal peak use to keep park activities consistent with the residential character of our neighborhood and responsible watershed management practices (no refilling gas or oil at the boat launch, etc.). Enforce existing boat launch hours of dusk to dawn. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 2 | Comment Card 1: A speed limit on the lake would make it safer for small human propelled use which is much more appropriate anyway. (Lois Garlick) | <i>1. The speed limit is addressed in the Lake Whatcom section under Recreation. PROSA - 6 was corrected to read from “dawn to dusk”</i> |
| PROSA - 7: The city has over 70 pieces of public art on display, but none at Bloedel Donovan. There is an opportunity here to use public art to improve the aesthetics of the site. In addition, a sculpture or mural reminding our | Comment written on poster for PROSA 7 – rights of dog owners are equal to those of swimmers & dog owners take better care of park than swimmers same area should be allowed for dogs or swim evening south by boat dock. (anonymous) No Comment Cards for PROSA7 | <i>NOTE: Because somebody wrote this comment about dog owners on the poster in the wrong section (under PROSA7), I believe several people placed yellow dots under PROSA7 when they meant to place</i> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>community of our relationship with our watershed may serve to motivate better stewardship of this resource. Green Dots 0 Yellow Dots 5</p> | | <p><i>them under PROSA 8. There were multiple verbal comments and questions at the open house about the off-leash area and no questions about PROSA7.</i></p> |
| <p>PROSA - 8: The City will recognize that the primary users in the summer season are human, particularly in the swimming area. The off leash dates allowed in the pet ordinance shall be consistent with this. Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 1</p> | <p>Comment Card 1: Rights of dog owners need to be accommodated I resent being prevented from having my dog at park because of swimmers who trash the park. Dog owners take much better care of park. Grateful Dog member. (Wendy Harris) Verbal Comment: Two separate women expressed concern about children playing in dog waste and thought the off-leash area should be separate from the play and swimming area. They were invited to fill out a comment card, but did not.</p> | <p><i>The Analysis and Objectives were expanded to reflect the concerns of dog owners and the health concerns of parents/grandparents of children using the play area and swimming area at Bloedel Donovan. PROSA8 was reworded as follows: Action 8) The City will recognize that the primary users of the Bloedel Donovan play and swimming area in the summer season are human, while recognizing the value of dogs in reducing the Canada Goose population. Clear off-leash dates and hours should be established and posted consistently in city literature and park signage (current signs and literature provide conflicting dates and times). The off leash times allowed in the pet ordinance should be consistent with seasonal use of the park. To address concerns of dog owners and parents, consider ordinance revision allowing year round off-leash activity in the grass and beach area to the east of the buildings at Bloedel Donovan Park while reserving the play area and swimming area north and west of the buildings only for human use during summer months.</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>PROSA - 9: The city shall install signs supporting the Promote Basic Park & Trail Etiquette program in support of the educational outreach process. Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 1</p> | <p>No Comment Cards for PROSA9.</p> | |
| <p>PRSOA – 10:</p> | <p>(see proposal 1, comment 2)</p> | <p>ADDED: PROSA – 10: Public lighting around the lake should be hooded to minimized light pollution.</p> |
| | | |

Chapter 9: Lake Whatcom

Education

Green Dots 40 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

After a review by city staff of the action plan, the question was asked how our plan interacts with existing plans. References to these plans were then added to the comments response.

LPEA-1: Craft and implement a personal outreach program utilizing city staff, SBNA, Master Gardeners, industry experts and others. This group will provide stewardship education for watershed residents that advocates appropriate stormwater management, gardening, home and auto maintenance practices, particularly during periods of peak outdoor activity.

Yellow Dots 1

Comment 1: I must have missed it...Publish model landscape designs for homeowners. Designs favoring a healthy watershed. People like myself need a step-by-step color book to “get it”. (MikeVandehey)

The Joint Lake Whatcom Management Team comprised of City and County executives and councils addressing Lake Whatcom Reservoir has developed a multi year work plan to address Lake Whatcom issues. The Intergovernmental Coordinating Team (ICT) is a committee of City and County employees charged with implementing the work plan. While we don't believe they are sufficiently empowered to be very effective, they have developed a work plan with many good initiatives. Where they intersect this Action Plan, it is so noted by referencing the Joint Lake Whatcom Goal (JLWG) and the Lake Whatcom Work Plan Task (LWWPT).

1. We endorse the City/County goals and tasks. “Develop educational materials describing land preservation options.4.1 Develop an integrated community outreach strategy that targets specific audiences with key messages about lake protection. 4.5Expand lake-friendly gardening program to reach additional audiences.” (JLWM Goal 1

