

## Appendix D: Public Comment Received

| Fairhaven Parking Task Force Public Comment |                   |   |   |
|---|-------------------|---|---|
| Date Submitted                              | Name              | Comments  | Response  |
| 1/6/15                                      | Rod Dean          | The quick answer to Fairhaven's shopping popularity as opposed to downtown is FREE parking.   | Opinion noted   |
| 1/6/15                                      | Mary Windell      | Having just read the article in The Bellingham Herald, I had an immediate response. No parking fees or meters. I come to Fairhaven not Bellingham because I can park for free and do local walking to shops I like and use. It takes me about 30 minutes to drive to the area. I have done this for 9 years. A free public garage would probably help the area. I refer you to University Village in Seattle where the public continues to come and parking is difficult due to high capacity usage. It is nice to know there is a garage there now to help with parking. It has made a difference this year. Please consider no parking meters for Fairhaven as the main option, and look at the community supporting a parking garage. I would consider a purchased sticker or pass I could use to park in Fairhaven. | Opinion noted   |
| 1/7/15                                      | Dorothy Goldsmith | Parking is always hard to find in Fairhaven. No matter what time or day. There is also a problem with people who work in Fairhaven taking up prime parking spots. Not all, but some. When I was attending weekly counseling sessions in Fairhaven, I would have to leave work a half hour earlier, because I knew I'd be driving in circles for at least 10-15 minutes trying to find parking. I think meters would help to eliminate this problem, unless the city wants to build a parking garage. I seldom shop in Fairhaven now because I know parking will be such a hassle.   | Opinion noted   |
| 1/7/15                                      | Margarette Grant  | Think long term. Build a garage big enough to close off the main shopping area to car parking and make it a walking, biking area with no cars. Route all traffic to the ferry terminal, Marine Park, etc the way the buses go--Larabee, 10th, Harris. That would be sweet! Might even be some grant money available to help pay.  | Opinion noted. Garage is included as possible long term solution in stage 4 |

|        |                     |  |  |
|--------|---------------------|--|--|
| 1/7/15 | Rick                | I would avoid Fairhaven if parking fees are instituted, just as I avoid downtown Bellingham. Parking isn't any easier when you are charged for it - the fee just adds another layer to the aggravation.  | Opinion noted  |
| 1/7/15 | Andrew Pellar       | The report indicates parking is adequate in Fairhaven. There is no need for a 300 space garage. If parking becomes a problem, let the merchants buy land for additional parking when it becomes a problem for the merchants. After all, if the merchants didn't exist no people would come. As for meters, the city will find that expenses exceed income if they pay people \$ 62,000 to write tickets and \$ 52,000 to attend to meters. Furthermore if recent history is any indication, these costs will rise faster than revenue. Additionally the meters are ugly and detract from the area's intrinsic appeal. The report's starting point is based around the idea "how much money will people pay for parking" and then discusses various schemes to charge people for parking and finally concludes that parking needs to be "managed". If Fairhaven remains a desirable location that people want to visit and parking is a problem for them, the visitors have several options for managing parking. Visitors can alter the time of their visit. Visitors can park further away and walk further. Alternatively, visitors can leave the car at home and walk, bike, or take the bus. This least cost option lets individuals decide for themselves how much they are willing to pay for parking. | Opinion noted, Management stages 1 through 4 address both Self management and active management. |
| 1/7/15 | V. "Sandy" Gilliard | NO! Parking meters hurt downtown businesses. Keep downtown friendly and parking meter free.  | Opinion noted  |
| 1/7/15 | Patricia Hawley     | Parking meters will just drive shoppers to the mall, or people will park at Haggen hurting that business. I avoid downtown because of paid parking, but then many of the downtown businesses have moved or closed. Was that the result of parking meters? Think about it.  | Opinion noted  |

|        |                |   |   |
|--------|----------------|---|---|
| 1/7/15 | B. Pendelton   | I am adamantly opposed to installing parking meters in Fairhaven. Additionally I would like to see the metered parking removed from downtown. I do not believe I am alone in my avoidance of downtown merchants due to parking meters, and I would extend that avoidance to Fairhaven in the event of metered parking. Walking to or the use of public transit is not an option for me to reach either of these areas. While I realize there are many unique businesses located downtown, as well as in Fairhaven, there are equaling interesting, affordable and easily accessible enterprises offering free, often off street, parking in a myriad of locations around the city. It is not unrealistic to assume both current and future business owners will take customer and employee parking (free versus paid) into their business plans.  | Opinion noted   |
| 1/7/15 | Michael Waite  | How about building more parking? There are many wasted spaces in Fairhaven. If you charge you are just going to piss off people like me who will stop coming. But since when has reason ever worked with this bass awkward so city?   | Development of additional parking is addressed in stages 3 and 4  |
| 1/7/15 | Melinda Cooper | Come on give us a break! Not only do property owners on the Southside have the 'extra' property tax levied on them since some people thought this would be a good idea for us to help the City of Bellingham repay the monies they borrowed! Now you want to implement parking meters! No way I say!  | Opinion noted   |
| 1/7/15 | Kari Chambers  | As an employee of a small business in Fairhaven I am very much against the installation of parking meters. Fairhaven is known to be a quaint town steeped in history. I have never had an issue trying to find a spot to park during the day and certainly don't mind walking a block or two. If forced to pay for parking residents will utilize whatever unpaid spots are available forcing us to walk long distances or pay for parking meaning feeding a meter. People are on limited incomes as it is and having to add yet another expense is a hardship. Like the age old saying goes, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." The installation of parking meters in downtown Bellingham did not gain the desired income, in fact it states the meters don't even pay for themselves. I would hate to see businesses in Fairhaven suffer as downtown has by people avoiding the area. | Plan reflects commenters observation that there is adequate parking today and that parking meters or other management strategies are not needed until exceeding the performance metric. |

|   |                     |   |   |
|---|---------------------|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">1/7/15</p> | <p>Bonnie Giles</p> | <p>Has anyone considered the 2 large grass lots by the tennis courts? Is there a way to lease them, gravel them and ask shop owners to request employees to park there? Perhaps this could be an excellent interim solution. I personally would not like to see Fairhaven have time limits nor meters. It may take one shopper an hour to get around Fairhaven, or it may take another shopper several hours to get around. I, for one can't walk quickly, so if I am limited in my time, then I won't go to Fairhaven. The hills are hard on a lot of people, and I think that fact gets forgotten. There are many people, who have mobility limitations and I don't think that gets considered. I guess it will come down to who Fairhaven chooses to cater to.</p> | <p>Creation of off street parking is identified as a long term, stage 4 solution.</p> |
|---|---------------------|---|---|

|   |                                       |  |  |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">1/7/15</p> | <p>Charles and Patricia Alexander</p> | <p>The quickest way to ruin the appeal and charm of Fairhaven would be to institute fees for parking. A much better suggestion for managing the high demand for parking in the core Fairhaven business district is two-hour parking limits, coupled with prohibition of employee parking in the core district. A recent article in the Bellingham Herald demonstrated that the cost of collecting parking fees was higher than the revenue gained from these fees. We should not forget what happened when the Bellingham Mall first opened. Arguably, the greatest appeal of the new mall was that it offered what downtown Bellingham did not offer: free parking. Even the City of Bellingham realizes the benefit of free parking to businesses in the downtown sector; otherwise, why would free parking be offered during the Christmas season? We do not need to build an expensive parking garage that ends up being just another way to have to pay for parking. All that is needed at this time is to force more rotation for the available street parking, and to require Fairhaven business district employees to park outside the core business district. The high occupancy of parking spaces in the core Fairhaven business district, as cited in the January 7, 2015, article in the Bellingham Herald, is a demonstration that the partnership of free parking, Fairhaven charm, and the current offering of local businesses, is working. We suspect there are many people, such as ourselves, who would drastically reduce visits to Fairhaven if paid parking is instituted. The only way paid parking "solves" parking availability problems is by driving some of the customers away. Public transportation is an admirable goal, but it should be primarily promoted for the employees who work in Fairhaven businesses, rather than tourists and shoppers who occasionally visit. We should not destroy one of the principle draws of historic Fairhaven by implementing any form of parking fees.</p> | <p>Time limited parking is included as an early stage management parking. Opinion on paid parking is noted.</p> <p>Free parking during the holiday season is done when requested by the downtown merchants. Note that opinions on free holiday parking in downtown are split. Data collected and anecdotal information suggest that the free parking results in little to no parking being available during "free" parking which is not a benefit to business.</p> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|

