

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
---	---------------	---------	----------------	--	--------------

1	03/15/2012	Bloedel Donovan Park	Les Scott 2427 Vista Drive Les Scott upjumpin@gmail.com	Really??? Someone wants to return the park to it's natural state? It's on of the nicest parks around. I know the lake has it's problems and we should work to mitigate them but is this really a solution? Sincerely, Les Scott 2427 Vista Drive Bham	
2	03/28/2012	Inadequate Public Information	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	To the Parks Director: The public has not been provided with meaningful information with regard to the proposed changes to the Bloedel-Donovan Master Plan, which is the subject of a public meeting scheduled on 3.29.12. The City website contains minimal information and the proposed changes are discussed in one short paragraph. The hyperlinks for additional information contain two maps of the Park, one in its existing state and another reflecting the proposed Master Plan revisions. However, these maps lack detail, such as measurements. In fact, the maps are orientated differently, making them challenging to compare. The maps do not reflect the changes in impervious surface or changes in the type and amount of vegetation. There is no written staff analysis or discussion of issues, including analysis of environmental impacts, or proposed mitigation. There is no reference to applicable legal provisions under SEPA, CWA, SMA, GMA, CAO or the City Codes and Comprehensive Plan. There is no discussion of the applicable Master Plan amendment process or an indication of where we are in the process. The average citizen does not monitor Council committee meetings and is unlikely to be aware that a more detailed discussion of this proposal was submitted as an agenda item. (Although the above items were still not discussed.) It is unclear why this information was not included on the website containing information of the public meeting. http://www.cob.org/web/council.nsf/0/85856E0975E750B2882579C900591BDA/\$File/26mar2012_AB19510.pdf?OpenElement/ I am bringing this to your attention because at some point in the future, the Parks Department will cite to this meeting as proof of its due diligence in obtaining public	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>input, as it did during the recent City Council meeting. This meeting appears to be an attempt to provide information, rather than to receive information. I am submitting this comment so that the future record will reflect this distinction.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris</p>	
3	03/28/2012	Fundamental Flaws in Bloedel Donovan Master Plan Proposal	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>Attached [see comment 4 below] please find the comment I have submitted with regard to the proposed dock and boathouse at Bloedel.</p> <p>I attended the Council committee meeting on the proposed amendments to the Bloedel Park Master Plan and was disturbed when the Parks Department failed to discuss the functional wetland immediately adjacent to the Bloedel boat launches. Increased land and water activity will impact fish and wildlife and their habitat. The Shoreline Management Act requires the City to protect all of the Lake's ecological functions. The Lake is classified as a Shoreline of Statewide Significance, entitled to a higher level of protection. The Critical Area Ordinance protects wetlands and Habitat Conservation Areas. Although the SEPA process for the new dock was completed, it failed to result in any mitigation requirement.</p> <p>The Council was not provided with an estimate of the change in impervious surface that will result from Park plan revisions. While the Parks Department touted the new vegetated areas, these vegetated areas need to be off-set with any increased impervious surface, based on a cumulative impact analysis. Because the Plan involves a critical area, the law requires that any changes incorporate best available science. The Parks Department is far along in its plans, without consideration or discussion of these issues.</p> <p>Please ensure the City continues to comply with the requirements of the GMA and the SMA.</p> <p>Wendy Harris</p>	
4	03/28/2012	Bloedel Donovan Master Plan- Kayak/boat house	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>Bloedel Donovan Master Plan Objection to Kayak Dock/Boathouse</p> <p>I strongly object to relocation of a hand launch boat dock and boat house at Bloedel Donovan Park, on the shorelines of Lake Whatcom. The dock and boathouse are being donated by the Whatcom Rowing Association for use by its members, who engage in competitive racing. Because these kayaks are routinely used in other waters bodies, this creates a high risk for introduction of invasive</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>species.</p> <p>The dock is currently located at the WWU Lakewood Recreational Facility. It is not coincidence that Lakewood has the worst Asian clam infestation on Lake Whatcom. When mapped out, the hot spots of Asian clam infestation in Lake Whatcom correlate with watercraft launches. Each time a kayak enters another water body and returns to Lake Whatcom, it carries a risk of introducing new aquatic invasive species or increasing the range of existing invasive species.</p> <p>The City has failed to consider the risks associated with the dock, along with the potential for increased costs of prevention, clean-up and control of invasive species. In fact, the City has not yet implemented an invasive species protection plan, and has no Asian clam management plan. Impacts to water quality or the aquatic ecosystem resulting from greater infestation has not be analyzed or addressed. In other words, the City is approving a project with a high risk of introducing invasive species without any adequate means of protecting the Lake, the Park or the public.</p> <p>The plans for the new dock are proceeding without consideration of the change in facts and circumstances since this project was initially planned. The Watershed Advisory Board, after careful consideration of the problem with invasive species, is requesting that the Bloedel boat launch be temporarily closed until we are better equipped to deal with aquatic invasive species.</p> <p>There are additional, and unmitigated, problems created by the dock and boathouse. Best available science establishes that overwater structures, including docks, are particularly damaging to the ecological functions of a Lake, and impact water quality. State agencies recommend no net increase in over-water structures in a highly developed Lake (i.e., those not already subject to a pending TMDL.) The City ignored this science, noting, during the SEPA process, that the impervious surface created by the dock is not relevant.</p> <p>The City avoided any discussion of the boathouse as part of the SEPA review, despite the resulting increase in impervious surface and accessory services, such as parking and restroom facilities. While this will be justified because the boathouse is not located on the shoreline, the boathouse is connected to the dock, and under SEPA, parts of proposals that are related to each other shall be evaluated in the same environmental document. WAC 197-11-060. I was unable to comment on this during the SEPA process because I lacked information regarding the boathouse.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>The City has also ignored the proximity of the dock to a functioning wetland. The wetland is habitat for many resident and migratory birds, and small mammals. The City must mitigate for fish and wildlife impacts under the CAO and SMP. The impacts of increased human presence, both on the land and in the water, have not been considered. The site of the dock is an established erosion area within a 100 year flood plain, and will impact shoreline ecological functions.</p> <p>The long term cumulative impacts of the dock and boat house have not been addressed, and should be reviewed comprehensively with the other changes proposed for the Park. Under SEPA mitigation provisions, the City should require compensatory mitigation for the impacts that result from changes in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The Parks Department is fulfilling its mission in meeting the needs of recreational watercraft users, but it is doing so without consideration of and mitigation for impacts to the Lake's ecological functions. Recreational use should be not at the expense of City residents who rely upon the Lake for drinking water, as well as its fish and wildlife.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris</p>	
5	03/29/2012	Public Comment: Bloedel Donovan Park Plan Amendment	Jeffrey A. Hegedus,MS,RS Environmental Health Supervisor Whatcom County Health Department 509 Girard Street Bellingham, WA 98227-0935 (360) 676-6724 ext. 50895 jhegedus@co.whatcom.wa.us	<p>Please accept this public comment regarding the currently proposed action of converting the Bloedel Donovan park east shoreline grassed area to native growth:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sand infiltration trenches treat surface water nutrient loading better than native growth areas. 2. Sand infiltration trenches cost less to construct and maintain than native growth areas. 3. Sand infiltration trenches allow the current land use of public waterfront enjoyment to continue, whereas conversion to native growth precludes this important land use. 4. Sand infiltration trenches also constitute a good legacy demonstration project opportunity for waterfront property owners. <p>For improved treatment of nutrient laden surface water, improved cost effectiveness, improved land use and improved public education opportunity, an improved strategy would be to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue the installation of sand infiltration trenches from the west shoreline area to the east shoreline area, extending to the boat launch area. 2. Reduce the size of the proposed east shoreline native growth area by 70%. 3. Install an education kiosk explaining how the use of BOTH trenches and native 	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>growth areas, for different shoreline locations and applications, are protective of water quality. Thank you, Jeff Hegedus.</p> <p>Jeffrey A. Hegedus,MS,RS Environmental Health Supervisor Whatcom County Health Department 509 Girard Street Bellingham, WA 98227-0935 (360) 676-6724 ext. 50895 jhegedus@co.whatcom.wa.us</p>	
6	03/29/2012	Bloedel Master Plan Ignores Wetland Impacts	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>Development planned for Bloedel Park is of sufficient scope to require amendment to the City Comprehensive Plan. While inadequate information has been released to the public, I do know that Lake Whatcom, Bloedel Donovan Park and an adjacent wetland are "Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas." BMC 16.16.55.470 applies to waters of the state, lakes, and "land useful or essential for preserving connections between habitat blocks and open spaces."</p> <p>The City Code requires mitigation for alteration to habitat conservation areas that achieves "equivalent or greater biologic and hydrologic functions and shall include mitigation for adverse impacts upstream or downstream of the development proposal site. Mitigation shall address each function affected by the alteration to achieve functional equivalency or improvement on a per function basis." BMC 16.16.490.</p> <p>Why, then, is the Parks Department proposing amendments to the Bloedel-Donovan Master Plan without consideration of, or mitigation for, fish and wildlife impacts? Increased development, with a new building, a new dock, new trails and roads, softer and more accessible shoreline areas, increased boat and car parking, a new watercraft permitting station, and increased Staff presence, in totality, increase use of land and water by humans and dogs.</p> <p>The Park abuts one of the only remaining Lake wetlands. As such, increased Park development will likely impact a rare urban habitat that is of high value to local wildlife species. Moreover, the Park and wetland provide habitat connectivity to Whatcom Creek and Bellingham Bay, as well as forested areas of the watershed that connect with the Chuckanut corridor. This habitat is of particular value for genetic exchange, and therefore, species survival.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>The City lacks a comprehensive wildlife conservation plan that identifies and protects habitat connectivity areas, or plant and species diversity. The SMP shoreline inventory and characterization fail to adequately reflect the abundant variety of wildlife or the value of this habitat. The fine work done years ago by Ann Eissenger on Bellingham Fish and Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat was never adopted.</p> <p>The City has no quantifiable baseline standard from which to measure biologic and hydrologic functions, on a per function basis. And no mitigation was proposed for the new dock, despite knowledge that over water structures impair ecosystem function and having on-going cumulative impacts once constructed, which require compensatory mitigation.</p> <p>And contrary to allegations by the Rowing Association, kayaks have significant impact on fish and wildlife due to their ability to navigate close to shorelines, disturbing habitat and allowing humans to visit locations that are otherwise difficult to reach.</p> <p>The wildlife and habitat value of the Park and wetland were not addressed in the prior SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) review for the Whatcom Rowing Association dock. The City summarily determined that there would be a net increase in ecological function simply because the dock was being moved to an area of the Lake with lower ecological function. This is not based on a specific analysis of habitat value and reflected a piece meal approach, where the scope and totality of Park development was not revealed. Thus, while I participated in the SEPA process, I was unaware that the dock needed to be considered as part of much larger development, with much greater impacts.</p> <p>The Parks Department should not be allowed to continue its on-going pattern of shoreline development for human use that completely ignores the needs of other species that share the land and water.</p> <p>The land speaks first. Why isn't the Parks Department listening?</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris</p>	
7	03/29/2012	Bloedel Donovan Plan	jhblethen@hotmail.com	<p>Gina,</p> <p>My master plan comments are:</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
---	---------------	---------	----------------	--	--------------

Page 7 of 43

				<p>Be sure the aggregate size is big enough to take the sw winds without washing out. There is quite a reach here. Yes to a naturalization on the point. No shore pines please.</p> <p>Remove the dotted line road to service boats- this probably would be need to be 22' wide with permeable paving and other mitigation and hugely expensive for the use. It would ruin the south portion of the park for me also.</p> <p>Reduce the power boat launches to one launch pad, and curtail or eliminate regular power boat launching from our park for three reasons- potential infestation of invasive mussels and clams which potentially could cause millions of dollars of damage to water inlets to the City's and to the many home owners who withdraw water from the lake- respect for our drinking water with potential spills and contamination from boats- And also for noise calming and safety for park users and property owners around the lake. Does parks (Dick Henry) have the number of boaters that use the lake?</p> <p>put the hand launch boat facility in part of the existing and mitigated power boat parking lot. Solar site this building for potential future solar applications. Be as inclusive of hand powered boat users as possible .</p> <p>Move the dog facility to a more appropriate (ie off our drinking water) location . Continue to look for ways to remove now resident rather than migratory geese from this park and the lake.</p>	
8	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Whatcom Rowing Association prefers Electric Avenue location due to boat conflicts	
9	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	How long will construction take?	
