

Appendix F: Public opinion

F.1 Community charrette/workshop comments

F.1.1 Bellingham - 11 January

- Maintain the I-5 corridor entering Whatcom County & the Chuckanut forest complex as a scenic and recreational corridor. Protect the view scapes.
- Can the County exchange land with the DNR to protect this area?
- General support for scenic "farm" drives
- Need to identify mining sites, logging camps, fish canneries, and mill sites. Check with Tim Wahl on early history. Ferris wheel and amusement park was located on north Lake Whatcom-ID on map. Add brick mill at Teddy Bear Cove and sandstone quarry in same area.
- Identify the Thompson-Fraiser gold rush trail/route. May be telegraph road. Would be nice to have a historical or interpretive marker for public.
- Cherry Point needs to be saved/purchased for public recreational use. There was an agreement for mitigation due to industrial development-need to look up status. Site can be used for beach access, boat launching, camping, and day use.
- Walk in accesses should be developed for Hutchison Creek and other streams in the County to provide fishing access.
- Anderson Mountain, Glen Haven, and connections with Skagit County should be preserved to ensure continued recreational development.
- Coordinate trail development with Skagit County.
- Maintain & preserve the trails on Vedder Mountain.
- Maintain trails & connections on Sumas Mountain.
- Connect the Lake Whatcom Trail-purchase the missing link.
- Obtain easements for trails being used throughout the County-preserve and continue to use all. Cannot afford to loose these.
- Limestone surface the Bay to Baker-Nooksack River trails for year round multiple use (bike, hike, and horse where compatible).
- ORV not a priority or desired activity-too damaging and incompatible with other uses.
- Put bird watching routes and wildlife/scenic view spots in plan.
- Hovander could possibly have non-dedicated fields for open space and games.
- Play fields could be developed at Bay Horizon Park.
- Provide mooring buoys and restrooms for boaters along lake Whatcom Trail and properties.
- No way for public to access south Lake Whatcom properties. Provide public access from the water and land. Area could be used for camping.
- Formalize park properties and sign them so the public recognizes them.
- Acquire Point Whitehorn for public use.
- Develop a water trail-canoe and kayak trail along river and lake (Whatcom)
- Marine-beach access is a high priority

F.1.2 Birch Bay - 12 January

- Public restrooms are needed along the beach area. Need to be open year round.
- Need to better accommodate beach and shore parking.
- Develop walks and trails-berm would help
- Berm along the beach will provide many recreational opportunities.
- County needs to map and purchase tidelands-too confusing on ownerships and public wants to use.
- Preserve wildlife habitat whenever possible. Provide buffers around parks to protect and screen them.
- Agencies must communicate to protect and preserve the opportunities in the BB area.
- Mouth of Terrell Creek needs to be acquired for public-preserve and access.
- Purchase Point Whitehorn- acquire and improve public access. Save entire area and open to public for recreation- Area is a kill zone so other development shouldn't go there.
- Open existing bathroom on shore year round.
- Inventory and sign public accesses at road ends.

- Purchase Semiahmoo spit to protect from development. Already a great public resource and treasure.
- Acquire Lily Point at Point Roberts-too valuable and significant to develop into homes.
- Provide a launch, campground, and day use park at Cherry Point.
- Mark and maintain canoe routes on California, Nooksack, Terrell & Dakota Creeks. Include interpretive guides, maps and campgrounds where necessary.
- Provide a campground on the outlet of Terrell Creek.
- Provide campsites for bicycling throughout the County- small rest areas.
- Keep horses and dogs off the beach & tidelands-don't belong and pollute the water and shellfish (question on existing laws not being enforced)
- Save the trails throughout the County.
- No support for ATV-off road use of public lands.
- Designate Birch Bay Drive as a scenic by way.
- Park Office is too far from Birch Bay and other parks-need to relocate. Park Department needs to have a greater presence in the Birch Bay area.
- Open Semiahmoo park again-don't need a day care. Use the building for public activities.

