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WESTERN
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Community

FROM: Dr. George A. Pierce

DATE: July 26, 1993

SUBJECT: Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Western Washington University’s Campus Master Plan

Western Washington University is facilitating its campus master planning process by integrating the long-range planning with the required SEPA guidelines, which require all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making final decisions.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Western Washington University’s Campus Master Plan was issued for public review on April 26, 1993. A thirty-day review period, which included a public hearing, ended on May 25, 1993. The Final EIS includes all comments and responses from the public review, as well as corrections, additional information, and a summary description of the proposal and alternatives.

Both the Draft EIS and the Final EIS, as well as other information incorporated by reference (listed in the Draft EIS Appendix B), constitute the Environmental Impact Statement for Western Washington University’s Campus Master Plan.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement is the last stage of the required environmental review process. The next step is for the University’s Board of Trustees to consider all information and to take action on the proposed Campus Master Plan. The final Campus Master Plan and preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement were presented to the Board of Trustees at their July 8, 1993 meeting. Action on the Campus Master Plan will follow the issuance of this document, and is scheduled for the August, 1993 Board of Trustees meeting.

For more information, or to obtain copies of the Draft EIS and Final EIS, contact Western Washington University’s Office of Facilities and Master Planning at (206) 650-3550, Physical Plant, 26th and Douglas Streets, Bellingham, WA 98225-9122.
### FACT SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Sponsor</th>
<th>Western Washington University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
<td>Campus Master Plan for Western Washington University. The programmatic action is a conceptual framework that defines land use sectors, circulation, open space, and land acquisition. A 10-year (1993-2003) timeframe is addressed, which includes programmatic projects. Currently envisioned building development totals about 646,935 square feet of net new construction, which includes 688,400 square feet of new construction less 41,465 square feet removed. Approximately 142,800 gross square feet of renovation is also planned, along with a series of preservation projects. Campus infrastructure improvements will reorganize circulation, open space, and activity zones. Approximately 56 acres of land are identified for future acquisition. Student enrollment would increase by about 11% (from 11,150 to 11,300 persons).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Western Washington University Bellingham, Washington 98225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Official</td>
<td>George Pierce, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs Western Washington University Old Main / Room 310 Bellingham, Washington 98225 206 / 650-3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Robert Bruce, Special Assistant to the President Facilities Planning and Development Office of the President Western Washington University Bellingham, Washington 98225 206 / 735-0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Western Washington University Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses, Permits, and Approvals</td>
<td>Western Washington University: Adoption of Master Plan by Board of Trustees City of Bellingham: Building Permits, Street Vacation and all necessary permits/approvals to build and occupy campus master plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors and Principal Contributors</td>
<td>NBBJ: Lead Environmental Consultant Hart Crowser: Geology, Wetlands, Habitat Consultant The TRANSPO Group: Transportation Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Date of Draft EIS</td>
<td>April 26, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Period</td>
<td>April 26 to May 25, 1993 (30 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date/Place of Public Hearing</td>
<td>May 18, 1993 Lecture Hall 2 7:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Date of Final EIS</td>
<td>July 26, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Background Data</td>
<td>Western Washington University Office of Facilities and Master Planning 26th &amp; Douglas Bellingham, Washington 98225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to the Public</td>
<td>A limited number of copies of the Draft and Final EIS are available free of charge at the Office of Facilities and Master Planning, 26th &amp; Douglas. When the supply is exhausted, additional copies may be obtained for the cost of copying.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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summary description of proposed action and alternatives
Western Washington University is one of six public-funded universities in Washington State. WWU has had a significant history of planning dating back to the first master plan completed in 1924. Since that original plan there has been a new or revised plan approximately every ten to fifteen years.

In 1974, WWU completed its first Draft Environmental Impact Statement with a supplement in 1981. In 1990, the University established a Strategic Planning Committee to review program goals and objectives of WWU and completed a final report in April of 1991. A Campus Master Planning Committee and Advisory Group were established in March of 1990 to develop the physical improvement requirements aimed at meeting the goals established by the Strategic Planning Committee. The Master Plan currently proposed considers all physical characteristics of Western's campus.

WWU is facilitating its campus master planning process by integrating the long-range planning with the required environmental impact review. The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21 RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making final decisions. The primary purpose of an environmental impact statement is to ensure that SEPA's policies are an integral part of the ongoing programs and actions of state and local government and to provide an impartial discussion of significant environmental impacts. Mitigation measures that can eliminate or reduce identified impacts are also formulated in the EIS to aid the refinement of the most appropriate campus plan.

The required environmental review process includes three stages, with related products:

- Public Scoping
- Draft EIS Review
- Final EIS Review

The first step was initiated by WWU, the Lead Agency, on October 12, 1992, with publication of a Determination of Significance (DS) and request for input on scoping of the environmental analysis. This scoping was intended to focus the environmental review on key issues of concern. Based on the public comments received until November 5, 1992, WWU identified the Elements of the Environment (see Appendix B) that were addressed in the Draft EIS.

The Draft EIS document was the subject of public review and comment and completed the second stage of the environmental review process. It incorporated by reference prior environmental documents that are available and on file at the WWU Facilities and Master Planning Office. The proposed action, the WWU Campus Plan, is programmatic in nature. Specific building projects and improvements have not yet been designed or detailed. Therefore, the environmental analysis was more generalized consistent with SEPA requirements (WAC 197-11-442). Future project-related environmental review may be required. Following the prescribed 30-day public review and hearing, the scope and format of the Final EIS were determined.

This Final EIS includes comments and responses received during the Draft EIS review. Additional information and analyses, as well as corrections, are also included. The preferred campus plan, Scheme E, was refined and is described in this document. Public issuance of the Final EIS is followed by a seven-day "no action" period. The Lead Agency may then proceed to implement the campus plan as modified or conditioned by the environmental process. The final Campus Master Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (which includes the Draft and Final documents and other relevant information incorporated by reference) are scheduled to be presented to WWU's Board of Trustees in July 1993, and address campus needs through the year 2000. Action on the plan by the Board of Trustees is scheduled for August, 1993.

The Campus Plan and EIS address the 192-acre WWU campus (proposed to be expanded to 248 acres) and its immediate environs. WWU owns and leases other off-campus properties that contribute to the fulfillment of the WWU mission, but these lands are not addressed by this EIS.

Characteristics and conditions of the WWU campus are well-documented in a series of separate publications. These technical details are included in documents incorporated by reference into the EIS and are listed in Appendix B of the Draft EIS. The documents are on file and available for review at the WWU Office of Facilities and Master Planning.

Western Washington University (WWU) proposes a ten-year campus master plan to improve, enhance, and expand facilities and infrastructure. For purposes of impact analysis, a time frame from 1993 to 2003 is assumed. Given the uncertainty with State directions and funding, the actual timing could change. The plan and impact analysis are programmatic in nature. Additional environmental review, if required, will be performed in the future when specific projects are more clearly detailed.

B. Strategic Principles / Goals / Objectives

The basis of the WWU campus plan is fulfillment of its educational mission, most recently articulated in a strategic plan: "A Framework for Excellence." Twelve strategic principles are detailed, which address the educational experience, the physical environment, intellectual values and administration.

A series of campus physical development goals and objectives are also expressed. The plan that is desired must be flexible, cost-effective, viable, and environmentally sensitive. A framework to accommodate and manage change is needed. The compatibility of new development with the existing campus attributes is also key. Objectives identify campus zones, circulation, infrastructure, open space, and land acquisition.
C. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The WWU campus master plan addresses the main campus in Bellingham, Washington. Other, off-campus properties are not addressed in the plan or EIS. A schematic concept generally shows the envisioned campus organization and development pattern. No projects have yet been designed so all descriptions and analysis are more generalized but of sufficient detail to identify potentially significant environmental impacts. The plan proposes some 688,400 square feet of new construction with removal of 41,465 square feet for a net increase of 646,935 square feet. There would be an approximate 11% increase in student population. A ten-year planning horizon is identified for impact analysis purposes. Actual development may extend beyond this period due to factors not controllable by WWU.

Key aspects of the proposed campus master plan are the land use organization, circulation, open space systems, and land acquisition. A unified "valley green" and realigned south campus circulation are major physical changes. Private property acquisition includes some 56 acres, located primarily to the south of WWU with some acquisition to the north. (Note: the Refined Scheme E deletes approximately 2.75 acres from the proposed acquisition area along Garden Street.)

Improvements projects by WWU include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Construction</th>
<th>Renovation</th>
<th>Removal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>688,400 gsf</td>
<td>142,800 gsf</td>
<td>41,465 gsf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both "preservation" projects and "programmatic" projects are included. The preservation projects renovate and abate life safety/code deficiencies of existing campus development. The programmatic projects include buildings, campus infrastructure, and renovations.

### Preservation Projects
- Fire Detection Systems
- Earthquake Mitigation
- Underground Storage Tank Removal
- Exteror & Roofing Renewal
- Electrical Distribution System
- Boiler/Cogeneration Electrical Production System
- Utility Upgrade
- Interior Renewal
- Roofing Replacement
- Grounds/Roadway Renewal

### Programmatic Projects
- Science Facilities I, II, III
- Haggard Hall Renovation
- Campus Services Facility
- Campus Recreational Center
- Programmatic Minor Works
- Projects
- Academic Program Re-location
- Recreation/PE Fields
- (Phases I & II)
- Academic Complex
- Parking Lots/Facility
- Land Acquisition
- Campus Infrastructure

Note that all square footages are estimates and project sizes will likely change when they are detailed in the future.

Five alternatives are considered in the environmental review:

- **No Action**: A continuation of existing conditions with no new development proposed.
- **Alternative A**: A different alignment and locations of the south campus access, green space and recreation center.
- **Alternative B**: A more rectilinear roadway system configuration and siting the recreation facility/visitor center adjacent to the Bill McDonald Parkway.
- **Alternative C**: A realigned campus drive along 21st Street for limited access and retention of South College Drive.
- **Alternative D**: South College Drive maintained as the main entry with a pedestrian corridor along a vacated 21st Street.

The proposed master plan was originally identified as the preferred "Scheme E." It evolved from refinements and modifications to the other alternatives. The proposed plan synthesizes attributes from the alternatives that were identified in a series of "cottages" community meetings and other campus master planning work sessions.

There have been additional refinements to the preferred master plan (Scheme E) since it was initially prepared. Impacts have been analyzed and the refinements are reflected in the plan drawing (Figure 1).
Proposed Master Plan Concept
Scheme E - Refined
Western Washington University Campus Master Plan EIS
errata, changes, and new information
The following are changes to the WWU Campus Master Plan Draft EIS. The specific change and its page number are identified. The changed pages, for figures and tables only, follow for replacement of the corresponding page in the separate Draft EIS document.

**Draft EIS Page No.** | **Change** | **Corrected Text/References**
--- | --- | ---
1 | Clarification to transmittal memorandum that a limited number of copies of the Draft EIS are available free of charge. When the supply is exhausted, $10 will be charged to cover the cost of copying. | -
1 | Fact sheet place of public hearing was changed from Wilson Library to Lecture Hall 2 due to availability. | -
1 | Table in subsection B: the numbers of students/FTEs were reversed; academic building areas of existing campus and future campus were transposed; administrative/service development area of future campus is 821,981 gsf (not 831,981 gsf). | Existing Campus (1993) | Total Future Campus (2003)

| Land Area | 192 acres | 248 acres |
| Population | | |
| Students/FTEs | 10,150/9,000 | 11,300/10,350 |
| Faculty/Staff/Other | 1,469 | 1,660 |
| Development | | |
| Academic | 20 buildings / 1,204,906 gsf | 26 buildings / 1,581,236 gsf |
| Residential | 3,778 units / 932,800 gsf | 4,486 units / 1,126,800 gsf |
| Administrative/Service | 703,881 gsf | 821,981 gsf |
| Removal | (41,465 gsf) | (41,465 gsf) |
| **TOTAL** | 2,841,617 gsf | 3,488,552 gsf |

- Closing High Street to general traffic and development of a pedestrian/transit mall will allow WTA access and will not adversely impact bus schedules and service.
**9** Under Impacts - Alternative D, elimination of last bullet regarding traffic on 20th Street.

**10** Second bullet under Parking should describe three parking garages, not two.

**19/Figure 3** Several details of the proposed master plan concept have been refined. The graphic is updated.

**20** Add note to Land Acquisition subsection.

**21/Figure 4** Housing core removed from area south of Bill McDonald Parkway.

**23/Figure 6** Change to acquisition area along Garden Street. The one-half block Garden street frontage between Oak Street and Myrtle Street is removed from the proposed acquisition area. Note this reduces the acquisition area by about 2.75 acres.

**32** Alternative D, Traffic Circulation: first bullet should be corrected; delete last bullet (redundant).

**Corrected Text/(References)**

**Alternative D**
- Limited by-pass routes
- No internal cross links
- Transit service only at campus edges
- Increase traffic along campus edges
- Parking/pedestrian access crosses street

- In addition to the TMP, the impact to on-street parking in surrounding neighborhoods can be reduced through construction of additional on-site parking or remote parking lots with a transit shuttle. Three parking structures are identified in the master Plan: one adjacent to the Viking Union; one as a mixed-use development on East College Way; and one on East College Way.

(See Figure 1: Refined Scheme E, page 3.)

**Note:** The proposed acquisition area, amounting to 56 acres, is reduced by about 2.75 acres in the Refined Scheme E. The half-block wide area along Garden Street between Oak and Myrtle Streets is deleted from proposed acquisition. Tabulations and impact analysis are not modified because the larger acquisition identified "worst case" impacts.

(See Revised Figure 4 following.)

(See Revised Figure 6 following.)

**Traffic/Circulation**
- Vacate 21st Street and use as pedestrian route; allow only limited vehicle access to parking.
- Extend East College Way beyond Old Main and connect with Indian Street.

(See Revised Figure 21 following.)

**71/Figure 21** Zone removed south of Bill McDonald Parkway.
"Classifications" should be "classifications."

Addition of item (d) of Land Use Development Ordinance.

Corrections/changes to proposed campus land uses.

Delete last bullet under Alternative D subsection.

Under Mitigating Measures, Transit System Improvements: first paragraph should be deleted.

Under Parking, the second bullet should be corrected to describe three parking structures, not two.

Add fourth paragraph to TMP subsection with timing and program commitment.

Alternative D
- Limited by-pass routes
- No internal cross links
- Transit service only at campus edges
- Increase traffic along campus edges
- Parking/pedestrian access crosses street

Transit System Improvements

In addition to the closure of High Street to non-transit and non-emergency use and associated transit improvements, there are two other transit-related improvements that may occur as part of the master plan. The first potential improvement is implementation of a campus loop shuttle to provide convenient access to all portions of campus. This shuttle would connect the new south campus loop road with West College Way/Highland Drive, High Street, and Garden Street. Another potential improvement would be to provide transit shuttle service between WWU and remote park-and-ride lots.

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) has been initiated by the Vice President of Business and Financial Affairs that will look at campus transportation issues including: traffic and parking on-campus and in the neighboring community; parking demand; alternative transportation modes; continuing a working relationship with Whatcom Transportation Authority; park-and-ride lots; shuttle service; bicycle and pedestrian circulation; and the feasibility of structured parking. The TMP will be developed during the next academic school year with the target form completion being the fall of 1994.
Planned Land Acquisition
WWU Property to be Disposed
Proposed Campus Boundary

(Revised) Figure 6
Proposed Land Acquisition
Western Washington University Campus Master Plan EIS
(Draft EIS page #23)
The general location and approximate capacity of existing streets and rights-of-way within the Institutional area shall be shown relative to the existing circulation system within the Institutional area, as well as those leading to it from nearby arterials.

Future details will be developed as part of the design of campus infrastructure and building projects.

A general description of the existing and planned circulation concepts for the proposal and alternatives is given. The development features also add to the rationale for the proposed land use classifications.

