Workshop Details
Tuesday, May 23, 2017
6:30 to 8:30 p.m.
Fairhaven Middle School Commons
110 Parkridge Rd, Bellingham, WA 98225

Overview
On May 23, the City of Bellingham hosted a community workshop to introduce the Resource Recovery at Post Point project. The first portion of the meeting was an open house format, where participants could review informational posters discuss the project with team members. Members of the project team then provided a presentation about the project, followed by a question and answer period.

Please see the project website for a set of Frequently Asked Questions developed based on the workshop discussion: https://www.cob.org/gov/projects/Pages/Resource%20Recovery.aspx

Total Attendance
Approximately 12 community members attended the workshop.

Total Comment Form Responses
Three people filled out the comment form: two online and one paper.

Comment Form Key Themes
- Most believe the project and evaluation criteria reflect the City’s Legacy Statements and Strategic Commitments.
- Top evaluation criteria include:
  - Environmental: E2 – Protect Air Quality
  - Social: S5 – Minimize Toxin Exposure
  - Technical: T1 – Proven Reliability
- Key concerns include:
  - Air quality
  - Resource recovery
  - Truck traffic
  - Turning the area into an industrial site
  - Toxic waste products
- Suggestions include:
  - Compost on-site
  - Use barges instead of trucks
- Use the captured heat and energy for on-site use
- Plant more trees on-site

**Comment Form Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project appropriately reflect the City’s Legacy Statements and Strategic Commitments? Why or why not?</td>
<td>I believe the overall digester project does largely reflect the city’s Legacy Statement and Strategic Commitments because it can be tied to all the overall guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not entirely. I am concerned that the &quot;digester&quot; will produce dangerous gas that will adversely impact the environment and the safety of the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the project is built and operates the way it was presented – it should reflect the City’s LS + SC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help the project team identify the best alternative, we have identified Triple Bottom Line Plus (TBL+) evaluation criteria. Do these accurately reflect the City’s Legacy Statements and Strategic Commitments? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Yes - A direct link of the four evaluation criteria can easily be referenced to each of the City’s Legacy Statements and Strategic Commitments as they complement one another in a manner that helps implement the city's guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They are a reasonable place to start a discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If all the criteria are met I believe it should meet the City’s LS + SC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To help us understand what’s most important to you, please choose your top two evaluation criteria for the Environmental category. | E1 – Minimize Carbon Footprint  
E2 – Protect Air Quality                                                                                                              |
|                                                                           | E2 – Protect Air Quality  
E3 – Maximize Resource Recovery                                                                                                           |
|                                                                           | All the Environmental criteria (E1-E5)                                                                                                     |
| Please tell us more about why you chose these Environmental criteria.         | E1-We need to do what is possible to limit global climate change.  
E2-Air quality is important to protect the atmosphere and the health of the nearby residents. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I select E2 and E3, but it was a hard choice. I choose E2 as there is an important need to improve the air quality the current incinerator produces. I choose E3 because we, as a society need to focus on the reuse of resources so that there’s an efficient cycle.</td>
<td>It was difficult to choose only two! I believe all are important especially the Environmental section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To help us understand what’s most important to you, please choose your top two evaluation criteria for the Social category. | S3 – Minimize Truck Traffic  
S5 – Minimize Toxin Exposure  
S5 – Minimize Toxin Exposure  
S1 – Minimize Noise  
S2 – Minimize Odor  
S5 – Minimize Toxin Exposure |
| Please tell us more about why you chose these Social criteria. | I choose S3 because any additional truck traffic would impact historic Fairhaven adding to traffic congestion. I choose S5 because we need as a society and people of Bellingham reduce any toxins produced from our waste to be less harmful to the overall environment.  
All these are very important for maintaining the health of the neighbors and the value of nearby homes. |
| To help us understand what’s most important to you, please choose your top two evaluation criteria for the Technical category. | T1 – Proven Reliability  
T3 – Maintain Flexibility  
T4 – Minimize Complexity  
T1 – Proven Reliability  
T2 – Minimize Post Point Impacts |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please tell us more about why you chose these Technical criteria.</td>
<td>I selected T1 and T3. I choose T1 because it focuses stable long-term market and disposal options, which is needed to better address the aftermath of our waste products. I choose T3 because it addresses current space needs and allows the city flexibility to adapt to future needs and requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am very concerned about the beautiful area being turned into an industrial site in the midst of a prime residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any other feedback or questions the project team should consider?</td>
<td>Instead of potentially increasing trucking use how about considering barging as the bay and Fairhaven Ship Yard is right there. Barge the waste product to a place where it could be better trucked elsewhere. Increasing trucking in the heart of Fairhaven just isn't a good thing. And I like the idea of composting on-site as we further reduce greenhouse gas emissions via less transport where it could be used locally or elsewhere as needed. Perhaps the composting could be a later phase contingent on factors to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It seems reasonable to capture and use the heat (and possibly energy) produced by a digester ON SITE. Piping or trucking gas and fertilizer off site and creating a toxic, smelly, noisy business in a beautiful residential area does not seem an appropriate function of city government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see a lot more trees planted! Many trees were removed from the site prior to the last “upgrade” and very few were replaced – contrary to promises. Trees would help reach the goal of S1, S2, S4, E2, E5 on the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who else should we inform about the project?</td>
<td>Neighborhood associations NextDoor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>