F.1.3 Kendall - 18 January

- Phil identified a number of mill and historical sites.
- Parks should have more historical and interpretive information available-signed.
- Kayak stop needs to be located around Cherry Point.
- Cherry Point should be used for recreational purposes.
- Encourage more non-motorized boating. Develop more access and campsites along the Nooksack.
- North Fork needs public accesses- Boulder Creek mouth would be a good public area. Others are North Fork bridge, Warner Bridge where Canyon Creek dumps into the river, Mosquito Lake Road & Welcome, Mount Baker Highway, Black Mountain Camp, Hutchinson Creek, Truck Road, Mosquito Lake, Campers Paradise, Glen at Maple Falls.
- Need more campgrounds in our area-Kendall and Maple Falls. Look at "German Parks" regarding garbage and multiple use.
- Horse camps needed at Sumas Mountain & other areas
- Develop a trail walk on the western beach of Lummi Island-need more public access.
- Maintain horse trails on Vedder Mountain and off South Pass road
- Provide horse camps with trails
- Yurts are very popular- we should explore use in the County
- Lou can provide info on horse contacts around Glacier.
- Stewart Mountain Trails need to be maintained and marked.
- John & Drew Adams have a mountain bike map of trails around Glacier.
- Reece Hill near Sumas has a great view and waterfall off South Pass Road which should be saved.
- A new retreat center is being built in Glacier.
- Nothing for kids to do- need more things for local residents like playgrounds and pools. No soccer leagues or other activities like Bellingham has. Need to provide these for the large number of children in the foothills.
- Re: Kendall Community Center-County needs to provide park staff for programs in addition to helping fund the building.
- The foothills community needs to come together to find ways to fund our local needs. We can provide all these things if these are priorities and we tax ourselves.

F.1.4 Ferndale - 20 January

- Can we do more to protect our recreational opportunities and landscapes in the future?
- Lily Point is an important Native American site and should be preserved. Book Nooksack Tales has good historical information.
- Let's get "stuff on the ground" after this plan. We have a lot of effort in planning and not enough on development.
- Acquire end of Sandy Point as an overnight kayak site.
- BP refinery has camping area for employees-ID and acquire for public use.
- Sudden Valley Campground has potential for public use.
- Lutherwood on Lake Samish should be acquired for public use if ever available.

- Look at “Duck Blind” camping on some lakes.
- Connect Pioneer and Hovander Parks with a pedestrian bridge over the Nooksack River.
- Develop a trail between Ferndale and Lake Terrell.
- Most hang gliding occurs in Skagit County. Some at Canyon Lake area-find launch sites and preserve.
- Improve the walking trails in Hovander Park. (Harden and improve drainage)
- Need additional shelters at Hovander-always booked and too big-expensive.
- Have camping at Hovander-it would be a great addition and make money for the County to do more!