10	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Will construction add pollution to the lake?	
11	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public	General Public	Why install a concrete pathway?	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
---	---------------	---------	----------------	--	--------------

Page 8 of 43

		Meeting			
12	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	With regard to new dock for Whatcom Rowers: No mitigation has been proposed, has not been properly permitted, project did not consider water quality. These projects will result in boats, more dogs, more use of the Lake. Invasive species will be brought in by boats and kayaks, Wetlands in proximity will impacted, fish and wildlife impacts have not been addressed, SEPA needs to consider cumulative impacts, need to incorporate a science-based analysis. Also, the native vegetation proposed is a habitat-island and has no benefit to species, need to mitigate for impacts from dogs and people.	
13	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	I support the boathouse. Rowing provides a positive, net gain and will reduce motorized boats on the Lake. Rowing provides events for people with disabilities in non-motor boating.	
14	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	The plan appears to limit public access for people to the lawn area. I am opposed to the plan. The park is busy. Don't remove area for people.	
15	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Concerned with limiting public access with the native planting area. We should use the sand infiltration trench along the entire shoreline instead of the proposed native planting area.	
16	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Supports location #1 for the boathouse [Electric Avenue]. Getting people paddling is positive. Rowing promotes healthy lifestyles with minimal negative impacts. You have a sense of ownership and care when you use the lake.	
17	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Supports location 1 [Electric Avenue]. It avoids conflict with boats and trailers at the boat launch. The Outriggers Club supports the Whatcom Rowing Association with location #1. It is easier and safer to launch at the lake than at the Bay. It is better for beginners.	
18	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Opposes the plan, except the proposal for the infiltration trench.	
19	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Concerned with privatization of parks for users groups like the rowing group. There's private use at Boulevard, Cornwall is taken over by a small interest group with their discs. Concerned with proposed road near wetlands. The fencing around the current rowing facility is maintained with spray herbicides. There's silt on the steps leading to the lake, which is runoff from the sidewalks. The rain gardens only treat a small percent of the parking area. Need to keep grass longer to absorb	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
---	---------------	---------	----------------	--	--------------

Page 9 of 43

				water.	
20	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Keep the grass for the picnic area. Likes the boathouse on the paved area.	
21	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Supports the Whatcom Rowing Association. There should be a request for bids for the public land.	
22	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	There should be opportunities for accessible boating on Lake Whatcom. Likes rowing, likes the picnic area.	
23	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Need more information and more detailed studies. The planting area takes away major use of the area. The sand volleyball area is highly used. The boathouse will conflict with recreation, volley ball, and swimming. Find another location.	
24	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	The size of the paved area does not seem large enough for the boathouse.	
25	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Supports area 1 for the boathouse [Electric Avenue]. The cement retaining wall is nice for sitting. There is no need for a large beach. The park is nice as-is.	
26	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Grateful dogs are stewards of the park - hope that any development does not impact their use.	
27	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	The master plan amendment is driven by a special interest group.	
28	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Concerned about invasive species with new dock and kayaks.	
29	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment	General Public	Appreciates opportunity non-motor boat safely onto lake.	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
		Given at Public Meeting			
30	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Many communities have rowing programs. Activities for youth. Supports boathouse. Likes location #1 [Electric Avenue] avoids conflicts with motor boat launch. Adds adult supervision near volley ball courts.	
31	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Removal of retaining wall will add more public space than wall. Safer water access for families. Marine park is similar and provides more environmentally friendly and safer access.	
32	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Whatcom Rowing Association Float - permit process and analysis with Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Ecology has concluded. The float will allow conduit for education about invasive species. Only the current location is approved. The Whatcom Rowing Association float was an existing float that was renovated.	
33	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Is there another location for the boathouse on the Lake so the park can be kept as-is? Western Washington University is at Lakewood.	
34	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	At the bulkhead, water is gushing out. This is not a good example of stewardship. This needs to be repaired/changed.	
35	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	The City is coordinating and communicating with state invasive species organization.	
36	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	<p>Q: Has it already been decided to do these things? Will native planting be available for picnicking? Opposes the road. Keep the grass area. Inspect boats outside of the park. Will native planting area help the lake? Grass is one of the best filters to keep chemicals out of the lake. Is sand better?</p> <p>A: One of the largest sources of phosphorous if from lawns and lawn clippings. Many homeowners are moving to native vegetation to reduce phosphorous run-off. This project can be an example to other property owners. Grass draws phosphorous from the soil, soils have phosphorous. Native forests are better at keeping phosphorous in place.</p>	
37	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public	General Public	20 to 30 new houses on the lake creating pollutants. Lake Whatcom is stagnant. No flow through the lake due to Georgia Pacific shutdown.	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
Page 11 of 43					
		Meeting			
38	03/29/2012	Verbal Comment Given at Public Meeting	General Public	Please include the Grateful Dogs as continued stewards of the park and lake through the use of the off-leash area. Grateful Dogs support responsible dog ownership and provides doggie pot bags and reduces goose population.	
39	03/29/2012		Mollie Faulkner 3006 Barkley Gove Loop, Bellingham, WA 98226 647-0391	<p>Gina Austin: Bloedel Donovan Park is a Jewell. It is the only public access to Lake Whatcom within the City Limits. The Park is heavily used by picnickers and swimmers in the summer and virtually empty in the winter. But first and foremost Lake Whatcom is the source for the City's drinking water. We have been hearing for some time that the lake side needs more vegetation to filter the phosphorous run off. Putting a boathouse on the grass just does not make sense. It will drastically cut down swimming and picnic areas and leave a large area where there can be no vegetation. How did this plan come about? The Whatcom Rowing club is used by such a small percentage of the population but clearly with money to buy public space for a seasonal activity. Grateful Dog off leash association have been stewards of the park for the last fifteen years. They clean-up after all dogs, clear-up garbage and keep the destructive gees as bay. The dog walkers hours have been cut down drastically even in the winter when the only other users appear to be drug addicts, if the amount of syringes, beer cans and condoms that are picked up are any example. The dog walkers have not been permitted on the Lakeside for the last two winters for fear they damage the grass. Do you really expect that the boathouse and the transportation of the rowing shells to the water will not do any damage?</p> <p>Sincerely, Mollie Faulkner 3006 Barkley Grove Loop Bellingham, Washington 98226 647-0391</p>	
40	03/29/2012	From Public Meeting - Comment Handout	Wendy Harris 922-0442	Comment: Habitat area - does not address habitat and species need. You are creating a nonfunctional habitat island. This is not in compliance with any Puget Sound Agency policies - no net increase in impervious surface and over water structure not in compliance. Shoreline access will increase human and dog presence. Legal standards for wildlife conservation area in CAO are high - equal or greater ecological function for each functions. What is baseline standard to measure mitigation? What science based analysis and stuff like no park	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				improvements offset impacts. I do not see a valid analysis per SMA, CAO, and CWA. What about connection of invasive species and recreational user. These kayaks were not inspected at Lakewood. They enter other water bodies and return to Lake Whatcom. Where is discussion of wetland - no consideration of rarity and impacts of increased use. This is not restoration under the SMA. It is offensive to talk about people with disabilities. I have disabilities and I do not support ignoring impacts of kayaks. Kayaks have significant impact on fish and wildlife and habitat and carry risk of invasive species. The rowing association failed to address any environmental impacts on SEPA application - did not know that Lake Whatcom is a sensitive water body and critical area report was only 2 pages. They do not care about public. There is no mitigation. The only people who support this plan are rowers. They do not live in the watershed. Who cares if rowing association is non-profit. They have the same impacts on water quality as any for-profit organization. This sets a very poor example for residents. For Comp Plan, you need a cumulative impact analysis - including impacts from boat inspection program, more parking, more boats, more employees, more roads. How much new impervious surface? Development is a source of water quality impacts - this is development - recreational use is source of invasive species in Lake - this is greater recreational use.	