|        |                 |   |   |
|--------|-----------------|---|---|
| 1/7/15 | LS              | <p>I'm writing to oppose the pay-parking proposal in Fairhaven, as do many other Bellingham residents I've talked to. One thing we all agree on is that we'd likely spend much less time in Fairhaven, which would be a shame since it's currently one of the most accessible and enjoyable parts of town. It's not just the cost of parking itself, but the chance of getting a ticket- anyone who shops downtown (or has since stopped) knows that all it takes is five minutes too long in a store or restaurant, and suddenly you have a \$40 parking ticket. It's just not worth it. Since many of Fairhaven's businesses depend on people wandering and browsing, this could be a serious impediment to many of them, especially the smaller and newer ones. Please reconsider charging for parking and leave the nicest part of town free for all of us.</p>                                       | <p>Opinion noted, paid parking is included as stage 2</p>                                 |
| 1/7/15 | George Sperline | <p>Every new Condo built in the Fairhaven district should have 2 designated parking spots for each unit in a parking garage. The idea that a person or family who is able to afford a condo in such a high cost area would have only one automobile is patently absurd. Again, poor planning, poor thinking, and the mistaken impression that people are suddenly going to rely on bicycles and public transportation as primary choices to get around. Pie in the sky, idealistic planning is fine for visions of the future, but the reality is that the car is still here and preferred. The "Pit" at 11th and Mill will one day become a building, and parking will be impossible, whether you have meters or not. The only positive is that new visitors to the area become very familiar with all the district has to offer, because they have to drive over all of it to find a place to park.</p> | <p>Opinion noted. Requirements for minimum parking levels are part of the zoning code</p> |

|        |             |   |   |
|--------|-------------|---|---|
| 1/7/15 | Mark McHarg | <p>If any action is taken to control parking in Fairhaven it should be limited to different time limits in different areas for parking, not meters. It seems like that would work well downtown as well. With the malls having free parking and essentially no time limits, paid parking with time limits seems crazy for Bellingham businesses.</p>  | <p>Time limits are part of stage 0 and stage 1 Mall parking is "paid" for by the merchant tenants. The possibility of creating a PBIA to have merchants and property owners pay for parking and other improvements is discussed in the plan</p> |
| 1/7/15 | Lia Prela   | <p>I was saddened when I read the January 7th front page headline article titled, "Paid parking suggested for Fairhaven". Because Bellingham does enforce paid parking I do not shop there. I shop in Fairhaven because of the convenient and free parking. I hope that paid parking is nixed. I agree with the task force, that time limit should be diligently enforced. Perhaps employees could be encouraged to not park in the core areas by being given assigned spaces in a separate parking lot. Assigned spaces would guaranteed they have a spot when they come to work. Adding more bicycle racks or storage assumes this a viable option for all. I know people who, like me, are not able to take advantage of bicycling because of leg, back or balance medical issues; and some people simply do not own bicycles. It seems to me that there has been an increase in the number of people that frequent Fairhaven. Perhaps it is because of the conveniences (parking) Fairhaven offers. Perhaps it is because vacant business units are being occupied; or perhaps because more commercial space/buildings are being added to the commercial core. As the commercial area grows, more parking space is needed to accommodate the increase in customers the new businesses draw as well as more space for additional staff/employees. Thus I urge that adding more parking spaces to accommodate growth be the primary focus for the parking task force.</p> | <p>Opinion noted. Additional supply is addressed by the plan in stages 3 and 4 of zones 1,2 &amp; 3</p>   |

|        |                 |  |               |
|--------|-----------------|--|---------------|
| 1/7/15 | Christine Gibbs | I am strongly against turning the free parking in Fairhaven into paid parking. Frankly, that is one of the reasons that I enjoy going to Fairhaven to shop. To me, it is a welcoming gesture and conveys a friendly intention. I always find parking, even if it might take a couple minutes to land a space. I also do not think it is a wise idea to spend millions on a parking garage. I do think it makes sense to install more bike racks and to have employees of businesses park away from the central area. | Opinion noted |
|--------|-----------------|--|---------------|

|        |                |  |               |
|--------|----------------|--|---------------|
| 1/7/15 | Geoffrey Brown | <p>This message is in response to the article published today in the Bellingham Herald regarding your consideration of pay parking and other such actions for Fairhaven. While it is obvious that parking in Fairhaven is in relatively short supply, this situation should be viewed as a result of the success of Fairhaven as a thriving business and residential district. In my frequent trips to Fairhaven, however, I have never had to park more than 1 block away from my destination, a minor inconvenience. If pay parking is instituted in Fairhaven, it will be another example of bad planning that results in high costs to both the City and the area businesses and residents. As you should be very aware, the highly restrictive implementation of parking "regulation" in downtown Bellingham has proved to be one of the primary causes of the gutting of downtown. Numerous businesses have moved out of downtown, or have failed and gone out of business, in large part because of parking problems created by the City. As was described in a fairly recent Herald article, the combination of high costs of enforcement by the vicious vulture-like enforcers coupled with the excessive cost of problematic and dysfunctional pay machines has resulted in a program that loses money. The fees and penalties fall short of the costs, yet the City continues to insist that this failed program continue, despite the fact that the City is always crying about needing more money. Is Bellingham trying to totally destroy the downtown? Does the City want only junk businesses that move in for a few months and then fail or leave? To the point at hand. Implementation of such destructive actions in Fairhaven would have similar results to the destruction of downtown. Patrons would shop elsewhere, where they could park without high costs and vicious enforcement. The small businesses, which are the heart of Fairhaven, would either leave along with their customers, or they would fail. The numerous small storefronts would either be vacant or occupied by transient businesses, much like Bellingham downtown is now. Yet another successful district would be gutted. Why do this? What sort of false statistics and bad ideas are being fostered on your Task Force by City staff? When was the last time you took inventory of the vacant spaces downtown? Have you noticed the open drug dealing on the street corners, even opposite the police department? Why do you want to</p> | Opinion noted |
|--------|----------------|--|---------------|

|        |            |  |               |
|--------|------------|--|---------------|
|        |            | <p>destroy Fairhaven as well? City planning and public works staff have repeatedly proved their limitations (read "incompetence") when it comes to traffic control. They have proved that their only idea is obstructionism, not ways to improve conditions. When is the last time you tried to proceed through the gauntlets of mis-timed lights in the "Sunset mess" or the strip of Lakeway from Holly St. past Fred Meyer, or Bakerview Rd from I-5 past Fred Meyer? (Imagine how much fun it will be spend an entire afternoon gridlocked in traffic on Bakerview when/if Costco actually relocates there and a few more mis-timed lights are installed?) As patrons of numerous businesses in Fairhaven, my wife and I plead with you to not destroy one of the gems of Bellingham, perhaps the last gem in a city that is systematically strangling itself by poor policies and worse planning. If destructive parking restrictions are introduced in Fairhaven, we and many of our friends will simply stop going there -- there are other options, especially when the businesses are forced to relocate. If the pattern evident in downtown is repeated, Fairhaven may well die.</p> |               |
| 1/7/15 | Roger Lamb | I am <i>in favor</i> of parking meters in Fairhaven.   | Opinion noted |
| 1/8/15 | Kathe Vago | As someone who shops frequently in Fairhaven, charging for parking is not a good idea. First of all, I rarely have a problem finding a parking spot at any time of the day. It may not be directly in front of the store/salon where I'm going, but driving around for 2 or 3 minutes to find a space won't discourage shoppers. However, parking fees might discourage spur of the moment shoppers who want to swing by, for example, to run in and pick up a book. Or visitors who want to stop for lunch and then do some shopping. And more importantly, the inconvenience of parking stations may turn off a lot of people. A parking garage makes more sense but ONLY if it conforms to the architecture in Fairhaven and does NOT block views.  | Opinion noted |

|        |              |   |               |
|--------|--------------|---|---------------|
| 1/9/15 | Jayma Nichol | <p>Paid parking coming to Fairhaven? What a shame. I have enjoyed shopping and dining in Fairhaven for many years. I have observed Fairhaven merchants come together to present a unique shopping experience for residents and visitors, a remarkable change from the struggling remnants of shabby shopping district of thirty years ago. I do not think these greedy fingers reaching out to steal a share of their successful efforts should be rewarded by implementing the measures listed in the report. Is it really necessary to change the character of Fairhaven to the level of Bellingham's fading commercial district? Bellingham certainly does have paid parking, parking meters, parking garage, and public and private parking lots. Have the parking amenities and bike lanes actually encouraged shoppers to visit Bellingham's retail stores? What Bellingham could use is more shoppers and a more welcoming reception to those shoppers. I purposely drive twenty miles from my home in order to shop, eat and enjoy the commercial district of Fairhaven. Either I am extremely patient or very lucky, but I do find a place to park, usually the first time I drive through or at most the second. Perhaps I am easily satisfied and don't mind a small walk. I would be less likely to visit Village Books, Gallery West, The Black Cat, A Lot Of Flowers and the other fine small businesses if these changes occur. I am sure I am not alone with this response to these ill thought out measures.</p> | Opinion noted |
|--------|--------------|---|---------------|