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <i>and LWWPT1.1,4.11nd 4.5)</i> |
| LPEA – 2: Enhance existing and implement new education programs that address daily homeowner practices such as fertilizing, watering, landscape layout, construction and stormwater control. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LPEA - 2 | <i>City / County Plan” Develop an integrated community outreach strategy that targets specific audiences with key messages about lake protection.” (JLWM Goal #1 and LWWPT 4.1)</i> |
| LPEA – 3 Require education, training and certification of commercial landscapers Yellow Dots 7 | No comments on LPEA - 3 | <i>City / County Plan. “Develop a watershed friendly certification program for landscapers, retailers and realtors through training workshop. 3.4 Explore enforcement and education options to improve compliance with development and erosion control standards.” (JLWM Goal #1 and LWWPT 4.7)</i> |
| LPEA – 4 Require education, training and certification for construction personnel doing concrete work, asphalt work, land excavation, earth moving, land clearing or disturbance, repair to existing underground utilities or exterior painting. Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 12 | No comments on LPEA - 4 | <i>City / County Plan. “Develop a watershed friendly certification program for landscapers, retailers and realtors through training workshop. and 3.4 Explore enforcement and education options to improve compliance with development and erosion control standards.” (JLWM Goal #1 and LWWPT 4.7)</i> |
| LPEA – 5 Provide watershed protection training to all city and county employees, including police, fire, public works, planning and also elected officials to insure that they understand their responsibility and accountability to report and respond to noncompliance with watershed regulations Yellow Dots 2 | No comments on LPEA 5 | <i>City / County Plan. “Develop a watershed friendly certification program for landscapers, retailers and realtors through training workshop.” (JLWM Goal #1 and LWWPT4.)</i> |
| LPEA – 6 Establish a single 24/7-point of contact for citizens to report watershed concerns and insure a timely response. | Comment 1: 24 hour hot line phone to report violations of watershed rules. (Pete Coy) | <i>1. This is what LPEA-6 states.</i> |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Yellow Dots 6 | | |
| LPEA – 7 Provisions shall be made in the city and county budgets for funding ongoing and special watershed education programs. Yellow Dots 2 | No comments on LPEA - 7 | |
| LPEA – 8 The city will conduct an annual review of the effectiveness of current education programs with SBNA and residents. Yellow Dots 2 | No comments on LPEA - 8 | |
| LPEA – 9 Establish a coordinating group between the city and county and SBNA to address watershed education concerns in areas adjacent to the city. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LPEA - 9 | <i>The Lake Whatcom Management Interjurisdictional Coordinating Team (ICT)</i> |
| LPEA – 10 Tailor education programs to address specific homeowner practices tied to stormwater pollutants found on or near their property. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LPEA - 10 | <i>“Develop an integrated community outreach strategy that targets specific audiences with key messages about lake protection.” (JLWM Goal #1 and LWWPT 4.1)</i> |
| LPEA – 11 Develop educational programs at Silver Beach School to protect the adjacent watershed protection property. Yellow Dots 2 | No comments on LPEA - 11 | <i>“Develop an integrated community outreach strategy that targets specific audiences with key messages about lake protection.” (JLWM Goal #1 and LWWPT 4.1)</i> |
| LPEA – 12 The City and SBNA in partnership with Silver Beach School will plan and implement landscaping changes to enable the school grounds to be a model for best practices for watershed protection. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LPEA - 12 | <i>“Develop an integrated community outreach strategy that targets specific audiences with key messages about lake protection.” (JLWM Goal #1 and LWWPT 4.1)</i> |
| LPEA – 13 Provide moveable educational signage at key locations during different times of the year, on the water, in participating yards, along rights of ways, | No comments on LPEA - 13 | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| during construction, at community meetings and schools. Yellow Dot 1 | | |
| LPEA – 14 Continue mailings, news releases, presentations at public meetings, BTV broadcasts and inserts in local print media and seek innovative messages for Lake Whatcom Reservoir Stewardship. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LPEA - 14 | |
| LPEA – 15 Establish 5th and 6th grade educational programs addressing Lake Whatcom Reservoir protection. Yellow Dots 2 | No comments on LPEA - 15 | <i>“Target water quality education through existing 5th grade Sharing Our Watershed program for public and private schools of Bellingham.” (LWWPT 4.11.)</i> |
| LPEA – 16 Redevelop and implement a Watershed Stewardship Program. Yellow Dot 1 | No comments on LPEA - 16 | <i>Currently being revised and will be implemented in fall of 2007.</i> |
| LPEA – 17 People have to know and believe that there is a problem, and they have to know what they CAN do about it. Only then, will they choose to act. Much of that education can be done by individuals and by the SBNA. The process of ‘educated neighbors-talking-to-neighbors’ is very effective. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LPEA - 17 | |
| General Comments | <p>Comment 1: I did not like any of it. My belief is that the main problem with lake water quality are the canadian honkers. The game dept. needs to trap, shoot,kill and get rid of the geese. They contribute tons of poop to the lake. Also the city needs to allow gallons of water to exit lake Whatcom so it cleanses impurities naturally. GP did and there was no problem with pollution!!! (Loi Walton)</p> <p>Comment 2: Excellent (Lori Polevoi)</p> <p>Comment 3: Work with conjunction with Science dept at Community College & Voctech to have science</p> | <p><i>Referenced in LWPDWA-12. There is a limit to the amount of water we can flush out of the lake at any given time especially during the summer and fall months.</i></p> <p><i>WWU has been monitoring Lake Whatcom Reservoir annually since the 1980’s and published an annual report.</i></p> <p><i>http://www.ac.wvu.edu/~iws/ will link to the monitoring results for the last</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| | and technology classes that would monitor water quality and the biology of watershed land use. (Doug Moolis) | <i>several years.</i> |
| | | |

Stormwater Management

Green Dots 18 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

Yellow Dot 1

LWSMA – 1 Individual property owners and occupants should install on-site treatment or infiltration/recharge facilities on their own properties, and minimize the amount of water that flows off-site. Many of the solutions involve low technology and low cost such as rain barrels or dry wells. We believe that costs for more expensive solutions should be shared or funded completely by City grants such as the Stormwater Retrofit Program.

Yellow Dots 34

Comment 1: The city needs to stop and control storm water runoff in to my yard before asking me to deal with runoff. (Tim Donnelly)

Comment 2: Stormwater Management #1 will not protect us from mudslides. The only thing that protects us are trees. Thank you all so much! (Lynne Findley)

Comment 3: We should not have to put on site treatment on our own property. Lets put in storm drains around the lake with curbs & sidewalks so we can control all of the runoff. (Tony Carter)

Comment 4: What are you thinking?? You must be kidding. NO! (Mike Vandehey)

Comment 5: I don't disagree with the intent of this but until the actions under LWPEA are implemented I think it would be premature. Much education and guidance will be needed. I think it also needs to be clear what level of expense individuals will have to bear. (Alan Kimble)

Comment 6: I like this in theory, but who pays for costs and how much? What about people on fixed income – are you going to drive them out of neighborhood due to cost? (Wendy Harris)

Comment 7: I am against #1 for homeowners to install treatment equipment on their property because it would be too expensive and they have No Control over how much it rains! (Loi Walton)

Comment 8: Individual property owners should not be responsible for implementing treatment on their own property – the city should. (Anonymous)

Comment 9: How much will this cost? (Anonymous)

1. We agree that the City should be as responsible for controlling stormwater just as residents are responsible._

For example the City will be repaving North Shore in the near future and will be implementing stormwater controls as part of this project.

