



**Re: Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity - 3rd Request**

**billgeyer** to: BBaldwin

01/17/2012 09:36 PM

Cc: Doug Robertson, NOliver, "Ted Carlson, Public Works Director",  
mkjelstad

---

Brent,

Thanks for the response, however questions remain, all inserted and *italicized* in your email below. These issues remain important to our clients so that they are properly prepared to respond to the City staff proposed Fairhaven Plan (draft). Even though items addressed at development permit application, the Fairhaven core is sufficiently small that the analysis requested does not appear to be too cumbersome.

A key point to recognize is the new Fairhaven UVP will have a shelf life of about 30 years. It is insufficient to rely on the current population projections of the City Comp Plan as that document adopted a planning horizon of 2022 - just 10 years away. A more complete analysis would address the issues raised in my email using generally accepted professional planning practices. Absent this quality of analysis, the resulting planning document becomes seriously deficient and may rely on conjecture instead of professional analysis. I trust this perspective will be shared with the credentialed professionals working on the draft plan document.

As a final point, please consider this a request to receive communications between Public Works and Planning documenting the analysis performed. This would include any directions Public Works received to initiate the analysis you have described to date. If additional analysis is forthcoming, please keep us informed of that request and the schedule to complete same. Thank you,

Bill Geyer, AICP

---

**From:** BBaldwin@cob.org

**To:** billgeyer@comcast.net

**Cc:** "Doug Robertson" <dkr@belcherswanson.com>, NOliver@cob.org, "Ted Carlson, Public Works Director" <TCarlson@cob.org>, mkjelstad@cob.org

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2012 3:53:54 PM

**Subject:** Re: Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity - 3rd Request

Hi Bill,

The direction we were given on the review of the Fairhaven Plan was that the total expected population for Fairhaven would remain constant to what was previously identified in the City's comprehensive plan.

*Wrong assumption - 30 yr planning horizon for Fairhaven UVP, runs beyond current Comp Plan horizon*

Based on that assumption, the water and sewer plans were used to provide analyses of the overall system capacities (storage for water, treatment capacity for sewer).

***Block by block analysis would be better, especially given height alternative scenarios.***

In addition, I understand that the current zoning for the core of Fairhaven does not have a height maximum. The new plan would establish maximum heights.

***Incorrect - current core has height limits (35' and 56'), and limits are proposed in staff draft. A key question is what is the maximum building height for the pressure zone serving Fairhaven? If not a problem, fine, lets document the number. Some locations may be better suited for higher buildings, but we cannot make that analysis in a vacuum.***

I did not speak to storm drainage in my previous email. I just sent Doug Robertson a reply to his email and cc'd you discussing points of stormwater.

***Acknowledged. Will await further details. The regional collection facility has merit for managing the storm water as well as removing the flow from the Padden estuary.***

You mentioned some specific deficiencies in your email in some blocks of the commercial core. Those deficiencies would be expected to be addressed at the development review stage of future development. For a comprehensive plan level review, it is appropriate to address whether the overall system capacity can support the intensity of development contemplated.

***The intensity of development is not known, only conjectured to date by staff. No analysis has occurred nor been deliberated by the property owners and businesses owners that would be served. A proper analysis would provide the information so the owners can assess the impact, rather than conjecturing a solution with discussion. Alternative land use models would be transparent, yet none have been defined. The alternate utility demand would be quantified to compare alternate land use models, yet no alternative utility demand analysis has been performed. In short, the utility analysis is totally insufficient to comply with SEPA or GMA concurrency requirements. I suggest the question be approached again.***

In the case of water, does the City have the water rights and storage capacity to provide adequate volume for expected population. In the case of sewer, does the treatment plant and collection system have capacity to handle the added waste. Since the total planned density for the neighborhood is being proposed for change, the water system plan and sewer plan provides this analysis.

***Understand Citywide system has capacity for serving areas within the City limits. However, our questions relate to the specific planning area defined within Fairhaven. Similar analysis was done for Old Town in determining its build out and building heights, yet that is not a Tier 1 Urban Village. Why should the analysis for Fairhaven be incomplete to prevent an honest assessment of Fairhaven's build out? Our clients are long term owners that are concerned about their long term ability to invest in their property. The information requested is necessary to see how the City staff plan will impact their ability to steward their investment and business properly.***

Public Works did not do additional modeling to determine what, if any, additional fire flow requirements might be required of a developer at a specific site. Again, this is typically completed at time of development.