|         |             |   |  |
|---------|-------------|---|--|
| 1/10/15 | Kirk Gulden | <p>One of the charms and appeals of the already charming and appealing Fairhaven is free parking. The 94-97% parking space occupancy found in the 2011 study quoted in The Bellingham Herald is surely not much greater than in the downtown metered parking during daytime hours. And the city apparently loses money with its current downtown metered parking program. Recommendations: 1. Urge Fairhaven businesses within the 9th St to 13th St and Larrabee Ave to Mill St core to voluntarily require their able-bodied employees to park on Harris below 9th St or Harris above 13th St. 2. If not already too late, require the building planned for construction at the site of the former Fairhaven Hotel on Harris and 12th to build a 2-3 story underground free parking garage much as we have at the Bellwether. 3. Consider construction of a 3-4 story below and above ground free parking garage on the vacant lot at Mill St and the South Bay Trail, subsidized over an extended period of time by a modest yearly fee levied on Fairhaven core businesses (who should benefit from increased parking), supplemented by other sources of funding from the city. If more of the parking garage is underground, the top of the garage can be made into an urban garden/park with views of Fairhaven, the Village Green and Bellingham Bay. Having a rooftop garden/park would also catch rainwater instead of having it run off into the bay, somewhat like the roof of the Whatcom Museum's Lightcatcher Building.</p> | <p>Plan addresses 1) employee parking, 2) additional parking supply, financing options for off street parking by merchants/ property owners.</p> <p>Downtown metered parking operations are revenue positive. Downtown offstreet parking facilities and enforcement are revenue negative and subsidized with metered parking revenues.</p> |
|---------|-------------|---|--|

|         |              |  |  |
|---------|--------------|--|--|
| 1/11/15 | Marsha Robey | <p>I have lived on the South Side of Bellingham for over 20 years. I work in the Lettered Streets near downtown Bellingham. I am strongly against installing pay stations in the Fairhaven area. "Charging a fee for the "convenience" of having parking available helps manage parking demand." What? Yes... paid two hour parking DOES deter parking near a commercial district. So much so, that I rarely stop in Downtown Bellingham during my day or on the way home to shop because of the PAID PARKING!! Shopping Downtown is not pleasant due to the restriction placed by parking meters ... and the inevitable chance of receiving a parking ticket. Therefore, most of my money is spent in Fairhaven. We all know when we drive to Fairhaven – to spend our money – that we may have to park a fair bit away from our destination. Or – we might be just lucky enough to find a space right where we'd like it. Regardless, we always find a place to park our car. Then, we proceed to shop. We might shop for twenty minutes – or we might be in Fairhaven – spending money -- for three hours. When I meet friends or business associates for lunch – it's never Downtown Bellingham. We always look to Fairhaven or another restaurant that has no paid parking. "Shop locally" is the mantra we hear. But when the mall provides free, expansive parking and both Fairhaven AND Downtown Bellingham have meters .... what will people choose? And again – there is always that threat of a parking ticket (hey – and no longer \$3.00). The statement from the so-called report detailing "fear of losing customers and tenants, a perceived inability of business to compete ... and user frustration related to inconvenience and type of payment methods" is real. There is such a thing as "user frustration." My recommendations: Prohibit employees and shop owners from parking near the core Fairhaven District by providing guidelines where to park; provide more bike parking; utilize private parking garages for the public (if feasible and agreeable by owners). Residents do not want a visitor center.... we want a friendly, welcoming Historic District. And we DO NOT want paid parking resulting in parking tickets for residents and visitors alike. However, I might support a rather unique vision of easy pay fee (swipe with debit/credit card) – one fee for 10 minutes or 5 hours – no limit. If you don't pay; nothing happens. If you do pay; nothing happens. Call it the Nice</p> | <p>Opinion noted. The plan clearly identifies that paid parking be implemented with flexible payment options</p> |
|---------|--------------|--|--|

|         |       |   |               |
|---------|-------|---|---------------|
|         |       | City Parking System. Or, you folks could design a parking system as onerous as WWU has put in place! Welcome to Fairhaven!  |               |
| 1/11/15 | Brien | After reading and considering the Fairhaven Parking Report, I respectfully submit my opinion that instituting paid parking in Fairhaven is an unwise solution. The reasons for my opinion are twofold: Paid parking does not cover the cost of infrastructure and enforcement. It certainly does not generate revenues to develop alternative parking. Parking is bad for business as long as there are other business districts with free parking. If I did not work downtown, I would not shop downtown during the day when paid parking is required. If paid parking is not bad for business, then why does the City waive paid parking in the afternoon during the year-end holidays? I also submit that Fairhaven is a more thriving business district, and has attracted far more growth and development than downtown. Everyone I speak with connects this with, at least in part, paid parking downtown and the absence of such in Fairhaven. | Opinion noted |

|         |                     |  |  |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|
| 1/14/15 | <p>Marcia Corey</p> | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the task force recommendations for parking in Fairhaven. I am a Fairhaven resident and have often commented on the increasingly difficult parking options for visitors. We are building more stores and restaurants yet parking spaces do not increase concurrently. I am not a fan of metered parking. I see how we avoid metered parking in downtown Bellingham and resent its presence. We go anywhere to avoid the hassle. I would not like to see this happen to Fairhaven. It is too cute to ruin with parking meters and our businesses cannot flourish if we avoid the area because of parking meters. I have often said that a parking garage should be our next option. But I think about the parking garage monstrosity in downtown Bellingham and worry that an eyesore like that would ruin the charm of Fairhaven. That is, unless we were to come up with a cute, smart option to make it work. Two ideas come to mind: The first option is simple and to the point: build a parking garage down by the ferry terminal and offer a cute little free shuttle up to the Village Green. My bolder and wiser recommendation is to think big, to build a structure that would attract attention and truly put Bellingham on the map. Build a modern, state of the art multi-purpose building for community use with parking that serves both purposes. One idea that comes to mind is to build a new education and recreational center for people over 50 to replace our old and tired, yet useful and necessary, Senior Activity Center. I envision totally modern architecture that is a statement for a hip, attractive, forward-thinking community that people want to come to, that provides parking for the businesses in Fairhaven, and that offers something else valuable to the community as well. Part of the reason people go to Sydney, Australia, is to see the opera house. We here in Bellingham can do something that draws a crowd. A box-style parking garage certainly isn't it. A modern structure that includes parking can be an attraction, not an eyesore. We certainly have enough wealthy corporations in the Northwest who might want their name attached to something wonderful. I encourage you to think outside the box. Parking meters or a plain parking structure are not the answer. They ruin the pretty little village feel and will discourage visits to our businesses. 2-hour parking restrictions will help but do not</p> | <p>Opinion noted. Stage 4 includes options for offstreet structured parking with a location to be identified in early stages. The taskforce recognized that paid parking is a necessary step prior to creation of addition off street/structured parking</p> |
|---------|---------------------|--|--|

|         |                |  |               |
|---------|----------------|--|---------------|
|         |                | solve the larger issue. Let's seek out a solution that is bold, innovative, and fun.   |               |
| 1/15/15 | Laya Shriaberg | I have recently opened up a massage therapy office on 11th in Fairhaven. Parking is not a problem! It never takes me longer than a few minutes to find parking. As a resident of Fairhaven or Happy Valley in the last 11 years, Fairhaven is so "user friendly" because it does not have parking meters. Being an historic area, and having a historic feel, greatly adds to the charm and dynamic living history of our shopping district. Certainly there are properties where adequate parking can occur if need be, like to the east and west of the WECU building. Free parking: Yes! Please preserve the timelessness of everyone's visit to the Fairhaven shopping district, whether it be locals or tourists. | Opinion noted |

|         |               |  |   |
|---------|---------------|--|---|
| 1/21/15 | Andrew Pellar | <p>The commission was formed to recommend implementation of parking systems. However the report concludes parking is adequate. Despite this, the City wants to get involved anyway. If parking is such a problem, people will weigh their alternatives which include: (1) waiting for a space to open (2) Parking further away and walk a bit farther (3) visit at another time when it is less crowded (4) leave the car at home and walk to bike. (5) not visit. This is working. If paid parking is implemented, the city will add to the opportunity cost of visiting Fairhaven. And burden the citizens with the unsustainable parking system. I read recently how the city voted to increase parking tickets because they lost money on writing tickets. If the city continues to grant 7% pay increases annually to the meter maids, soon they will be underwater once again. The current system is democratic. What is fairer than first come, first served. The democratic system will be supplanted incrementally with timed parking and progress to metered parking. And parking will not be any easier just more expensive both for citizens and the City. Also keep in mind that many of the busiest times in Fairhaven occur when paid metering isn't enforced - evenings and weekends. So paid parking won't really help. This is a bad idea and is not being driven by the patrons of Fairhaven. If you really think something needs to be done, build at parking lot using the transportation district funds. The tax was sold to citizens on the basis that Sunday bus service was made unaffordable due to lower tax revenue caused by the recession. The recession is over and tax revenue collects have exceeded prerecession amounts. It is time for the WTA to once again fund service. Put it on the ballot and let the people decide.</p> | Opinion noted. Note that paid parking as part of stage 2 would not necessarily be limited to the same hours or times as currently used in Downtown. |
| 1/24/15 | Marine Robey  | <p>Please do not install parking meters in Fairhaven. I avoid downtown because of the parking meters. Installing them in Fairhaven will take away from it's old world charm as well as drive away all of the locals. My opinion again is: NO PARKING METERS IN FAIRHAVEN.</p>  | Opinion noted   |
| 1/25/15 | Andrew Pellar | <p>Why?</p>  | Opinion noted   |