F.1.5 Acme/Van Zandt - 24 January

- Concerns about Bellingham making decisions about the South Fork area.
- Need to keep in mind the impact from Canada-come down and use our facilities.
- Tubing and floating devices disturb the protected salmon in the South Fork.
- Too much drinking by underage, litter, and disturbing the adjoining landowners.
- OK for local families & property owners to do, but College kids from all over ruin it. People travel from Seattle and Vancouver to tube. Too many people.
- Problem area between Saxon Road and Acme. Encourage people to tube from Acme downstream instead.
- Hatchery fish is also a problem for the resource.
- Need to preserve horse trails-Skookum Creek area is a good location.
- Provide trail links from west county to federal lands.
- End of Saxton Road (tribal property) could be developed for parking-trailhead access.
- Van Zandt dike is a popular hiking area.
- Provide a looped trail along the river through the County properties (Nesset).
- Provide shelters for bicyclists and horse riders throughout the county. Provide a place for bicyclists to camp.
- Widen Highway 9 to make safer for bicyclists.
- ORV-North fork road provides access to DNR property. Too many problems tearing up areas. Let the private sector provide if needed.
- Need more local places to play games-just grass.
- Purchase the Zobrist Store on South Lake Whatcom for historical value and a public building.
- Acquire Mt. Baker Baptist Camp as a public retreat and recreation area.
- Maple Falls school district has 4.2 acres that may have potential for recreational use.
- Develop a looped community trail for hiking and biking.
- Develop more camping sites for local residents. Develop a camping area by Skookum Creek.
- Reopen the DNR Campground on Hutchinson Creek.
- Develop a campground/park in the Mosquito Lake area.
- Mosquito Lake Road is a scenic road and bike route.
- Provide access to the Nooksack River but keep low key.
- Develop trails on the uplands on Lummi Island.
- South Lake Whatcom properties should be developed to improve public access.
- Connect the North Lake Whatcom Trail and develop a route around the lake for bicyclists.
- Use the industrial piers for public use if ever available on the saltwater.
- Cherry Point is used by the public and should be kept as a public park & access.
- Quarry on Lummi Island would be a good location for a park.
- Develop Bay to Baker trail but call something else. Look at Chain of Trails plan for ideas.
- Saxon Cemetery is a historical site. Numerous mill and historical sites identified on map.
- Kendall area needs a community center.

F.1.6 Point Roberts - 25 January

Agricultural Lands and Forests

- There are probably no workable agricultural lands left on the Point
- There may be some old growth timber that should be recognized and protected

- A Historical Farm is in the planning stages with the local Historical Society. Irene Waters can provide information on the Society's plans
- Old Growth Forests are located around Lilly Point that should be protected.
- A Tree Corridor should be preserved coming into Point Roberts and into Lilly Point.

Historical/Cultural Sites

- The local Historical Society has information on canneries and fish traps that were located on the Point.
- An old pier and other 20th Century artifacts are located on Lilly Point.
- Point Roberts may have been a military base in the past, but there was some disagreement on this claim.
- Point Roberts was once part of the Gold Rush Pathway to the Fraser Valley in British Columbia.
- The Point Roberts Cemetery is very old and unique and thus considered a historical site.

Resource Parks

- Point Roberts is a key stop on the Cascadia Water Trail according to Bennett VanBuskirk.
- Mark Ferno was concerned about local say of the use of Excise Taxes. Why do cities have a say and unincorporated areas like Point Roberts don't?
- Terry (?) from the local Chamber of Commerce made a brief pitch for the Pier at the end of Gulf Road and the Lighthouse Project.

General Point Roberts Suggestions

- Lilly Point is made up of three parcels that are currently for sale.
- A small parcel by the mouth of the Marina should be designated for kayaks and other small boats.
- Access to the waterfront is a major priority. Most access is through private property.
- The State Constitution allow people to walk around the Point on the tide lands.
- The following roads would provide access to the water.
 - South Beach
 - Largo
 - Maple Beach
 - County Fire Road located in the middle of Lilly Point
- Mr. Jim Linde has specific recommendations about Lilly Point trails and access.
- Bennett VanBuskirk has a local Planning Document about recommended Point Roberts Multi-Use Trails.
- Joe Ferguson from the Wackie Walkers would like to see Exercise Stations set up along trails at Lighthouse Park.
- People at Point Roberts are not aware of the State Recreational Immunity Law. When this was shared with the Marina they were will to allow limited access.
- The entire Point would be great for scenic bike routes. They have been working with County Public Works to use gas tax money to widen roads. See David Niles
- People would like to see Point Roberts included in plans for the Coast Millennium Trail. People could camp at the Park before catching the ferry.
- Viewscape Roads include.
 - Tyee
 - A.P.A. Road
 - Boundary Bay Road
- A historic church is located on A.P.A. Road
- People have recommended that a Museum facility be added to the Community Center Building.