The networks of existing utility facilities and distribution systems are given in this document. (See Public Services and Utilities Section).

WWU will work with the City of Bellingham to coordinate concurrency of development with necessary infrastructure.

A general description of the exiting and planned circulation elements is given in the Transportation Section of the Draft EIS.

The campus plan defines both existing and proposed campus boundaries. Property ownership is identified in the "land acquisition" graphic. The explanation of the land use and circulation concepts for the proposal and alternatives is given. The development features also add to the rationale for the proposed land use classifications.

The networks of existing utility facilities and distribution systems are given in this document. (See Public Services and Utilities Section).

WWU will work with the City of Bellingham to coordinate concurrency of development with necessary infrastructure.

A general description of the exiting and planned circulation elements is given in the Transportation Section of the Draft EIS.

The campus plan defines both existing and proposed campus boundaries. Property ownership is identified in the "land acquisition" graphic. The explanation of the land use and circulation concepts for the proposal and alternatives is given. The development features also add to the rationale for the proposed land use classifications.

The networks of existing utility facilities and distribution systems are given in this document. (See Public Services and Utilities Section).

WWU will work with the City of Bellingham to coordinate concurrency of development with necessary infrastructure.

A general description of the exiting and planned circulation elements is given in the Transportation Section of the Draft EIS.

The campus plan defines both existing and proposed campus boundaries. Property ownership is identified in the "land acquisition" graphic. The explanation of the land use and circulation concepts for the proposal and alternatives is given. The development features also add to the rationale for the proposed land use classifications.

The networks of existing utility facilities and distribution systems are given in this document. (See Public Services and Utilities Section).

WWU will work with the City of Bellingham to coordinate concurrency of development with necessary infrastructure.

A general description of the exiting and planned circulation elements is given in the Transportation Section of the Draft EIS.

The campus plan defines both existing and proposed campus boundaries. Property ownership is identified in the "land acquisition" graphic. The explanation of the land use and circulation concepts for the proposal and alternatives is given. The development features also add to the rationale for the proposed land use classifications.

The networks of existing utility facilities and distribution systems are given in this document. (See Public Services and Utilities Section).

WWU will work with the City of Bellingham to coordinate concurrency of development with necessary infrastructure.
comments and responses
The public review of the Western Washington University Campus Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement occurred from April 26, 1993 to May 25, 1993. The 30-day comment period included a public hearing held on-campus on May 18, 1993. A total of 14 letters were received by the Lead Agency in response to the Draft EIS and they are all included in this section of the Final EIS.

Private Interests
- PLAS Tools/Clyde M. Hackler
- Scot D. Kelley
- John and Noreen Fassler
- Darol Streib
- Steven E. Henson and Molly McLaughlin
- Hal and Joan Downey
- Andy Koch
- Brian Malvey
- Lisa Beck
- Melissa Fackler

Public Agencies
- Whatcom Transit Authority
- State of Washington Department of Community Development, Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
- State of Washington Department of Ecology
- City of Bellingham

A transcript of the Public Hearing that documents public comments is also included in this section of the Final EIS.

Each comment/question requiring a response is identified by the bar code and reference number in the margin, with the corresponding responses adjacent to or following the letter.
Dear Mr. Benner:

I will not be offering public testimony at the May 18th public hearing and please accept this letter as my formal response regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

It is my understanding that the proposed Master Plan for WWU Campus will require the space now occupied by my home and business located at 404 20th Street.

Please understand up front, that left to our own devices we have absolutely no desire to move from this house that we purchased nineteen years ago when we arrived in Bellingham. We selected this house and property because of its proximity to Western, the school district, and the fact that it was on a dead end street, which gave us seclusion, yet centrally located. Three of our four children grew to maturity in this house even though they are not presently living at home, they certainly regard it as home. In fact, they were quite distraught when they learned of the plan.

If it should eventually become necessary that we are required to relocate our domicile there are matters associated with the relocation that the University Administration shall take into consideration. We would certainly want to continue to live in the South Hill area because of the convenience to our work stations, i.e. we would not want to drive half way across Whatcom County to get to our jobs. You should also know that any relocation will disrupt in important ways, my opportunity for gainful employment. Perhaps I should explain for the record, that postprofessional staff members (professors) receive no pay during the summer. This is certainly true in my case. I have established a consulting business under the name of Plas tools with all the City and State permits required to operate at 404 20th Street. This consulting business yields a significant percentage of my annual income which my wife and I are dependent upon. Further, the conditions of my health simply will not allow me to be moving the heavy machinery that I have accumulated and use in my consulting business to produce models and prototypes in order to test designs.

While we have no interest in moving, we certainly support the positive growth and development of the University. We are especially supportive of any plans that will eliminate West College Way, and there by avoiding what I surely believe will be a major disaster. You and I have talked about this before and the accident record on that curve will demonstrate clearly that our luck is running out. I personally attended four complete roll overs, two of which under normal conditions would have produced up to eight fatalities. Trust me, our luck is running out. I can't tell you what an awful feeling it is to know you have to be the first on the scene.

I'm sure that we can work together and agree on arrangements that will be fair and positive that will meet our respective needs and interest. Please give us as much lead time as possible.

I have mostly addressed issues assuming that the Plan E would be the one directing concerns that would require the space occupied by my home. I now would like to respond to Alternative Plans A, C, and D. I do not feel that the noise impacts from a recreation below my house would be tolerable or acceptable.

Sincerely,

Clyde M. Hackler
Owner

May 13, 1993

1 Comment acknowledged.
2 The referenced property is proposed to be acquired by WWU.
3 Comments acknowledged.
4 Comments acknowledged. The Hackler property is zoned single family residential.
5 Traffic circulation improvements, particularly related to safety, are a priority for WWU. The alignment of the West College Way/21st Street/Hill Street connector as a by-pass route is intended to address the noted concerns.
6 Comments acknowledged. WWU is prepared to work fairly with all property owners to reach agreeable arrangements. As much lead time as possible will be given, recognizing that funding appropriates are dependent on State Legislative actions beyond the control of WWU.
7 Comments acknowledged. The refined Scheme E is the preferred WWU master plan concept. The alternatives do create different, and in several instances, greater impacts than the proposal.
May 20, 1993

Rick Benner
Facilities & Master Planning
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement, WWU Master Plan

Dear Mr. Benner:

The "Outback Farm" area south of Fairhaven Residential Complex, designated as 16-P on the Master Plan, has been a valuable academic resource utilized by many students at Western. If this area is re-zoned as residential the students will lose that academic resource. The area is a wetland habitat, a fact that has no doubt been illuminated in previous discussions of the Campus Master Plan. I do not minimize that aspect of the area, but point to students' continuing interest in organic gardening programs offered at the Outback.

Another consideration is also due: In light of the escalating cost of boarding resident students at Western, perhaps it might be less costly to allow the private sector to provide increased student housing. Following the trend of off-campus housing rates we see them paralleling the university increases. As a large, state-administered organization, why should Western compete with the dynamic nature of the private sector?

I have been a student at Western since September 1991, and have witnessed a large number of students use the area. As a resident at Buchanan Towers during the 1992-93 academic year I also have seen many students move off campus. University Housing was not meeting their needs, mainly due to excessive costs. For these reasons I request that the Western Washington University Master Plan be revised to re-zone the wetland area 16-P immediately south of Fairhaven Residential Complex as "academic". Thank you.

Scot D. Kelley
Western Washington University

RESPONSE TO SCOT D. KELLEY

1. Comments acknowledged. The proposed plan has been modified to retain the academic land use designation in the vicinity of the "Outback Farm" (see revised Figure 29: Proposed Land Use, in Section II of this document). The wetland identified by the City of Bellingham at the "Outback Farm" is designated PA-16 (see Draft ES, page 56). The designation uses a two digit system that refers to the watershed (i.e., PA is Padden Creek) and the number locates it in the watershed, numbered consecutively upstream from the mouth. This wetland was identified as Palustrine Emergent (wet pasture) with an area of about 0.3 acres. Additional wetland analysis and delineation will likely be required to determine its functional value and extent, as well as the applicable regulatory requirements.

2. Comments acknowledged. WWU does not want to compete with the private sector related to housing provision and sees the public and private sector offering two different products/services. Off campus, private housing is a reasonable alternative to on-campus student housing. Nonetheless, WWU is committed to providing housing as part of the total University experience envisioned in its educational mission.

3. The recommendations are acknowledged and will be considered by the Lead Agency and the decision-making authority (Board of Trustees).
Rick Benner, Manager
Facilities & Master Planning
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225

May 20, 1993

Dear Mr. Benner,

Following are our concerns/comments on the Campus Master Plan Draft EIS.

1. We are greatly concerned about the "fair market value" referred to in the Draft EIS. As homeowners on 20th Street, we are aware that fair market value will not relocate us in our own neighborhood - to say nothing about the privacy and safety that our street affords us. Adequate compensation needs to allow for relocation to a comparable home and environment, as well as for costs and inconveniences incurred.

2. No timeline is referred to on the purchase of the two properties on 20th Street. As a family who has not moved in eight years, with two children at Lowell School, this is most disturbing to us. Our ability to consider any home improvements, or market our home is all stymied with your lack of commitment to us. We need to have knowledge of your specific time frame so that we may plan for ourselves accordingly. We have sent two letters to the University requesting this information and have received no response. We're angry that we've been ignored, considering this is our home we're referring to.

3. We feel it very important that High Street remain open for the residents and visitors of South Hill. It truly is the only safe route in snow or icy conditions. I'm certain there would be an increase in auto accidents should we be forced to use the other steep access streets.

Please add the above to the other public comments on record concerning the Draft EIS.

Sincerely,

John & Noreen Fassler

---

Rick Benner, Manager
Facilities & Master Planning
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225

RECEIVED
MAY 20 1993

NBBJ PLANNING

RESPONSE TO JOHN AND NOREEN FASSLER

1. Comments acknowledged. Relocation and other costs as well as inconveniences with moving are potential impacts due to the proposed WWU property acquisition. Property acquisition and condemnation proceedings of private property by a public agency are regulated by state law.

2. No specific property acquisition time frame is known because funding must be appropriated by the State Legislature and the timing of their action is unknown. In the latest budget, approved May 1993, no funds were identified for WWU property acquisition. WWU requests will continue to be made for funding.

The noted letters were received by WWU and no information was provided because timing was not known. WWU apologizes for not responding.

3. Comment and impacts acknowledged. High Street is proposed to be closed to public traffic and would be used only for public transit and emergency/service vehicles. However, during extreme weather conditions, WWU and the City of Bellingham will coordinate detour routes. Determination of 'extreme conditions' is made by the City Director of Public Works.
Carl Root  
Planning and Development  
Western Washington University  
Bellingham, WA  

May 20, 1993  

Sir,

Though I was present at the public hearing May 18, I was unable to speak due to time constraints. Herewith are my comments for the record.

Regarding the campus plan and draft E.I.S.

Too much area is dedicated to parking with a permanent sacrifice of natural environment. The university should be promoting alternative transportation. Students, staff and faculty should be issued city bus passes. If the campus plan shows automobile routes, then bicycle routes should be indicated as well. Every new street should have a designated bike lane.

Fairhaven's Outback Gardens should not be sacrificed for housing. Many students are actively involved in these gardens. While there may be some area for housing at the south end toward Buchanan Towers, the wetland and two clusters of fir and cedar trees should not be disturbed. That green area is a continuation of the Sehome Hill ridge and is a valuable buffer zone.

I am concerned that your office received nearly a hundred letters in favor of preserving the Outback Gardens at Fairhaven and that sentiment is not reflected in the final plan or any of the alternate plans.

While the campus planning process gives the appearance of seeking public and student input, in fact the University Administration and Housing seem to have a predetermined agenda and give little attention to the values of others. While cement buildings and parking lots proliferate, we steadily and permanently lose the few remaining examples of our natural environment. Aesthetic values, such as an intact residential neighborhood, or peace and quiet, are sacrificed for sports facilities or parking. We need to do a better job of preserving natural landscapes and building in harmony with them.

The University planning process is a sham when public concerns are ignored. The plan favored by the administration runs like a steamroller over everyone else who is unfortunate enough to participate.

Darol Streib

Response to Darol Streib

1. Comments acknowledged. The campus land area devoted to parking is estimated to remain the same in the future as now exists, at approximately 22.9 acres (see Table 22, page 89 of the Draft EIS). Given the proposed land acquisition, the percentage of the campus for parking decreases. The campus parking supply is reduced by 5% in the proposed campus plan.

Alternative transportation modes, particularly transit and bicycles, are promoted by the recommended Transportation Management Program (see page 126, Draft EIS). Parking demand reduction and discouraging single occupant vehicles are basic objectives. Bicycle routes will be designated where reasonably feasible.

2. Comment acknowledged. Also see Response #1 to Scot D. Kelley.

3. The refined proposed plan has been modified to retain the "academic" designation in the "Outback Farm." (See Revised Figure 29: Proposed Campus Land Use, in Section II of this document.)

4. Comments acknowledged. WWU seeks to improve and enhance the development relationships with the natural campus setting. These goals and objectives are noted in the plan (see pages 15-16 of the Draft EIS).

WWU has complied with the procedural requirements of SEPA related to this environmental review process. In addition, WWU has conducted other community involvement to obtain public input into the master planning.

5. Comment acknowledged. WWU disagrees with the expressed viewpoint.
Dear Mr. Benner:

We are writing to convey our comments on the Campus Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This letter elaborates on and adds to our comments made at the public hearing on May 18, 1993.

First, we would like to thank you and your colleagues, Robert Bruce and Carl Root, for keeping us informed regarding the master planning process, and for taking the time to discuss with us our questions and concerns.

We feel that the proposed Master Plan, Schematic E (Refined), thoughtfully and effectively addresses a number of serious issues facing Western, particularly regarding traffic flows and pedestrian safety. We are also gratified that a number of our earlier concerns have been addressed in this Schematic. At the same time, we share with other neighboring homeowners a number of remaining concerns about the proposed Plan and its potential impacts on the quality of life, and on property values, in our neighborhood. We have several specific comments regarding the Draft EIS:

1. In earlier correspondence we had expressed concern about the uncertainty created by the identification of our property for possible acquisition in Alternatives A-D. We are gratified that our home has been eliminated from the acquisition plan in the proposed concept, Schematic E (Refined). However, the original acquisition boundary that contains our property within it remains in the versions of Alternatives A-D included in the Draft EIS (see Figures 7-10), and refers to that acquisition remain in the text in present tense (see, for example, page 6, column 2; page 7, column 1; and page 90, column 3). The inclusion of such references may convey to a reader unfamiliar with the history of this planning process the mistaken impression that such acquisition is still being actively considered. This continues to impose a cloud of uncertainty over our property that may adversely affect its resale value. We request that any such textual references be removed, and that the acquisition plan in the proposed concept, Schematic E (Refined), be modified to reflect the University's actual present intent, as shown in Schematic E (Refined).

2. We would of course prefer that no homes in the 20th Street neighborhood be designated for acquisition; and we are concerned about the planned acquisition of two parcels at the north end of the street and the general expansion of the campus into this single-family neighborhood. Given that this expansion is part of the proposed concept, however, we wish to see the impacts of that expansion mitigated to the extent possible. The Draft EIS proposes mitigating impacts on housing by offering existing residents "fair market value" is an adequate compensation for the loss of economic value that one receives from his or her property. (If it were, the owner would have already sold voluntarily.) One is never "made whole" by "fair market value" compensation in a forced sale. Payment should be sufficient to compensate the owner for loss of enjoyment of the property and to allow relocation to a comparable setting elsewhere.

3. The "fair market value" of a property must be determined as of some particular point in time. Fair compensation would require that this value be determined as of a time prior to the development, or the public announcement of any development, that may adversely affect the value of the property.