2. A tree retention action item, LWSMA-6 is being added to this plan.

3. Storm drain treatment has not been effective in removing phosphorus. Until an effective treatment for phosphorus removal can be found the most effective way of removing phosphorus from the lake is to control it at the source.

4. This comment is too nonspecific to permit a response.

5. We agree that education is a critical element in solving the Reservoir's contamination problems. However, the health of the Reservoir is declining rapidly and intervention is needed now to initiate a recovery. 6, 7, 8 & 9. Language was added to LWSMA -1 to respond to these comments.

City / County Plan. "Develop strategy for pollutant source reduction that considers community outreach,

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <i>regulations and enforcement options.” (LWWPT 2.5.)</i> |
| <p>LWSMA – 2 Roadway signs and pavement markings highlight the path and effect of chemicals from vehicles. The City's infiltration/recharge and treatment facilities on public properties will substantially reduce the amount of pollutants that are carried off the road surfaces. The City will conduct a national search for known best practices, and collaborates with researchers on this topic for even better practices.</p> <p>No dots</p> | Comment 1: Not at my expense (Matt Myers) | 1. We currently pay for this through the stormwater fees. |
| <p>LWSMA – 3 Stormwater treatment facilities that are installed and operated by the jurisdictions shall have a maintenance program that assures that the facility meets the original specifications. They shall have regular and effective water quality testing of inflow and outflow to determine the success or failure of each facility. The City and the SBNA shall publish and distribute these reports</p> <p>No dots</p> | No comments on LWSMA - 3 | <i>City / County Plan. “Coordinate and implement programs to address NPDES Phase II stormwater requirements in the watershed...Pollution and prevention/ good housekeeping for municipal operations.” (LWWPT 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 for the County)</i> |
| <p>LWSMA – 4 Everyone who lives or travels in the reservoir should refrain from allowing such materials to be placed on the land in such a way that those chemicals can enter the runoff stream or the Reservoir.</p> <p>Yellow Dots 1</p> | No comments on LWSMA – 4 | |
| <p>LWSMA – 5 In order to establish a fair and equitable City-wide stormwater management program, the City will implement a three-tiered program that</p> | <p>Comment 1: fines – yes; taxes – no (Lori Polevoi) Comment 2: We are taxed more than most already. Use the money wisely don't ask for more money (Tim Donnelly)</p> | <p>1. The language in the Action Plan has been rewritten to explain what is intended with a program of fees. 2, 3, 4 & 5. Unfortunately cleaning</p> |

includes incentives to assist property owners in managing stormwater runoff from their property with natural (low technology) techniques or fees for those who choose not to manage their property's runoff that shall be used to pay for off-site mitigation. The enforcement of existing City Codes will include fines to be used to mitigate any negative impacts caused by the infractions.

Yellow Dots 39

Comment 3: taxes & fees – will already pay taxes this is extreme government & public discrimination against those who live on Lake Whatcom

(Anonymous)

Comment 4: What are you thinking?? You must be kidding. NO! (Mike Vandehey)

Comment 5: I think the intent of #5 is good but again what about all the properties beyond the city's control. And is there going to be a proposal to charge user fees for all lake users (not just the power boats)?

(Alan Kemble)

Comment 6: We, in the watershed area already pay our share in taxes and fee on the footprint I propose user fees for all Non city users of the Lakes and parks in the city- Tacoma has 2 rates at public golf courses.

(Cheryl Davis)

Comment 7: Isn't Silver Beach already too much an enclave of snooty rich folks – this would drive out middle & working class. I am on a fixed income – what exception will be made for me & other folks who aren't nouveau riche? When I moved into Silver Beach 4 months ag, I did not know it was a watershed or what it entailed. I would challenge the validity of such tax on a retroactive basis. If tax is enacted it should be done to those moving in who know about it before hand. Since the City & County allow growth in the watershed. They should pay for costs, or simply prohibit future growth How would fines be fairly enforced? I now lots of people who use prohibited chemicals – how do you prove this & who gets singled out? (Wendy Harris)

Comment 8: No to # 5! Homeowners should not be taxed extra for living on the lake! People who have worked hard to live where they live. (Loi Walton)

Comment 9: How define “those who benefit?” under Stormwater Management Sudden Valley not in our neighborhood (Anonymous)

up the watershed costs more than the current fees collect. Along with County residents living in the watershed, we create the problems that affect the quality of water in the Reservoir and we should have some responsibility in resolving the problems.

6. Not specific enough for a response.

7. We agree that County residents living in the watershed are similarly responsible for the failing quality of the Reservoir's water. We hope that an empowered Lake Whatcom authority is established to initiate a fair process of generating the funds necessary for Reservoir cleanup.

7 & 8. Unfortunately this is not practical since parks are open and without gates or entrances. This may work with boats.

9. There are a multitude of taxing programs that are available to address every income level. The city already makes exceptions for income on water and sewer. We also propose an educational program for realtors to advise prospective residents of the implications and responsibilities of living in a watershed.