Community Center

- George Wright has talked to the County Executive about the County building a large Community Center that would serve all age groups and allow for alcohol use.
 - He wants a facility built by the County but controlled by local interests

F.1.7 Sumas - 27 January

- Add scout camps, bible camps, and RV parks to list of possible acquisitions for public use.
- The old oxbow channel below the Linden Museum use to be a grounding spot for the flat-bottomed steamers.

- Preserve the I-5 corridor into the southern portion of the County and keep it undeveloped and forested for public recreation.
- The mouth of Fish Trap Creek should be purchased as a multiple use area-camping/canoeing/kayaking/fishing.
- Additional campsites for bicyclists and water trail users should be developed throughout the County.
- Cross border access for bicyclists needs to be maintained and improved at Sumas.
- Straka Farm on South Pass Road maybe a heritage farm that warrants saving.
- Intalco has a private RV park that should be acquired as a public park-campground on the saltwater.
- More boat-only parks could be developed. Need for canoeists and kayakers on the Nooksack, Whatcom, saltwater shores and Lummi & Portage Islands.
- Sandbar at Lynden's sewer treatment plant should be acquired for public access-traditionally access has been allowed by the private landowner. It would be a shame to loose the opportunity.
- Dave Black gave detailed information on trail access and routing in the Lynden area. He has been working with the City to make trail connections and is available as a trail resource. (Contact for future reference)
- Preserve trail connections on Sumas Mountain and work with the school district on the Lost Lake trail access & Ostrum site.
- Preserve trails on Vedder Mountain and along border.
- City residents tend to use indoor pool facilities across the border. Probably wouldn't be interested in providing-supporting a similar facility in the County.
- The Mayor will have the Sumas Public Works Director submit a letter addressing the plan and other opportunities.
- The City allows horse camping at the Rodeo Grounds.
- Develop additional horse camping sites throughout the County.
- The Glen Echo is a good example of a private community center that supports itself without public funding.
- The Nooksack River/Bay to Baker trail will connect Sumas with other areas of the County. A spur connecting the City would be helpful for both residents and trail users alike.

F.1.8 Park Office - 29 January

- Explore option of a trail segment from Jensen road to Agate Bay for the North Shore trail route.
- Important connection through Euclid Park for neighborhoods and recreational riding. Steep slope and no access from the south make it a challenge.
- Identify mineral resource lands on the mapping.
- Add the Deming Logging Grounds, Baptist Camp on the Way to Mt Baker, Lummi Island Camp, School Outdoor site on south Lake Whatcom, Nessel Farm and all other camps and centers in the County to the map for potential acquisition.
- Alusta Park Railroad right of way-could it be used for trail purposes?
- Need waste disposal stations & restrooms at kayak stops-rest stations.
- Develop kayak & canoe stops around Lake Whatcom-great area for short trips.
- Provide public access on Sentinel Island.
- Develop a dock(s) along the Hertz Trail for all watercraft users. Needs to be accessible.
- Plan for an alternative powerboat launch on Lake Whatcom in the event the one in Bellingham closes. Full restrooms needed on lake in several areas.
- Check "Firs" on Canyon Creek being closed and acquire.
- Improve accessibility in all parks.
- Provide cluster areas with camping for bicyclists and hikers.
- Develop a hiking trail from the Y-road to North Lake Whatcom Trailhead
- Develop an off road trail along State Highway 9 for bikes and hiking. Road is too dangerous but an essential route.
- Open up the Nessel property and lands on south Lake Whatcom. Cannot find on maps. Please put up signs marking park property.