4. The uncertainty created by identification of property for possible acquisition has an immediate adverse impact on its value due to the uncertainty created in the minds of potential buyers. This limits the existing owner's ability to sell, improve, or otherwise enjoy the property. Once property is identified for acquisition, such acquisition should proceed in a timely manner agreeable to the owner. The Draft EIS does not identify any time frame for such acquisitions or other measures for mitigating adverse impacts on property values.

5. The proposed 21st Street - Hill Street connector is likely to have significant impacts on the aesthetic quality of our neighborhood, such as increased traffic noise. These impacts will be exacerbated if the city implements its proposal (referred to on page 125) to extend 21st Street to connect with Old Fairhaven Parkway. The Draft EIS does not adequately address these impacts or possible mitigating measures. For example, at the most recent public meeting the Facilities and Master Planning staff suggested that these impacts might be mitigated by proper grading of the connector, so as to move traffic below the elevation of 20th Street and away from remaining residences. However, the actual location and grading of this connector are not addressed in the Draft EIS. We request that the Final EIS specify more explicitly the location of this connector and other mitigating measures that might be taken.

6. We feel very strongly that preservation of the dead-end barricade at the north end of 20th Street is absolutely essential for maintaining our neighborhood character, our privacy, and our children's safety. We are encouraged by the oral assurances we have received from the Facilities and Master Planning staff that this barricade will be maintained, and indeed may be enhanced by vegetation screens; but it is not included in the Draft EIS. We request that the Master Plan and Final EIS explicitly include the designated designation for 20th Street, together with a physical barrier, vegetation screen, and other measures as may be appropriate to maintain this designation.

7. The Plan does not adequately address the impacts on neighboring residents of the net reduction in parking capacity. Indeed, the Draft EIS explicitly states (for example, on pages 9, 10, and 124-126) that the Plan will increase on-street parking in surrounding neighborhoods. The document refers to a proposed (but apparently not yet existing) Transportation Management Program intended to alleviate these impacts. With no plan in place and no specific mitigation measures proposed, the Draft EIS does not adequately allow the effectiveness of mitigation to be assessed.

May 23, 1993

STEVEN E. HENSON
MOLLY MCLAUGHLIN
520 - 20th Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
(206) 671-2952

Mr. Rick Benner, Manager
Office of Facilities and Master Planning
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225-9122

Mr. Rick Benner, Manager
Mr. Rick Benner, Manager
8. The Draft EIS makes reference in several places to "increased traffic on 20th Street near residences" under Alternative D. (See, for example, page 9, column 3; and page 124, column 3.) It is not clear what this means, or how Alternative D differs from Alternatives A-C and the proposed Schematic E (Refined) in this regard. Is this a typographical error? If not, would this impact occur in our neighborhood under Alternatives A-C or Schematic E (Refined)? We request that this be clarified in the Final EIS.

9. Finally, we understand the problems associated with vehicle/pedestrian conflicts and aesthetics that motivated the proposed closure of High Street through campus. However, because this is the safest route onto and off of South Hill during icy conditions, we request that emergency access during such conditions be incorporated, if possible, into the redesign of this area.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Steven E. Henson
Molly McLaughlin

RESPONSE TO STEVEN E. HENSON/MOLLY MCLAUGHLIN

1. Comments acknowledged.

2. The property acquisition area is different in the Refined Scheme E from the alternatives. The subject property as well as other land west of 20th Street is not proposed for acquisition.

The alternatives are included for purposes of comparatively evaluating environmental impacts and satisfying SEPA requirements (WAC 197-11-440,5). The Refined Scheme E is the WWU proposed course of action.

3. The noted property at the northern end of 20th Street is proposed for acquisition to realign the street given typography and the current traffic hazards. WWU is prepared to work with property owners to reach fair compensation for acquired property.

4. Comments acknowledged. Specific development plans are not yet defined for the proposed property acquisition area. Timing of both acquisition and development are uncertain, given the uncertainty of State funding. Determinations of property value will be made at the appropriate time.

5. Comments acknowledged. As noted in the preceding comments, the timing of the valuation is key. For example, more intense redevelopment of a property could increase its value if the valuation were determined after the redevelopment. Cost/benefit and economic impacts/mitigation are not usual subjects addressed pursuant to SEPA. The proposed master plan addresses a 10-year time frame. The timing of specific property acquisitions is uncertain.
RESPONSE TO HAL AND JOAN DOWNEY

1. The complete hearing transcript (May 18, 1993) is included in this document (see Items 15-19 in the Response to Public Hearing Comments).

2. Numerous Master Planning Committee meetings have been held in the last two years. The public was not regularly notified as to the schedule of this committee. Cottage meetings were held in which the campus community and neighbors of WWU were invited to discuss concepts and process as it evolved.

3. The WWU preferred master plan is Refined Scheme E. The alternatives were analyzed to fulfill environmental review requirements. WWU Board of Trustees action is sought and will be the next step after completing SEPA requirements. Implementation timing, including land acquisition and compensation, cannot be readily defined because it is beyond the control of WWU (i.e. subject to State Legislative action).

4. It is acknowledged that estimated parking demand will exceed supply with a deficit of some 1,040 spaces. Impacts will occur unless parking demand is reduced, such as by an effective TMP to encourage alternative modes of travel or unless additional parking supply is provided on campus. WWU will develop a realistic TMP as part of implementing the master plan.

5. The suggested mitigation is acknowledged and will be considered by WWU.

May 25, 1993

Dr. George Pierce, Ph.D.
V.P., Business and Financial Affairs
Western Washington University
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Dear Dr. Pierce:

This will confirm comments stated during the May 19, 1993, meeting regarding the Master Plan Draft EIS for the ensuing ten years. We have four specific concerns regarding the planning process and the EIS scoring.

First. Even though required environmental review process has probably been met completely, the fact that the plan was in fact initiated at WWU level in early 1990 should have been made known to non-campus interested parties earlier in the process than October 12, 1992.

Second. The impact of a major governmental institution's future plans should be understood before conceptual iteration. The statements contained in the "cottage meetings" and the Draft EIS must either be adopted or clearly declared no longer under consideration when the Final EIS is approved and promulgated. Those which are adopted and have a bearing upon adjacent properties must include an action plan for immediate acquisition or compensation within six months of adoption.

Third. The scope of parking needed during the 10-year plan has been totally under-planned. The proposed TMP must be realistic in real-time and real-budget factors.

Fourth. The prospective impact for us personally is likely to be most noticeable if the completion of the 21st/Hill St/Parkway connections occur. Mitigation to increase buffering for noise and air quality along 20th Street might be greater if lighting for the street and the adjoining areas of campus were all undergrounded (including Cable TV) to avoid tree and shrub interference which presently exists with overhead wires.

We look forward to early resolution to our mutual concern.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Signature]

Hal & Joan Downey
Dear Mr. Root and the Master Plan Committee

As a property owner and former Fairhaven College and WWU student (my address is 113 21st St) I am very concerned about developments on campus in general and 21st Street specifically.

I am upset that more was not done to solicit input from property owners directly affected by these decisions. I took the time to comment on the master plan originally and find it alarming that I was not notified of the outcome or that another comment period was in progress.

If my neighbor had not informed me I would not even have known. Why was I not notified??

I feel strongly that the plan should emphasize alternative transportation to campus, giving priority to carpooling, bus, bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

With enrollment on the rise and budget cuts on the horizon it seems that we should make the best of what we have rather than start new projects. (over)

I object to the rerouting of 21st Street. Already the traffic averages 55-40 mph in front of my house. The speed limit is 25.

Streamlining the street will only make this problem worse creating an even greater hazard to cyclists and pedestrians.

It seems wasteful to me, to destroy a precious urban greenbelt area, when widening the present street adding bike lanes, a pedestrian overpass and a stop light at 21st & College would serve the same purpose at a fraction of the cost.

The money saved could be used to establish priority lots for carpoolers more bike lanes and routes to & through campus and improve the quality of education at WWU.

Please keep me informed on developments of this critical issue and thanks for listening to my comments.

733-7464 Andy Koch 1113-21st Bellingham, WA
1. Prior public comments on the various master plan alternatives were utilized by WWU staff to prepare the currently proposed Refined Scheme E. Notifications of the Draft ES availability and comment period were sent to some 200 people in the vicinity of the WWU campus that have shown a continuing interest in the process. The original mailing list included some 600 people, including property owners 300 feet outside of the proposed property acquisition area. Notices were also published in the Bellingham Herald and the Western Front.

2. At the time when WWU used Whatcom County Assessor's Office records to identify property owners 300 feet outside the proposed property acquisition area, Andy Koch's name did not surface.

3. Comment acknowledged. The plan does emphasize alternative campus transportation modes, particularly transit, bicycles, and pedestrian. The High Street transit mall and its related facilities are intended to make this option attractive and highly accessible. Pedestrian and bicycle use is a major focus of the master plan. (See Draft ES, page 125.)

4. Current WWU enrollment is limited to 9,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students. The plan anticipates that this state-controlled limit will be increased to 10,050 FTE students. Limited funding availability is acknowledged.

   The plan does include a series of "preservation and renewal projects," which intend to "make do" with existing facilities by extending their useful life and making necessary code and life-safety improvements.

5. Comment acknowledged. The extension of 21st Street is intended to eliminate existing safety hazards with the roadway alignment, grades, and poor visibility. Enforcement of posted speed limits is the responsibility of the City of Bellingham, with both the Bellingham and WWU Police Departments providing law enforcement.

6. See Response #5 above.

7. Comments acknowledged. The specific improvements are not yet defined and costs are not detailed. The suggestions will be considered in the preparation of actual design concepts.

8. Cost savings are not certain and will be investigated.

9. Comment acknowledged. The name is added to the WWU mailing list and future notices/correspondence will be provided.
I am very concerned about Western Washington University's proposal to develop the wetland/wildlife habitats on south campus. I also find inexcusable the Master Plan's provision of no reasonable alternative to the development of these habitats among its five options. Not one alternative to the destruction of the last remaining natural environments on campus!

Given the continued degradation of Earth's environment -- what values does this proposal express to students? Our physical campus gives WWU the opportunity to let the world know what we stand for. Is this what we stand for? The destruction of living habits whose ecological, educational, and aesthetic value is immeasurable.

I am especially concerned with the proposed development of the habitat adjacent Sehome Hill, known as the Outback.

Beyond the area's intrinsic natural beauty and the sanctity of its living creatures, this wetland habitat represents a rich and evolving educational resource for the university. In addition to classes offered at Fairhaven College and its use as a living laboratory by biology students, independent study projects initiated by students have thrived at the Outback. Perhaps the most important project is the rehabilitation of the habitat's wetland. Students, with the help of faculty and wetland professionals, are not only learning how to enhance wetlands -- they are learning how to teach others this process. A curriculum is being developed for local school children.

Sustainable agriculture, appropriate technology, environmental education -- Outback students are trying to learn the skills necessary to nurture the planet back to health. If nurtured, the Outback can provide unlimited opportunity for future projects. Once it is developed, however, this living educational resource is lost......forever!

Even partial development of the wetland will cause irreparable damage to its habitat and to the Outback as an educational resource. The Outback is more than a place to set up shop, more than a small patch with raised beds for organic gardening classes. The wildlife habitat is a living system, a microcosm of the Earth. It inspires students to raise their environmental consciousness and prepare themselves to help the human race adjust its presently destructive relationship with nature. This very important wetland and educational resource must be protected.

I also am concerned with the impact development of that wetland will have on the forest habitat of the Sehome Hill Arboretum. A natural extension of the hill, the wetland well could be called the Sehome Hill Wetland. The forest habitat and the wetland habitat overlap each other, and the wetland serves as a natural source of water for both.

Though WWU proposes no development for the hill, further study is needed to determine the full impact wetland development would have on the forest habitat. But one thing is certain. Placed wetland wildlife surviving development of the Outback will seek refuge in the neighboring arboretum, disrupting the delicate natural balance existing within the forest habitat.

The Outback, a natural base for tours through the arboretum, also represents an educational resource for the hill, itself an under-used resource.

The dynamic educational philosophy of encouraging students to actively develop projects not formally offered by WWU means Outback students may play an important role in the future rehabilitation of the arboretum's forest. Many of the arboretum's Douglas-fir trees are infected with a destructive root fungus and strategic planting of trees not affected by the fungus, such as Western Red Cedars, may be needed to assure the formation of a climax forest. Douglas-fir represent the dominant species on the WWU-owned portion of the hill, running along the east side of campus from Old Main to the Outback. The fungus appears to be most concentrated in that area. If the Outback is developed, however, the opportunity for students to assist in and learn from such a project is lost......forever!

The Outback's wetland habitat needs to be protected to allow the continuation and future development of its potential as educational resource. It should be allowed the same protective status as the WWU-owned portion of Sehome Hill, with a special designation for academic uses. To fully protect the habitat, its wetland should be buffer from new development by a minimum of 100 ft. on all sides. This wetland needs room to grow.

I realize WWU needs room to grow, too. But even if the university decided to zone the Outback wetland for housing, its limited bonding capacity would prevent the construction of any units for nearly a decade. Why zone a valuable environmental and educational resource for destruction ten years in advance? Such a zoning decision will make it much more difficult for the Outback to attract funds from grants and contributions -- funds for the university.

In order to meet WWU's need for off-campus land for other uses, the university should enter into negotiations with the City of Bellingham for the acquisition of the city-owned recreation field at the bottom of Arboretum Drive, a few hundred feet east of the Outback. That parcel is roughly the same size as the wetland, and it was protected and nurtured. The field of play was developed for Open Space/Recreation and would not require the costly filling and mitigation measures the university would face in developing the wetland habitat. In the past, the city has been very reasonable and flexible in its effort to protect wetlands and natural open space. I encourage university planners to do the same.

I am very concerned,
Brian Malvey
President A.S. Friends of Sehome Hill
1. Comment acknowledged. The proposal (and alternatives) will impact wetland/wildlife habitats identified in the Draft EIS (see page 57). Mitigating measures are proposed to reduce/eliminate significant adverse impacts (see Draft EIS, page 58).

2. Comments acknowledged. The campus plan reflects the values of the expressed WWU mission.

3. Comment acknowledged. The "Outback Farm" is within the identified Wetland PA-16. The extent and value of this wetland are not yet determined.

4. Comments acknowledged.

5. Comments acknowledged.

6. Comment acknowledged. The impact is noted in the Draft EIS (see page 57).

7. Comment acknowledged. The impact is noted in the Draft EIS (see page 57).

8. No wetlands are identified in the Forest Habitat of Sehome Hill (see Draft EIS, page 55). However, habitats and flora/fauna are features of this forested area. Wetlands are identified in the Urban/Wetland and Stream Interface Habitat, including Wetland PA-16 at the "Outback Farm".

9. Comments acknowledged. As noted in the Draft EIS, "edge habitats" (where two different environmental conditions meet; in this case, between a more natural preserve and human activity) often have greater wildlife usage (see Draft EIS, page 56). The delineation of the wetland and its habitat values may need to be better defined in the future when specific development is proposed.

10. Comment acknowledged.

11. Comments acknowledged. The referenced forest pathogen is estimated to infect some 6.5 hectares of the Arboretum (see Draft EIS, page 53 and Appendix B, item #26, page 136).

12. Comments acknowledged. The width of wetland buffer is dependent on the category of wetland per the City of Bellingham Wetland and Stream regulatory chapter.

The category of the "Outback Farm" wetland has not been determined. Setbacks range from a minimum of 100 feet for Category I wetlands to 50 feet and 25 feet for Categories II and III, respectively. The definition of the wetland categories (Ordinance 12691) is adjacent.

13. The campus master plan is a long-term vision of future improvements to WWU. Uncertainty with funding and the extended timing for actual project implementation are acknowledged.

14. Arboretum land has not been included in WWU's land use planning; however, the City of Bellingham is currently updating its Open Space Plan and has engaged in discussion with WWU regarding this area.