10. It is not clear that watershed residents are charged any more for “living in the watershed” since stormwater fees are charged to all Bellingham residents. We have been

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>LWSMA-6 The City of Bellingham will develop and fund a voluntary program to support retention of existing trees in the watershed and the planting of new and replacement trees using the “right tree, right place” management policy that compliments the city’s existing street tree policy.</p> | <p>Comment 10: Residents living “in the watershed” were charged w/ being good stewards of the watershed and especially those living on the lake have paid a premium to do so. No additional fees s/be assessed to them. However, I would favor fees on non-county residents boating on the lake and/or fining those violating rules (Anonymous) Comment 11: I don’t totally understand this one – “for those who benefit from living in Lake Whatcom”? How will this be implemented? Who will monitor? How will you fund/ How will you verify charges? (Anonymous)</p> | <p><i>unable to devise and outline a program that would discriminate between county resident and non-county vessels.</i> 11. The details of such a program are the proper role of government. We are simply proposing a reasonable revenue stream to fund a badly needed Reservoir recovery program.</p> |
| <p>General Comments</p> | <p>Comment 1: We live on Northshore Drive and the water runoff is out of control! We get black soot from tires coming down our driveway, with who knows what esle. We are not the only ones that use the roadways around the lake. I think that to tax just the owners living in the watershed is unfair. I belive we absolutely need stormwater drains. This should be done by city taxes. (by everyone) It is everyones water source. I will definately do my part in continueing to not use chemicals in my yard and to not wash our vehicles at home. I would lke more education as tot what I should plant in my garden. Thanks for all your work! (Carrie Donnelly) Comment 2: No way (Matt)</p> | <p>1. The city will be repaving Northshore Drive next year and installing stormwater controls. Other citizens, outside of Silver Beach, are paying the \$10 stormwater fee that funds such projects. Watershed Friendly Gardening classes are held throughout the year. You may also contact the Master Gardeners or SBNA for more information. SBNA on stormwater management, Lake stewardship and lake friendly gardening. 2. Comment is too vague to be addressed</p> |
| | | |

Monitoring

Green Dots 37 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

LWMA – 1 Continue the current annual reservoir water column and enhanced tributary monitoring program.
No Dots

No comments on LWMA - 1

City / County Plan. “Review all monitoring studies and reports to determine policy implications.5.2.1 Conduct tributary monitoring for pollutant loading data. 5.2.2 Special projects for tributary monitoring within watershed. 5.4 Tributary monitoring in Lake Whatcom and Lake Samish consistent with Watershed Friendly Gardening Grant.” (LWWPT 5.1.)

LWMA – 2 Characterize organic contamination in lake water and sediment including traditional organic compounds on the priority pollutant list such as pesticides, herbicides, phthalates, phenols and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and add other emerging compounds of concern such as pharmaceuticals, flame retardants and endocrine disrupters. Continue a program of periodic monitoring to track any changes. Each organic pollutant of interest should be monitored at least once during each 5-year period, more frequently for pollutants with concentrations trending upwards.

Yellow Dots 1

Comment 1: My question is – is every 5 yrs. Enough? (Laurel Ayling)

More frequent monitoring would be ideal but the cost of laboratory analysis associated with monitoring is significant. For example, a broad range analysis for organic contaminants would probably cost over \$1,000 and that would describe the condition in the reservoir at one point, at one depth. More contaminants, like metals, analyzed for the same sample point, would add to the cost. Characterizing the reservoir with a statistically valid sampling program will likely be too expensive to do on an annual basis. What is important is to have a continuing program of regular monitoring for pollutants of concern that will show trends in the reservoir. A trend of increasing concentrations of a contaminant should trigger studies to determine the source of the contaminant and a program to

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| | | <i>attack the source. More frequent sampling of the contaminant would track changes until the trend turns downward.</i> |
| LWMA – 3 Regularly monitor benzene contamination of the reservoir and the city’s treated drinking water. Determine the pathways by which benzene enters the reservoir. (No Dots) | No comments on LWMA - 3 | |
| LWMA – 4 Determine the impacts to aquatic organisms, water quality and potentially human health from the leaching of contaminants from oxygen-depleted bottom sediments during reservoir stratification. (No Dots) | No comments on LWMA - 4 | |
| LWMA – 5 Determine the impact of increasing algae concentrations on the reservoir and drinking water. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LWMA - 5 | |
| LWMA 6 - Continue monitoring mercury concentrations in water, sediment and fish tissue to insure we are not surprised by air transport deposition from global industrialization. Mercury monitoring should be conducted at least once every five years, more often if mercury contamination appears to be increasing. Yellow Dots 1 | No comments on LWMA - 6 | |
| LWMA – 7 Groundwater at multiple depths in the immediate vicinity of old dumps and other potential sources of groundwater contamination that might find its way to the reservoir shall be sampled and analyzed for a broad range of pollutants including pharmaceuticals, flame | No comments on LWMA - 7 | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>retardants and endocrine disrupting compounds. Sites identified as contributing to groundwater contamination shall be monitored at least every 5 years. (No Dots)</p> | | |
| <p>LWMA – 8 Conduct hydrologic measurements and modeling in the watershed to identify and record the flow of water into the reservoir from precipitation, tributaries and groundwater. (No Dots)</p> | <p>No comments on LWMA - 8</p> | |
| <p>LWMA – 9 Conduct scientific studies that characterize flow in the reservoir at different depths during different times of the year.</p> | <p>No comments on LWMA - 9</p> | |
| <p>General Comments</p> | <p>Comment 1: Put on educational programs that explore technical parts of monitoring water- I do not have a science background & need to learn more to understand what reports mean & how & what to monitor (Wendy Harris)</p> | <p><i>1. Understanding water quality monitoring requires some research and education. Monitoring reports from 1997 to 2006 can be found at http://www.ac.wvu.edu/~iws/. Appendix 4 will be updated to include a primer on water monitoring.</i></p> |
| | | |