41	03/30/2012	From Public Meeting - Comment Handout	Tom Yorkston 2425 Sylvan St Bellingham, WA 360-354-1183	Comment: I think it should be left the way it is cause there are a lot of people who enjoy sitting an BBQing away from the main park cause it is more privet and there are BBQs and picnic tables. I don't think that it is going to change anything with pollution to the lake. Interests: Just leave it for the people - they like it the way it is.	
42	03/30/2012	From Public Meeting - Comment Handout	Dick Rothenbuhler 3112 Meridian 733-6020 drothenbuhler@comcast.net	Comment: Removes an area where the morning sun is an often the only dry area. Have watched the sun rise there many times. Also removes to much picnic area and to few spots now 1 of the only public areas where this can be down now. Not in favor of special intrest groups taking over a park I had to carry or rent that privilage while I grew up and at 11 or 12 had to carry my boats. They also have that option even make trailers for them. Interests: 1 of the only sites on the lake available the public has now.	
43	03/30/2012	From Public Meeting - Comment Handout	Daphne Sluys 1116 Birch Falls Drive 360-778-1106	Comment: I fully support the proposed changes and prefer boathouse location 1 [Electric Avenue]. Interests: boating, walking, swimming. Family been here 23 years and enjoyed many aspects of park. Believe all changes to be positive.	
44	03/30/2012	Protect Swimming Area	Brian Scott 360-310-0065	Would like to see the public swimming areas protected for all people and is concerned for children's safety when more uses are introduced at the park for paddlers and rowers.	
45	03/30/2012	Proposed Changes to	Deborah Anderson Deborah-	I would like to make a comment with regard to proposed changes to Bloedel Donovan Park.	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
		Bloedel Donovan Park	@earthlink.net	<p>I looked at the map of proposed changes but it isn't very detailed. For example I was looking for the picnic tables on the east side of the park but can't tell whether they would be preserved or not. I hope so because in the summer, eating lunch or dinner at the picnic tables while watching the boats come and go is most enjoyable. Please do preserve the picnic tables and enough open space so that we can see the lake.</p> <p>Deborah Anderson</p>	
45	03/30/2012	Proposed rowing club modifications to Bloedel DOnovon; Other watershed issues	<p>David M. Camp</p> <p>Editor, Whatcom Watch PO Box 1441 Bellingham, WA 98227-1441 Email: editor@whatcomwatch.org Website: www.whatcomwatch.org</p>	<p>Hi, Gina,</p> <p>Two Items:</p> <p>1) ROWing CLub: I'm told you are the responsible person on this proposed project, so I'm contacting you to request more information on what is proposed to accomodate the rowing club at Bloedel DOnovon. Can you send me a map or drawing (perhaps part of a powerpoint presentation) of it? As you know, Bloedel Donovan is a very heavily used (in the summer) public lake access point - to me there should be a public debate about this proposal, which benefits only a very few prosperous people, potentially at the expense of the moderate income people who use the park and who are not well-connected like the rowing club proponents. Can you tell me what consideration has been made in the planning process for the needs and wants of the existing park users? Someone needs to be speaking for them in this process.</p> <p>2) Can you direct me to the person responsible for the program which helps landowners in the watershed with improvements to their properties? I'm not sure what it is called, but I've seen one such property, and the process seems very strange to me, as it involves killing a healthy turf with roundup, then covering with cardboard, then loading several yards of mulch, in preparation for planting shrubs, apparently. I'm really questioning how this is improving the watershed and why my taxes are going to pay for this.</p> <p>Thanks in advance,</p> <p>David</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>PS: copied to City council members and Mayor Linville because someone has to do it, I don;t get paid to do this and I don;t have time to be formal!</p> <p>David M. Camp</p> <p>Editor, Whatcom Watch PO Box 1441 Bellingham, WA 98227-1441 Email: editor@whatcomwatch.org Website: www.whatcomwatch.org</p>	
47	04/01/2012	Public Comments from Anara about Bloedel Master Plan	Anara Thomas 504 16th St. Bellingham, WA 98225 671- 4193 smilined@yahoo.com	<p>Dear Gina: After listening to comments at the public meeting about the Bloedel Master Plan amendment on March 29, 2012, speaking for Grateful Dogs Organization, I just want to restate my concern over keeping a dog off leash area at Bloedel. Remember, about one in four people own dogs and need areas to recreate with them, especially since there is water access, the only in the city. City wide, we want to retain our legitimate areas so people don't become scofflaws by taking dogs off leash in non-designated spaces. Our group has partnered with the city on projects like planting trees at Squaticum Creek Park, providing Doggie Bags at Bloedel and acting as park stewards by cleaning up after our dogs, others' dogs and people who litter the park. We are a committed group invested in keeping that park clean. We are the only users there in the winter--no matter what the weather. As long as geese like grass, the presence of dogs should keep them at bay.</p> <p>Speaking for myself and not for the Grateful Dogs, I want to bring up concerns about developing Bloedel park that leads to increased motor boat usage. If anything, motor boats on our only source of drinking water should be highly regulated. I'm also wondering about what paths or roads would need to be built if a boat house gets built? Would there be hidden costs to the public for a new boat house? After hearing support of the boat house from the Kayak and Canoe groups, I get confused about who would store boats on city parks property. I would have to say what interests me most about this site is the environment; including health of the lake and increased use of motorboats.</p> <p>You did a great job clearly describing this project and moderating comments and questions.</p> <p>Please contact me with additional info about Bloedel Park development.</p> <p>Anara Thomas 504 16th St. Bellingham, WA 98225 671- 4193</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
48	04/02/2012	Bloedel Donovan Master Plan	Jennifer Brighton 108 Crestline Drive Bellingham, WA 98229 jenbrighton@comcast.net	<p>smilined@yahoo.com</p> <p>Dear Ms. Austin:</p> <p>I am a member of the Grateful Dogs Off-Leash Association and am a native of Bellingham. I own two very active dogs and wish to offer some observations and comments about the need for off-leash areas for dogs in our city and especially a place for dogs to romp and swim at Bloedel.</p> <p>Over the years, as Bellingham has grown, the need for off-leash areas has grown, but as I'm sure you know, we've actually lost many spaces where dogs can be legally off-leash and especially places where dogs can swim (Post Point, Whatcom Falls Park, limited hours at Bloedel, the bulk of Lake Padden). I frequented Bloedel Donovan with my female dog almost daily until adopting a second dog from the shelter. The second dog can be unruly in a large group of dogs, so he is not a good dog park candidate. However, he is very socialized and does well in areas where he can run, such as the pipeline trail behind the cemetery, the Galbraith trails, Lake Padden trails, etc. where there are not a lot of dogs packed up in a small space.</p> <p>This weekend, while walking the trails in Whatcom Falls Park with my leashed dogs, it brought home the need for more off-leash areas, not less, and especially where dogs can swim. Of about 15 dogs I encountered in a short period on the main trails, only about 4 were leashed. My dogs are very social and have no problem encountering off-leash dogs that run up to them when they are on leash. However, many dogs are reactive in such a situation. The trails are narrow in WFP. I believe the loss of the full-time lake access winter hours at Bloedel has exacerbated this problem and I foresee it will continue to get worse as the population of Bellingham continues to grow. In fairness to all its citizens, the city must look out for dog owners (and collaterally non-dog owners), if nothing else as a safety measure, so owners have somewhere they can legally swim and let their dogs romp and owners who for one reason or another need to walk their dogs on leash have somewhere they can feel safe and be assured that other unleashed dogs are not going to run up to theirs.</p> <p>Thank you for your time in reading this email and your willingness to consider everyone's interests.</p> <p>Jennifer Brighton 108 Crestline Drive Bellingham, WA 98229</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
---	---------------	---------	----------------	--	--------------

Page 16 of 43

				jenbrighton@comcast.net	
49	04/03/2012	Invalid use of park land/invalid master plan proposal	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>I request that your legal department review the City's handling of the two watercraft storage areas that have been provided to the Whatcom Rowing Association at Bloedel Donovan Park. One area was a pre-existing use and one is new. These privileges violate the City's Code and impair the public's ability to use Bloedel Park. This use has not been disclosed on the Park Master Plan and violates public process. I demand that these storage areas be immediately removed.</p> <p>Pre-Existing Storage Area With regard to the pre-existing storage area, (lower set of racks), I see no legal authority that extends the concept of nonconforming use to the City's public parks. The purpose of a nonconforming use statute is to protect private property rights when the public interest requires changes in land use and zoning codes. Because parks are managed in the interest of the public, there is no private property right that must be considered. Thus, the changes required for public health and safety should be fully implemented.</p> <p>Moreover, the City holds legal title to public lands. To the extent that it permits a special interest organization to use public land, the organization obtains no right or interest in public property that it could convey to another organization. Rather, upon cessation of use by the first group, the land reverts back to the City.</p> <p>Evidence of this is found in the City Code. The City's CAO and land use Code contain nonconforming uses and structures provisions. There are none in the BMC Title for Parks. This is because nonconforming uses were never contemplated for public land.</p> <p>Additionally, by the end of 1990, the Planning Department was required to notify anyone with a nonconforming use that they must apply for a certificate of nonconforming use, which would be issued only in limited circumstances after a public hearing before the Hearings Examiner. BMC 24.14.030.B.</p> <p>In this case, there is no record of a valid permit ever having been issued. Nevertheless, you assert that because you can not disprove that a permit was verbally issued, you must continue allowing the nonconforming use. This is contrary to City law. Assuming that nonconforming use of public land was legal, the lack of a required certificate would terminate this use.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>This conclusion is also supported by the City's nonconforming use regulations, which contain termination provisions for discontinuation or abandonment of use. The burden of showing continuous use is always place upon the owner or applicant for a use. BMC 20.14.030; 16.55.130. It would be ludicrous to approve a conditional use based on lack of evidence and I certainly hope that this has not been the basis of other permit decisions.</p> <p>New Storage Area With regard to the new locked storage area provided to the Whatcom Rowing Association, you assert that it is 200 feet outside of boundaries regulated by the CAO for wetlands. However, the wetland delineation report noted that a "profession survey of the field delineation would be needed to determine the exact size and location of the wetland." The location and size of the wetlands in the provided report were noted to be "approximate."