050 WETLAND CATEGORIES

A. Category I Wetland: Wetlands which have a high resource value based on ecological diversity, the presence of rare wetland communities and are sensitive to disturbance. These wetlands have one or more of the following features:

1. Contain documented habitat for endangered, threatened or rare plant, fish or animal species recognized by state of federal agencies.

2. Contain irreplaceable or rare wetland types in the Puget Sound Basin. These types are sphagnum bogs, marine influenced wetlands, and mature, forested wetlands.

3. Are comprised of three or more wetland classes, as defined by the Classification of Wetlands and Deep Water Habitats of the United States, published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington D.C., 1979, one of which may be persistent open water, and are undeveloped.

B. Category II Wetland: Wetlands not included in Category I, but still have a moderate resource value based on their functions. These wetlands have one or more of the following features:

1. They are contiguous with any regulated stream or lake.

2. Contain documented habitat for sensitive plant, fish or animal species recognized by state of federal agencies.

3. Contain three or more wetland classes, but do not meet Category I criteria.

4. Are abutting designated public open space, park or greenways corridors and are over 10,000 square feet in area.

5. Provide a significant and necessary storm water management function, such as retention/detention, without alteration, thus avoiding the need to construct artificial facilities.

C. Category III Wetland: All wetlands not included in Category I or II wetlands. Category III wetlands include, but are not limited to, wetlands not contiguous with a regulated stream, lake or designated open space, park or greenway corridor with no endangered, threatened, rare, or sensitive plant, fish or animal species or rare wetland types. These wetlands have only one or two wetland class types and do not serve a necessary storm water management function. Generally they provide only low value habitat functions.
Dear Mr. Root:

I have two serious objections to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the University's Master Plan.

The first is with the product: The preferred alternative plan places an excess of emphasis upon automobile transportation. There are too many parking lots, too many trees being cut down for cars, and too much traffic. More consideration should be placed upon alternatives such as buses and bicycles. Particularly ill-advised is the extension and straightening of 21st Street. This should be deleted from the plan as unnecessary and dangerous.

The second is with the process. Even though I am a neighbor to the University, and was initially informed about the Master Planning Process, I received no notice of the recent DEIS or the comment period, until a neighbor mentioned it. On these grounds I suggest that the process is seriously flawed and should be reconsidered from the start.

Sincerely,

Lisa K. Beck
1020 21st St.
Bellingham WA 98225
May 21, 1993

Dear Mr. Benner,

I am writing on behalf of the land referred to as "Outback". I also wrote a few years ago on the same subject. It is an ongoing concern of myself and many others who either are unaware that this is coming up again or who can’t get a letter to you at this time for whatever reason. And I too speak for the animals, plants, young children seven generations down the road and the just plain ignorant people that if told would be in agreement.

The decision to bulldoze Outback is a bad one. From the position of the campus architects perhaps it is aesthetically the best place. From the standpoint of all that I mentioned in the first paragraph of this letter, to keep it as Outback is the wisest decision. There are numerous considerations that make more sense to leave it as Outback that outweigh the logical strategic move to build housing on that land.

First, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in the WWU Master Plan needs to be changed. It is WWU's last remaining wetland habitat. It will destroy plant and animal life. People need the company of the natural world. People start behaving strangely when too separated from its multidimensional aesthetics. There are numerous opportunities for learning opportunities for WWU's students and the broader Bellingham community and beyond. I believe the zoning ought to be changed to "academic". I am happy to discuss in person with you the many opportunities this zoning change would offer.

I ask you to consider the many silent voices as well as any vocal objections to this needless wetland destruction. Please consider a "reasonable alternative". As I say this I am entirely certain that I speak for all that I listed in my first paragraph. Please go inside and feel these words with your heart and consider carefully. You will be making a better decision to change the WWU Plan in favor of what I have just spoken of in the very long run for many reasons. I thank you for your serious consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Melissa Fackler
590 Inez St.
Bow, Wa. 98232
(206) 766 6536
May 17, 1993

Dr. George Pierce, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
Western Washington University
Old Main / Room 310
Bellingham, Washington 98225

RE: Testimony on W.W.U. Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear George:

We appreciate the close working relationship that Western Washington University and the Whatcom Transportation Authority have had in developing the transportation elements of the W.W.U. Campus Master Plan. We are very supportive of the concept identified as "Schematic E - Refined" in the April 1993 W.W.U. Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

As we have indicated throughout our discussions with W.W.U., access of W.T.A. public transportation services to the street network serving W.W.U. is essential for W.T.A. service to W.W.U. students, faculty, and staff as well as neighborhoods surrounding the campus. We feel that the concepts outlined in the draft EIS will provide the W.T.A. with access needed to ensure the efficient and cost-effective delivery of public transportation services to W.W.U. and the Bellingham community.

W.T.A. comments on the Draft EIS are as follows:

1. The W.T.A. is very supportive of developing a Pedestrian/Transit Mall for High Street with other transit amenities. We were concerned that page nine of the EIS labeled "Transit Service" states: "Closing High Street to general traffic to allow restricted use for transit vehicles may impact bus schedule and other service". It is the W.T.A.'s understanding that the proposal would not restrict use of transit vehicles on High Street. We request removal of the sentence or clarification of language. Based on the W.T.A.'s understanding of our discussion with W.W.U. we recommend that the sentence be rewritten to reflect: Closing High Street to general traffic and development of a Pedestrian/Transit Mall will allow W.T.A. access and will not adversely impact bus schedules and service.

2. The W.T.A. is supportive of efforts of W.W.U. to develop modified roadway design standards for High Street with which to develop a Pedestrian/Transit Mall.

3. The W.T.A. is supportive of changes proposed to South Campus roadways and improved pedestrian and transit access to the "South Gateway". It is our understanding based on review of "Schematic E - Refined" the connector road from 21st Street will be built with the appropriate roadway geometrics to allow for 40-foot long, 102-inch wide transit coaches to make necessary turns. We request that as the plans are developed for these roadway elements, that W.W.U. work closely with the City of Bellingham Public Works Engineering Division and the W.T.A. to ensure that the roadway elements and parking are located in a manner to ensure safety and appropriate traffic flow.

The issues that the W.T.A. has identified above are more fully explained and documented in W.T.A. correspondence to:

- Robert Bruce, February 28, 1992
- George Pierce, December 21, 1992
- Robert Bruce, April 14, 1993

If you have additional questions, please contact Rick Gordon, W.T.A. Service Development Coordinator, or me at 676-6843. We look forward to a close partnership between the W.T.A. and W.W.U. with which to achieve W.W.U.'s Master Plan and vision and address regional and community alternative transportation needs.

Sincerely,

Martin Minkoff,
W.T.A. General Manager

cc: Chairperson and Members of the W.T.A. Board of Directors
    Robert Bruce, W.W.U. Special Assistant to the President
    Patricia Decker, City of Bellingham, Director Planning and Community Development
    Tom Rosenberg, City of Bellingham, Engineering Division

May 17, 1993
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1. Comment acknowledged.

2. The noted correction is acknowledged and is completed in this Final EIS. (See Section II, page 4 of this document).

3. WWU will coordinate specific roadway/pedestrian improvements with WTA to assure that mutual objectives are met.

4. Comment acknowledged. See response to #3 above.

5. The referenced correspondence is on file at the WWU Office of Facilities and Master Planning and will be utilized when more detailed project implementation occurs.
May 21, 1993

Mr. Rick Benner, Manager
Office of Facilities and Master Planning
26th & Douglas
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225

Log: 043093-16-WWU
Re: WWU Campus Master Plan DEIS

Dear Mr. Benner:

The Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) is in receipt of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Western Washington University Campus Master Plan. From the document I understand that this action will provide a framework for campus development for the next ten years.

In response, I concur with the plan's finding that adoption of the plan will have no adverse effect upon historic resources on campus. As is mentioned, Old Main is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Any rehabilitation work performed at Old Main should be done in accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (copy enclosed).

Further, we note from Tables 14 and 30 that eight existing campus buildings were constructed on or before 1950. The Canada House and Stearns House were also constructed during this time period. Therefore, I recommend that a survey be conducted of historic resources on campus to evaluate eligibility for listing in the National and/or State Registers of Historic Places. Results of the survey and evaluation process should be incorporated as part of the University's campus planning process. In general, we recommend that any buildings or structures eligible for listing in the National or State Registers should be maintained and preserved. Accordingly, rehabilitation work on eligible properties should be in conformance with the enclosed Standards. As evidenced by the existence of outstanding buildings such as Old Main and Edens Hall, preservation of WWU's historic properties clearly enhances the scale and quality of the campus' built environment and enriches the academic experience for students and faculty.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIS. Should you have further questions or would like information about conducting a survey of historic resources at the University, please feel free to contact me at (206) 753-9116 or SCAN 234-9116.

Sincerely,

Gregory A. Griffith
Comprehensive Planning Specialist

WWU will consider the recommended historical resources survey to evaluate these buildings' eligibility for National/State Historic Register listing. It is also acknowledged that any work on eligible historic properties will be in conformance with the rehabilitation standards.

Mr. Rick Benner
May 21, 1993
Page Two

State of Washington
Department of Community Development
Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

RESPONSE TO STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1. The comment is correct.
2. Comment acknowledged. WWU will comply with the noted rehabilitation standards for any work performed on Old Main.
3. In addition to Old Main (constructed in 1895), there are 10 buildings (including the two "houses") constructed on or before 1950 (listed in Table 14, page 73 and Table 30, page 113 of the Draft EIS):

   - Edens Hall South: 1921
   - Wilson Library: 1928
   - Miller Hall: 1943
   - Central Heating/Steam Plant: 1948
   - College Hall: 1947
   - Fine Arts Building: 1950
   - Canada House: 1920
   - Carver Gymnasium: 1936
   - Performing Arts Center: 1950
   - Stearns House: 1925

WWU will consider the recommended historical resources survey to evaluate these buildings' eligibility for National/State Historic Register listing. It is also acknowledged that any work on eligible historic properties will be in conformance with the rehabilitation standards.

4. Comment acknowledged.
May 21, 1993

Mr. George Pierce
Western Washington University
Old Main, Room 310
Bellingham, WA 98225

Dear Mr. Pierce:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for your Campus Master Plan. We reviewed the DEIS and have the following comments.

The final environmental impact statement (FEIS) should address wetlands mitigation more specifically, including a summary of wetland impacts and mitigation measures. The completion of a wetlands report, as specified on page 3, will be essential to assessing wetland impacts of acreage, function, and value. The DEIS does not address these criteria adequately.

Placement of fill in wetlands may require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. We advise the applicant to contact the Corps to determine if a permit is needed.

Ecology recommends that a buffer of native vegetation be retained to protect the functions and values provided by the wetlands. The FEIS should address wetland buffers in relation to the wetlands to be protected, created or enhanced. Ecology staff would be glad to assist in determining appropriate buffer widths.

Due to the flooding and water quality problems in Bellingham, reduction of surface water quality and quantity impacts could be mitigated by compliance with the Puget Sound Stormwater Manual.

If you have any questions, please call Mr. Mark Bentley with our Wetlands Section at (206) 493-9262.

Sincerely,

Rebecca J. Inman
Environmental Review Section

Mark Bentley, Wet
May 25, 1993

Rick Benner, Manager
Office of Facilities & Master Planning
26th and Douglas
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225

RE: WWU Master Plan DEIS

Dear Rick:

Thank you for presenting WWU’s proposed Master Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) at the City’s May 13 Technical Review Committee meeting. As was indicated in the meeting, our comments primarily focus on traffic and circulation.

1. There is no mention in the draft regarding the operation of the Samish Interchange. The interchange at the overpass has a very low level of service, and we believe that traffic from WWU has a considerable impact. The overpass is a critical location and should be acknowledged as such in the report.

2. The intersection of Samish Way and Byron Street should also be included in the study. This intersection is congested on a daily basis. We have assumed that a major component of its traffic is from WWU.

3. The 21st Street connection to Old Fairhaven Parkway is a key element of WWU’s circulation plan. The feasibility of the extension of 21st Street deserves some discussion due to the recent action by the Bellingham City Council deleting the project from the City’s Six-Year Construction Program. In addition, there should be some mention in the DEIS of the management of a future intersection of 21st Street and Old Fairhaven Parkway and its compatibility with the intersection at 24th Street. The 24th Street intersection may require signalization when area build-out occurs.

4. The geometrics of 21st Street and W. College Way should be reviewed to determine if intersection angles and lane assignments are practical and feasible to accommodate vehicle movements safely and efficiently.

5. The City would be opposed to any proposal to restrict access by transit vehicles to High Street.

6. The University should address the overall parking issue and the impact on the adjacent neighborhoods. Transportation demand management programs, permit parking systems, increased parking fees and fines, park and ride lots and other methods should be evaluated as mitigating measures.

7. We will be happy to work with the University during the Bellingham comprehensive plan update process to design a system into the neighborhood plans that will allow institutional zoning to take effect on properties purchased by WWU. This system would apply only to properties inside your identified property acquisition zones.

Again thank you for including the City of Bellingham in your master planning process. If you have questions about these comments, please contact Greg Aucutt of my staff or Tom Rosenberg in the Public Works Department.

Sincerely,

C Mayor Tim Douglas
Patricia Decker, Director
Tom Rosenberg, DPW

Joann R. Smith
Planning Manager
RESPONSE TO CITY OF BELLINGHAM

1. Level of services (LOS) was calculated at the Samish Way/I-5 Southbound Ramps intersection to provide an indication of traffic operations at the Samish Way Interchange. This intersection currently operates at LOS B during the PM peak hour. In the year 2002, the intersection is expected to operate at LOS E without the additional traffic generated by the Western Washington University Master Plan and LOS F with the additional traffic. Minor improvements to add a protected eastbound and westbound left-turn phase at the intersection would improve the level of service to LOS D in 2002 with or without the project. WWU should only be responsible for a proportionate share contribution to improvements at this intersection, based on the ratio of project-generated to total traffic volumes entering the intersection or other equitable method. Project-generated volumes from the proposed WWU Master Plan represent three percent of the total entering PM peak hour volumes at this intersection. Furthermore, if 21st Street is extended to connect with Old Fairhaven Parkway, traffic volumes at the Samish Way interchange would be reduced and level of service would be improved.

2. Because the Samish Way/Byron Street intersection is next to the Samish Way/I-5 Southbound Ramps intersection, level of service is expected to be similar. This intersection was not included in the analysis because impacts from the proposed WWU Master Plan are not expected to be significant. The 21st Street extension to Old Fairhaven Parkway would also reduce traffic volumes from WWU at this intersection.

3. Even though the Bellingham City Council deleted the extension of 21st Street to Fairhaven Parkway from the Six-Year Construction Program, WWU supports the project. This extension would improve accessibility to the WWU campus from the south and would reduce the amount of campus-generated traffic at the I-5/Samish Way interchange and Byron Street/Samish Way intersection. Because this intersection would be approximately 1,000 feet west of the Old Fairhaven Parkway/24th Street intersection, a traffic signal at 21st Street could be designed to be compatible with a new signalized intersection at 24th Street.

4. The specific geometric design of the new 21st Street/West College Way intersection has not been determined. This intersection will be designed to ensure that vehicle movements are accommodated in a safe and efficient manner.

5. The proposed master plan will not restrict access by transit vehicles to High Street.

6. WWU will implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to encourage students and employees to use alternative travel modes to and from campus as part of the Master Plan (see page 126 of the Draft EIS). The TMP may include increased parking fees for single occupant vehicles and transit pass subsidies for students and employees.

7. Comments acknowledged. WWU looks forward to the opportunity to work with the City of Bellingham on zoning implementation for acquired properties.
PUBLIC HEARING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
MAY 18, 1993

DR. PIERCE: Good Evening. It's Tuesday, May 18th, 1993. My name is Dr. George Pierce. I'm the Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs at the University and the responsible official for the Western Washington University Master Plan Environmental Impact Statement. I will be conducting the public hearing tonight, and would like to welcome you all here this evening. The purpose of tonight's public hearing is to take comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and for the proposed Western Washington University Campus Master Plan.