Land Acquisition

Green Dots 29 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

Yellow Dots 2

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>LWLAA – 1 In partnership with Whatcom County, Bellingham will seek state and federal and private funding to assist in acquiring all of the remaining undeveloped land in the watershed through outright purchase, conservation easements, or purchase of Development Rights. Green Dots 6 Yellow Dots 10</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 1</p> | |
| <p>LWLAA – 2 Bellingham will develop and implement a public campaign to encourage donation of land in the watershed for watershed protection reserves. No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 2</p> | <p>City / County Plan. “Develop educational materials describing land preservation options.” (JLWM Goal #1 1.1)</p> |
| <p>LWLAA – 3 A neutral third party such as the Whatcom Land Trust will hold conservation easements on all city owned watershed property to oversee and enforce the goal of management for water quality protection. Yellow Dots 1</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 3</p> | |
| <p>LWLAA – 4 All property acquired by the City for watershed protection will have all development rights permanently removed through the use of deed restrictions and/or other legal means. Yellow Dots 12</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 4</p> | |
| <p>LWLAA - 5 Bellingham will develop and implement a public recognition program for landowners donating all or part of their watershed properties or entering into a conservation easement that limits future use of the land to watershed protection.</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 5</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>The program would only pertain to properties for which all development rights were removed. Yellow Dots 1</p> | | |
| <p>LWLAA – 6 Bellingham will develop and implement an effective Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program. This program would remove development rights permanently from land in the watershed. Property owners can choose to sell some or all of the zoned development units from their watershed property to developers or the City to increase density in predetermined areas that are not as environmentally sensitive. Yellow Dots 2</p> | <p>Comment 1: #6 Define Transfer of Development program How extensive is the development that is restricted? Beaches? Parks? Present home repair?</p> | <p>1. The Action Plan has been changed to better describe the TDR process. City / County Plan. “Enhance Whatcom County TDR Program to ensure coordination between County, City and Water District and other planning efforts. And 1.5 Evaluate components of TDR Program that the City is capable of performing.” (LWWPT 1.2)</p> |
| <p>LWLAA – 7 Bellingham will develop a forest management plan aimed at maintaining or restoring diverse forest structure and composition with native plants within one year of acquiring control of each specific property. No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 7</p> | |
| <p>LWLAA – 8 Bellingham will begin forest restoration activities within three years of acquiring control of property that includes elimination of invasive non-native plants. No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 8</p> | |
| <p>LWLAA – 9 Bellingham will remove unnecessary roads, culverts, and built structures from all acquired property within three years of acquiring control of the property. No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA 9</p> | |
| <p>LWLAA – 10 Bellingham will target purchase or conservation easements of developed property with willing sellers to</p> | <p>No comments on LWLAA - 10</p> | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| provide natural stormwater treatment in key locations to prevent pollution sources from reaching the lake. Yellow Dots 4 | | |
| LWLAA – 11 Each acquired property will have a baseline-monitoring inventory that states existing characteristics, habitats and detailed restoration goals and actions. No dots | No comments on LWLAA - 11 | |
| LWLAA – 12 Periodic monitoring will be compared to the baseline inventory, goals and action plans to ensure that management strategies are producing the desired results No Dots. | No comments on LWLAA - 12 | |
| LWLAA – 13 All reports of misuse of protected land are addressed either through adaptive management or enforcement. No Dots | No comments on LWLAA - 13 | |
| LWLAA – 14 Signs detailing allowable activities will be posted on all watershed protection properties. Yellow Dots 4 | No comments on LWLAA - 14 | |
| LWLAA – 15 The Watershed Ranger will have a visible presence in the watershed by providing ongoing education about and enforcement of watershed protection regulations and activities. Yellow Dots 4 | No comments on LWLAA - 15 | |
| LWLAA - 16 Bellingham will strictly enforce its policy of not allowing hookups to City water outside of UGA's in the watershed. Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 2 | No comments on LWLAA - 16 | |
| LWLAA – 17 Bellingham will renegotiate | No comments on LWLAA - 17 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>its contracts with Water Districts in the watershed to eliminate future extension of City water to building lots created after 2007 and to reduce current contractual agreements for hookups so that fewer new homes are built in the watershed. Yellow Dots 5</p> | | |
| <p>General Comments</p> | <p>Comment 1: Bellingham cannot afford the taxes this would require – it has to be coordinated with the County and impact the whole lake- a completely clean north basin (city surrounded) won't help water quality from the central basin (Anonymous) Comment 2: Be sure to speak to geographic jurisdiction coordination. COB does not control the rest of the lake outside city limits. (Anonymous)</p> | <p><i>1&2.Lake Whatcom is listed as an impaired body of water and it is required to be cleaned up under State and Federal law. The City currently has a land acquisition program that purchases land outside the city to protect the quality of our drinking water source. This program is done in conjunction with the County and Water Districts. Limited research by WWU has shown that flow patterns in the Reservoir include a significant and counterintuitive back flow from Basin 1 to Basins 2 and from Basin 2 to Basin 3.</i></p> |
| | | |

Water Habitat

Green Dots 31 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| LWWHA – 1 Implement the strategy for conservation and recovery of native fish populations currently being developed by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. No Dots | No comment on LWWHA - 1 | |
| LWWHA – 2 Monitor water quality in Silver Beach Creek to guide restoration of water quality. Yellow Dots 1 | No comment on LWWHA - 2 | |
| LWWHA – 3 Restore legally mandated riparian areas buffers along side of Silver Beach Creek with native vegetation both inside of the city limits and in the county. If the buffers prove to be insufficient, expand the buffers as necessary. Green Dots 2 Yellow Dots 6 | Comment 1: # 3 Buffer would violate property rights of homeowners (Doug Mooers) | 1. Stream buffer required under the Critical Areas Ordinance already exist. Existing buffers would be enforced and additional buffers could be required if yard runoff into streams was causing pollution to enter Lake Whatcom Reservoir. |
| LWWHA – 4 Develop and implement a plan to work with property owners adjacent to the Lake Whatcom Reservoir or tributaries to modify activities or land uses to enhance stream and hence Lake Whatcom Reservoir water quality protections. Yellow Dots 3 | #4 Like idea of working with homeowner but do not like mandate on homeowners. Freedom to Mooers) | 1. See LWWHA 3 Response above. We agree that we should have the freedom to disagree with research based practices but believe that we all have an obligation to comply with legal requirements |
| LWWHA - 5: In conjunction with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, develop and implement a plan to reduce or eliminate non-native fish species from Lake Whatcom Reservoir. Green Dots 2 | No comments on LWWHA - 5 | |
| LWWHA - 6: Monitor fish species for contamination. Post advisories at popular | No comments on LWWHA - 6 | |

fishing locations and boat launch areas.
Report advisories in local media and place
notices in the City Sewer and Water
billings.