</p> <p>Moreover, you have failed, without explanation, to impose applicable provisions of the CAO for Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas. As you know, where a site contains 2 or more types of critical areas, a report is required for each type. BMC 16.55.480.</p> <p>The new storage area was created against the fence line for the wetland associated with the Lake. The wetland is a wildlife conservation area because it is useful or essential for preserving connections between habitat blocks and open spaces. It was identified in City documents as a riparian zone that was an important wildlife corridor. The wetlands also contain priority species and habitat (eagles, osprey, blue heron, cavity nesting, beaver.) . BMC 16.55.470; http://www.cob.org/documents/parks/development/pro-plan/2008-draft-update/wildlife-habitat.pdf.</p> <p>A conservation area report is required for any project site within 300 feet of a wildlife conservation area, and to my knowledge, this was not required. Moreover, as developed, there is no buffer between the Rowing Assoc.'s storage area and the conservation area, although this is also a CAO requirement. Required buffer widths shall reflect the sensitivity of the habitat and the type and intensity of human activity proposed to be conducted nearby. BMC 16.55.490.F. Bald eagle habitat may be protected under BMC 16.55.500.A.3. The Code requires consultation with WDFW and DNR, which has not occurred to my knowledge. I am not certain if the provisions for riparian habitat buffers under 16.55.D are</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>applicable.</p> <p>Summary In sum, the City is providing public land to a special interest organization without consideration and mitigation for important species and habitat and without legal authority to permit a nonconforming use that violates current land use requirements. These storage areas will have a harmful impact on a habitat corridor from the Lake to Whatcom Creek and Bellingham Bay because they were permitted in connection with a planned new road that run along side the storage areas, creating a barrier to wildlife travel.</p> <p>The decisions of the Planning Department and Parks Department should be reviewed by the Legal Department and revised as appropriate, and additional notice and revised Master Plans for Bloedel should be reissued to the public.</p>	
50	04/05/2012	Bloedel Master Plan Amendment	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>I am disappointed that the City is not following its own recommendations for good Lake Stewardship with regard to vegetated shoreline buffers. Instead, the proposed amendments to the Master Plan for Bloedel Donovan include a sand infiltration trench, and virtually no vegetated buffer along the Lake's shoreline. This should be corrected to ensure that vegetated buffers are prioritized. If it is still feasible and funding exists to include an infiltration trench, then both should be incorporated.</p> <p>The suggested proposal contradicts the most recent cost/benefit analysis study indicating that native vegetation protection and restoration activities were often more effective and less costly than expensive engineered solutions.</p> <p>The restoration of Lake Whatcom requires a holistic watershed management approach. Healthy water is the result of a healthy ecosystem. An infiltration trench performs only one primary ecological function... reduction in stormwater run-off. A vegetated buffer performs a wider array of ecological functions, including wave attenuation, flooding, erosion, shoreline stabilization, reduction in water temperature, and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Vegetated buffers are particularly indicated at Bloedel given the problem with goose poop and water quality. The geese and other waterfowl are attracted by grass lawns, and now, by the Asian clams. A vegetated buffer between the water and lawn provides an established deterrent for geese. Thus, in the case of the Park, a vegetated buffer provides an important water quality component missing with an infiltration trench.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>The importance of vegetated buffers is reflected in the Shoreline Management Act and related SMP Guidelines. In particular, the Guidelines recognize the importance of vegetation in urban areas, noting that the ecological function it provides is often as great as or even greater than in rural areas due to its scarcity. Vegetated buffers are an important component of meeting SMP “no net loss” requirements.</p> <p>The City’s updated SMP (still awaiting DOE approval) established as a foundational goal that “shorelines of Lake Whatcom should be restored in such a manner that bulkheads are removed, in-water structures are minimized, and a variety of native vegetation is planted in close proximity to the shoreline so that natural processes are reintroduced.” SMP 2.02.20.B This policy applies to shoreline impacted by historical use. This is also in keeping with the Park’s environment designation as urban conservancy. Additional policy goals emphasize the need for native vegetation sufficient to provide shade and filtration to reduce pollutant loading to Lake Whatcom’s shorelines. SMP 2.02.20.I.</p> <p>Please redesign your proposal to include vegetated shoreline buffers. Access points to the docks and swimming areas could be incorporated into this design so that both restoration and public access are achieved.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris</p>	
51	04/12/2012	Non-Motorized Boats and Bloedel Donovan Park Proposal	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>The below Western Front article provides excellent information regarding the risks associated with non-motorized boat use on Lake Whatcom and infestation from aquatic invasive species. This article contains unusually candid quotes from City and County staff that underscore the reasons that it is improper to allow a competitive rowing team to use Bloedel Donovan Park for its classes, competition practices and competition events. We should not be promoting increased recreational use of the Lake when it is in direct conflict with the need to protect and restore our drinking water.</p> <p>Wendy Harris</p> <p>Western Front Blogs: News Sports Photos Lifestyle Tech</p> <p>Asian clams in local lakes threaten water quality, beaches Written by Mikey Jane Moran</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
---	---------------	---------	----------------	--	--------------

				<p>Tuesday, 10 April 2012 05:28</p> <p>Bivalves are bombarding Bellingham. They kill native mussels, fill Bellingham shores with razor-sharp shells and pollute the drinking water of 85,700 people across Whatcom County. They are the Asian clam, and students may have brought them to local lakes. Invasive Asian clams have been found in Lake Whatcom, including around Lakewood, Western's water sports facility according to the City of Bellingham. Students who do not properly clean their boats could be part of the problem, said Teagan Ward, environmental resource assistant for the Bellingham Public Works Department.</p> <p>Asian clams pose a threat to native mussel species and could cause algae to grow in the lake, polluting the water pouring out of Whatcom County's taps, said Laurel Baldwin of the Whatcom County Noxious Weed Board. Live Asian clams and dead shells can also be swept into water intake pipes, costing the U.S. approximately \$1 billion dollars per year in damages according to the U.S. Geological Survey estimates.</p> <p>Many students are unaware of the disservice they could be doing to the lake by not properly washing their boats.</p> <p>Ward said Lakewood is a "hot spot" for clam colonies, and though they could have spread from other parts of the lake, they were most likely introduced by infected student crafts.</p> <p>Jeff Davis, the Lakewood facilities manager, said the sailing team often travels to compete, and has sailed on infested bodies of water. The clams may have traveled back to Bellingham on the team's boats, he said.</p> <p>Asian clams, or <i>Corbicula fluminea</i>, were first found in Lake Whatcom in September 2011. Significant infestations have been confirmed around Bloedel Donovan Park, Lakewood, Sudden Valley and Wildwood.</p> <p>Laurel Baldwin of the Whatcom County Noxious Weed Board said clam colonies are centered around areas with high boat traffic, which suggests they were spread by boaters.</p> <p>Clam larvae are spread easily through mud and sand left on boats or in the bait barrels of fishermen, Baldwin said. Invisible in the sediment, larva can only be contained if boats are properly washed and dried between uses.</p> <p>"They can be in a cup full of water, and you don't even see them," Davis said.</p> <p>Although the adult clams are very small, measuring only a few centimeters in length, the effects they can have on the lake are huge.</p> <p>Baldwin said users of a clam-infested beach may be injured on shores littered with thousands of sharp shells, which accumulate rapidly due to the clams' high</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>reproduction rate.</p> <p>"They can be so prevalent that they cover the beach and they can be a little bit like glass," Davis said.</p> <p>But sharp sand is the least of Lake Whatcom's worries when it comes to Asian clams. Clams may also be linked to water quality issues. Ward said the connection between algae blooms and clam populations is still unclear, but clams excrete phosphorus and nitrogen into the water. These chemicals encourage algae to bloom, which pollutes Bellingham's drinking water, Ward said. A larger clam population means more phosphorus and nitrogen, and thus more algae.</p> <p>Davis, Ward and Baldwin all agreed clams mean trouble because they are a warning sign of more threatening invasive species: the quagga and zebra mussels.</p> <p>Ward said these mussels have threads that allow them to attach to any surface, including water pipes. The mussels can form layers as thick as six inches, clogging pipes and costing tax dollars to remove. The mussels are more easily spread because the threads strongly attach to boats and are difficult to remove. Mussels can even latch on to native clams.</p> <p>While the Asian clam presents problems of its own, Davis described it as a "harbinger of worse situations."</p> <p>As Asian clams die, their shells dissolve, releasing the calcium zebra mussels need to form their shells, Ward said.</p> <p>So far, neither the school nor the city has done anything to address the clam infestations around Lakewood, but Ward said the city is considering distributing brochures and putting up signs around the facility to warn boaters about spreading invasive species.</p> <p>Lakewood staff and students who use the facility, including Davis, admitted to knowing little on the topic of invasive clams. Training boating instructors about cleaning boats or producing educational videos are good options to curb the spread of Asian clams, Ward said.</p> <p>Ward said the city is currently mapping clam colonies and discussing management strategies with a dive team from the Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p> <p>Baldwin said in other lakes, benthic barriers, or large plastic tarps, were spread across the lake floor to suffocate clams. While this method was effective, Baldwin said tarps kill all species, including native clams, and can be expensive. She said the city of Bellingham is still studying containment options and looking for ways to educate the public about the risks of spreading invasive species.</p> <p>Both Baldwin and Ward said the city hopes to have a plan to deal with the clams by the summer.</p> <p>http://westernfrontonline.net/news/14506-asian-clams-in-local-lakes-threaten-water-quality-beaches</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