As you can see, we have a court reporter up front who will make a transcription of all comments so we will have an accurate record of the comments made here this evening. We would appreciate it if you would come forward to the microphone, for those of you who will be speaking to the group, and speak clearly and slowly so that the court reporter can keep up with you. If there is a question, she might ask you to stop and repeat your comments.

If you have written comments, we would appreciate receiving those once you have completed your verbal testimony. There is a sign up sheet at the table by the door. You should have indicated on that sheet if you want to speak tonight, or if you just want to be placed on the mailing list to receive more information, or perhaps both. I'll be using that list to call the speakers, so if you wish to speak and you haven't signed up, please do so now, and Carl will bring the list to me.

We want everyone to have an opportunity to speak, so if there are a substantial number of speakers, I may have to limit your time. But please be assured that we'll give you as much opportunity to speak as you would like, however there are others in line behind you.

If you have additional comments or wish not to speak this evening, you can submit written comments until May 25th with Rick (phonetic), Facilities of Master Planning, Western Washington University, Bellingham Washington, 98225.

The notice of this hearing and the availability of the Draft EIS was published in the Bellingham Herald in accordance with the SEPA regulations and Washington Administrative Code, section 197-11. In addition, we sent notices to citizens who have attended past Master Plan meetings or have expressed an interest in the campus plan.
Western Washington University has been working with our neighbors in a series of college meetings to prepare this Master Plan. This hearing is another step towards assuring your participation and obtaining your input. The process began with the publication on October 12, 1992 and requests for input on the scope of the EIS. The comments were received until November 15, 1992. The Draft EIS was issued to the public on October 26, 1993. There is a 30-day public comment period now under way, with all comments due no later than May 25, 1993, as I previously mentioned. We have copies of the Draft EIS available for you tonight, if you need them for information purposes. Copies are also available at Western's Wilson Library Resource Services Reserve Room in the Bellingham Public Library downtown in the Fairhaven branch and at the Facilities and Master Planning Office at 25th and Douglas.

The next steps are preparation and final issuance of a Final EIS which will primarily put restrictions upon the Draft EIS. The timing of the step is within the next one to two months. The Western Washington University Board of Trustees can then consider the Proposed Master Plan and all the related records, and take action on this proposal. We expect this to occur on July 8, 1993. W.W.U. will then proceed with detailing of the Master Plan implementation.

As I mentioned earlier, the purpose for us tonight is to take public comments on the Draft EIS. We will be able to respond to procedural questions as well as make some clarifications, however, other substantive questions will be responded to in the Final Draft Environment Impact Statement.

At this point, we would like to present a very brief summary of the Proposed Master Plan. Please see the Draft EIS for details of the Master Plan as well as the Environmental Impact Analysis. Mr. Robert 'Base' (phonetic), the Master Planning architect, will highlight the process and the eventual projected process.

MR. BRUCE: Many friendly faces out there tonight. If you would feel more comfortable coming down if you can't hear me, since there's a small group tonight, I will answer questions on process for each one of the items before we get into the EIS -- that's the planning process. Vince will answer questions on the EIS process.

A very brief summary: Western's Campus Master Plan began in March of 1990 with a charge from then
President Ken Mortimer to develop a comprehensive, physical Master Plan.

A Master Plan Committee was formed and comprised of the faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The Master Plan Committee met regularly and followed a scope of work. This is something that we've probably shown many of you at cottage meetings, and it's entered in the record as Exhibit No. 1. It basically defines what the Master Plan Committee was going to do with their charge.

A Master Plan Advisory Group was also formed, made up of university personnel and representatives from City and County government offices to serve as a review board and provide additional input. They met with us on a regular basis, as needed, through the scope of the work.

An Institutional Profile was developed that documents existing conditions on and around campus. The physical environment, circulation patterns, and traffic flows on campus were analyzed, as well as the documentation of utilities, emergency response, landscape, and land use classifications. This is Exhibit No. 2, and this will comprise the base work or lay out type for our Final Master Plan. Same sort of elements.

Information was collected from Student Services, Housing and Dining, Athletic Programs and the Physical Plant. Also considered were off campus influences, such as City of Bellingham Comprehensive Plan and input from the Master Plan Advisory Committee.

Also considered was a space inventory from Space Administration, Registration/Enrollment information from the Registrar's and Admission's office, Financial Statements, and Capital Budget Requests from the Budget Office, and input from Western's Board of Trustees. We've met and provided evidence reports at certain times during the course of the initial draft.

The Master Planning staff divided the campus into study zones to allow for a more detailed look at the positive and negative conditions on and around campus. This is identified as Exhibit No. 3, okay? Most of you have seen this before.

Also, a Strategic Planning Committee was formed by the University to put together a strategic planning report. This report summarizes the committee's view of the academic future of Western Washington University. The Master Plan is intended to review program goals and directions identified in the
strategic report and to develop physical improvements to the campus needed to support these goals. That's Exhibit 4.

Concepts A, B, C, and D were developed as a result of a series of charrettes, or brainstorming sessions, in which the major elements of the schematic plans were discussed and debated. The plans were then presented to and reviewed by various governmental agencies, such as the City of Bellingham Planning Department, Buildings and Codes, Public Works, Police Department, Fire Department, the Whatcom Transit Authority, and the Mayor's Neighborhood Advisory Commission. These are Exhibits 5, 6, 7, and 8, A B C and D.

A campus parking and transportation study was completed by an outside consultant that reviewed the existing parking system and analyzed impacts of the four schematic plans.

A series of cottage meetings were held to meet and discuss the concepts with the campus community and the neighbors of the University.

All comments were compiled and used to develop a single plan, Scheme E, which contained elements from the previous plans. Scheme E was presented to Western's Board of Trustees and endorsed as the preferred plan. Exhibit 10.

Since then, refinements have been made and are reflected in Scheme E-Refined, Exhibit 11, and this exhibit is in, I imagine it's the first page or second page of the draft.

Scheme E-Refined is currently undergoing this EIS process with public hearings and review by regulatory groups and City, County, and State agencies. Any revisions arising from the EIS review will be reflected in the final EIS and brought to the Board for approval as the conceptual plan. The conceptual plan will then be used as a controlling element, as the more detailed elements of the Master Plan are developed.

Any questions as to procedures on the planning process? It's a small group tonight.

First, would you please state your name and address?

MR. RENAUD: My name is Andrew Renaud. My address is 1316-23rd Street, Bellingham, Washington.

MR. BRUCE: How do you spell your name?

MR. RENAUD: R-e-n-a-u-d.

MR. BRUCE: Thank you.

MR. RENAUD: What mailing list did you use to send out the notice of the meeting? Because I've been
in all of them, and I didn't get a notice. I was just curious.

MR. BRUCE: The meeting tonight?

MR. RENAUD: Yeah.

MR. BRUCE: Carl Root is in charge of our information process, but I understand we were required to advertise through a newspaper of public record.

MR. RENAUD: You said that you sent notices about the meeting to people that have been interested in the past?

MR. BRUCE: Yes.

MR. RENAUD: And I sent in comments, and I've attended meetings, and I've talked to Carl several times, and I didn't get a notice, and I was just wondering who did.

DR. PIERCE: Go ahead, Carl.

MR. ROOT: For the on campus people, we relied on the Western Front and ft,~< to get the information out, and the mailing lists made up of people outside campus. The original mailing list that we began with was property owners 300 feet outside of the proposed land acquisition zone, with that comprised of approximately over 600 property owners. Those that responded asking to be involved in the project, responded with some interest, stayed on the mailing list, and that was over 200, and over 200 went out this last time notifying them of the Draft EIS and the public hearing.

MR. DOWNEY: Hal Downey, 504-20th Street, Bellingham. My question is, do we have a representative of the City Planning Department here tonight?

MR. BRUCE: I'm not sure that we do. They were notified. We have met with them officially, okay, as late as last week, I believe, in their Technical Review Committee, yes, and they will provide oversight and comment on the Draft.

MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.

MR. OLSEN: Hal Olsen, 612-20th Street. Am I correct that we have no independent person representing, being represented in this hearing? We do only have college personnel; is that correct?

DR. PIERCE: We have the consultant from NBBJ who drew up the Environmental Impact Statement, the Draft.

MR. OLSEN: Who is he? Is he independent?

DR. PIERCE: He's a consultant for the University.

MR. OLSEN: So, he's hired by the University. He's not independent.
MR. BRUCE: He is independent.

MR. OLSEN: No, he's hired by the University for a fee.

MR. BRUCE: For a fee, yes, but the University was the lead agency, sir, in the EIS process.

MR. OLSEN: But he's not independent.

MR. BRUCE: That's true. He gets paid.

MR. OLSEN: So we don't have any independent representation at the hearing.

DR. PIERCE: Other than the people in the audience. I'm assuming you're here as an independent person.

MR. OLSEN: Should we not have somebody independent?

DR. PIERCE: I'm not sure what your point is, sir. Are you concerned that we should find somebody independent to work on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement --

MR. OLSEN: Evaluate, yes.

DR. PIERCE: Committee, as Mr. Bruce mentioned?

MR. OLSEN: Where are they tonight?

DR. PIERCE: We have one member I see in the audience, who's a student chair in that committee. I'm here this evening.

MR. OLSEN: But he's (sic) a student at Western, so he's not independent.

DR. PIERCE: The individuals who are setting on those groups will be receiving copies of this testimony. They will have the full record in front of them as they make their full recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

MR. OLSEN: I just want to define that there's nobody independent, okay?

DR. PIERCE: In terms of your speaking, no, there's no one.

Yes, Helen?

HELEN: I want to clarify -- my name is Helen... by independent, so that that person is a contractor, and we contract to the University who contracts him to do the job. They are paid to do the job, but they are not employed by the University otherwise.

MR. OLSEN: But, you're a student, right?

HELEN: Yes.

MR. OLSEN: So, you're paying a fee for your tuition, right?

HELEN: Au-hau.

MR. OLSEN: Okay. You're not independent.

DR. PIERCE: If there's no further point of
clarification, I'd like to proceed with the public
comments. Again, I will be referring to this sign-up
sheet, and we'll be calling speakers to the microphone
in the order that they signed up. Please come to the
front so that our court reporter and the audience can
hear you. Once again, please say and spell your name,
and provide your address before you make your
comments. The first speaker is Brian Malvey.

While he comes to the front, I think I misspoke
earlier when I said that the Draft EIS was issued to
the public in October. I did mean April 26, 1993.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MR. MALVEY: My name is Brian Malvey. My
address is 1001 Mason Street. I'm a Fairhaven student
and a member of a student organization called Friends
of Sehome Hill.

First of all, I'd like to thank you, all the
people who worked in the planning process, for putting
all this time and effort into the plan. For the most
part, they did a good job. It's a creative way of
dealing with a lot of the problems that Western's
facing in the future. I'd like to also apologize for
being one of the people who wasn't involved in the
process earlier on and has come in at the tail end of
the process with some criticism of part of the
project.

But there are some important concerns with the
project concerning the way that the natural
environment is treated, and it's not just important
for the preservation of the natural environment, it's
also important for the University and for what type of
university Western is going to be in the future.

One of the problems I have with the Draft EIS
Statement is, there seems, even though it's supposed
to be impartial and provide reasonable alternatives,
there seems to be a bias running through it against
natural environments and towards sort of marmade,
artificial environments. And I'll give you an
example. These conceptual plans that are up on the
wall, we'll notice certain labels, like a lawn will be
called the "Valley Green," which is sort of a romantic
term and gives a sort of a positive notion of it.

Or, it will have an arrow pointing to some
trees that stand in front of Old Main as a bird
sanctuary, although technically it's not a bird
sanctuary. There's great trees because many years ago
somebody had the foresight and respect of nature to
keep them, and generations of people have benefitted
from those trees.

By the way, because of a lack of certain kinds of grasses and vegetation and a protective buffer, it really doesn't qualify as a bird sanctuary. There are, however, three very thriving bird habitats on Western's campus, but those are slated for destruction, and it's not mentioned on the map what they are.

So what we get is, we get these landscaped environments that are referred to in a real positive, romantic manner, and when we come to the natural living environments, they're called urban complexes or urban forest interface. And wetlands which are teeming with life are referred to as wetland BB7A or wetland BB6, so it's really nonpartial. There's a sort of built in bias which I don't think is intentional, but it's there nonetheless.

Another bias that's there concerning landscaped environments and lawns is, there's no mention of the environmental impact that they present us with. For instance, all of the lawns and landscaped areas on campus are going to require consumption of water which won't be a one-time investment. It will be a continual thing as long as the University exists.

They're also going to require chemical fertilization, chemical herbicides to eliminate native wildflowers that are not wanted in that particular habitat. They're also going to require gas-powered machinery to cut them and keep them in their lawn state, because what you're talking about with the lawn is, it's a special kind of habitat that involves two species, grass and man, and man, as a resource, is required to keep it in that lawn state.

Also, as for mowing the lawn, there's going to be quite a bit of noise. I didn't see any mention of the effects of that, whether any acoustic studies were done as to how that sound will travel through Valley Green. I notice, when I see maintenance people at Western, they wear protective ear devices, but I'm not sure what the sound's going to be like, and people who run around the track they propose nearby, if there's going to be any adverse effects on them.

Also, the cost of maintaining those lawns could be prohibitive, because it's going to be an ongoing process, and considering the size of those lawns and landscaped environments, is there going to be a case in the future where Western has to refrain from hiring faculty members because they have to pay groundskeepers?

Also, another bias that comes up is the section
in the Draft EIS on the plan's impact on Bellingham's Parks and Recreation System. It mentions that there will be a slight impact on that system, and that that will be mitigated by the construction of recreation and playing fields, but that doesn't recognize the vast majority of age range. Bellingham Parks and Recreation System is not playing fields or recreation areas. There's natural environments through which trails have been cut, so that if that impact was to be mitigated, it would have to be mitigated with natural environments and not playing fields. And like I said, I don't think that bias is intentional. I think that's just part of our Western culture.

And I notice one of the goals of the University is to try to broaden our cultural base and to respect multiculturalism, but what we get with the plans is the classic Euro-Roman conquer nature attitude, to eliminate nature and rebuild it in our sort of well-ordered image. The plan might have been better served if we sought some advice from people from indigenous cultures, because when it comes to nature, people from indigenous cultures have a lot of wisdom to offer, and I think that's something that we have to think about.

Also the impact of eliminating the natural areas, and what I'm talking about are the natural areas with the wetlands west of 21st Street, the natural areas with the wetlands south of Bill McDonald Parkway, the natural areas with wetlands that are south of Fairhaven College known as the Outback. That's going to be a tremendous loss, not only because we're eliminating nature, but those are the last, last pieces of natural environment left on Western's campus.

And we also have to put that in context of the larger community. Because of increased enrollment at Western, natural environment in Happy Valley over the past few years has been severely impacted, so it's desperately important that we keep those habitats just for the sake of keeping them as living things, and also because of the loss of education opportunities for Western students.

The Impact Statement mentions that there will be some loss, but what the Impact Statement doesn't address is the potential of that area for educational opportunities. We're just not dealing with what it provides for Western students today. We have to consider what it could provide for Western students in the future, because this is a plan for Western's future, and once those areas are gone, they're gone
I'm sure there's universities all over this country who would give their, I don't know, they couldn't give their right arm, but they would be very glad to give natural areas like that on the campus, but they can't, because they're urban campuses. But here we are with a natural environment, and we're turning ourselves into an urban area.

The construction of these "natural" areas is also going to result in a cost of an aesthetic opportunity. I know the plan's been drawn up to affect a real attractive look to it, but what we're missing is the opportunity to have that face of the south campus to have a natural look to it, to be able to preserve those areas north, south -- no, well the three natural areas, west of 21st, south of the Parkway, and the Fairhaven Outback at the face of the south of the University.