Recreation

Green Dots 30 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>LWRA – 1 Use Bloedel Donovan Park as a model to demonstrate 'Best Practices for Care of the Watershed' by providing the interpretive examples of caring for the watershed, advocating pesticide/phosphorus free lawn care and labeled plants in rain gardens. No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWRA - 1</p> | <p>City / County Plan. "Coordinate with City and County parks departments to develop and manage parks and open space in the watershed in a manner consistent with water quality protection goals." (LWWPT by task 9.1.)</p> |
| <p>LWRA - 2: Clearly and publicly post all boating, park rules, and swimming rules No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWRA - 2</p> | |
| <p>LWRA – 3: Establish position of Lake Ranger/Sheriff to allow for better enforcement of city rules on the lake, with additional support on holidays. Green Dots 3 Yellow Dots 13</p> | <p>Comment 1: What will the ranger do? Will he report people for washing cars & putting rocks in front of their house (Audrey) Comment 2: #3 Need to define role of Sheriff in terms of private property homeowner's use of their property. (Doug Moolis) Comment 3: People who are homeowners in the watershed have the right to do what they want on their property. NO to #3! No sheriff monitoring and extra expense to homeowners. (Anonymous)</p> | <p>1, 2 & 3. The Ranger will insure that residents comply with legal requirements through a program of education and enforcement. If washing cars is prohibited in the watershed, he/she would address the infraction. People do not have the right to do anything they want on their property such as operate a Meth lab or build a high rise apartment complex if the zoning does not so permit. City / County Plan. "Seek additional funding sources for implementation of the program elements. Someone specifically assigned to educate and enforce existing regulations in the watershed." (LWWPT11.1)</p> |
| <p>LWRA – 4: Establish position of Lifeguard/Lake Steward/Educator (combined role) for summer and holidays at park. Green Dots 9</p> | <p>No comments on LWRA - 4</p> | <p>City / County Plan. "Seek additional funding sources for implementation of the program elements." (LWWPT 11.1)</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>LWRA – 5: Increased Compliance with Watershed Guidelines during community events and activities (see appendix 5) No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWRA - 5</p> | |
| <p>LWRA – 6: Develop and implement safe swimming guidelines (see appendix 5) No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWRA - 6</p> | |
| <p>LWRA – 7: Enforce current and proposed boating and water sports regulations including: WA State Navigation law (Note: New legislation in force 1-8-2008.) (see appendix 5) Possession of Washington State Boater Education Card. Legal age requirements for boat operation, and rules therein. Guidelines of the Lake Whatcom Management Program, 'Boatnotes: A handbook for Boater's on Lake Whatcom' (see appendix 5) No Dots</p> | <p>No comment on LWRA - 7</p> | <p>City / County Plan. "Coordinate with City and County parks departments to develop and manage parks and open space in the watershed in a manner consistent with water quality protection goals." (LWWPT by task 9.1.)</p> |
| <p>LWRA – 8: Introduce boat trailer parking Fees at Bloedel Donovan Park. Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 10</p> | <p>Comment 1: #8 - Charge fee for Boat Trailers ONLY if out of city Residents (C. Davis) Comment 2: Don't we already pay enough taxes tgo cover this already? Of course we do!! We're already overtaxed on the lake!! (Anonymous) Comment 3: #8 fees prohibit lower income families from using the lake (Dave Moolis) Comment 4: Boat trailer fees – As long as it's enforced and consistently applied. Yeas ago, a kiosk was "occasionally" collecting fees at peak times – not fair. (Mike Vandehey)</p> | <p>1 & 2. It is not clear why City residents should be spared paying for the parking lot pollution controls and maintenance of the launch since they use it too. Users should pay for what they use. 3. Fees would largely pertain to power boat users who can afford to own and pay for fuel for a boat. 4. We agree.</p> |
| <p>LWRA – 9: Provide written guidelines to boaters at the fee collection kiosk, including 'Boatnotes', posters and information displays.</p> | <p>No comments on LWRA - 9</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| No Dots | | |
| <p>LWRA – 10: Adopt and enforce new powered personal watercraft regulations including: Power watercraft must proceed out 200 feet from shoreline without generating a wake, or exceeding 5 MPH; Remain at least 100 feet from swimmers at all times; Proceed out and return to shore in a straight line; Ban personal powered watercraft rental and watercraft racing; and All watercraft noise should be 80 decibels or lower (this is also the current tractor trailer trucks guidelines for roads.) Green Dots 1 Yellow Dots 13</p> | <p>Comment 1: Swimmers are already 100 feet from dock. Include swimming barriers so boating lanes are clear. (Ken Bell) Comment 2: No to #10!! These rules would be next to impossible for adult to do let alone a teenager. Everyone would have to carry a measuring tape in their boat for 200 ft from shoreline, 100 ft from swimmers and who can measure noise? This si a hidden strategy to discourage people from using the lake for recreation. (Anonymous)</p> | <p>1. This would apply to all lakefront property, 2. Existing rules as found in “Boat Notes” revised 2006 edition, should be followed and enforced</p> |
| <p>LWRA – 11: Review existing and update regulations for seaplanes and amphibious aircraft in the Watershed. This would include: Developing a plan for handling a fuel spill, human injury or other disaster. Publishing this plan so that it can be reviewed by the public and emergency response professionals Prohibiting place from being refueled on the lake or in the watershed. No Dots</p> | <p>No comment on LWRA - 11</p> | |
| <p>LWRA –12: Replace boat docks with aquatic-ecosystem friendly docks No Dots</p> | <p>No comment on LWRA - 12</p> | |
| <p>LWRA –13: Ban all use of fireworks in the watershed, because they pollute the air, soil and water with heavy metals, and also cause noise pollution, litter, and add other toxic elements in our water supply No Dots</p> | <p>No comment on LWRA - 13</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>LWRA – 14: Develop City supported workshops and an on-line link to the Neighborhood web site No Dots</p> | <p>No comment on LWRA - 14</p> | |