|         |               |  |   |
|---------|---------------|--|---|
| 1/25/15 | Andrew Pellar | You have to be kidding. If the City enough money to waste on this, they should pay off 100 Acre instead of letting a few pay for something that benefits everybody.  | Opinion noted   |
| 1/25/15 | Ellen Portman | Hello- Thank you for taking this issue on. I'm a business owner in Fairhaven (psychologist), and I've been there for seven years. In my first location, on 11th Street, we experienced growing issues with our patients being unable to find space to park over time. Then I moved up to 13th Street and this problem went away, thanks to a large empty lot next to our building. That lot, however, may become a building in the future. It is almost filled to capacity most days, likely by folks working in Fairhaven, and if the parking commission makes the proposed changes, even more Fairhaven employees will park there. If the city were to purchase this lot, or perhaps the large pit on 11th street, these properties could easily be striped to hold many, many cars now, and would then be available for a parking structure in the future. If they go, and are developed, we'll have a crisis. Parking meters will not solve the problem and forcing people to take the bus or ride bikes is not going to work either. These "solutions" will simply cause people to go to shop on the Guide Meridian where parking is free and ample. That being said, I don't complain about paying to park downtown. The only hassle is having to worry about having coins for the meters. I've often run into a local business to ask for change. If you must install meters, please spring for the ones that take credit cards so that merchants won't be harassed by people needing change. Thanks for taking the time to read my comments. | Opinion noted. The plan identifies triggers to manage parking demand in response to development pressure. The taskforce clearly identified that paid parking meters would use multiple payment options including credit cards and pay by phone. |

|         |                 |  |   |
|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| 1/26/15 | Amy Van Pelt    | <p>One of the pleasures of shopping and working in Fairhaven is the ability to park for free. And parking is always available - I have never left for lack of a parking space. True, I rarely park in front of the store or restaurant that may be my prime destination, but then again, I usually visit more than one establishment. And I never mind parking a short block or two away. It's not as if we have long blocks! One reason I rarely shop in downtown Bellingham is because of the annoyance of having to pay to park. Numerous examples exist around this country of thriving commercial districts that thrive (at least in part) because the parking is free. Please don't turn Fairhaven into another example of how to destroy a thriving commercial district by charging shoppers and clients to park. Businesses should bear part of the cost of providing parking for customers and employees. While a parking structure would be very expensive, there are vacant lots available that could be utilized for owner and employee parking at a reasonable cost if the businesses decided to work cooperatively to arrange such a thing. I support the enforcement of 2 hour parking. I oppose paid parking. I support angled parking on 112th St between McKenzie and Larrabee, and on Larrabee between 10th and 12th St. I support designated employee (and owner!) parking with identification of these vehicles required. Thank you for your attention to these concerns.</p> | <p>Opinion noted. The plan does describe options for businesses to help finance the cost of providing on and off street parking and managing employee parking</p> |
| 1/29/15 | Gary Southstone | <p>The only logical solution, in my opinion, is to build a parking garage. Downtown also needs to consider adding another.</p>   | <p>A parking garage is considered as a stage 4 option</p>   |

|         |              |   |   |
|---------|--------------|---|---|
| 1/30/15 | Elaine Woods | <p>Paid parking in Fairhaven is a TERRIBLE IDEA. I live in Chuckanut square, where our parking lot is almost always too full for residents. We have to use street parking. Making some places paid parking with have a huge SPILL OVER EFFECT. People will be parking now in residential neighborhoods bordering Fairhaven Center. Neighbors will be complaining. You will have to put up signage on all the neighborhood streets the same way you do for Sehome hill. All the employees of the businesses will take the street parking now available for residents who cannot find room in their parking lots. If you are trying to protect the residential neighborhoods by doing this, it will have the complete opposite effect. People will need passes to park in front of residential homes bordering the neighborhood, and those of us who live here will be impacted. If you think this is a revenue enhancing idea, please factor in: &lt;signage costs for the nearby residential areas that a pass is needed to park on the streets; &lt; enforcement costs; &lt; handling complaints from neighborhood residents who now find they cannot park on the streets due to spillover from avoidance of formerly free parking spots nearer in who now park slightly further out. PAID PARKING IS A TERRIBLE IDEA.</p> | <p>The plan includes management strategies to limit neighborhood spill over parking. Paid parking is intended to manage demand not to produce revenue. Any revenue in excess of capital and operational expenses would be used for improvements in the area as is done in the currently done in Downtown Bellingham. Parking meter revenues in Downton are used to support landscaping, events, the business association and beautification</p> |
|---------|--------------|---|---|

|         |              |  |  |
|---------|--------------|--|--|
| 1/30/15 | Steve Nelson | <p>A. Emphasize the immediate action items actually being implemented—especially marking and enforcing timed parking spaces and identifying location for a future parking facility. B. Explore options with the Port for a parking facility and include merchants and property owners in the economics—they are the persons most likely to benefit by having a place for employees to park which frees up spots near the businesses for customers to park. C. Recommend the termination of the Fairhaven Parking District—all properties should participate in improving the current parking situation as well as share costs of the future. D. Recommend that the property owners and merchants provide the baskets and flags needed to have an effective crossing flag system at the informal crossing of Harris between 10th and 11th Streets; COB to cooperate in allowing this to occur. Though not a parking item per se it is sorely needed from a safety perspective. E. If the Fairhaven Parking District has any funds, apply to implement immediate action items. F. In the very near term institute paid parking and limited time parking zones, with enforcement.</p> | <p>Opinion noted. The Fairhaven Parking district is addressed in the plan. Pedestrian safety needs are addressed by the Bellingham Pedestrian Master Plan.</p> |
|---------|--------------|--|--|

|         |                |  |  |
|---------|----------------|--|--|
| 1/30/15 | Vince Biciunas | <p>The Fairhaven Park Task Force (FPTF) deserves praise for completing this report describing current conditions in Fairhaven and suggesting future parking management scenarios. Thanks to everyone who attended monthly meetings for two years and more, and spent many extra hours studying the various issues. I agree that early planning for long-term development is an important aspect of our neighborhood and urban village planning. Here are some of my observations and questions brought up by the details in this draft report: —The FPTF Draft Report includes the most comprehensive written description on the origins and functions of the two existing Parking Districts, formed in 1994 and 2003. I did not see discussion in your report of their future utility or alternatively, planned expirations. How can these parking districts contribute more to parking solutions for the future? —The suggestions to encourage employers and employees of village businesses to use public transportation and alternatives to vehicles is good, and should be acted upon, but very difficult to enforce. Not everyone is able to ride bicycles to work, no matter the amenities, so WTA use should have a high priority. —Satellite Parking: people who live more than a mile or two distant will often need to drive. Why not seriously explore all-day parking options on nearby Port of Bellingham property? Why not explore leasing all-day parking on nearby privately owned vacant land on Harris and Sixth? Why not encourage all-day parking at the large park-n-ride lot on Lincoln Street, establishing a convenient shuttle service straight to Fairhaven? —In the short term, encouraging and maybe subsidizing WTA ridership and bicycling are good first steps. For the near future, providing for all-day parking on nearby vacant properties seems preferable to metered or other paid parking in the Fairhaven core. Thanks again to everyone on the Fairhaven Parking Task Force for completing this next phase of planning for Fairhaven.</p> | <p>Opinion noted. Parking is currently available with bus service from the Lincoln street park and ride and the Port of Bellingham properties.</p> |
|---------|----------------|--|--|