What we have to remember is, people don't get in their cars and drive hundreds of miles to see landscaped areas. They get in their cars to see natural areas, so there's a tremendous beauty there that we're not dealing with.

And also, the prohibitive costs involved with making a choice between a natural environment and an artificially landscaped environment: Natural environments take care of themselves. You don't have to water them. You don't have to cut them. You don't have to feed them. Earth is pretty intelligent. When it brings in these systems, they take care of themselves, but all of the artificial systems will be really hard to sustain, and they will be hard to implement. Every single one of these areas, if they are built over, will require a prohibitively expensive cost. We're talking about special drains and filters, and I think that should be more focused in the statement that we are making a choice that will result in a greater cost for the University. Excuse me for a second while I catch my breath.

DR. PIERCE: I would hope that you're near conclusion.

MR. MALVEY: Yes, I am.

I guess that's the bias I see. The second part was the lack of a reasonable alternative which is required in an EIS, and there really is no reasonable alternative. We had plans A, B, C, and D, but we don't see any reasonable alternative for those natural areas on south campus except for no action, which really isn't a reasonable alternative, because there are alternatives where most of the Master Plan could
be implemented, and those areas could be saved.

So what we need is an alternative that would not disrupt the Master Planning process that much, an alternative that would protect the natural environment, which is in accordance with the University's goals. It would increase educational opportunities, in accordance with the University's goals. It would be inexpensive, which was one of the goals for the Master Plan. It would honor a sort of multicultural wisdom, which is in alliance with the University's goals. It would be more balanced aesthetically between the natural and the manmade environment.

We need an alternative that could improve contact with the community and the alumni even more, and I think if we preserve these natural environments and establish an alternative center, it would be much more friendly to the community and the alumni, as well as being an effective tool for raising funds for the University.

I think approval like this would leave an indisputable mark as to what Western stands for. It would define Western's strength and build on its vision, which are the University's goals, and it could probably, in the future, give Western a lead role that would be nationally recognized in the effort to save our planet, because we're sending a signal with this development.

What does Western stand for? Do we pave over natural environments and put parkades on them, or do we try to find someplace else to park our cars and save these areas?

And thank you for letting me go on. I just think that we should have a reasonable alternative to this plan, and that we shouldn't -- the planning process is taking so long, we shouldn't be so quick to end it. I think we should wait till we have a new president who will lead Western into the future, and maybe they should be able to comment on the plan.

DR. PIERCE: Thank you. Bay Renaud is next.

MR. RENAUD: My name is Andy Bay Renaud. R-e-n-a-u-d, and I live at 1316-23rd, Bellingham. I'd like to thank you, the Master Planning Committee too, for giving us these great books. I've never seen the University look better than this. But I did notice some mistakes, or omissions maybe, and a lot of what my concerns were were addressed by Brian. And I met him tonight, but I should have known him a week ago, so I won't go through all of that, but basically it
seems like the natural area pavings and development
isn't in accordance with the strategic guidelines just
as Brian said, and I would ask to just be mentioned in
support of Brian's comments in its entirety so I don't
have to go through them.

But I notice on Scheme E-Revised that the area
of the Outback Farm is shown as housing, and on page
92, proposed campus land use, the area of the barn,
and the herb gardens, and the pond, it looks like, and
the wetland, at least a third of the wetland, is
academic area, and I was wondering how that was
addressed? Maybe you can just answer this. How was
that addressed as far as to make Schematic E-Revised
to show that whole area as housing? Could someone
address that?

MR. VERGEL de DIOS: People will respond to
that in the Final EIS.

MR. RENAUD: Now, the other question I had was,
as also in the conceptual and cottage meetings, you
were saying that the total area or number of cars for
parking would not be increased, and is that, was that
with the addition of the proposed area that you'll buy
south of campus or without? How do those numbers work
out?

DR. PIERCE: Those will also be responded to.

MR. RENAUD: Thanks.

DR. PIERCE: Thank you. Next are Hal and Joan
Downey.

MR. DOWNEY: I'm Hal Downey, 504-20th Street,
Bellingham. Joan I don't think wants to speak, but
that's the way we signed up.

First of all, I appreciate the fact that we
have these informal-type gatherings. My biggest
concern is that some of the other meetings related to
this Master Planning project were not directly brought
to the attention of people affected by it at an
earlier point in time. We attended without any
particular invitation or notice one of the Master
Planning meetings conducted by Dr. Pierce on campus,
at which time he resolved some of the problems that
we, as neighbors of the campus, had experienced or
felt, namely, the fact that they wanted to take our
property and acquire it in order to modify the
boundaries of the campus. Since they had not in their
own meetings addressed this issue earlier, they
decided at the request of Dr. Pierce and some of his
Planning Board that they should not declare that as
part of the Master Plan, and I concur with that 100
percent.
I also feel that the City, who is apparently in absence tonight, and has control of land uses, and other zoning laws, and certain other things related to the campus, since it's integral to the city itself, is remiss by not attending this particular meeting or being represented at it.

One of the main factors that this issue really doesn't address so far is not just the 10-year period that you are planning for, but what will be the scope of this campus 20 years out or some longer period of time? Now, maybe in your planning process you do address that, but we, the public, are not aware of it.

My wife and I had an opportunity to visit our own alma mater back in the midwest last year for the first time in 30 years. The change in that campus was beyond anybody's ability to project, but on the other hand, it is completely occupied with buildings for academic, and residential, and other uses. And the athletic program is almost eliminated. You're using or planning to use a great part of the available space in this valley for athletic purposes, or greenways, or whatever you refer to them as, and I feel that in the future, you are, in the not too distant future, with the probable growth of the Northwest, that you will also find it necessary to infill those areas, in which case, where will you put your athletic program? Or will you have to discontinue it?

I think parking is a major problem that no one of us have really addressed, both for residential purposes and on campus purposes. Either we need to restrict on campus use of that vital space, or we better build it in multistory configurations so that we don't use up the land area. You have done so to a limited degree.

And we keep talking about alternative transportation methods, bicycles, buses, or some other form of public transportation, but realistically, the American public, unless it changes in the next 25 or 30-40 years, is not going to be separated from their private vehicles. You, as an institution, have to define whether or not they should be allowed to have that as an on campus thing, publicly supported. It is impacting the neighbors, as you know, and it's not easy to address, but it needs to be more fully addressed than it has been in this study, I believe.

The one vital thing that got us involved in it is personal property rights, since we were neighbors of the campus rather than acting users of the campus. Your Master Plan is necessary, and I don't discount that necessity. But its effect, when you plan it for
University purposes, isn't necessarily in agreement with the surrounding neighborhoods. Even though we recognize that we like the University, we think it's an important part of community, it's an important part of our state, it's an important part of our country, when you make a judgment for an on campus decision which affects off campus decisions, it needs to be considered informally before it becomes a public statement of policy, and that is where we began to rub elbows, with friction, initially. I think we solved a good many of those problems during this process, but that should not arise again just because your viewpoint is different than the viewpoint of the community itself. Could I answer a question about my comments before I quit?

DR. PIERCE: Answer questions?
MR. DOWNEY: Do you have a question of me?
DR. PIERCE: No.
MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.
MR. PIERCE: Next is Steve Henson.

MR. HENSON: Thank you very much. My name is Steve Henson, H-e-n-s-o-n. I live at 520-20th Street. I'm also a member of Western's Economics Department, but tonight I'll be wearing my neighbor's hat and not my economics hat, which everyone will be grateful for.

First of all, I'd like to thank you, the staff for Facilities, Rick, Robert, and Carl for keeping us all informed about the process, and for allowing us to have comment regarding it. My wife and I feel that the appropriate Master Plan Scheme E draws a number of concerns very thoughtfully and effectively, especially regarding traffic flows and pedestrian safety at Western. At the same time, we have a number of concerns that remain. I think Hal has addressed many of those. We're also gratified that some of our earlier comments have been incorporated in Scheme E.

Earlier, we had expressed some concern about the uncertainty created by the identification of our property for possible acquisition under alternatives A through D. We're gratified that this designation has been eliminated for our home in the preferred Scheme E. However, the original acquisition boundary remains in the versions of alternatives A through D that have been scheduled in the release of the Draft EIS. In reference to that, that acquisition remains in the present, in the text in the present tense. The inclusion of such references may convey the impression to a reader that acquisition of those properties are still being actively considered, although we had the
definite impression that that was no longer the case. That imposes a cloud of, of uncertainty of our property that may adversely affect its resale value.

Second, we had expressed earlier a preference for an alternative such as Alternative C that did not involve the straightening of the 21st Street dogleg which would have taken out property at the end of 20th Street. While we would prefer that no single family property in the neighborhood be designated for acquisition, and we are concerned about the expansion of the University into this neighborhood, we of course recognize that this has been the proposal that has been put forward from a committee to the Board of Trustees.

I would like to offer several points, however, regarding those acquisitions. The document proposed mitigating impacts on housing by offering residents fair market value. Whatever the legal status of that principal, I would like to point out briefly, putting on my economics hat, that fair market value is not adequate compensation for the loss of economic value that one receives from his or her property. The acid test of that is, of course, that if fair market value were adequate compensation, then the owner would have already sold. One is never made whole by fair market value compensation in a forced sale.

In my view, compensation should include some additional amounts to compensate the owner for loss of enjoyment of property, and to allow relocation to comparable property elsewhere. If one's property is identified for possible acquisition, such acquisition should be provided in a timely fashion to avoid the adverse impacts on the value of that property in the intervening time. The Draft EIS does not identify any specific time frame for property acquisition. My view is that such a time frame should be stated in the Master Plan and addressed in the Final EIS.

Another concern we have regards the grading of the 21st Street, Hill Street (phonetic) connector, which Mr. Bruce mentioned at a previous cottage meeting. -- could be arranged so as to minimize the effect of traffic noise and headlights on the remaining homes in the neighborhood by dropping 21st Street below 20th Street rather quickly. We're, I think, concerned by that prospect, however I did not see that in the Draft EIS. I would hope that more specifics would be included regarding the location and grading of that 21st Street connector.

Another issue we feel very strongly about is the preservation of the dead end barricade at the end
of 20th Street for maintaining the character of the neighborhood, the privacy, and our children's safety. Again, we're reassured by the oral assurances by staff that that barricade could be maintained and enhanced by the addition of vegetation screens. We hope that that would be included in the Master Plan and the Final EIS in detail. I saw no reference in the Draft EIS to maintaining 20th Street as a dead end, and I think that should be explicitly addressed.

The plan does not seem to adequately address the impacts on neighboring residents of the net loss of over 1,000 parking spots. In fact, the Draft EIS explicitly states in several places that the plan will -- the document refers to a proposed transportation management program for the University, which to my knowledge, I may be wrong on this, that program has not yet been developed.

Until that plan is actually developed, the Draft EIS does not appear to adequately address the impact of parking problems on neighboring areas. The Draft EIS makes reference in several places to, and I quote, "Increased traffic on 20th Street near residents," under Alternative D. For instance, such a reference occurs on page 9, column 3. This impact is not listed in A through C. It is not clear to me exactly what that means or in what sense Alternative D might differ from the other Alternatives, A through C, in that regard.

Finally, we understand the problems associated with vehicle/pedestrian conflicts and aesthetics along High Street through campus. We hope that with the closure of High Street, that access will still be preserved during icy weather, as that continues to be the safest source on and off of South Hill during icy conditions.

I have some additional comments that I will expand on, and clarify, and convey in writing. Once again, I would like to thank you and the staff for keeping us informed and for this opportunity to comment.

MR. ROOT: There's a gentlemen that wants to leave, and he is requesting moving up in the order on this list here. There are three speakers in front; Mr. Olsen, Mr. Minkoff, and the McCollums. Is that all right?

MR. KIRKPATRICK (phonetic): I'd like to thank you, all of you who allowed bumping me up on the list. I think it will be to everyone's advantage to get myself and my kids out of here. I apologize for the
My name is Daniel Kirkpatrick. I live at 1020-21st, and I still haven’t figured out if my property is within or without the boundary. I requested more information on that subject in a letter I wrote to the University over a year ago and never got any more information, and so at this point, I'm awaiting an opinion from my attorney, because I feel like my home is directly under threat from this plan, because I can’t tell if it’s inside or outside the boundary. If it is in the proposed land acquisition area, I'd like to say there is no way in creation, I guess, that fair market value is going to compensate me for all the work and love and caring I've put in my home and garden, so I want to say that.

My first real substantive comment, if that wasn't one, is that I feel like the public process around this plan has been at very best, inadequate, and at worst a scam, and the reason I say that is because I was originally notified, I think, about a year and a half ago that this process was underway, however, at that time the essential priorities, the design criteria, was already created. So, when I was notified that there was going to be a public meeting, I attended and followed up that public meeting with a lengthy, three-page, single-spaced letter, detailing numerous points that I felt were inadequate about this plan, and I heard nothing, heard nothing, heard nothing. And it just happens that I accidentally heard about this meeting tonight, so I don’t know how exactly this process of notifying people was supposed to have taken place, but if I do end up in court with the University, that's going to be a strong piece of my case. I just was not informed, and I don't feel like adequate measures were taken, except potentially at the beginning, to adequately notify me of what's going on.

I'd like to echo the gentlemen who spoke about natural features and habitat. I feel strongly about those things too, but I won’t go into them, because he did a fine job.

My concerns are around transportation. All the plans place a heavy emphasis on automobile transportation, automobiles as transportation and parking as land use. There is no planning. If the idea is planning for the future, and if you're planning for the future in fact, then we need to be looking at what's happening, and cars are not a sustainable form of transportation. Nobody disagrees with that as I found, so I look in these plans.
Where's the evidence that alternative transportation is being considered? And I did find somewhere in the fine print one of the discussions that at no point were the form laws used to calculate the amount of area needed for parking adjusted for an increase in public transportation, and I think that's a real oversight on the part of the planners.

Likewise, I noticed that the percentage of land use area for parking in the preferred alternative is the same percentage of land use as existing, however there's also a major land acquisition area, and so, can I request a clarification as to whether the percentage of parking of the total land use area in the proposed plan includes that land use acquisition area? Just a point of information.

MR. VERGEL de DIOS: We'll respond to that in the Final EIS. I hate to guess. It would be a guess rather than an accurate answer.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't want a guess either. However, this is real significant to me too, because there's a big chunk of land use being acquired, and I think maybe my house is in that, and I don't know it. Is my house on the slate to be bulldozed for a parking lot, or is it a tradeoff bargaining chip so you can acquire more houses for someone? And either way, there's a responsibility for forward looking planning.

Likewise, all the plans, including the Alternative, the Preferred Alternative, indicated pushing buses off of High Street, and if in fact there's going to be some movement towards alternative transportation, we need to make it easier for people to get into the core of campus by public transportation. So, I think as lovely as the idea of a pedestrian's mall is, by pushing the buses further from the core of campus, you're going to encourage more people to drive and fewer people to take the bus. That's a mistake.

Likewise, more needs to be done to encourage alternative transportation, specifically bicycles, but also buses. I looked at the amount of cars that are speeding by my house on 21st Street, and it looks like it's going to go up by 25 percent in the University plans. There's already a massive amount of traffic to where I really don't feel safe in the street, or who knows. cars could come -- but who knows. But there's also a rush hour, I'd like to point out for those of you who don't live there, significant rush hour in the morning and afternoon which has been dramatically increased.

I think I have one more point here. Oh, so to
finish that one thought, I was advocating that in
every student's activity fee be included a bus pass so
that there was a strong incentive to take the bus. I
understand the UW has this. It was in my letter. I
don't see it anywhere mentioned. As far as I could
tell, this letter was ignored. None of my points
showed up in writing as far as I could tell. And
every faculty and staff member should have, as part of
their benefits package, should have a free bus pass,
and that money -- even if those people chose not to
use their public transportation privileges -- there
would be a lot more money going for public
transportation which would be highly appropriate and
reduce traffic and the amount of land use needed for
parking.