| <p>LWRA – 15: Encourage public and private partnerships between agencies and groups to promote overall goals as stated. No Dots</p> | <p>No comment on LWRA - 15</p> | |
| <p>LWRA – 16: Establish an annual Community ‘Best Practices’ Award for Sustainability No Dots</p> | <p>No comment on LWRA - 16</p> | |
| <p>LWRA – 17: Establish an easy reporting and enforcement mechanism, so citizens are encouraged to file nuisance reports due to unacceptable loud noises on the lake, observed safety violations, vandalism, or polluting activities on the lake. No Dots</p> | <p>This will not promote community - it will turn neighbor against neighbor – (Bob Bray)</p> | <p>1. We disagree. Enforcement is the responsibility of citizens as well as the authorities. Citizens are frustrated at present since there is no one to call to address such violations of City ordinances.</p> |
| <p>General Comments</p> | <p>Comment 1: We need to review legal conveyance documents regarding gifting of park to city to determine what items we can change and what we are prohibited from doing (Wendy Harris)</p> | <p>1. The City would explore such legal contingencies if the Action Plan were adopted.</p> |
| | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Pure Drinking Water Green Dots 29 (Indicates approval of entire chapter) Yellow Dots 5</p> | | <p>Moved to first position in Chapter</p> |
| <p>LWPDWA – 1 Create a city department to be responsible for the Lake Whatcom Reservoir, its watersheds and associated drinking water treatment facilities. Pending creation of this department, all jurisdictions shall establish and implement the same regulations pertaining to the Reservoir, its watershed and associated drinking water treatment facilities; a single individual shall coordinate these regulations. No Dots</p> | <p>Comment 1: As the city controls such a relatively small area of the lake how is it likely that all areas in the watershed can be brought into similar compliance. Is it feasible to have some sort of “watershed super-authority” (Alan Kemble) Comment 2: This supposes the city can have jurisdiction over all of the lake – this won’t happen – plan for better treatment and filter infrastructure and other water sources (Anonymous)</p> | <p>1. True the City occupies a small portion of the reservoir; however it provides water for most of the people in the area. We believe that such a sole authority is vital to effective management of the Reservoir and think it is feasible. 2. The need for increasing levels of treatment to maintain drinking water quality in the system results in increasing levels of Trihalomethanes (THMS), suspected cancer causing compounds. We think it vital that we maintain good quality source water to minimize the exposure of our citizens to these compounds. City / County Plan. “Research options for creation of a Lake Management District.” (Referenced in ICT 11.8.)</p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 2: Determine the pathways by which benzene enters the Reservoir and determine procedures to interrupt these pathways. No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWPDWA – 2</p> | |
| <p>LWPDWA - 3: Establish a program that requires an annual inspection and permit for any fossil fueled vessel to operate on Lake Whatcom Reservoir. Permitted vessels shall prominently display a permit sticker when on the Reservoir or when entering or leaving the Reservoir. Fees</p> | <p>Comment 1: Boats are certified by EPA with respect to emissions. (S. Hover) Comment 2: I don’t believe that most of the boats require an inspection maybe after they are 20 years old or something like that if they are polluting have the sheriff sight them a ticket. (Anonymous) Comment 3: 3 – Another tax and spend bureaucracy.</p> | <p>1 & 2. New engines standards were adopted in 1998, were phased in between then and 2006 and pertained to new engines only. This program would insure that engines are properly tuned to minimize emissions</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>collected by this program shall be used to enforce the program and monitor the effect of fossil fueled vessels on the Reservoir. Yellow Dots 17</p> | <p>Show me the benefit!!(collecting fees to enforce fee collection?) Comment 4: With 2 stroke engines removed from the lake I don't feel another rule needs to be implemented and have to be enforced. (Tim Domeg) Comment 5: No to #3! The government doesn't need more control by requiring vehicles to have annual inspections and permits for living in the watershed. Also people are conserving gas anyway by carpooling and riding the bus. And most important, people living in the watershed don't need to pay more taxes. (Loi Walton)</p> | <p>3. The benefit is fewer hydrocarbons in the source water for our drinking water. 4. This program would help to insure these polluting engines are kept off the lake and would help insure those boats approved for lake use are as pollutant free as possible. The City's two stroke ban is unenforceable, the County's is not yet in effect and when it does go into effect, it exempts some two stroke engines. 5. This seems to be objecting to a recommendation that is not contained in the SBNP, namely that cars and trucks be subjected to emissions inspections.</p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 4: Prohibit fueling of boats at public boat launches on the Reservoir – this would include all of Bloedel Donovan Park – and on roads within 1,000 feet of a launch site. Yellow Dots 7</p> | <p>Comment 1: - 4 OK (Mike Vandehey) Comment 2: Requiring boat owners to pull their boats out of the lake to refuel will result in tremendous congestion at boat launches – Increased traffic increased pollution. Perhaps and eco friendly fueling station would be a better idea. (Ken Bell)</p> | <p>2. Refueling should be done off the Reservoir to prevent the introduction of hydrocarbons into our drinking water.</p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 5: Only permit fuel tanks that attach directly to engines on the Reservoir; prohibit all other fuel containers from use on Lake Whatcom Yellow Dots 8</p> | <p>Comment 1: - 5 – Senseless – you haven't completed – 2 study. (Mike Vandehey)</p> | <p>1. Although there may be other benzene pathways to the Reservoir, data do suggest that boats are responsible for a significant portion of benzene pollution. (Conversation with Steve Hood, Department of Ecology)</p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 6: Exclude all carbureted two cycle engines from Lake Whatcom Reservoir. Yellow Dots 2</p> | <p>Comment 1: - 6 – no – not based on science. (Mike Vandehey)</p> | <p>1. Studies have shown that carbureted 2 stroke engines pollute significantly more than fuel injected 2 stroke or 4 stroke engines.