|         |               |   |                |
|---------|---------------|---|----------------|
| 1/30/15 | David Carlsen | <p>“City officials, developers, lenders, leasing agents, and tenants all assume that planners know how much parking each land use needs.” (Donald Shoup, In Lieu of Required Parking)</p> <p>Transportation Commissioner,</p> <p>Some communities are proud of their enterprise incubation efforts, the Fairhaven Parking Task Force (FPTF) Draft parking plan removes any doubt that some Bellingham property owners and city officials are striving to achieve the converse, an enterprise extinction area, now existing in the Fairhaven commercial core and apparently intended to endure forever without change or improvement. The town council decided in 2012 to let parking problems fester in Fairhaven for a couple more years so that an intentionally biased task force could contrive this parking plan charade. Since then, numerous Fairhaven businesses have closed: Jelita Arts, Purple Smile Wines, Trek Video, Archive Music, Big Fat Fish Restaurant, Extremes Sports Bar, Fairhaven Pub &amp; Martini Bar, Mrs. Hudson’s Yarns and Teas, Bead Bazaar, Katie’s Cupcakes, Pacific Chef, a dispensary, an optician, and likely more. There is no reason to exclude parking supply scarcity as contributing to these enterprise extinctions. The FPTF Draft seems to exploit the discovery that people take parking for granted, thinking it part of the landscape, assuming that there is a ledger somewhere with a calculation suggesting what parking supply could be constructive. Parking supply data for the Fairhaven core, coincidentally the area within the Parking District boundary, has not been separately tabulated or studied as part of this planning exercise. Parking District supply remains oblique despite area-wide parking studies that have been conducted. Parking studies have assumed the requirement for commercial parking supply has been consistently applied throughout Fairhaven. The FPTF Draft fails to recognize that, since 1994, the Fairhaven core, where parking is scarcest, has developed to an unknown, unquantified, secret parking requirement standard. The Draft needs a complete overhaul. Quit now, before more public resources are wasted. Of course nobody wants an ocean of unused parking in Fairhaven, and there is no threat that will occur. This plan, as drafted, benefits only one special business group - the handful of commercial landlords and prospective mixed-use developers that wish to be cleared to continue a pro-gram of unbridled</p> | Opinion noted. |
|---------|---------------|---|----------------|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>development on parking lots existent in the parking district core. The plan does nothing genuine to relieve the oversaturated parking condition prevailing in the core. The meager supply of core parking has for years constrained ordinary commercial activity within dozens of small, independent local enterprises and severely inhibits access to the area by the public. The combination of proposals in the FPTF Draft will only worsen the situation. The reason this plan only benefits property interests is because city staff and department executives refuse to address, establish and impose a parking supply standard for the useless Fairhaven Parking District. The total catalogue of Fairhaven Parking District history and accomplishment informing the FPTF Draft can be found in the April 15, 2014 meeting minutes: "Paul discussed the parking district, and its history. Brad and Phyllis noted that the district met its obligations. Jackie also spoke to the Parking District history, and said the job of the task force is to move forward." Where parking District history appears in the Draft, it is wrong or misrepresented. "The District paid for the construction of approximately 100 off-site parking spaces (Draft, p.9) could not be more misleading - the parking District paid for the striping of 100 spaces on-street. The Draft implies the Parking District entity will be abandoned. The result this dissolution will have on the zoning privileges granted Parking District properties should be addressed in the Draft, yet is excluded (will new developments continue to enjoy waiver from parking requirements and a height allowance from 35' to 54"?). This plan deliberately exploits the spectacular neglect of parking standards that has existed for 20 years in Fairhaven's commercial core Parking District. The fix, for now, could be a simple lab experiment: 1) postpone the Fairhaven Neighborhood Urban Village Plan (FNUVP) Parking Plan approval a couple more years; 2) immediately impose two-hour time limits uniformly on all on-street parking inside the large Parking District boundary that also comprises the Fairhaven commercial core, 3) compile and assess results, formulating recommendations two years hence. This experiment would permit observing the effect of exporting "load" parking from the core (Zone1) into adjacent zones, concurrent with observing 'market' effects for property uses in the area. Parking reform scholarship pioneered by Donald Shoup is shamelessly exaggerated</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>throughout the FPTF Draft, plainly deployed just for greenwashing and pettifoggery. The draft pursues ardently the most extreme version of parking extermination, although such measures realistically are intended for consideration in genuinely dense population centers like Tokyo or Mexico City. The limited supplemental readings that accompany the draft are similarly inappropriate for Fairhaven, being selected to reinforce the “demand-managed,” no-parking model preferred by Draft authors. Not to suggest that the Bellingham transit system and Fairhaven parking technology are not indeed quite cosmopolitan, but they are comparatively elementary. The Shoup ethic to enlighten transportation choices and reduce the “auto subsidy” granted by excessive parking requirements is unflinchingly transformed in the FPTF Draft. An extravagant subsidy for development is the result. All commercial parking requirements in the core Parking District become eliminated, by stealth, and all of the land and money thus saved is channelled directly into the pockets of property owners. The FPTF contemplates the parking amenity being stripped away from the neighborhood, replaced by nothing except new buildings that generate even more demand for parking. Inside the largest Fairhaven ‘parking district’ the FPTF anticipates a parking supply reduced to the impermanent 400 or so spaces existing on-street. This would be much less than the existing supply that causes the present parking crisis. Approving this plan would be tantamount to condoning a swindle to steal land and money and encouraging profitable new private development on the backs of uninformed merchant tenants that have no reason not to conclude they have located in an area featuring the same commercial parking supply standard as is typically found elsewhere in Bellingham. The light recently beamed on residential tenant protection in Bellingham should also be directed toward commercial tenancy and prevailing standards (including parking) for business premises. “To ensure economic viability of businesses within Fairhaven there needs to be a balance in parking supply.” (Transpo Study p.9<br/><a href="http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/neighborhoods/2010-docket-materials/fairhaven-np/Final_Fairhaven_Parking_Plan10122011_ReportOnly.pdf">http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/neighborhoods/2010-docket-materials/fairhaven-np/Final_Fairhaven_Parking_Plan10122011_ReportOnly.pdf</a><br/>f) The private appropriation of the parking amenity is</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>diametrically opposite the outcome generally championed by Shoup, who favors a rational parking supply with a market/cost component to promote full-spectrum transportation choices. Shoup scholarship is turned on it's head and then twisted throughout the FPTF Plan. Shoup quite consistently differentiates among residential, office and retail uses and the corresponding parking reductions that could idealize land use. The greatest reductions are always for special residential applications (proximity to transit, for example), and the smaller reductions for special commercial applications (shared cost and utilization among developer investors, for example). The FPTF Plan reverses the Shoup model, featuring high parking requirements for residential units in the Fairhaven core while altogether eliminating parking requirements for commercial space. Commercial parking, incidentally, has two components: float, which accommodates visitors and patrons, and load, necessary for tenants and staff connected to the aggregate area. The FPTF membership includes representatives from the Transportation Commission and features six community members intended to represent three Fairhaven groups having divergent and possibly conflicting interests. The groups supposedly represented are property owners, business owners, and neighbors, two from each group. Three of the representatives own rental properties in the vast Parking District, another owns commercial property nearby in Fairhaven and is the spouse of an attorney who has represented Parking District interests. This constitution creates bias, not representation. The FPTF membership includes representatives from the Transportation Commission and features six community members intended to represent three Fairhaven groups having divergent and possibly conflicting interests. The groups supposedly represented are property owners, business owners, and neighbors, two from each group. Three of the representatives own rental properties in the vast Parking District, another owns commercial property nearby in Fairhaven and is the spouse of an attorney who has represented Parking District interests. This constitution creates bias, not representation. This is not to say that many of the actions recommended in the draft should not be advanced. Most of the parking restriction suggested for the Parking District (Zone 1) should already have been completed at least five years ago. All on-street</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>parking inside the Fairhaven Parking District should already be time limited for a two hour maximum. If any spaces are metered inside the Parking District, then all should be metered. Inside the Parking District total parking saturation is consistent throughout the Parking District boundary (Technical Appendix, Figure C.2 &amp; C.6 On Street Peak Hour Parking Utilization, Weekdays &amp; Weekends <a href="http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/neighborhoods/2010-docket-materials/fairhaven-np/Final_Fairhaven_Parking_Plan10122011_Technical_Appendix.pdf">http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/neighborhoods/2010-docket-materials/fairhaven-np/Final_Fairhaven_Parking_Plan10122011_Technical_Appendix.pdf</a>). It is telling that a benchmark long passed in the Parking District, one open parking space per block-face, is cited in the Draft as a future signal that more demand-management will need to be applied. The problem for Fairhaven today is 20 years of supply mismanagement, not failure to apply demand-management today. The documentation underlying the plan shows that one open space per block-face has not existed in the Parking District since at least 2011 (Technical Appendix C.2 and C.6). The only reason the daily peak hour (really several hours much of the year) is not also the saturation level all day is because thousands of former regular patrons and visitors already have been deterred from visiting Fairhaven. This is because of the chronic, unresolved parking hassle regularly encountered by visitors. This is not just harmful to business. Not only is Bellingham harmed by reduced economic vitality, but also the public is harmed by impeded access and possibly is forced to increase auto use, driving greater distances to places where appropriate parking is available. I own residential and commercial property in Fairhaven and have operated a business there for more than 20 years. For the past several years patrons of my business have re-reported that their visits to Fairhaven have substantially dropped-off because parking is too challenging. I often hear this a few times in a single day. Another benchmark “trigger” to increase parking “demand-management” (price) is a newly titled “Significant Development” application. This is defined as a development proposal on a site presently providing public parking (one identified site, the large “parking lot” pit NW of Mill and 11th, actually does not provide “public” parking, it is posted for “authorized parking” only - yet it is always quite full). The Draft fails to address the impact on parking supply that will be introduced by these</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>“significant” developments. Parking District property owners do not recognize any obligation to provide a single parking space in the FPTF draft. They assert during task force meetings that their obligations have been fulfilled. At the same time they expect a disproportionate role in planning and implementing on-street parking policies in the area where parking demand for their own developments has likely galloped far ahead of the required parking supply (float and load) that they do not provide. The “historic context” provided in the Armistead Plan information folder, freshly sifted and presented with the FPTF Draft, was not so available for public consumption during the 2012 FNUVP planning process. The Armistead Plan folder contains new information also validating overhaul of the FPTF Draft and could possibly support a recommendation to Council that the zoning approved in 2012 was misinformed by an exaggerated assumption of parking supply. A criteria Bellingham imposes for Parking District adoption is that the proposed Parking District must achieve equivalence with the parking requirements tabled in Bellingham Municipal Code 20.12.010 Parking: “The director shall further have the authority to waive parking requirements for subsections (A)(2)(a), (b) and (c) of this section, when consistent with an area-wide parking plan and/or district which has been instituted together with a mechanism for providing required parking for the area or district. These plans and/or districts must have been approved by the city council after public hearings before the planning commission and city council. This provision is intended to allow on-street parking and off-site parking to meet parking requirements in those areas.” This requirement to provide standard parking supply for new development in the largest Fairhaven parking district has not been changed nor been consciously studied since the FNUVP was adopted and the parking plan was peeled off for more attention. Many jurisdictions would recognize that land use zoning, if promulgated similarly to Bellingham’s “parking district” legislation, would solidly bind the resultant district to remain in compliance with the zoning requirement and would infer an “anti-property right” is created by agreement, assuring compliance. Review of the Armistead Plan, the Transpo Study and all sources of history for Fairhaven parking discloses that much more public parking should be present in the core</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>today. New development that will include more demand on existing, oversaturated on-street parking should be halted until the supply is brought up to a reasonable standard. "Demand management" should be contemplated after supply standards have been established and implemented. The available on-street parking in the Parking District core likely could not by itself fulfill required parking capacity standards for the existing build-out. The FPTF Draft expects that same small on-street supply to additionally service all new buildings - some constructed on lots presently used for parking. The Armistead plan posits many sources of potential future off-street parking, but the Parking District has failed to implement any of them. There is no 'parking lot west of 10th,' there is no 'second deck of parking along McKenzie' the Parking District has not provided any permanent off-street parking at all despite zealously using the limited District parking waiver to build numerous new buildings. Perversely, these new buildings enjoy the privilege of height increase to 54' granted when the District was enabled. These new buildings enjoying increased height create impediments to full-spectrum transit options in the core by placing diagonal parking in the narrow streets (buses cannot traverse portions of Harris, bike lanes have not been possible on portions of 12th). Transpo promotes a much different parking plan than is proposed by the FPTF Draft. They cite the parking plan for downtown Concord, North Carolina as a possible plan for emulation in Fairhaven (Transpo Study, p.22). The map for Concord parking discloses a plan much closer to that envisioned by the Armistead Plan: on-street and off-street parking combined to supply enough parking to sustain the hospitality district (<a href="http://www.concorddowntown.com/Parking/Parking.aspx#.VMgbT8bFui4">http://www.concorddowntown.com/Parking/Parking.aspx#.VMgbT8bFui4</a>). The Armistead plan never required eliminating the parking supply, it promoted shared parking as an alternative to fulfill standard requirements, possibly to slightly reduced requirement levels. The Armistead Plan anticipated shared parking to waive parking requirements so that small infill development (foot-print 2500 s.f.) could be permitted. The waiver has since been applied to any and all developments regardless of size. The failure to comport with Shoup ethic is not the main problem with the draft. The reason this draft needs complete overhaul is that it omits and disregards any conscious, rational,</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>comparative estimate of the legitimate public interest for some numerical commercial parking supply requirement applicable to the Parking District and Fairhaven core. This exclusion of an appropriate, rational numerical parking supply assessment is the trademark of the entire FNUVP charade. The supply within the Parking District needs to be separately studied to reveal the source of parking inadequacy (ratio of commercial floor area per available parking space is the standard formula for rationalizing parking requirements virtually everywhere). If it is indeed as represented in the FPTF plan draft that 'the market' should dictate parking supply, why shouldn't that effort begin before a final Parking Plan is adopted by Bellingham officials? The parking plan already is lagging behind the zoning plan for the area by three years. What harm could result from delaying final approval a couple more years so that effects from experimental new parking strategies can be observed? The FPTF draft authors apparently actually dislike the free market concept for Fairhaven parking. Treating all of the parking adjacent to district properties equivalently, for example, is not part of the plan, though all of the property is equally invested in the parking district. District overlords, professing possession of no property permanently reserved for parking and yet having much commercial space for rent, want to decide where the 20 minute zones should be, where the metered zones should be, where the two-hour zones should be, etc., on the public streets. Why not begin two hour limited parking on all on-street parking spaces in the Parking District, then observe the effects of that utilization scheme for a couple of years? Deterred visitors would then have a chance to return and fill parking that is not already consumed by employees, entrepreneurs, and office professionals. Businesses promoting alternate modes of transit for their staff would be rewarded with more parking for customers. Property owners could earn new revenue charging their tenants for long-term parking in a mud pit. Market rationality would be unencumbered by our friendly "invisible hand." Businesses that choose to locate in Fairhaven would see parking issues beginning to be addressed. If the goal is elimination of off-street parking, banners could be installed promoting alternate transit and declaring "Target: Parking Requirements Reduced 100%." The public could become educated about parking and</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>some commuters might actually shift transportation modes because their cars could not be parked in front of their offices or stores all day. Unlike Shoup, who promotes reduced parking supply requirements for commercial areas with agreements for shared cost and utilization, the FPTF plan instead seems to assume an eliminated parking supply requirement for the large Parking District commercial area. Not one jurisdiction studied by Shoup has eliminated the parking requirement and Shoup warns against it (Shoup, In Lieu of Required Parking). Apart from inducing fiscal disaster, Shoup also has demonstrated that inadequate parking supply requirements are earth killing, not earth saving. It is possible that cars hunting for parking in the parking starved, “demand-managed,” future Fairhaven could cause nearly as much auto emission as the toxic cloud that will be formed from the new gyre of traffic extending from Canada to the new Bellingham Costco, if built (Shoup, Cruising for Parking, <a href="http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/CruisingForParkingAccess.pdf">http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/CruisingForParkingAccess.pdf</a>). The FPTF Draft does nothing to remove cars from the area, just parking. Parking lots off-street could not be less pedestrian friendly than cars hunting for parking. The pedestrian experience in Fairhaven could be enhanced by some parking facility, then the sidewalks might be filled with actual people. The fuss over driveways is completely off-target, why would driveways into residential complexes be better for pedestrians than driveways into parking facilities? If auto use is to be discouraged, it seems like the requirement for residential parking should be the first thing eliminated from the FPTF Draft. Nothing promotes auto use more than having a car. If the city will not make any effort to establish a standard for required commercial parking in the commercial core, it could at least broadcast the “demand management” imperative and increase public awareness of very scarce parking resources. Property managers presently represent Fairhaven commercial space as having ‘plenty of parking.’ Any parking ‘capacity’ that may be presently interpreted as existing is solely the product of deterred visits, not conscious auto disuse due to scarce Fairhaven parking. Many people walk, bike and use transit to visit Fairhaven. That is because they have made a conscious personal decision to reduce auto use, not a decision to avoid the parking hassle imposed by substandard parking supply in the Fairhaven core. Why</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>should the profit margin of a small pool of developers be satiated and rewarded by the altruistic actions of the public? Those who want to avoid the parking hassle of Fairhaven simply choose to go elsewhere; where parking is reasonable, and that likely happens hundreds of times each day. "Parking requirements would do no harm, of course, if they did not force developers to provide more parking than they would supply voluntarily. But research has repeatedly found that developers usually provide only the required number of parking spaces, which strongly suggests that the requirements drive the parking supply." (Shoup, p.96, journal article, High Cost of Minimum Parking Requirements? Thanks for considering my comments, David Carlsen Non COB Web Links:<br/><a href="http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/InLieuOfRequiredParking.pdf">http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/InLieuOfRequiredParking.pdf</a>;<br/><a href="http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/CruisingForParkingAccess.pdf">http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/CruisingForParkingAccess.pdf</a>;<br/><a href="http://www.concorddowntown.com/Parking/Parking.aspx#.VMgbT8bFui4">http://www.concorddowntown.com/Parking/Parking.aspx#.VMgbT8bFui4</a>; <a href="http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/HighCost.pdf">http://shoup.bol.ucla.edu/HighCost.pdf</a></p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|         |                        |  |   |
|---------|------------------------|--|---|
| 1/30/15 | <p>Brooks Anderson</p> | <p>You and your task force were handed a formidable job to find solutions for parking in Fairhaven that the Fairhaven Village Plan could not resolve. I appreciate all of the hours and deliberations that the members of this task force have spent. While I applaud the short term solutions and encourage you to move forward with them now, I am concerned that the larger issues remain, as they are viewed through different lenses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The FPTF spent a lot of hours reviewing and discussing the relevancy of the Parking Districts. While there seem to be agreement that the parking districts had served their purpose (including Phyliss McGee who was one of the founders) the discussion of how the parking districts might be of use now, or contribute to future parking solutions , to my knowledge, never happened. There were members of the task force who said the parking districts were contracts with the city that nothing could be done about changing them. I question that conclusion if there is the political will to address the parking districts. The parking districts create and unfair parking playing field for development now and in the future.</li> <li>2. While the suggestion of metered parking has met with great resistance, isn't it a solution to the currently unenforceable employer and employee of village businesses parking out of the core area? In the past ten years I heard repeated unsuccessful educational efforts on the part of employers to get employees to not park in the core.</li> <li>3. Instead of the long term solution of an expensive parking garage, that no one wants to pay for, including developers, the city, or the public, it seems better solutions would be to partner with the Port on their near-by property for all day parking...maybe metered parking there? A parking garage seems so not historical Fairhaven.</li> <li>4. The Fairhaven residential Neighborhood does not want overflow parking. I believe it is less likely to be impacted than the Happy Valley Neighborhood and the Southside Neighborhood because of the ingenious solution of the berm. No residential neighborhood should take on parking for the profit of the commercial part of Fairhaven. The</li> </ol> | <p>Opinion noted. The parking District is addressed in the plan. All Day parking is available at existing Port of Bellingham parking lots for a nominal fee. Management strategies to deal with neighborhood spillover parking are found in the Zone 4 descriptions</p> |
|---------|------------------------|--|---|