The other point I wanted to make, setting my
concerns about the natural areas aside, has to do with
housing, and there appears to be a significant amount
of increased housing that is in this plan. I don't
understand why, and nobody's been able to tell me, why
the University insists on providing its own housing.

There are studies which I could make available,
or I could dig up, which say that piling people
together in residences with people of their same age
group is not psychologically healthy, and if you hung
out at a senior citizens center, you know they would
be happier in mixed-age housing. Fairhaven's
experience in mixed-age housing has been a success,
and certainly anyone who's lived in a high-rise
dormatory knows that that's not a healthy arrangement.
So, I think the University should be supporting low
income housing elsewhere in the city so the University
students were spread out in the city, for their own
benefit and for the benefit of the city.

So, in closing, I guess my main concern,
besides the fact that I don't feel that I've been
informed, is that the basic assumptions I think are
askew. I don't think you're doing a good job of
assessing what needs to happen as we move toward the
future, and subsequently, we have all these plans
which are great pictures. Some of those make sense,
I'm not down on everything you've done, but I don't
see that the priorities are very forward looking or
healthy in terms of environmental and community
health, and so I'd really like to see more questioning
being done about the assumptions, maybe a little bit
of rethinking of the design criteria, and I'd like to
see a stronger plan that really supports the community
and the environment come out of it. Thank you.

DR. PIERCE: Thank you for your comments. Mr.
MR. OLSH: My name is Owen Olsen. I'm a resident of 612-20th Street. I have attended the meetings, and I certainly appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. I have some areas of concern that still concern me, although we have gone through some changes in our various A, B, C, and D presentations.

First of all, what concerns me is that we are residents of this area. And Mr. Bruce said that the plan was formulated with contact with the City Transportation Department and various departments that would appear to be absent, and what I'd like to know is, I've stressed independence. I'd like to know, is this just a college plan, or did somebody else have independent input in the formulation of this plan? I don't have to have it mentioned, the names of the persons involved, that can go on record, so we don't have to take time to do that, but I feel there is a lack of independence when I see a plan formulated just by the college that vitally affects the neighborhood. So, that is one of my great concerns.

The other concern that I have, and I am a professional, and when I see the cost that must have gone into -- not only by the staff department, but has anyone -- and it doesn't have to be taken down tonight -- estimated the cost of what this really did cost the taxpayer? Not only the people that are staffing the department, but also what it cost to acquire all this property and all these various modifications you're going to do to the neighborhood?

The biggest concern I have is -- and I have addressed the issue with Mr. Bruce, and that's probably the biggest one I have to put over tonight -- the elimination of High Street, because I've lived up here for many, many years, and when there was a closing of High Street for use during the week, this was understandable, but there's a covenant with the City of Bellingham -- and Mr. Bruce has a copy, I've supplied him with that -- which guaranteed the residents, because this has happened, that we would not be hindered from using High Street at any time under certain circumstances. And that was for emergency vehicles, public transportation, and when the weather conditions were bad. While I lived on 20th Street, we've had our streets blocked off so you could not get downtown, couldn't get down Garden Street by the watertower, they were all barricaded by campus security. So we've got a problem here.

The other thing is, I think was possibly a
bigger problem, is when is a street not a street? And if somebody got hurt, let's say a public transportation unit went through? You break this over, there's no definition of a street. There's snow, somebody gets hurt. Who's responsible?

So, if you take that street away, and I talked to two personal injury lawyers, he said whoever had anything to do with this plan could be held personally responsible, because it is a trap. If somebody gets hurt, you've got a bus, or emergency vehicle, or even a passenger vehicle passing through High Street, and they hit somebody, and you have no longer defined that as a street, that is going to be a big problem.

That is probably my biggest concern of this whole plan. The impacts on the neighborhood has been a big item of discussion. In our meetings, I don't recall the cottage meetings, but I think sometimes Mr. Bruce didn't feel that they were, but there has been some concern about the neighborhood. I can't stress that when you live in a neighborhood, we want to get along with the neighbors. We know the college can do certain things, but it really is important that somebody independent is in on that side of it. How does it affect -- what's the impact on the neighborhood? I mean it's not like the college just

has a blank check and can do anything they want, expropriate property, and take it away from you. Too bad you live there, you bought it at the wrong time. To me, that is not right, and I think it has hurt a lot of images.

Now, I have been a very great friend of Western Foundation as a professional. You can check. I'm not on the mailing list, but I can assure you that many of the trusts that I've worked on where people dedicated money for education purposes, not aesthetical purposes, for the college, it was meant for future education of students of Western Washington, well, I can assure you, people I've talked to, that it's going to hurt Western Foundation if they start injuring the people around the area, injuring the Bellingham neighborhood with some of these plans.

Now, in summary, all I can say is that if I could see any way that this plan could be improved at the educational level of a student at Western, I'd be very happy to say so. I just cannot see it. I think it's been, it's spending an awful lot of money. I've talked to the legislators about it. They're concerned about the cost of colleges. It always looks like this college has got too much money that they can spend on anything, anything, like a blank check. Now that's
not right, because I'm also a taxpayer. And I speak with a lot of taxpayers.

Finally, I was the one who got the barricade up at the end of 20th Street. I talked with the police chief, and I think Steve Henson tonight mentioned that we certainly would want to be assured if the college expropriated property at the end of 20th Street, we want to make sure that a barricade is put up so it does not become a trap, because that is really what we had before without a barricade.

I thank you.

DR. PIERCE: Thank you, Mr. Olsen.

MR. MINKOFF: Thank you. My name is Martin Minkoff, M-i-n-k-o-f-f. I'm the General Manager with the Whatcom Transportation Authority. We're the public transportation provider in Bellingham, Lynden, and Ferndale, and unincorporated portions of Whatcom County, and between. Western Washington University is a major activity center within our service area and a major concentration of our service.

What I'd like to do is read a letter into the record and convey that for transcript use.

First off, we appreciate the close working relationship that Western Washington University and the Whatcom Transportation Authority have had in developing the transportation elements of the Western Washington University Campus Master Plan. We are very supportive of the concept identified in "Schematic E-Refined" in the April 1993 W.W.U. Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

As we have indicated throughout our discussions with W.W.U., access of W.T.A. public transportation services to the street network serving Western is essential for W.T.A. service to W.W.U. students, faculty, and staff, as well as neighborhoods surrounding the campus. We feel that the concepts outlined in the Draft EIS, specifically Scheme E-Refined, will provide the W.T.A. with access needed to ensure the efficient and cost-effective delivery of public transportation services to the University and the entire Bellingham and Whatcom County community.

W.T.A. comments on the Draft EIS are as follows:

1. The W.T.A. is very supportive of developing a Pedestrian/Transit Mall for High Street with other transit amenities. We were concerned that page 9 of the EIS, labeled "Transit Service" states, "Closing High Street to general traffic to allow restricted use for transit vehicles may impact bus schedule and other
services." It's the W.T.A.'s understanding that the proposal would not restrict the use of transit vehicles on High Street. We request the removal of the sentence or clarification of the language. Based on the W.T.A.'s understanding of our discussion with the University administrators, we recommend that the sentence be rewritten to reflect, "Closing High Street to general traffic and development of a Pedestrian/Transit Mall will allow W.T.A. access and will not adversely impact bus schedules and service."

Secondly, the W.T.A. is supportive of efforts of W.W.U. to develop modified roadway design standards for High Street with which to develop a Pedestrian/Transit Mall.

Thirdly, the W.T.A. is supportive of changes proposed to south campus roadways and improved pedestrian and transit access to the "South Gateway". It is our understanding based on review of Schematic E-Refined that the connector road from 21st Street, and I didn't get the exact names of the roadways, so I hope I get the nomenclature correct, but there is a link to 21st Street that would allow buses heading go southbound to turn northbound, that that link be built with appropriate geometrics to allow for 40-foot long, 102-inch wide transit coaches to make the necessary turns. We request that the plans are developed for these roadway elements, that W.W.U. work closely with the W.T.A. and the City of Bellingham Department of Public Works Division to ensure that the roadway elements and parking are located in a manner to ensure safety and appropriate traffic flow.

The issues that the W.T.A. has identified above are more fully explained and documented in W.T.A. correspondence to Robert Bruce, dated February 28, 1992; George Pierce, dated December 21st, 1992; and Robert Bruce, dated April 14, 1993.

We look forward to a close partnership between the W.T.A. and Western Washington University with which to achieve Western's Master Plan and vision and address regional and community alternative transportation needs. And I would like to add that the W.T.A. takes our role as a transportation problem solver seriously. We're very excited about the future prospects of future service, and we've begun preliminary discussions with the University toward implementing a campus rail (phonetic), and that's something that the University has been supportive of, and we look forward to major improvements for the benefit of Western faculty, staff, and students, and area residents in the upcoming years, and ultimately
providing viable alternatives to the single occupant vehicle which has been a focus of discussion throughout this planning process. I thank the University for the opportunity to speak, and look forward to seeing the Final Master Plan. Thank you.

DR. PIERCE: Dick McCollum.

MR. McCOLLUM: Dick McCollum, 715 North Garden Street, Number 201. My concern is with traffic and with public transportation parking. It seems to me, and also listening to the public transportation representative here just a moment ago, that this is the time right now that you should be addressing some kind of a central depot, either on the surface or underground somewhere, located essentially on the campus. And I say that from the standpoint of this expansion plan that we see here. It is surely just one of many that are going to take place in the future, and before we have buildings all over this area, which we will have one day undoubtedly, because like the University of Washington, this place is not going to just stay up here on this hill.

It's going to be much easier to establish a facility which would encourage riders in public transportation, to take public transportation rather than their automobiles. And get it done now, and make that a central focus of everything else, all the other buildings that you plan on campus. If you don't do that, I think you're blowing an opportunity to really impact the very things that frustrate your neighbors: mostly traffic and parking. And if you don't live in this neighborhood, and you don't have people parking on your lawn or in your private driveway, and haven't had to have them towed away, and all of the confrontation that takes place week after week after week after week, you don't know the frustration some of us encounter.

I think that we would be deluding ourselves by thinking that public transportation is the answer to everything. I think it is not. And I think that a plan for expansion that does not include a plan of expansion for parking on campus is shortsighted. Now, I don't mean, and I certainly don't agree with acres and acres and acres of parking lots. We have a concept called parkades that are multi-story things which could certainly chop down to one-fifth the area that we have marked on here for parking if they were strategically located.

Perhaps in the future we'll all be burning natural gas or, for heaven's sake, using solar power.
We'll still see students and faculty driving some kind of conveyance, and we need to furnish them a place to park those conveyances, but I think it is very shortsighted not to take into account right now, before this University becomes five times the size that it is right now, to strategically locate bus depots, again, above ground or underground, that may bring people into the heart of the campus in all weather, covered and convenient to get anyplace else on campus.

Those are my concerns, and I do want to congratulate you gentlemen on a beautiful package that you put out, but I'm still concerned about traffic, and parking, and public transportation.

DR. PIERCE: Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

MS. GROOVER: We sent in a letter that we wanted to speak for us. Can that be assured that that will happen?

DR. PIERCE: What's the name on that letter?

MS. GROOVER: Sarah Groover. We mailed a letter.

MR. BRUCE: Who did you address it to?

MS. GROOVER: The person she said for us to write to.

DR. PIERCE: Rick Hennies? Do you wish acknowledgement of receipt of the letter?

MS. GROOVER: We want to make sure that it will speak for us.

MR. ROOT: We have received that letter.

MS. GROOVER: And we want it included.

MR. ROOT: Yes, it will be included.

DR. PIERCE: It is now 8:25, and I am closing the public hearing. Just a reminder, the comment period of the Draft EIS ends a week from today, on Tuesday, May 25th. If you have any additional comments, please submit them in writing by that date. Thank you very much, again, for attending.

MR. HENSON: Just a procedural question regarding how the comments that are received both this evening and in writing will be addressed in the Final EIS?

MR. VERGEL de DIOS: The next step in the process is to prepare a Final Environmental Impact Statement. In the Impact Statement there is going to be response to all the comments that have been made tonight at the hearing, as well as any written comments received by the agency before that deadline. Documents will be published and distributed with the same distribution. Use the sign-up sheet if you wish
to be on that list. If your name and address is
there, you will receive a copy of that.

MR. HENSON: Will the actual comments be
included in transcript, or verbatim form, or
summarizing?

MR. VERGEL de DIOS: Correct. A transcript as
well as all the letters will be included as they were
received.

MR. HENSON: Thank you very much.

(the hearing concluded at 8:30 p.m.)
RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

1. As noted in the response to Mr. Renaud by Mr. Root, some 200 notices of the public hearing and Draft EIS availability were mailed to people within the immediate vicinity of the WWU campus that have shown a continuing interest in the process. Notices were also published in the Bellingham Herald and Western Front.

2. Apparently no one from the City of Bellingham attended the public hearing. However, multiple copies of the Draft EIS were sent to the city (see distribution list of Draft EIS, page 135) and WWU and the City of Bellingham have maintained active participation throughout the master planning process with regular reviews by all city agencies.

3. Research, analysis, and production of the Draft EIS was led by NBBJ, a private professional consulting firm. Work was completed under contract with WWU, the Lead Agency. As a professional consultant who has prepared numerous EIS and environmental analyses, NBBJ is recognized for objectivity, technical rigor, and ethical professional conduct.

4. According to Mr. Olsen's definition of "independent," no WWU faculty, staff, students or private contributors would be considered independent.

5. Comments acknowledged. The treatment of the natural environment is an important part of the future WWU campus. (Specific WWU goals and objectives are noted on page 16 of the Draft EIS.) Physical environmental aspects and values are expressed.

6. Terms used to describe the master plan concepts, including the alternatives, attempted to describe future visions of the campus. The descriptors may be read as "planning jargon." The Old Main Quadrangle, with its mature tree cover, is sometimes referred to as the "Bird Sanctuary;" it is not an official bird sanctuary.

Three faunal habitats (forested, urban complex, and urban/forest interface) were identified in the Draft EIS. Each of these three habitats supports birds. The forested habitat contains bird species adapted to conditions associated with second growth Douglas-fir forests. The urban complex habitat contains bird species adapted to manmade environments such as lawns, ivy-draped buildings, and landscaped areas. The urban/forest interface habitat may contain bird species from both the forested and urban complex habitats. A portion of the urban and urban/forest interface habitats will be lost to development. No development is planned in the forested habitat. Mitigating measures that address the loss of faunal habitat are presented on page 58 of the Draft EIS.

The wetland reference numbers (BB-7a, PA-1a, etc.) are defined by a City of Bellingham classification system. The first letters refer to the watershed: (PA - Padden Creek; BB - Bellingham Bay) and the second numbers identify wetlands numbered consecutively from the watershed north. No bias was intended.

7. Water consumption impacts associated with lawns and other landscaped area are acknowledged. The Draft EIS notes that existing water consumption for irrigation amounted to 10,331 cubic feet for 1991/1992. Future water consumption for irrigation is expected to be similar (see Draft EIS, page 131, Table 40). A number of possible mitigating measures are identified to reduce these impacts, including drought-tolerant plantings, computerized irrigation controls, zone control watering, and more efficient spray nozzles for more uniform water distribution (see Draft EIS, page 134).

Use of fertilizers, chemical herbicides, etc., is also a potential impact associated with the continuing maintenance of campus grounds. Fuel for equipment, related noise and costs are also acknowledged impacts. However, the impacts are not expected to be significant. Elimination of grass clippings and pruning wastes are part of the waste reduction program (see Draft EIS, page 131, Table 41). The costs of maintenance are not expected to reach the point where it would prohibit the hiring of faculty members.

8. Comments acknowledged.

9. The referenced wetlands are proposed to be replaced. Comments acknowledged. The actual value and extent of these wetlands will be determined in the future when specific projects are defined.

Educational opportunities lost with the displacement of natural areas are a potential impact.