</p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 7: Require that the few</p> | <p>No comments on LWPDWA - 7</p> | <p>City / County Plan. "Review</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>remaining septic systems within Bellingham's city limits be connected to the sewer system Green Dots 1 Yellow Dot 1</p> | | <p><i>applicable policies and provide recommendations on prohibiting OSS in the City's portion of the watershed and 10.6 Consider options for requiring on-site septic system (OSS) inspections during all real estate transactions. " (Referenced to ICT 10.5)</i></p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 8: Lift the Sudden Valley golf course's exemption from the phosphorus fertilizer ban in the watershed. Examine and implement ways in which the Sudden Valley golf course may be managed to reduce or eliminate the use of all fertilizer. Yellow Dots 2</p> | <p>Comment 1: - 8 YES! (Mike Vandehey)</p> | <p><i>City / County Plan "Coordinate with Sudden Valley Community Association to establish best management practices consistent with source water protection goals for Sudden Valley Golf Course, braches and other public areas." (Referenced to ICT 10.5)</i></p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 9: Require chipping and ban burning of material left over after any form of land clearing. No Dots</p> | <p>No comments on LWPDWA - 10</p> | |
| <p>LWPDWA - 10: Require that wood burning stoves meet EPA criteria for smoke emissions and work to upgrade stoves already in use which do not meet these criteria. 1 Yellow Dot</p> | <p>No comments on LWPDWA - 11</p> | |
| <p>LWPDWA - 11: Ban the use of fireworks inside the watershed Green Dots 5 Yellow Dots 9</p> | <p>Comment 1: I am delighted to see a suggestion to ban fireworks. I understand that this recommendation is made to preserve the health of Lake Whatcom and while I totally support that, I would suggest the fireworks are crating a noise nuisance as well as a fire damage. I live next to the forested watershed & frequently walk in there- For the week following & preceeding July 4th, I see evidence that fireworks have been ignited in the forest. From the front window of my home, I also see fireworks projectiles</p> | <p>2. Fireworks have many harmful components, specifically heavy metals, that pollute the Reservoir. There are many sanctioned fireworks displays that can be observed.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>landing near wood fences and dry brush. (Anonymous) Why? How will this protect the watershed? Don't take away all our fun & community spirit! (Anonymous)</p> | |
| <p>LWPDWA - 12: Study and implement methods of reducing the Canada goose population in the Lake Whatcom watershed. This would include discouraging the planting of grass adjacent to water frequented by Canada geese and promote alternatives to lawn in areas where geese are known to feed or nest. 15 Yellow Dots 2 Green Dots</p> | <p>Comment 1: Arrange for Fish & Wildlife round-up of canadian geese for 3 yrs. To eliminate population. Geese cannot fly last 3 wks of June – F & W will do round-up & euthanize them for a fee of +/- \$2000. Need to do this as our beach is so full o f feces we don't allow swimming. (Susan Edgar) Comment 2: -12 Geese – Lift the no shooting zone ordinance – Geese are good eat'n! (Mike Vandehey)</p> | <p>1. This is a suggestion which falls under the recommendation to study and implement control methods. However, the experience in other areas suggests that the problem will not be solved in three years by this method. 2. It is not likely that shooting will be permitted within the City limits; or the populated portions of the County for that matter.</p> |
| <p>LWPDWA - 13: Determine the deleterious impact of unused pilings in and near the Reservoir. Prepare and implement a plan to remove unused pilings, beginning with those determined to be most harmful to water quality. 5 Yellow Dots</p> | <p>Comment 1: #13 Unharmful pilings keep intrusion of boating from shoreline. Also provides evidence of past docks that were removed. (Doug Moolis)</p> | <p>1. The recommendation is to remove harmful pilings. Many, if not most, old pilings were protected with substances harmful to marine organisms and may be a source of ongoing contamination. Such contamination should be removed from the Reservoir. See recreation for provisions to keep boats away from shoreline.</p> |
| <p>General Comments</p> | <p>Comment 1: These issues go beyond the scope and expertise of a neighborhood association. Should be referred to appropriate city/stat/federal agencies. (Kerry Garrett)</p> | <p>1. The City has charged SBNA with the responsibility of developing a neighborhood plan. The entire SBNP will take the form of recommendations to the City and County. Nothing recommended in this document can be enacted without governmental action.</p> |
| | | |

Enforcement

Green Dots 30 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

LWEA – 1: The City shall vigorously pursue enforcement of the laws, by increasing staffing and resources. A "Lake Ranger" position will be funded and supported, no later than January 31, 2008.
1 Green Dots 1
Yellow Dots 14

Comment 1: Impose large fines for violations of current 2 cycle motor ban. Not being enforced (Pete Coy)
Comment 2: Oppose creation of a ranger with power to fine/oversee residents. This is big brother.

2. The role of the ranger or enforcement officer is to educate and enforce.

Long Range Planning

Green Dots 30 (Indicates approval of entire chapter)

LWLRPA - 1: The City will conduct a biennial review of long range planning alternatives to our current drinking water system in response to future events that might include:
Moving the water intake
Changing water treatment processes
Changes to the Middle Fork Nooksack River Diversion
Acquiring a totally new water source
Renegotiating agreements to provide water to non-city residents
Green Dots 4

No comments for LWLRPA - 1

General Comments

Comment 1: Consider requiring homeowners to disclose land/home use regulations & restrictions when selling their home or property