|         |               |  |  |
|---------|---------------|--|--|
|         |               | <p>benefits and the costs of parking for shopping in the commercial district need to be met by the commercial part of Fairhaven.</p> <p>While I am president of Fairhaven Neighbors the above comments are my personal thoughts and are not meant to represent Fairhaven Neighbors.</p>  |  |
| 1/30/15 | Robert Keller | <p>Although social change and adjustments can be slow, we need to recognize that the private automobile has become obsolete. That is more immediately evident in Seattle than Bellingham, but the constant congestion in King County will eventually envelope Whatcom due to population growth. Given this, we need to consider the example of many German cities that have banned the private auto in the center of towns. At the very least we need to strongly support local reform programs such as Smart Trips. One beginning would be for Fairhaven businesses to give employees free monthly bus passes. A creative and partial solution: turn some of the vacant land down Harris into parking, then for non-walkers connect it to the business district by frequent trolley or shuttle rides for a small fee. As I wait for buses in the district or on State St. I often count the number of autos with driver only. The result is 80-90% of vehicles.</p> | <p>Opinion noted. The taskforce discussed the idea of shuttles or trolleys. Financing options are include in the plan. The plan identifies bus passes by employers as a stage 2 strategy</p> |
| 1/31/15 | Kristi Lee    | <p>I have read the proposal for parking in Fairhaven. As a business owner, and as an entrepreneur with a MBA, I think that <b>2 hour limits to parking in the core of Fairhaven is the best solution. Paid parking</b> can discourage customers, and is a <b>capital expense</b>, a "one-time" construction project that can be controversial. Who will get the bid for the construction? What are the political ties of the contractor and their governing authorities? In light of the unpopular campaign run by Democrat Seth Fleetwood, underwritten by money from out-of-state, California private funding; I deem it prudent to put this project on hold, to avoid the appearance, or reality, of unknown underwriting, possible money laundering of campaign slush funds.</p>   | <p>Opinion noted. Construction bidding laws are open, competitive and rigorously followed by the City of Bellingham.</p>   |