52	04/19/2012	From Public Meeting - Comment Handout	Sharon Belk-Krebs 3942 Lakemont Road Bellingham, WA 98226 360-738-6888	<p>Sorry this has taken so long - especially since I may not remember everything! I think the efforts are fine + good to improve shoreline + retaining wall. What I don't like, in that aspect, is narrowing lawn area on the already narrow area on the boat launch side with wider native plantings. There are more efficient ways to reduce run-off without impacting an already small area of picnic tables + dog walking. My biggest concern is that it appears that Whatcom Rowers + other non-motor groups want to buy the use of Bloedel for their own niche use that will probably expand + expand + drive out dogs, swimmers, picnickers, sun bathers etc. I understand they even have their own key to the pavilion to do rowing exercise. Just because they have some big money + name behind them doesn't mean they should be allowed to take over. And will park workers be expected to deal with even more graffiti + vandalism to their boathouse, etc? They already deal with so much + this will probably bring more problems. Also, I don't really understand this boat road along field between field + Old Mill Village. Rowers have already taken away some of the driest area to walk. I can't imagine why Parks would think this is a good idea. Please see other side for my "interests" answer.</p> <p>My biggest use + interest has been as a responsible dog owner 1st + then discovering + joining Grateful Dogs. I have for years experienced some of my most available social contact there both me + my dogs. It's wonderful to meet like-minded folks + truly socialize my dogs to people + other dogs. Besides, look how we help with the goose poop! Speaking of poop - I have always picked up + encouraged others, but as part of Grateful Dogs we have more chance to educate less responsible owners through our actions, well-timed words to "offenders," + public events such as Paws n Claws + Dog Days. Our 1st Saturday poop clean-up is not really restricted to 1st Saturdays. Most of us do that every day we are there. Some of us also spend our spring + summer days helping to pick up the <u>loads</u> of garbage (some very disgusting) left by people. The dogs couldn't hope to do so much mess + damage. Bottom line, I've been saddened by the restrictions of the last couple years to our use of the park. We used to be able to be on the lakeside unlimited from sometime in Oct to May. Gees still poop then, you know! That whole part of the park gets little use in winter, late fall + early spring, other than after nightfall in the form of vandalism, beer parties + who knows what. I would love to see us reinstated, but at the very least, please don't restrict us even more or shut us out altogether. Specially not for rowers backed by big name + money who'd like to see the park their private playground.</p> <p>Sincerely Sharon Belk-Krebs</p>	
53	04/26/2012	Trailer parking at Bloedel-	Larry Mansfield mansf@comcast.net	Dear Council Member,	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
		Donovan		<p>At last week's Watershed Advisory Board meeting, Gina Austin presented the revised Bloedel-Donovan Master Plan Amendment. Many questions arose. In particular, Board members are concerned about boat trailer parking in the Park's play field. Gina said that there is no provision in the plan to change this. However, Clare Fogelsong said that he is considering using the strip across from the Park between Electric Avenue and the street, also called Electric, as a parking lot for boat trailers. When I said that this is a green area he said, "there are always downsides."</p> <p>I find it appalling that the City would even consider turning this strip into a parking lot. Most of the strip is in trees and the portion that is not should have been planted long ago. The strip not only provides a buffer for the City residents living along Electric, but it is a natural area seen when driving or walking by the Park. Isn't it time the City put its entire population ahead of the relatively small number of people who use the Park's boat ramp to launch powerboats on the Lake?</p> <p>Sincerely, Larry Mansfield</p>	
54	04/30/2012	Bloedel Master Plan Comments	David Jefferson 2230 Erie Street Bellingham, WA 98226 "David Gmail" david4per@gmail.com	<p>Hi Gale,</p> <p>Thank you for presenting at the WAB and Bloedel Donovan. Challenge getting all this public input but it looks like you are getting in done.</p> <p>Would like to add a few comments to the Bloedel Master plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Not in favor of providing public park property to a private entity (boathouse) for private use. This will reduce park size, take away public use of property and water down the agreement that citizens have with their government that public property is for all public use. If the rowing club is allowed a club house, will Woods Coffee or another provider apply for a coffee shop permit? · I am in favor of closing the large park area to boat overflow parking. · The Public Works department and City Council is considering a boat inspection and cleaning station. This should be included in the plan for a variety of reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The community needs to see that departments are collaborating on large community wide programs like safe drinking water. Failure to show this degree of collaboration minimizes major goals and objectives and confuses the citizens about City priorities o It is incongruent to suggest more boat launching areas (private boat house) 	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>while ignoring the potential infestation mussels from boats that are already using the launch.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new infiltration projects seem appropriate but I would strongly suggest highlighting why this is being done, who are your collaborating partners, why this benefits the larger community and how this all ties into the grand plan of protecting our water source. <p>David Jefferson 2230 Erie Street Bellingham, WA 98226</p>	
55	5/7/2012	Bloedel Donovan peoposed Boathouse	William Hadley <wahadley@live.com>	<p>One of the top complaints about the proposed update of the Bloedel Donovan Master Plan has been the relocation of the proposed boat house. I think there will be conflicts with other park users and traffic exiting the parking lot at the proposed new location. One of the questions asked was "Isn't there the somewhere else they could launch their boats?" There is a possibility, Euclid Park. I visited the park Saturday to get a fresh look. There is about 250 ft. of undeveloped shoreline in a somewhat sheltered cove. It looks like it would be a great location for boat launch for unpowered boats. There has been a long standing question about a viable use for Euclid Park. I think the possibility is worth some serious consideration.</p> <p>Some other features for consideration are: The land near the shoreline is flat so placement of the boat house could be near the shoreline. The current trail length from the parking area is about 500 ft. The area is currently quite wet so there may be need for augmented drainage. There is probably not enough parking but it could be easily expanded. There would be a need for a restroom. There appears to be water and sewer available at the parking lot. In short there are lots of things to be considered but the possibilities seem to be warrant serious study.</p> <p>BillHadley</p>	
56	5/8/2012	Bloedel Donovan	Glenn Merrill gpm5@comcast.net	I am writing to voice concerns about the Bloedel Donovan Master Plan, specifically about the reduction in useable public space on the east shore of the park. The	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
		Master Plan		<p>plan to remove the bulkhead is commendable and will model good shoreline management practices; the accompanying development of a natural beach will add to aesthetic and access qualities. What I have concerns about is the plan to extend the planted landscape toward the east beach, minimizing the grassy space and picnic area available for use. When the north swimming area and playground are crowded (which is quite frequent during summer months), the east shoreline is the only quiet alternative in the park. In addition, it provides an extended view of the lake, the best of the morning sun, and the only sense of real natural space in the park (the north shoreline looks directly across to a highly developed housing area.)</p> <p>I encourage you to reconsider plans for redevelopment that retain as much public picnic space and grassy area along the east shore as possible.</p> <p>Glenn Merrill gpm5@comcast.net</p>	
57	5/31/2012	Bloedel Donovan Master Plan Amendment	Larry Mansfield WAB member mansf@comcast.net	<p>Dear City Council Member,</p> <p>I believe the Bloedel Donovan Master Plan Amendment has been sent to the City Council without sufficient input from the public. I attended the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board meeting at which the Amendment was first presented. I was amazed that there were no questions raised by members of the Parks Board. It is my understanding that there was again no comment at the second presentation when the Parks Board approved sending the Amendment to City Council. The Parks Board's reaction was in stark contrast to comments made at the public meeting and by members of the Watershed Advisory Board [WAB.]</p> <p>At the public meeting on the proposal, it was my impression that most of those not involved with the rowing club were opposed to the Amendment. There was a strong statement in opposition to turning over part of the park to a private organization. The general tenor seemed to be "don't mess with our park."</p> <p>One point made at the public meeting by supporters of the Electric Avenue position for the boathouse was that the present situation requires families to walk through the boat launch area to get to the hand launch float, thereby endangering people, especially children, from backing boat trailers. If the boat launch is closed for this year's boating season, then this is no longer a pressing problem. The one project that seems to need doing soon is the removal of the bulkhead and establishment of a natural beach. This should not require an entire revision of the Master Plan.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>When the Master Plan proposal came to the WAB, it was the third time I had heard a presentation. However, it was the first time that the "Outdoor Equipment & Storage" area was mentioned. This feature is easy to miss on the drawing unless it is pointed out. It is to occupy the gentle grassy slope along Electric Avenue to the north of the proposed boathouse. Aside from comments on this storage area, there was strong opposition to the boathouse itself and the construction of a path and launch site for a private group in such a heavily used park. In addition, WAB members wanted boat trailers banned from the play field. The Master Plan should resolve this parking issue. Maybe a provision closing the play field to parking and a simple sign at the park entrance indicating when the trailer parking lot is full.</p> <p>It appears that this Master Plan Amendment is being rushed through. For example, the map presented to the Parks Board and the public meeting had an incorrect distance scale, two boathouses with one twice as long as the other, and a "road" through the play field that was no larger than a footpath. In addition, as a property owner in Silver Beach, I received the notice for the public meeting by snail mail before the Parks Board approved the date.</p> <p>Personally I believe that the infiltration trench in the Amendment is the wrong solution to a poorly defined problem. I have obtained confirmation of this position from an environmental engineer. I see the boathouse and especially the outdoor storage area as having the potential to produce an unsightly view of the park from Electric Avenue. Finally, the new location for the hand launch float is not well chosen. It is at the end of the swim area near the bridge used by many swimmers. A private launch float does not belong in a swim area with no other floats available to swimmers.</p> <p>When something is called a Master Plan, one expects more care devoted to its preparation. One would also expect that an advisory group dedicated to parks should have something to say about the design. It clearly was not perfect when the Parks Board saw it the first time and I submit that they passed on a flawed design the second time they saw it.</p> <p>This Master Plan Amendment is not worthy of City Council Approval.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Larry Mansfield WAB member</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