***This is the specific type of analysis needed to assess the building height alternatives. Again, no specific height has been decided. It has only been proposed by staff. Alternatives that should be analyzed include 70' limits (like Fountain District and Samish Commercial area) for the commercial core, industrial parcels and the residential multiple areas along the northeast and south east portions. Is there capacity? Sufficient pressure? Equally, we need to know any deficiencies in delivering fire flow at commercial or industrial standards, and at which blocks. Without this level of information, how can the plan consider multi story structures, or expanded commercial structures (Haggen), or mixed use facilities (12th & Harris, south side of Harris) or marine industrial uses on the waterfront. This information cannot be delayed to development permit stage. To do so relegates this Tier 1 Urban Village to an area of unknown utility requirements which will further destabilize the ability to develop this area as envisioned.***

I hope this helps answers most of your questions. I'll follow up with stormwater later in the week.  
***No, your initial response does not, and I hope my additional descriptions help you obtain a better appreciation of the importance of this information. The City's effort to Fairhaven for a professionally complete plan will do great service towards a better land use management tool, one that will last a long time. Property owners and business owners do not make their major investment decisions with incomplete information. We must strive to achieve a similar standard to craft a plan that so many people will rely upon to make some very significant decisions.***

Brent

From: billgeyer@comcast.net  
To: BBaldwin@cob.org  
Cc: Doug Robertson <dkr@belcherswanson.com>, "Ted Carlson, Public Works Director" <TCarlson@cob.org>, NOliver@cob.org  
Date: 01/17/2012 10:55 AM  
Subject: Re: Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity - 3rd Request

---

Brent,

Thank you for the reply. To assist my clients understanding of the work performed, please identify the specific iterations of the plan presented to the Public Works staff. We are under the impression that only one land use model was presented for staff review. If this is correct, please confirm. If incorrect, please provide documentation of the models reviewed. At a minimum, SEPA provides for a "No Action" review of the current land use. Additional SEPA review will require analysing the utility capacity and demand for the proposed land use models. Since you referenced the existing water, sewer and drainage plans in your email, there was some level of analysis performed. Please describe that analysis and provide documentation of its results, such as email recommendations to the Planning staff.

Our clients are aware of water deficiencies in some blocks within the Fairhaven commercial core. Please advise if the current water mains provide sufficient pressure, supply and fire flow for a complete buildout of the current zoning. Please do the same for any land use model proposed by the Planning staff. Our concern is recommendations for multi-story buildings within this Tier 1 Urban Village require sufficient water systems to support its ultimate buildout and fire protection. As you know, Fairhaven is designated a Tier 1 status in the City Comprehensive Plan that places it on par with the CBD as a designated infill location. Accomplishing the goals in the Comprehensive Plan as adopted by the City Council will require a diligent analysis of the water system capacity for Fairhaven. The current passing commentary on this issue to date is insufficient.

Our clients are equally concerned about the storm water system serving Fairhaven, and the same level of analysis described above should be done for storm water. We are aware of changes to the DOE manual that encourage regional collection/treatment for urban areas with a high percentage of impervious surface. At a DOE presentation last year, staff described potential changes to accommodate this solution within their oversight role on the City NPDES. In a separate memo from Doug Robertson today, he raised the potential for other alternatives for water quality treatment in the Fairhaven core. The ideas should be pursued in the current planning process.

Since the Fairhaven core is a relatively small area, I would anticipate the analysis described above could be completed in a short time, especially several iterations of the plan have already come to Public Works attention. This information, properly prepared, will enable our clients to assess the quality of the Fairhaven Plan that will eventually guide development of their property for the next 30 years. We have a focused interest in seeing the plan meets all professional standards and is compliant with SEPA, GMA and the City Comprehensive Plan.

I look forward to your earliest response to the information requested.

Bill Geyer, AICP

---

**From:** BBaldwin@cob.org  
**To:** "Bill Geyer" <billgeyer@comcast.net>  
**Cc:** "Doug Robertson" <dkr@belcherswanson.com>, "Ted Carlson, Public Works Director" <TCarlson@cob.org>, NOliver@cob.org  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2012 9:07:30 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity - 3rd Request

Good morning Bill,

Sorry for the delayed response on this, I was out of the office most of last week.

In answer to your questions, Public Works staff was asked to review various iterations of the plans that have been developed as part of this planning process. Utility systems within the City are guided by the Comprehensive Sewer Plan and Water System Plan which include analysis, modeling, recommendations for improvements and financing plans. The draft Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village Plan is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Sewer Plan and Water System Plan. Overall capacity of the water and sewer systems within Fairhaven are adequate to accommodate full build out as proposed in the draft plan.

Brent

From: "Bill Geyer" <billgeyer@comcast.net>

To: "Brent Baldwin" <bbaldwin@cob.org>  
Cc: "Ted Carlson, Public Works Director" <TCarlson@cob.org>, "Doug Robertson" <dkr@belcherswanson.com>  
Date: 01/12/2012 08:32 AM  
Subject: RE: Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity - 3rd Request

---

Good morning Brent,

Below is my email chain with Martin Kjelstad, PE, regarding utility capacity and demand in Fairhaven. Martin informs me the questions below have been forwarded to you. As the authorized Public Works staff person responsible for this information, please respond at your earliest opportunity.

We seek the information from the credentialed staff person within the operating department that can provide an accurate response. As a fellow credentialed AICP, you bring our common understanding that accurate utility capacity / demand data is critical to assessing proposed land use scenarios, or developing alternatives. This is basic planning, and is a required GMA standard to insure concurrency and that the final plan is internally consistent. Our goal is for a professionally defensible, internally consistent Fairhaven plan that complies with the City Comprehensive Plan to last for the next 30+ years. Your support to reach this professional standard is appreciated.