|        |            |  |   |
|--------|------------|--|---|
| 2/2/15 | Susan Kaun | <p>As you are aware, parking has long been a chronic issue for the Fairhaven Neighborhood, and the draft Report forecasts it will become more acute as growth continues. We are fortunate that a number of stakeholders volunteered their time and energy to work on potential solutions, and help prepare the Report. Hopefully, its recommendations will result in a more viable future than gridlock.</p> <p>However, I am concerned that underlying the present parking problem is the fact that around 2003-4, when the residential and commercial Harris Square and McKenzie Square projects were going through the City's planning process, the City in my opinion was remiss in not requiring adequate parking of two spaces per unit within the buildings, as well as adequate parking spaces for the businesses within the buildings. Further, it seems that if residents are required to pay for their parking spaces, it often determines whether or not they will use the space or park outside the building. I believe the lack of thoughtful planning by the City has contributed to the present 600+ space parking shortage.</p> <p>Presently, a large number of these residents park along both 9th Street and McKenzie Avenue, either because there is no parking space within the buildings or they have a choice to not pay for building parking. The residential cars parked on the streets limit available spaces for shoppers and tourists in the Fairhaven Village, and can financially impact the businesses. One need only to drive along these particular streets in the evening or on weekend mornings to observe the impact of residential parking from these two buildings.</p> <p>Therefore, before the parking problem becomes even worse, the City should either purchase a large plot of land, like the open field at Harris and Ninth Street, and construct a parking garage, possibly located above street level shops and businesses; and/or amend its development regulations to require that all new structures provide sufficient, interior parking spaces for the residents and businesses.</p> | Opinion noted. Construction of a parking garage is included as a Stage 4 management strategy. |
|--------|------------|--|---|