58	5/31/2012	Bloedel Donovan Park Master Plan Amendment	Mollie Faulkner 3006 Barkley Grove Loop Bellingham, WA 98226 360-647-0391	<p>May 31, 2012</p> <p>Bellingham City Council 210 Lottie Street Bellingham, WA 98225</p> <p>Dear Council Members:</p> <p>I am a daily—year-round user of Bloedel Donovan Park. I walk my small dog there each morning before 10 AM.</p> <p>I am well aware of the amount of Summer use at the Park—picnickers, swimmers, volleyball players, fishermen, boaters and more.</p> <p>The Park is so small, in the last few years the boat storage enclosures have taken away valuable walking areas. The present rowing club storage forces winter walkers into ankle deep water.</p> <p>The thought of placing a huge boathouse and dock in the picnic and swimming area is madness. It would affect the emergency access, picnickers, the volleyball court and fisherman and most of all take away valuable grass area needed to protect this lake and our drinking water.</p> <p>Please give this new plan some serious thought. As the population grows and space becomes limited we all need to share. Not be taken over by those who can afford to pay. There is the danger of privatization of our public parks!</p> <p>Sincerely, Mollie Faulkner 3006 Barkley Grove Loop Bellingham, WA 98226 360-647-0391</p>	
59	06/04/2012	Bloedel Donovan Master Plan, new hand carry boathouse	Clayton Petree publicpolicyperspective s@comcast.net	<p>Dear Council, Mayor Linville, and Parks,</p> <p>I would like to express my support for improving the Bloedel Donovan park. I live close-by and it is one of the more popular parks in the entire city. Growing up in Bellingham, I have fond memories of my visits there, especially swimming and jumping off the diving boards.</p> <p>As a short term goal (1-3 years), I would like to see planning for at least some of the various docks and diving boards be brought back to the park. As it is today, the swimming area was always a highly used part of the park and when I was growing up, a fantastic way for me to spend a sunny day. As you can see by the number of</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>people that have been forced to jump from the Electric Avenue bridge, this is something that people want to do at a swimming area. Actually, even though it may be a little bit dangerous, I think it's a very interesting look at human nature that people jump off the bridge since the diving boards were removed - when you take away an opportunity to have fun, people will still find a way to have fun. It would make sense to provide that opportunity again, especially since there are so few opportunities for swimming outdoors in Bellingham's park system. The only other good place to swim and have fun in a similar way that I can think of is the cliff at Whatcom Falls Park.</p> <p>I would also like to express my opposition to the first location of the new proposed boathouse next to Electric Avenue. Putting the boathouse and a path to the water there will certainly conflict with the heavy use of the park in that location. There are constant volleyball matches and other uses there. However, the alternative location proposed where the locomotive currently sits is an excellent one and I urge you to adopt that as the primary, and only location. The proposed alternative hand launch dock location would be much better than along the bridge, but an even better location could be from the "existing rain garden" area. A dock could be designed to go over the rain garden (allowing the garden to continue to do its job), and the hand launch boats could launch on the other side of the floating logs there keeping everybody just a little bit safer with less cross traffic at the motor boat launch.</p> <p>I hope you find my comments helpful,</p> <p>Clayton Petree</p>	
60	06/04/2012	Opposed to Bloedel Master Plan Revisions!!	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>Why are we discussing proposed revisions to the Bloedel Park Master Plan when many of these changes have already been implemented by the Parks Department? This reflects the Parks Department's disregard for public process, resulting in a Master Plan proposal that is procedurally and substantively flawed. I have submitted numerous comments on these problems over the last 6 months, all of which were ignored by the Parks Department, (referenced and incorporated herein).</p> <p>Wetlands The Park Master Plan revision fails to protect one of the only remaining urban wetlands on Lake Whatcom. This area adjacent to the public docks is a Shoreline of Statewide Significance, entitled to a greater level of protection under the SMA. It is also protected under the City Critical Area Ordinance as both a wetland and a "Fish</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
---	---------------	---------	----------------	--	--------------

				<p>and Wildlife Conservation Area.” BMC 16.16.55.470.</p> <p>Park development, and greater use of land and water, will have impact on this wetland, as well as the habitat corridor connecting Lake Whatcom with Whatcom Creek and Bellingham Bay and forested areas of the watershed that connect with the Chuckanut corridor. This corridor has particular value for genetic exchange, and therefore, species survival, but there is no mitigation for habitat impacts.</p> <p>The City lacks a comprehensive wildlife conservation plan that identifies and protects habitat connectivity areas, or plant and species diversity. The SMP shoreline inventory and characterization fail to adequately reflect the abundant variety of wildlife or the value of this habitat. The fine work done years ago by Ann Eissenger on Bellingham Fish and Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat was never adopted. And contrary to allegations by the Rowing Association, kayaks have significant impact on fish and wildlife due to their ability to navigate close to shorelines, disturbing habitat and allowing humans to visit locations that are otherwise difficult to reach.</p> <p>The City has no quantifiable baseline standard from which to measure biologic and hydrologic functions resulting from new Park development and use (i.e, ability to measure and monitor “no net loss”). No compensatory mitigation was required for the new dock although it is known that over water structures impair ecosystem function and have on-going cumulative impacts once constructed.</p> <p>Asian Clams The Parks Department proceeded with development plans without considering the impacts from development and increased Park use on Asian clam infestation or water quality problems. I repeatedly raised concerns during the SEPA review for the new dock and was ignored. Moreover, it was never disclosed that the new dock was connected to much greater development and use of the Park. The City engaged in improper piece-mealing during the SEPA process to avoid mitigating the totality of impacts from the revised Master Plan.</p> <p>The City has no invasive species management and control plan to deal with Asian clams nor an invasive species prevention plan to prevent new species from establishing. This calls into the question the wisdom of rededicating the park for the use of the Whatcom Rowing Association. Encouraging greater use of watercraft at Bloedel Park is likely to increase problems associated with invasive species.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>Public Participation</p> <p>Public participation in the proposed Park Master Plan amendment has been particularly flawed. The City is engaging in a meaningless exercise intended only to meet its legal obligations. While the Parks Department is soliciting public input, "proposed" changes in design and use have already been implemented, and the ink on a Facility Use Agreement with the Whatcom Rowing Association has long since dried.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the Park Master Plan were released on March 13, 2012. This is subsequent to installation of a new dock and a 2400 square foot boat storage area for the Whatcom Rowing Association. The WRA website and Facebook page proudly lists Bloedel Park as its home, as well as the location of its boathouse.</p> <p>Public plans reflect a "proposed" boathouse, but the public was not advised that a fenced boat storage area already exists. No shoreline permit was required because the Planning Department took the absurd position that the Row Club was entitled to a "nonconforming use" of park land, contrary to specific statutory requirements on point.</p> <p>My concerns are much more extensive than what is included in this comment, but have been documented in prior email comments, which I incorporate by reference herein.</p> <p>Please address these problems before approving any changes in the Bloedel Master Plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris</p>	
61	06/04/2012	Bloedel Park Plan "Update" Draft Proposal	Stan Snapp Bellingham City Council snappcouncil@gmail.com	<p>Fellow Parks Committee Members,</p> <p>I suggest we have a ways to go before approval of the draft "plan update" proposal. My first read through raises plenty of red flags. From the goal statement to who initiated it, to the recreational tone from start to finish, this is not a plan that I can support. For the record, this process was initiated by Jack and myself by lobbying staff for as long as we've been on council. As another example, there have been many citizen complaints about the lack of our being good stewards of our park in terms of maintenance practices and other measures to protect our water supply that are consistent with practices we are imposing on watershed residents via the Silver Beach Ordinance and other extensive regulations.</p> <p>This update, the first in 32 years, seems to be driven primarily by a proposal to establish a club centered rowing facility as an added recreational activity in the</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>park. The update draft lacks any specifics including one recommended site for a new boat house and storage facility that would actually "add" to the impervious surfaces in the park with no mitigation suggested.</p> <p>In walking the park it is striking to me that so little has changed in the 32 years since the original plan was approved. It's appalling to me that we've spent millions of dollars effecting change in virtually all other aspects of drinking water protection and the only visible change at this huge impervious facility is two small, first generation rain gardens to handle some of the parking lot run off.</p> <p>At our March 29 meeting parks staff presented information to us that they have reduced herbicide and pesticide uses and no longer apply fertilizer containing phosphorus. These are very recent changes, that were imposed upon Silver Beach residents as best practices twenty years ago.</p> <p>I want us to adopt a "plan" or "update" if they insist on calling it that, recognizing throughout the tone and content that this park will become an example of drinking water protection stewardship that includes recreational activities consistent with that stewardship. This plan should state clearly in strong language the specifics of how and where those protection measures will be installed and should set out policies and mitigation strategies for processing the runoff from all impervious surfaces including buildings current and future. The early draft set aside a large part of the little used area directly east of the field house for an infiltration oriented native plantings area that could become a treatment area for field house runoff as a major step in mitigating that large impervious foot print. This latest draft removes that set aside because recreational users don't want to give up any of the grass that is now in a large portion of this park.