While the WWU portion of the Sehome Arboretum will remain the same (38 acres), other open areas, excluding "manmade" usable open space/recreation areas, will be reduced (from 67.8 to 47.5 acres). Not all of this area, though, is natural open space. However, usable open space/recreation areas will be increased (from 22.9 to 36.8 acres). (See Draft EIS, page 89, Table 22.)

10. Environmental impact requirements are that alternatives be identified and comparatively evaluated. "Reasonable" alternatives are defined as: "Reasonable alternatives shall include actions that could feasibly attain and approximate a proposals objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation." (WAC 197-11-440 5) The "No Action" alternative maintains existing conditions. The proposal and Alternatives A, B, C, and D all identify conceptual land use zones. Actual development projects can utilize the programmatic information of this EIS and be designed to protect/mitigate potential impacts to the natural environment.

Comments for an alternative that "protects the natural environment increases educational opportunities, is in accordance with University goals, is inexpensive, includes multicultural wisdoms, and balances the natural/manmade environment" are acknowledged. The Lead Agency (WWU) will consider these aspects when the master plan concept is further defined in the future.

11. WWU believes the proposed master plan concept and alternatives are all "reasonable." There are refinements and numerous project details to be resolved in the future. If the concept is approved, then many of these details will be addressed in the next phase of planning.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS (continued)

7. Water consumption impacts associated with lawns and other landscaped area are acknowledged. The Draft EIS notes that existing water consumption for irrigation amounted to 10,331 cubic feet for 1991/1992. Future water consumption for irrigation is expected to be similar (see Draft EIS, page 131, Table 40). A number of possible mitigating measures are identified to reduce these impacts, including drought-tolerant plantings, computerized irrigation controls, zone control watering, and more efficient spray nozzles for more uniform water distribution (see Draft EIS, page 134).

Use of fertilizers, chemical herbicides, etc., is also a potential impact associated with the continuing maintenance of campus grounds. Fuel for equipment, related noise and costs are also acknowledged impacts. However, the impacts are not expected to be significant. Elimination of grass clippings and pruning wastes are part of the waste reduction program (see Draft EIS, page 131, Table 41).

The costs of maintenance are not expected to reach the point where it would prohibit the hiring of faculty members.

8. Comments acknowledged.

9. The referenced wetlands are proposed to be replaced. Comments acknowledged. The actual value and extent of these wetlands will be determined in the future when specific projects are defined.

Educational opportunities lost with the displacement of natural areas are a potential impact.

While the WWU portion of the Sehome Arboretum will remain the same (38 acres), other open areas, excluding "manmade" usable open space/recreation areas, will be reduced (from 67.8 to 47.5 acres). Not all of this area, though, is natural open space. However, usable open space/recreation areas will be increased (from 22.9 to 36.8 acres). (See Draft EIS, page 89, Table 22.)

10. Environmental impact requirements are that alternatives be identified and comparatively evaluated. "Reasonable" alternatives are defined as: "Reasonable alternatives shall include actions that could feasibly attain and approximate a proposals objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation." (WAC 197-11-440 5) The "No Action" alternative maintains existing conditions. The proposal and Alternatives A, B, C, and D all identify conceptual land use zones. Actual development projects can utilize the programmatic information of this EIS and be designed to protect/mitigate potential impacts to the natural environment.

Comments for an alternative that "protects the natural environment increases educational opportunities, is in accordance with University goals, is inexpensive, includes multicultural wisdoms, and balances the natural/manmade environment" are acknowledged. The Lead Agency (WWU) will consider these aspects when the master plan concept is further defined in the future.

11. WWU believes the proposed master plan concept and alternatives are all "reasonable." There are refinements and numerous project details to be resolved in the future. If the concept is approved, then many of these details will be addressed in the next phase of planning.
12. Comments acknowledged. See responses to Brian Malvey (Items #5 through 11).

13. The "Outback Farm" and pond have been redefined as a "special academic use zone within the housing zone. (See Revised Figure 29: Proposed Campus Land Use, in Section II of this document.)

14. In the future, the campus land area devoted to parking will remain the same as currently exists. Parking amounts to about 22.9 acres of the campus and it will be the same under the master plan. This land area is 12% of the total campus and, due to proposed land acquisition, will be 9% of the total in the future. It is also estimated that the existing on-campus parking supply of 3,019 spaces will be reduced by 5% in the future. With the same mode split, there will be an unmet parking demand of 1,040 spaces. A Transportation Management Program (TMP) is proposed to increase the use of modes other than single-occupant vehicles (e.g., transit, bicycle, carpool/vanpool, etc.) to reduce parking demand in the future. (See pages 89 and 125 of the Draft EIS.)

15. Numerous Master Planning Committee meetings have been held in the last two years. The public was not regularly notified as to the scheduling of this committee. Cottage meetings were held in which the campus community and neighbors of WWU were invited to discuss concepts and process as it evolved. The currently proposed master plan concept (Refined Scheme E) is different from other alternatives in that it does not propose property acquisition west of 20th Street.

16. Comments acknowledged. Copies of the Draft EIS were distributed to the City of Bellingham. Bellingham Plan and regulatory requirements are detailed in the document (see Draft EIS pages 69-84).

17. WWU plans are to review the Master Plan on an appropriate period time line established by changes in campus growth and strategic plan updates. The current plan allows for an approximate 30% increase in academic gross square footage.

18. Comments acknowledged. The existing and future campus land area devoted to parking remains the same: 22.9 acres (see Table 22, page 89 of the Draft EIS). The campus parking supply is reduced by 5% in the proposed campus plan. The need for additional transportation management planning is acknowledged and is identified in the Draft EIS (see page 126). Parking fees, for example, have proven to be an effective element of many demand management programs. Off-campus parking impacts, however, must also be carefully minimized with such a program and such efforts will be made in cooperation with city agencies.

19. Comments acknowledged. WWU will continue to work with its neighbors to resolve issues of mutual concern.

20. Comments acknowledged. Also see responses to Mr. Al Donney, Items #15-19.

21. The currently proposed acquisition area is shown in Refined Scheme E and depicted on Figure 6, page 23 of the Draft EIS. The different acquisition area in Alternatives A-D is for comparison only, and is not proposed by WWU.

22. Comments acknowledged. The exact configuration of the 21st Street realignment has not yet been determined. Future planning and engineering analyses will be necessary and a separate feasibility study will be conducted by WWU.

23. Comments acknowledged. Property acquisition and condemnation proceedings of private property by a public agency are regulated by state law.

The timing of property acquisition is uncertain due to the uncertainty of funding availability from the state. The plan is for a 10-year time frame. However, staff appropriations are beyond the control of WWU and cannot be predicted.

24. The alignment and grading of the 21st Street/Hill Street corridor is not yet defined. The concern for impacts is acknowledged. Future designs will attempt to minimize noise and light impacts and a separate feasibility study will be conducted by WWU.

25. WWU desires to maintain the dead-end configuration of 20th street if the 21st Street connector is extended. The enhancement of "vegetation screening" as proposed by staff would improve conditions for both neighbors and WWU. These issues will be design concerns addressed in the "engineering feasibility study" to be conducted by WWU.
The on-site parking supply was assumed to be reduced by about 5% (see Draft EIS, page 125). With an existing on-campus parking supply of 3,019 spaces, this amounts to a reduction of about 151 spaces (not 1,000 spaces). However, future parking demand is estimated to exceed the supply by some 1,040 spaces. The proposed mitigation is the WWU TMP, and construction of additional on-site parking or remote parking lots with a transit shuttle. Specific details of the additional parking and the TMP have not yet been finalized; however, general information is contained in the mitigating measures section of the Draft EIS (see pages 125-126).

The comment of "Increased traffic impacts on 20th Street due to Alternative D" was incorrectly stated. The Refined Scheme E does not promote campus traffic on 20th Street.

High Street is proposed to be limited to pedestrians, transit, and emergency vehicles. However, during extreme weather conditions, when hazards exist on surrounding streets, WWU and the City will coordinate detour routes along High Street for general traffic. Determination of "extreme conditions" is made by the City Director of Public Works.

The referenced property, 1020-21st Street, is located within the WWU proposed acquisition area (see Draft EIS, page 23, Figure 6). The property is located on the west side of 21st Street, between Douglas and Knox Avenues. Comments acknowledged.

All comments received regarding the Master Plan concepts and process were brought before the Master Plan Committee and taken into consideration.

Notifications related to the environmental review included publication of the Determination of Significance, Public Scoping, and availability of the Draft EIS/Public Hearing. Notices were published in the Bellingham Herald and Western Front. In addition, direct mailings were sent to some 200 persons within the immediate environs of WWU. Property owners within 300 feet of the proposed acquisition boundary were identified for the list.

Comments acknowledged (see prior responses).

The proposed campus plan addresses the next 10 years in the future of the campus and does not envision extraordinary shifts from single-occupant vehicles (SOV) to other modes. However, shifts in mode will be encouraged, particularly through the proposed Transportation Management Program (see page 126 of the Draft EIS). Although campus growth will occur, parking will actually decrease as a disincentive toward SOV use. Care must be taken to avoid disruptive spill-over impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. Transit facilities are planned in a core area of the campus to improve its potential usage. Coordination is occurring with WTA (see following WTA comments). The proposed plan emphasizes alternatives to SOV travel including transit, carpooling, bicycling, and walking.

The comment is accurate. Existing and proposed parking amounts to 22.9 acres of the campus. Because of the land acquisition, the percentage of total campus area used for parking decreases from 12% to 9%. The percentage calculations do include the acquisition area.

As previously noted, the referenced property and home are within the proposed WWU acquisition area.
40. Comments acknowledged. A copy of Ordinance 8527 follows, which notes in Section 2 that High Street can be used for private vehicular traffic when winter weather conditions require it as an alternate route. Section 5 also notes the City of Bellingham can change the requirements.

41. Legal liability will be reviewed by WWU Risk Management for consideration in the design study for High Street improvements.

42. Comments acknowledged. The EIS is an objective, factual document intended to disclose information and assist officials with their decision making. Specifically, it identifies potential impacts and suggests mitigating measures to eliminate or reduce adverse effects.

43. Comments acknowledged.

44. Comments acknowledged.

45. Comments acknowledged.

46. All comments of Mr. Minkoff with WTA are the same as the letter submitted. See response to Mr. Minkoff's letter.

47. Facilitation of the use of public transit is a major objective of the proposed campus plan. The High Street transit mall locates transit access within the campus core. Specific improvements will be coordinated with WTA. Information kiosks, weather protection, and related amenities are envisioned. This transit service point is recognized as an activity center so transit provisions will be appropriate.

Comments acknowledged.

Both structured and surface parking are included in the plan.

48. The letter from "Sarah Cloudhawk" is actually the letter from Clyde M. Hackler (Pias Tools) and is included in the response to comments section.
portion of High Street shall however, be open to vehicles at all hours on Saturdays and Sundays and on state holidays; Provided, however, that city transit vehicles, vehicles licensed or officially designated as emergency vehicles, college maintenance and support vehicles and bicycles shall not be subject to such prohibition.

Section 2. The Director of Public Works is hereby authorized to allow the use of that portion of High Street described above for circulation of private vehicular traffic at such time during the winter months as he believes weather conditions require, as an alternate route to access to citizens of the area. In such event emergency access signs shall be placed at conspicuous places upon the street.

Section 3. Western Washington State College, upon the effective date of this ordinance, is hereby authorized to place informational signs and traffic diversion devices within the said street right of way of High Street so as to most effectively effectuate the purposes of this ordinance. All devices and/or signs placed upon the demised street right of way by the college shall be done under the direction of the Director of Public Works with specific approval therefor.

Section 4. All costs relating to the modification and/or placement of diversion devices upon that portion of High Street described in Section 1 above, exclusive of the cost of street stripping and the placement of regulating signs shall be borne by Western Washington State College.

Section 5. The Bellingham City Council hereby finds that the pedestrian use of the referenced portion of High Street by students and college personnel of Western Washington State College on those days and during those times referenced in Section 1 above, is such that the real property upon which the said right of way is located is hereby declared to be devoted mainly to the educational and research activities of the college, subject to the following conditions:

a. The City of Bellingham reserves the right to repeal or amend at any time this ordinance or any portion thereof and any and all authority granted to Western Washington State College hereunder.

b. Should the portion of Garden Street affected by this ordinance, in the judgment of the Public Works Director, reach "level of service D" as defined in the Transportation and Traffic Engineering Handbook published by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, 1976, for prolonged periods of time during the hours and days set forth in Section 1, then pursuant to sub-section "a" above, this ordinance shall be brought before the council for amendment or repeal.

c. The City of Bellingham hereby acknowledges the authority of Western Washington State College to adopt rules pursuant to RCW 26B.10.560 to regulate pedestrian and vehicular traffic on the subject portion of High Street, provided, that such rules are consistent with the terms of this ordinance.

d. Western Washington State College shall have no authority to restrict the utilization of the subject portion of High Street by City Transit vehicles or by vehicles which are licensed as emergency vehicles or officially designated as emergency vehicles, or to limit the access of private vehicles to High Street when authorized by the Public Works Director in the winter months under the conditions set forth in Section 2 above.
Section 6. Persons found to be in violation of the regulations of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, which shall be punishable by the imposition of a fine of not more than $300.00.

Passed by the Council this 9th day of November, 1976.

[Signature]

COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Approved by me this 9th day of November, 1976.

[Signature]

MAJOR

Attest: [Signature]

FINANCE DIRECTOR

Published: November 15, 1976
appendices
Appendix A: Distribution List

STATE AGENCIES
Office of the Governor
Department of Ecology
Ecological Commission
Department of Social & Health Services
Office of Financial Management
Planning & Community Affairs Agency
Department of Transportation
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Fisheries
Department of Wildlife
Department of Commerce & Economic Development
Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation
State Energy Office

WHATCOM COUNTY
Whatcom County Council
Whatcom County Executive
Whatcom County Planning Department
Whatcom County Planning Commission
Department of Buildings & Code Administration
Whatcom County Health Department
Whatcom County Fire Marshal
Whatcom County Library
Whatcom County Parks Department
Whatcom County Engineering Department

CITY OF BELLINGHAM
Office of the Mayor
Bellingham City Council
Bellingham Planning Commission
Department of Planning & Economic Development
Department of Public Works
Bellingham Public Library
Bellingham Parks & Recreation Department

OTHER AGENCIES
Council of Governments
Northwest Air Pollution Authority
Port of Bellingham
Bellingham Public School District
Whatcom Community College
Lummi Tribal Council
Nooksack Tribal Council

OTHER PARTIES
Bellingham Herald
Bellingham Chamber of Commerce
Fourth Corner Development

B. LIST OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of the Environment</th>
<th>Discussed on* Draft EIS Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Physical Features</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion/Enlargement of Land Area (Encroachment)</td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odor</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Movement/Quantity/Quality</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runoff/Abstraction</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floods</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Movement/Quantity/Quality</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Water Supplies</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plants and Animals</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for and Numbers or Diversity of Species of Plants, Fish, and Other Wildlife</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Species</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish or Wildlife Migration Routes</td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Required/Rate of Use/Efficiency</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source/Availability</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-renewable Resources</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Renewable Resources</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Resources</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Affecting Public Health, Releases or Potential Releases to the Environment Affecting Public Health, such as Toxic or Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RELATIONSHIPS TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS AND TO ESTIMATED POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odor</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Impact</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of Explosion</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release or Potential Releases to the Environment Affecting Public Health, such as Toxic or Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND AND SHORELINE USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans and to Estimated Population</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Preservation</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Crops</td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Impact</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Systems</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Traffic</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterborne, Rail and Air Traffic</td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/Location of People or Goods</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Hazards</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks or Other Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Storm Water</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer/Solid Waste</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Governmental Services or Utilities</td>
<td>Discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Draft EIS is a separate document and is available at the WWU Office of Facilities and Master Planning.

** NR: Not Reviewed; proposal not expected to generate probable significant impacts for this element.