F.1.9 Lummi Island - 1 February

- **Additional bike racks, lockers, and covered bike parking at the ferry landing are needed. Biking is low impact and would be used more if facilities were improved. Too few racks now-often full. May need to refer to Public Works.**
- Overall-preserve the island's scenic quiet character. Like the wild places-a place to walk with trails
- Limitations to recreation on island include increased traffic, lack of water and public amenities, over crowding of limited ferry service, parking problems, uncontrolled fire, limited or no law enforcement and intrusion on the island's quiet nature.
- Park development should focus on smaller low impact areas like accesses and pocket parks to avoid creating more traffic and attracting large groups of people.
- **Concern that if we build it, they will come.**
- 60% of island residents would like a public boat launch- but limited to primarily resident use. Parking & ferry use is a problem.
- Beach access a high priority on the island-only public beach is Park Department's property at the landing and the Church beach. County should purchase small parcels in key areas for beach and water access.
- Public Access to southern portion of island for hiking is desirable. Concerns regarding fires if public allowed. Need to get public access to the "mountain". Access to this portion of the island should be a priority, but keep low key to avoid attracting large numbers from the mainland.
- Quarry would make a nice park area.
- Utilize the road ends as pocket parks and beach accesses. Stop the adjoining property owners from trying to keep the public from using them.
- Wetland maps and critical areas maps need corrections. Peregrine Falcon site not noted on maps.
- Safer roads for walking and bicycling.
- Develop several small rest areas (table, restroom, maybe water or small shelter) to serve bicyclists and hikers
- End of Tuttle Lane-did the County vacate?
- Large groups of kayakers using the ferry a concern.
- Salvation Army Camp would make a great park
- A transient dock for boaters, kayakers would be an attraction- place to stretch legs and use restroom.
- Cherry Point needs to be preserved for public use.
- Mosquito Lake road and bridge crossings should be improved for access to the Nooksack River.
- Preserve the social trails on the island-everyone uses but could be lost due to change in ownership or attitudes.
- Develop walking paths along the roadways-little room now when vehicles pass.
- Preserve and interpret the reef netting area-village. Rapp House and other historical sites need to be preserved.
- Scenic roads shown on map- all roads are scenic. Can we maintain in present character and not lose the narrow winding rural nature? Can we develop road standards to preserve?
- Kayak launch sites are needed around the island to put in and take out during bad weather.
- Consolidate the County's ownership at the ferry landing and turn into a low impact park.
- Create an off road trail across the island for hiking and biking. Almost happened once. Need County Parks to take a leadership role in order for it to happen.
- A larger community center is needed. The Grange Hall is too small for some events. The Boys & Girls Club is also interested in using a new center.

F.2 Mail-out/phone-back survey

A random sample of resident voter households in Whatcom County were contacted to participate in a controlled sample survey concerning park, recreation, and open space planning proposals in August 2005.

Approximately 600 households agreed to participate in the survey and were mailed a copy of a summary description of the plan and a copy of the questionnaire. Survey results

were compiled for the first 300 households who completed the surveys by follow-up telephone call - the number planned for in the original survey scope - of which 49% were male and 51% were female.

The resulting survey results are accurate to within +/-7% of the opinions of the general population (the statistics are rounded and may not add to 100% and do not list don't know responses). The statistics also account for undecided, did not know, or refused a response. Following is a summary of the results for the total sample group.

F.2.1 Respondent characteristics

Location of residence

The respondents home address generally reflects the current distribution of registered voter households:

1% live in the Port Roberts area	6% live in the Sumas/Nooksack area
1% live in the Lummi Island area	11% live in the Ferndale area
3% live in the Blaine area	57% live in the Bellingham area
2% live in the Birch Bay area	11% live elsewhere in the county
8% live in the Lynden area	

Length of residence

Most survey participants are very long time residents of Whatcom County:

1% resident 0-1 years,	11% resident 6-10 years, and
10% resident 2-5 years	78% resident 10+ years.

Type of housing

Most survey participants are homeowners:

96% own their home,	4% rent their home.
---------------------	---------------------

Age group

Most survey participants are from older age households:

1% age 18-24,	40% age 50-64, and
5% age 25-34,	27% age 65+ years.
27% age 35-49,	

F.2.2 Recreation program priorities

Survey participants were asked if household members had participated in recreational programs provided by the county in the last year.