</p> <p>The draft identifies that the grass on site has been tested and contains high amounts of phosphorus and we know that grass is a very poor surface for infiltration which is a preferred strategy for reducing phosphorus runoff into the reservoir.</p> <p>It is not surprising that recreational users like the park the way it is but we have a policy mandate to implement change and I see little of that in this draft plan.</p> <p>I'm going to seek a series of work sessions by our committee and other C M's that may assist us. An early session could, with your approval be held on the park site so we can view how little has changed over the 32 years of the current plan.</p> <p>Lastly, I talked with Michael yesterday about his concerns as a "non-committee" member and I asked that he send those to me. They are set out below for your consideration.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p><i>With this new goal statement, I believe a few more changes in the plan would be called for. The most important change that I would like to see is a return to the original proposal for an enhanced planting area on the northeast side of the park. Page 9-10 of the draft plan indicates that this enhancement was removed from the final version "based on subsequent public and staff input." Well, I would hope that it will be restored based upon subsequent Council directives. Along the same lines, near the bottom of p. 12 of the draft plan, we read "In response to public comment, the additional trees and shrubs should be located so as not to significantly interfere with existing public uses." I disagree. Again, I think this shows the wrong priorities, placing a "want" above a "need." This sentence should be struck or amended, in my view.</i></p> <p><i>I understand why park managers and park users would resist this change, but the City Council has an obligation to serve our community's best long term interests, even if a bit unpopular. Knowing how much work and passion you have put into Lake Whatcom, I am hopeful that you will agree and that you will work to make these changes at the committee level.</i></p> <p><i>Thanks for listening.</i></p>	
62	06/25/2012	Bloedel Donovan Park	Les Scott 2427 Vista Drive upjumpin@gmail.com	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I would just like to make few points and ask one question:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing phosphorous problem in the lawn area is most likely the result of years of usage by geese and other waterfowl. 2. The usage of this area by off-leash dogs has eliminated or greatly reduced this problem and dog owners that use this area are very conscious of the importance of picking up after their pets. Many of us pick up after other pets in the few cases where their owners don't. 3. Every effort should be made to enhance the usage of this park while mitigating the pollution of the lake. This is one of Bellingham's premier parks and should be treated that way. 4. My question is - will the proposed unmotorized boat dock be available for usage by fishermen? This area is frequently used for that purpose. <p>Thank you all for the work you do to serve the people of this beautiful city.</p> <p>Les Scott 2427 Vista Drive</p>	
63	06/25/2012	Re: Bloedel Donovan Park	Stan Snapp Bellingham City Council snappcouncil@gmail.com	<p>Scott,</p> <p>See responses below.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>On Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 10:18 AM, <CCmail@cob.org> wrote: Bloedel Donovan Park</p> <p>Les Scott to: ccmail</p> <p>06/25/2012 10:14</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>I would just like to make few points and ask one question:</p> <p>1. The existing phosphorous problem in the lawn area is most likely the result of years of usage by geese and other waterfowl. It is unknown but staff tells us they have not used fertilizer with phosphorous for years. We do need to address the runoff and staff is not wed to the trenches being proposed and we have a grant to do the research to get the best answers.</p> <p>2. The usage of this area by off-leash dogs has eliminated or greatly reduced this problem and dog owners that use this area are very conscious of the importance of picking up after their pets. Many of us pick up after other pets in the few cases where their owners don't. Yes, the dogs have been a help. Trouble is, during the wet season they destroy the turf making lawn restoration in the spring a major problem. Also, the quantity of dogs is making this situation worse. To me it says that we need more off leash areas than we have given the huge number of dogs in our community.</p> <p>3. Every effort should be made to enhance the usage of this park while mitigating the pollution of the lake. This is one of Bellingham's premier parks and should be treated that way. That has been council members point for a long time. I do think we've turned the corner with staff and the public on this.</p> <p>4. My question is - will the proposed unmotorized boat dock be available for usage by fishermen? This area is frequently used for that purpose. All park facilities are open for uses. On a recent walk I noticed sun bathers using the new dock and I expect there will always be a variety of uses for it.</p> <p>Thank you all for the work you do to serve the people of this beautiful city. Thanks for emailing us Scott.</p> <p>Les Scott 2427 Vista Drive -- Stan Snapp, Bellingham City Council</p>	
64	06/26/2012	Re: Bloedel Donovan Park	Les Scott 2427 Vista Drive	Thanks for the reply prompt reply,	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
			upjumpin@gmail.com	<p>2. The usage of this area by off-leash dogs has eliminated or greatly reduced this problem and dog owners that use this area are very conscious of the importance of picking up after their pets. Many of us pick up after other pets in the few cases where their owners don't. Yes, the dogs have been a help. Trouble is, during the wet season they destroy the turf making lawn restoration in the spring a major problem. Also, the quantity of dogs is making this situation worse. To me it says that we need more off leash areas than we have given the huge number of dogs in our community.</p> <p>Concerning the problem of the dogs tearing up the turf - In my opinion, the problem is the poor drainage qualities of this area. If the drainage issue were addressed, the turf degradation would be addressed as well. Although, more off-leash areas is a good idea. ALL of Whatcom Falls Park trails would be a good start.</p> <p>Thanks again, Les Scott 2427 Vista Drive</p>	
65	06/25/2012	Bloedel Plan	Larry Mansfield mansf@comcast.net	<p>Leslie and Gina,</p> <p>Just for your info. No response needed. I'm happy that the research will give us the best answers and the DOE funding will help pay for the research for BMP's.</p> <p>Kind regards, Stan</p> <p>----- Forwarded message ----- From: Larry Mansfield <mansf@comcast.net> Date: Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 11:08 AM Subject: Re: Bloedel Plan To: Stan Snapp <stansnapp@gmail.com> Cc: lbryson@cob.org, gaustin@cob.org, jking@cob.org, Seth Fleetwood <seth@openaccess.org>, Jack Weiss <zweiss@comcast.net>, Mayor Kelli Linville <klinville@cob.org></p> <p>Stan,</p> <p>Thanks for following up on this. My fear is that once something like a trench is drawn into the Master Plan, it will have a life of its own. The June 21st drawing still shows the trench with the label changed to "future stormwater infiltration improvements." The drawing also shows a "future beach enhancement" all around</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>the shoreline. It is hard for me to believe that the people who use the park will view over 30' of sand along the water's edge as an enhancement.</p> <p>When Gina presented the amendment to the Parks Board, she said that it had not been determined whether the bulkhead at the swim beach would be removed. The June 7th update had it and the steps removed, along with all the vegetation along the lake and replaced by a beach that might be found on a seashore, but not on a lake. If Parks is open to various approaches to storm water management, then why does the drawing look like the entire waterfront should be transformed? As I said in my May 5th message to you, I have confirmation from an environmental engineer that the run-off near the swim area can be handled without destroying the shoreline.</p> <p>Larry</p> <p>On Jun 25, 2012, at 10:22 AM, Stan Snapp wrote: Leslie, Thanks for doing that. There are lots of ways to infiltrate and I'm appreciative of your taking the time to do it the best way. It's great to have the funding to support that effort. Our thanks to DOE for that and for their being flexible regarding other plant layers besides trees.</p> <p>Stan</p> <p>On Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 9:49 AM, <lbryson@cob.org> wrote: Stan: We made the stormwater improvement section of the master plan more general with the possibility of all kinds of stormwater infiltration designs. The grant will allow us to spend money on site evaluation and design to come up with the best methods.</p> <p>Leslie Bryson Design and Development Manager Bellingham Parks and Recreation 360-778-7000 FAX:320-778-7001</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>Supporting a healthy community by providing high quality parks and recreation services.</p> <p>From: Stan Snapp <stansnapp@gmail.com> To: gaustin@cob.org Date: 06/21/2012 16:41 Subject: Bloedel Plan</p> <p>Gina,</p> <p>Larry Mansfield, of the WAB sent me this email regarding the "trench" which he is very opposed to.</p> <p>Stan,</p> <p>Why are you ignoring the possibility of installing a dry well in that depression near the swim area? As Mark and Gina have said this could take care of the storm water in the area without destroying the beach.</p> <p>Larry</p> <p>I wrote back that you and I haven't discussed the "trench" or a depression, although I know what area he is talking about, it's the depression directly north of the beach volley ball court just north of one of the retaining walls.</p> <p>Stan</p>	
66	06/26/2012	Park give away	J. Kaye Faulkner 3006 Barkley Grove Loop Bellingham, WA 98226 360-647-0391 MAltha6995@aol.com	<p>June 25, 2012</p> <p>City Council:</p> <p>Giving such a block of space to Diehl for boats is likely the first step in the privatization of Bellingham City Parks. If this does not work out can the City back track? What constraints are there? Are they consistent with the needs of other users of the Park? It appears there will be crowding.</p> <p>This appears to me like another move of the former Park Director Leuthold and is consistent with the attitude toward what is happening in County parks. All of us should be concerned about losing control over our park system to private parties—one should wonder if our city council is thinking straight about the consequences for their public.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				J. Kaye Faulkner 3006 Barkley Grove Loop Bellingham, WA 98226 360-647-0391	
67	06/26/2012	Bloedel-Donovan plan and boathouse	Sincerely, Sharon Belk-Krebs sewbk1@gmail.com	I am writing about the comprehensive plan for Bloedel. I attended the information meeting at the park a while back to learn of the plans for maintenance, use, etc. I was please with most of it such as shoreline improvements. What I have a real issue with is the plans for a boathouse and access for a private, special interest group of rowers. It feels like their money and influence in the community is buying special interest use that is not appropriate. This lake is a wonderful place for picnics and swimming and has historically been Bellingham's prime place for this activity. This proposed plan seems to be a sort of take over by a special interest group that will shove out especially swimmers and impact their safety. I'm also unfortunately aware of the graffiti and other damage that happens at Bloedel. This boathouse and stored boats could very well be an attraction for even more of this activity. I wonder who is going to foot the bill for any damage that might happen. I am totally pained by the damage I've seen and wish there was a solution for it, but I fear this may exacerbate those problems. And Parks should not be responsible for any costs incurred. But mostly, I'm concerned about the shoving out of the traditional uses of the park and swimmer safety. I hope you reconsider this plan. Sincerely, Sharon Belk-Krebs	