|         |   |  |   |
|---------|---|--|---|
|         |   | <p>Otherwise, I worry that at a future point in time there will be spillover into the adjacent residential areas, some of which are already constricted with narrow streets and no sidewalks. This will cause potential disruption of quiet neighborhoods, traffic congestion, and potential collisions between pedestrians and cars attempting to use the same roadways.</p> <p>I also wish to point out there is a Settlement Agreement, which was signed in February 2006 between the City, Fairhaven Neighbors, and Fairhaven Harbor, that closes 8th Street, and removes the pavement for use as an essential riparian area for the Padden Creek Estuary. One of the earlier Task Force Maps I remember seeing indicated there were a number of parking spaces along 8th Street, between Harris Avenue and McKenzie Avenue. Sometime in the future, 8th Street will not be available to cars, so those spaces should not be counted for use.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment on the Draft Fairhaven Parking Task Force Report.</p> |   |
| 2/10/15 | Fairhaven Merchants - via Jody Finnegan and Robin Robertson | If paid parking is implemented into Fairhaven, is there a way that merchants can validate parking for customers - such as an electronic swipe card or token?   | Yes.  |
|         |   | <p>Page 37:<br/>         "Introduction of paid parking would be the first significant investment required in the parking management plan and would occur in Stage 2 in Zone 1. A rough estimate of revenue potential, operating costs, and initial capital expenses for a pay station system indicates a need for approximately \$500,000 in capital and an annual operating cost of \$300,000. Revenues would likely exceed operating costs but not pay back the capital cost quickly. Based on characteristics similar to downtown Bellingham, implementation of paid parking would require support from the City in the early years."</p> <p>I find this contradictory to the earlier statements that paid parking would create funds for every wish list item conceivable (paid on-street parking revenues could be used to support pedestrian improvements, acquisition, construction and maintenance of off-street parking, support for the business association, beautification, litter</p>   | Correct. On street metered parking will likely not generate sufficient revenue to build, operate and maintain off-street lots or parking garages. |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | control, lighting and events ) including a parking garage. If a Parking garage costs \$12M and paid parking isn't able to pay off the \$500K startup costs in a reasonable time frame it seems unlikely that it will generate funds for offstreet parking.  |  |
|  | If I read page 45 spreadsheet correctly it forecasts about \$100-200K annually in net revenue from paid parking. Or is the forecast the third column which is about break even. \$200K would pay 4% bond interest on a \$5M capital project (parking garage or surface improvements). Not sure how long the bonds could be issued for but if 50 years, we would have something interesting. also, I would assume in out years that paid parking expands beyond core zone so more revenue. Bill Miller | Correct. Bonds are typically issued for a period equal to or less than the life of the facility. Bonds for the downtown parking garage were issued in 20 year terms. A parking garage for this area was estimated to cost at least \$12.8million |
|  | Will there be enough time to see the impact of each stage before moving onto the next stage. Don't want to jump to the next stage too soon.   | Opinion noted  |
|  | Would like different time limits in different areas. 30 min for some - load/unload zone, 2 hrs 3 hrs - based on use   | Opinion noted  |
|  | Use Mackenzie as an employee parking area. Provide stickers for employees to park there. Don't allow 24 hr parking on that area. Many of the tower residents parking there all day & all night.   | Opinion noted  |
|  | No paid parking. It has killed downtown.  | Opinion noted  |
|  | Would like a parking structure  | See stage 4  |
|  | Have businesses pay for the parking - validate for customers  | Would be an option with modern metering and payment technologies   |
|  | sticker from the city - park for free if you have a business in Fairhaven - only businesses   | Opinion noted  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | Need employee parking lots  | Noted  |
|  | Can we secure the Imus lot (the Pit) for parking? Can we pay them for the use of the pit?   | A funding mechanism to purchase or pay for the property would need to be identified  |
|  | Will there be weekend enforcement? Weekends are really bad for parking, especially in the summer.   | Time periods for paid parking and enforcement were   |
|  | Can the yellow zones in Fairhaven be shortened and additional parking spaces added?   | In most cases yellow curbs are marked to provide for visibility and safety.  |
|  | <p>-Fully utilize street right of ways for on-street parking. Some long range - some now.</p> <p>A. South side of Larrabee between Yorkys and 14th - put in angle parking. (diagonals adds 15 spaces)</p> <p>B. East side of 13th between Larrabee and McKenzie. (install storm drain at SE corner McKenzie &amp; 13th.) (diagonals adds 10 spaces)</p> <p>C. Both sides of Larrabee between 11th and 10th (adds 8 spaces)</p> <p>D. West side of 11th between Larrabee and McKenzie (adds 5 spaces)</p> <p>E. North side of Larrabee between 11th and 12th. Some street parking is now used by the public but needs gravel and turterriers to be useful.</p> <p>F. West side of 11th between Mill and the new buildings to the north</p> <p>G. East side of 11th between Avenue Bread and Finnegan Way</p> <p>H. North side of Mill between 12th and 13th.</p> | On street improvements throughout zones 1, 2 & 3 are included with Stage 3. Street improvements not provided by developing properties require funding from another source. Funding alternatives are discussed in the plan. There are no planned street improvements anywhere in Zone 4 |
|  | Allow use of vacant lots for parking without requiring major improvements. These are temporary, each lasting one to only a few years before development. The "pit" parking area is a savior for our district. It has been in use for several years now and has been   | Properties developed for parking are required to meet established  |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  | without problems. But it is a temporary lot and we all know this. We need to put in a safety light - at our expense. And signs indicating entrance. We have other vacant lots that can be used until such time as the owners decide to build. The old South Side Service station at 12th & Harris is one. This is a common practice in the downtown area. Currently, city hall does all it can to discourage parking in vacant lots. This needs to change. Also, we need to be able to improve the pit - dangerous steps and no lights for at night. And put up signage. (this could add 50 to 100 spaces) | standards to protect water quality, safety and address neighborhood concerns. |
|  |  | Reduce the amount of yellow curbing to only what code requires. Some yellow painted curbing exceeds by several feet the no parking near crosswalks and such over what city codes specify. Downtown doesn't have yellow stripes at many intersections. Why not? Double standard? (this would add maybe 10 spaces)   | Noted   |
|  |  | Motorcycle parking. Utilize yellow parking areas at street corners to add motorcycle parking spots. Some will take only one, many will take two and some will take three or more. We can add perhaps 20 to 30 motorcycle parking spaces without taking away any car parking. ( adds equivalent of almost same number of cars)  | Noted   |
|  |  | Require Bellingham Housing to have all their tenants park in the designated parking lot. If insufficient spaces then require BHA to build a second parking level - or expand the current lot. Currently between 22 and 28 Chuckanut Manor tenant cars park on the Fairhaven streets. BHA provides parking for only 21 cars with a total of around 100 living units. This is left over from over 40 years ago and needs to be updated. (this would add approx 30 spaces)  | Noted   |
|  |  | Park & Ride use. Find a way to eliminate some streets - McKenzie - from being used as park and ride lots. This is a huge problem. (guess this adds 20 to 50 spaces)  | Noted   |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | Place many more bike parking posts. Before we can expect people to bike and not use their cars, we need to accommodate bikes. More bike racks will aid parking congestion. Also, Bike parking posts are installed 3 and 4 feet from curb. Dangerous. Downtown bike posts are 2 feet from curb - and useful. Again, why different for Fairhaven? This is a recurring problem.  | Additional bike parking and bike racks are identified as a stage 0 strategy  |
|  |  | We currently have 14 parking garages in Fairhaven with between 400 and 500 spaces not being used ever. We need city codes to be changed to do one or both of two things.<br>a. Allow building owners to lease out unused spaces to Fairhaven business owners for use of employees.<br>b. Encourage residents to use the spaces built for them and to not park on the streets. | City code does allow for leasing of unused spaces. Leasing of offstreet spaces is economically challenging when on street parking is free. Time limited or paid parking will encourage residents to park off street. |
|  |  | Eventually operate a rubber tire trolley from cruise terminal to 14th with parking in the lower area.   | WTA currently provides bus service from this area.   |
|  |  | Change the angle parking to back-in/head-out parking. This may be easier and safer than current practice and is inexpensive. It is especially helpful on sloping streets.   | The change to back in parking would require either a significant change in curb and street geometry or a loss of parking supply  |
|  |  | Bring the transit buses into the core of the district. South down 11th to Larrabee, west on Larrabee, north on 10th and then finally west on Harris is a route that would better serve the commercial district.   | Noted  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | There are now enclosed bicycle parking units made of fiberglass and that are hinged. Portland uses these and they totally protect a bike. A few could be installed on a test basis.  | The City is looking at a number of possible options for bicycle parking as part of the bicycle master plan |
|  |  | Eliminate the need to push a button for the walk signal at Harris and 12th. Most visitors do not know they need to push this and many dangerous situations happen each month. There is sufficient pedestrian traffic to warrant timed walk signals for all light changes.  | Noted.   |
|  |  | Some intersections need more adequate lighting. Here are the two in most need of additional lighting. 12th and McKenzie is in need of lighting to show pedestrians on the crosswalks across 12th. At night the driver of a south moving car has a difficult time seeing pedestrians on these two crosswalks. The intersection of 12th and Larrabee needs a light. There is none. Currently, Larrabee Ave between 11th and 12th is a dark hole. | Noted. Street lighting is beyond the scope of this report  |
|  |  | Crosswalk stripes are needed at the following intersections.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Across Mill and also across 10th where they intersect.</li> <li>- Across Harris on the east side of intersection with 9th</li> <li>- Across Harris at west side intersection with 13th</li> <li>- Across 13th at south side of intersection with Harris</li> </ul>  | Noted. Pedestrian improvements are beyond the scope of this report   |
|  |  | The asphalt strips down Harris Ave between 13th and 10th need to be replaced. The center strip of bricks are OK and the concrete on the outer lanes are for the most part OK - but the asphalt is badly damaged and tosses cars about.   | Noted. Pavement conditions are beyond the scope of this report   |
|  |  | Allow the Fairhaven business community to arrange the use of vacant lots for additional off street parking. These two measures will allow the Old Fairhaven Association to positively motivate business owners and their employees to park outside the commercial core, leaving sufficient parking for customers to the shops and restaurants.   | There is no prohibition on these types of arrangement.   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Negative impacts from the Housing Authority by not providing sufficient parking in the past The Housing Authority needs to take greater responsibility for their tenants' cars. A suggested rule is that all parking by tenants' cars must be on the Housing Authority parking lot. Tenants who qualify for housing assistance are required to list their assets and show their need. As part of this, Housing knows which tenants have cars and should be required to not have more tenant owned vehicles than there are parking spaces onsite. This should be the basic rule. They have 101 units in the Chuckanut Square which is located right in the commercial district. Yet they provide only 21 off street parking spaces. As a result, up to 30 tenant cars park on the streets of our commercial district every day - day and night. This has a very serious negative impact on commerce in the historic commercial core. The Housing Authority should be able to provide this commission with the number of cars registered at Chuckanut - and you will be able to see that it far exceeds the 21 spaces provided. The Housing Authority should be required to insure that no tenant owned cars are parked on the streets. Currently the Housing Authority gives parking stickers for the cars of tenants - but routinely gives out more stickers than there are parking spaces. While this prevents others from parking in the Housing Authority lot, it still allows tenant cars on the streets. One solution for Fairhaven is to require a second deck of parking to be built to accommodate at least 60 cars - still far below the normal city requirements. That facility was built in the late 1960s and was originally only for the elderly - who had few cars. By converting to HUD tenants, cars became a problem. This government owned facility should be required to be a good neighbor and build sufficient off street parking.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|         |                        |  |                      |
|---------|------------------------|--|----------------------|
| 2/25/15 | <p>Laurel Vodopich</p> | <p>I am writing to comment and voice opposition to paid parking in Fairhaven. My husband and I live in Edgemoor and we are frequent visitors in Fairhaven. We go there for a cup of coffee, to walk the trails, shop, listen to concerts or other events on the Village Green. We meet friends, have a donut, go to a coffee shop and enjoy the village, sometimes multiple times a day for various reasons.</p> <p>For example, yesterday morning I went to Village Books and Paper Dreams looking for a gift for a friend. In the afternoon I met a friend at the Village Green, walked to Boulevard Park and back to Fairhaven and then went to The Rustic for a cup of coffee and time to chat. I had absolutely no difficulty finding parking during either visit. In fact, around Village Books there were several open parking spaces and in the afternoon, once again, had no difficulty finding a place to park.</p> <p>I agree that during peak shopping times, seasonal shopping or huge events such as Ski to Sea, parking spaces are at a premium. This is also true downtown, every Saturday for the Farmer’s Market, where you have to pay for parking and there are still not enough spaces so you have to park a ways away and walk. It is also true at the Mall, especially during Canadian holidays and during the Christmas shopping season where you do not have to pay to park. In Fairhaven, we have always been able to find a spot even during Ski to Sea or Christmas or the Wednesday Farmer’s Market though we might have to walk a block or two.</p> <p>It looks as though the task force is addressing the need for more bicycle parking racks and storage areas to encourage people to bike to the Village. There are already many walking trails and sidewalks to accommodate walkers. My husband and I regularly avail ourselves of those options but also drive and park in Fairhaven for a variety of reasons. The weather may be inclement which means these aging bones do not want to walk or bike; we may not have the time to walk or bike; groceries and shopping items may not fit or be appropriate for either activity. In short, we walk, we bike, we drive and park. It seems to me if the goal is to reduce parking needs in the Village by encouraging walking and biking, then go ahead and put in the additional biking racks but leave the rest alone and let</p> | <p>Opinion noted</p> |
|---------|------------------------|--|----------------------|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>us continue to park a little away from the Village when we have to and <b>walk!</b></p> <p>Fairhaven is a unique, very special area. Like Barkley Village (where parking is also free), it is a place where people gather for multiple reasons to enjoy all that it has to offer. Leave it alone—please—don't make it hard for those of us who live there or nearby to continue to enjoy it—sometimes multiple times a day—for FREE.</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|