I look forward to receiving your response.

**Bill Geyer, AICP**

Geyer & Associates, Inc.

360.738.2836 office / 360.224.6317 cell

**From:** mkjelstad@cob.org [<mailto:mkjelstad@cob.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 12, 2012 7:42 AM  
**To:** Bill Geyer  
**Cc:** BBaldwin@cob.org  
**Subject:** RE: Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity - 2nd Request

Bill

I have not been directed or done any work on this planning process. I have passed this request onto Brent Baldwin, Development Manager for Public Works Engineering. I believe he has passed this request for information onto Nicole Oliver. I haven't heard anything back on how this is being processed.

Hope this helps explain why I haven't been able to give you an answer to your questions.

**MARTIN KJELSTAD, P.E.**

Utilities Project Engineer  
City of Bellingham  
Public Works Engineering  
210 Lottie St.  
Bellingham WA 98225  
Phone 360-778-7900  
Desk 360-778-7941  
Fax 360-778-7901  
email: mkjelstad@cob.org

From: "Bill Geyer" <billgeyer@comcast.net>  
To: "Martin Kjelstad" <mkjelstad@cob.org>  
Cc: "Ted Carlson, Public Works Director" <TCarlson@cob.org>, "Doug Robertson" <dkr@belcherswanson.com>  
Date: 01/12/2012 07:33 AM  
Subject: RE: Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity - 2nd Request

---

Martin,

As of this writing, I have not received a response to the questions below, and hereby renew my request.

My clients include most of the commercial property owners and merchants in the Fairhaven business district. The information requested directly relates to their analysis of a staff proposed plan that impacts their property and businesses. Accurate engineering data is needed so they may draft an informed response to the current staff efforts. General statements from staff members outside of Public Works that current City comprehensive utility plans (water, sewer, storm water) were reviewed is non-responsive to our request. We are requesting the information from the credentialed PE and duly authorized administrators responsible for these utility system, in short, the Public Works Department.

Please respond to our request for the information below at your earliest opportunity. Otherwise, please detail why these questions cannot be answered and forward my request to Director Carlson.

Thank you for your assistance in this request.

Bill Geyer, AICP

Geyer & Associates, Inc.  
360.738.2836 office / 360.224.6317 cell

(Note – minor grammatical change made to second paragraph below from initial email.  
–BG)

**From:** Bill Geyer [<mailto:billgeyer@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2011 9:57 AM  
**To:** Martin Kjelstad (mkjelstad@cob.org)  
**Subject:** Fairhaven Utility Demand and Capacity

Good morning Martin,

You may be aware of the ongoing planning study for Fairhaven to create a the Fairhaven Urban Village Plan (UVP) and revised neighborhood plan. The Planning Department recently released a staff draft report on the COB website.

<http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/neighborhoods/2010-docket-materials/fairhaven-np/2011-12-11-fairhaven-uv-plan-hi-res.pdf>

I represent the Old Fairhaven Association, the Fairhaven Village Association and several commercial property owners on this issue. My clients comprise most of the Fairhaven businesses and commercial property owners, and they have a very key interest in the quality and outcome of this planning effort. We are focused on completing a new UVP that is compliant with the City Comprehensive Plan, internally consistent with its goals and recommendations, is developed with the highest level of professional competence, meets the GMA, and a new UVP with a shelf life greater than 30 years.

Our questions today focus on the City utility systems (water, sanitary sewer and storm water system) serving the Fairhaven neighborhood. For all three utility systems (water, sewer or storm water system), as part of the Fairhaven planning program, has the Public Works staff been asked to:

1. Quantify the current system demand for the existing land uses?
2. List current system deficiencies?
3. Project potential demand for full build out under the current Fairhaven Neighborhood Plan (1980)?
4. Document the capital projects currently listed in the City Comprehensive Plan and the related Water, Sewer and Drainage Comprehensive Plans?
5. Review the land use model in the Planning staff document listed above?
6. Estimate the demand on all three utility systems if the staff proposed land use is built out?
7. Comment on other land use models and the resulting impact on utility system demand?
8. Document how current system deficiencies are resolved, or if these current deficiencies increase due to the Planning staff proposed land use model?

9. Project system demand for alternative land use models and resulting deficiencies?
10. Consider alternative regional storm water management systems for the Fairhaven commercial core and the Port waterfront?
11. Consider increased fire flow and pressure for prospective multi-story buildings in the commercial core or the Port waterfront?
12. Coordinate discussion with the Port engineers regarding possible utility system changes to serve the waterfront?
13. Comment on the long term operational needs of the Post Point treatment facility as it relates to the Fairhaven commercial core?

If discussion and analysis has occurred on any of the points above, please provide a summary of the nature and the outcome of the discussion. We can follow up on a later date for copies of the various emails and reports.

Thank you for your assistance in this effort. We look forward to additional discussion with the Public Works staff on these important points.

**Bill Geyer, AICP**

Geyer & Associates, Inc.

360.738.2836 office / 360.224.6317 cell