68	07/02/2012	Bloedel Master Plan Amendments	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	I urge the Council to postpone the approval of the Bloedel Master Plan amendment until it contains some degree of certainty as to what, where, when and how. The actual engineered stormwater improvements and design are not determined, nor the impacts from the engineering project(s). The City still needs to meet with and obtain DOE approval for its stormwater proposal. So instead, the Master Plan amendment reflects what "may" occur. There is no discussion of how effective the engineered improvements will be or quantifiable standards that can be measured and monitored. There "may" be impacts to mature trees from the stormwater improvements and if so, that will involve yet another public process, resulting in further piece-mealing of environmental impacts. The wisdom of removing natural resources crucial to healthy ecological function in order to install expensive, man-made engineered solutions warrants more discussion and review. A landscape plan has not been developed although the Master Plan amendment involves up to 1500 new plantings. This is a significant oversight and fails to indicate how the plantings will impact existing park functions and uses, and whether this is the best choice for water quality improvement. The condition and functions of two existing rain gardens is unknown and needs to	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>be analyzed in order to determine the adequacy of other proposed park improvements. NNL should be a quantifiable science, but this reflects lack of appropriate measurements and monitoring to ensure TMDL standards will be met. A critical area report and a fully delineated wetland survey have not yet been completed, although the Master Plan changes will impact wetlands, habitat and a wildlife corridor. A new dock and kayak storage area have already been approved and constructed, indicating that the wetland and wildlife corridor require more oversight and protection than is provided for in this proposal.</p> <p>“Other improvements’, not identified in the Master Plan amendment, may be implemented.</p> <p>“A committee of city staff and citizens may be used to oversee design.” Is this an existing committee, is a new one to be created, who will be appointed and by whom?</p> <p>Because so many important details of the Master Plan amendments are still undeveloped, there is no justification for approving this proposal at the current time. Doing so would deprive the public of the right to public comment and would grant the Parks Department an inappropriate amount of discretion without public accountability. This nullifies the entire purpose for a Master Plan, which is to ensure clear, comprehensive policy and goals are established to guide future park use and development. The Parks Department’s desire for “flexibility” exceeds any reasonable parameters under this proposal.</p> <p>I hope that the rush to approve the Master Plan amendments is not driven by the Whatcom Row Club’s desire to move rapidly towards construction of its boathouse, as could be concluded from the recent Bellingham Herald article. Nor would DOE grant deadlines justify this type of sloppy planning for a matter so important to our community.</p> <p>The Row Club’s current assertion that none of its shells leave Lake Whatcom is still not adequate protection of our water quality because this is not just a matter of preventing new infestation. It is also a matter of managing and controlling existing infestation. Use of dedicated watercraft in an infested Lake is still likely to spread and increase the areas of Asian clams infestation.</p> <p>The fact that the boathouse is being built on existing impervious surface is not justification for approval. Under the TMDL, the City is required to protect and restore water quality. Since this proposal indicates that the current staff vehicle access area is not necessary, this is an area of impervious surface that could be restored. Status quo is NOT a victory.</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>The Master Plan amendment incorrectly references an “undocumented” wetland. However, this wetland is discussed and incorporated into the City’s new SMP. Review of the SMP shoreline reach inventory clearly reflects the wetland and connected wildlife corridor, and indicates this area should be prioritized for protection against development. While I am glad to see that the amendment includes possible plantings and improvements for this area, it fails to improve the wetland buffer, or to acknowledge the wildlife corridor and the need to protect habitat. The proposed trail should not be approved because this would run adjacent to the wetland/wildlife corridor. At a minimum, mitigation would be necessary.</p> <p>For the above reasons, the Bloedel Master Plan amendment needs additional development to ensure optimal use of the Park, maximum protection of water quality and adequate mitigation for impacts. The current proposal is an improvement over the original proposal, but more work is needed to protect the public’s interest.</p> <p>I am particularly interested in ensuring that the wetland and wildlife corridor are protected and improved and believe that the DOE grant provides the ability for the City to do so. If this proposal is approved, I request appointment to the city staff/citizen design review team, if one is created.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris.</p>	
69	07/02/2012	Bloedel Park and wetland/wildlife corridor improvements	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/wacademy/acad2000/wetlands/values.htm</p> <p>Above, please find a link listing the ecological service and benefits provided by wetlands. This was created by the EPA as part of its Watershed Academy Program. Please read this link before you take action on the Bloedel Master Plan amendments.</p> <p>I have repeatedly emphasized the importance of restoring Lake Whatcom under a holistic approach that focuses on restoring all ecosystem functions. Engineered solutions are generally more expensive and less effective than protecting and maintaining the environmental integrity of natural resources degraded by development.</p> <p>Amendment to the Bloedel Master Plan emphasizes expensive engineered</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>stormwater solutions, while paying little attention to a rare remaining wetland and wildlife habitat adjacent to the Park. This wetland was been mapped by the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife and the State Department of Fish and Wildlife as well as the City of Bellingham.</p> <p>The wetland and habitat corridor is documented in the SMP Shoreline Characterization and Inventory for the Lake Whatcom reaches. http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/shoreline-master-program/characterization-inventory/lk-whatcom-reach-48.pdf.</p> <p>It is noted that “the only native habitat that remains in this segment is a shrub wetland just south of the boat launch. A narrow strip of undeveloped land along the southern park boundary provides some amount of connectivity, for some animals, between this shoreline habitat and the upland habitat to the south and west (the wetland complex in Reach 3 and Whatcom Falls Park). The analysis recommends protecting and enhancing this area. Planting and diversifying the native plant community is listed as a way to benefit the shoreline, wetland and improve the habitat corridor, while noxious weeds should be eliminated and monitored.</p> <p>The best and highest use of the native vegetation that the City is receiving from the DOE grant is improvement of the wetland and its buffer, the shoreline and expansion of the habitat corridor to provide better connectivity to Whatcom Falls Park, which is a WDFW mapped area of biodiversity and wildlife corridor.</p> <p>The means of improving the ecological function and ecosystem services of Lake Whatcom is within reach. Improved wetland function will help reduce algae blooms, improve water quality, prevent shoreline erosion, and increase biodiversity. The wildlife corridor could be enhanced to improve connectivity for the benefit of local species, many of which are species of state or federal concern.</p> <p>Please take advantage of this important opportunity for ecological enhancement and greater ecosystem services. Ensure that these items are included and prioritized in the proposed amendments for the Bloedel Master Plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris</p>	
70	7/30/2012	Complaint against	Mr. Frank Parker 734-4450	Mr. Frank Parker 734-4450 called the Mayor’s Office to make a complaint about there being no room for the boathouse and he is against the taxpayer money being	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
		boathouse being built at Bloedel Donovan		<p>used for this. Vanessa asked that I forward this to your department.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>Tracy Lewis Administrative Assistant Mayor's Office City of Bellingham 210 Lottie Street Bellingham, WA 98225 360-778-8100</p>	
71	8/27/2012	Increased Invasive Species Risk for Lake Whatcom and Lake Samish	Wendy Harris w.harris2007@comcast.net	<p>The Bloedel Park Master Plan revision was approved by City Council based, in part, on assurances by the Whatcom Rowing Association that their rowing shells would not leave Lake Whatcom and that they would not be sponsoring events on Lake Whatcom where rowers would be bring outside shells to the Lake. This was intended to reduce concerns that relocating the WRA to Lake Whatcom would increase the risk of invasive species.</p> <p>Each year, the Whatcom Lake Classic Long and Short Course races are held on Lake Whatcom, beginning and ending at Bloedel Park. This event, held in May, can attract over 100 boats. Perhaps the WRA is not "officially" sponsoring this event, but clearly, the Parks Department is permitting it.</p> <p>The WRA routinely participates in other regional races. Where do these shells come from? Are they privately owned by members or by WRA? If so, how likely is it that these shell are not used for practice in Lake Whatcom and other County lakes? I believe we may have been told technically correct information, i.e, that the shells used for classes are only used in Lake Whatcom, but other information relevant to the increased risk of invasive species infestation, has been withheld.</p> <p>The WRA website reflects information regarding other races that WRA is participating in. For example, WRA will be participating in the "Lake Samish Salmon Roe" on September 22, 2012. Where will they obtain the rowing shells to compete in the Lake Samish competition, and more importantly, why are we increasing the risk of spreading invasive species, including Asian Clams already present in Lake Whatcom and Lake Padden, to yet another impaired County watershed that is source of drinking water?</p> <p>Additionally, the City gave little consideration to the fact that rowing shells kept on Lake Whatcom still increase the risk of spreading Asian Clam colonies throughout</p>	

#	Date Received	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on: Bloedel Master Plan Amendment Updated August 28, 2012	Notes/Status
				<p>the Lake.</p> <p>The City's approval of the Bloedel Park Master Plan increases the risk of harm to the water supply source for over 90,000 residents and needs to be re-evaluated. My fears have increased subsequent to the public meeting that WRA was required to hold regarding their planned boathouse and boat launches. It was clear that they had little concern for the environmental impacts of their actions, and that the City was not going to require mitigation from the WRA. The City can not, on one hand, advise the public that it is working on improving Lake Whatcom water quality and preventing spread of invasive species, and on the other hand, authorize activities that increase risk of water quality degradation.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Harris</p>	