48% used program in last year,	52% had not.
--------------------------------	--------------

Survey participants were asked to rate the need for the county to provide recreation programs in Whatcom County in general on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 was the least important and 5 the most important.

A choice was considered critical or very important if the participants selected ratings of 4 or 5 in high percentages, nice-to-have or medium if the participants selected a 3 rating, and not important if the participants selected ratings of 1 or 2 in high percentages. Following is a rank ordering of their selections.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<u>Recreational program in priority sequence</u>			
Rental of campsites and cabins?	25%	16%	58%
Hosting of music, drama, art, and other festivals and special events in a park?	24%	20%	56%
Rental of picnic shelters and lodges?	24%	21%	54%
Historical, archeological, and heritage exhibits, walks, programs, and events?	22%	31%	47%
Wildlife habitat exhibits, walks, programs, and events?	25%	28%	47%
Youth volunteer park construction/work parties?	33%	20%	45%
Adult volunteer park construction/work parties?	31%	23%	42%
Rental of Roeder/Hovander homes for weddings,	39%	20%	40%

parties, and other special events?			
Roeder/Hovander home historical displays and tours?	31%	29%	39%
Environmental exhibits, walks, programs, and events?	35%	25%	39%
Youth day use and overnight summer camps?	38%	21%	39%
Youth hike, bike, or horse trail excursions?	35%	25%	38%
Outdoor skill and safety instructions in biking, boating, horseback riding, etc?	38%	23%	38%
Rental of bikes, canoes, boats, and other equipment?	37%	25%	37%
Family or group picnic and camping events?	38%	27%	32%
Family hike, bike, or horse trail excursions?	41%	27%	30%
Farm and agricultural exhibits, programs and events?	47%	26%	27%
Adult hike, bike, or horse trail excursions?	41%	28%	26%
Campfire social and entertainment programs?	60%	24%	16%

Note - the overall results indicate the relative rank-order importance the survey participants gave these needs as a general population - and therefore, which needs would likely receive the highest general population approval ratings where general funds, for example, to be used to finance program services.

Conversely, a low rank-order does not mean the need should or does not need to be provided. Rather, that the need may appeal to a more limited age or interest group (adult hiking and campfire programs, for example) and may need to be funded by special means or discretionary revenue sources rather than general monies.

Program costs

Survey respondents were asked to rate the following methods of paying for future recreational programs assuming that it would require more money to provide present or future services than can be budgeted at the present time.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<u>Program cost option in priority sequence</u>			
<u>Increase user fees for non-residents</u> - to finance program services?	18%	16%	64%
<u>Reduce the number</u> - of programs to control costs?	31%	31%	36%
<u>Increase user fees for everyone</u> - to finance program services?	40%	25%	35%
<u>Reduce the content, variety, and duration</u> - of programs to control costs?	31%	33%	33%
<u>Increase county taxes</u> - to finance program services?	63%	18%	18%

F.2.3 Facility priorities in general

Survey respondents were asked how they rated the existing inventory of all park, recreation, and open space facilities provided in Whatcom County by the county, cities, school districts, port, state, and other park providers?

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<u>Quality</u> - of maintenance conditions and furnishings including parking, restrooms, trails, campsites, shelters, cabins, and other facilities in existing parks?	6%	26%	67%
<u>Quantity</u> - the number, size and location of existing park and trail sites to serve the existing population?	11%	27%	61%

In general, the respondents gave the existing countywide park, recreation, and open space inventory high ratings for quality and the quantity.

F.2.4 Project priorities in general

Survey respondents were asked to rate the need for the following additional facilities within the county in general whether provided by the county, cities, school districts, port, state, or another park provider.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<i>Generic project proposals in priority sequence</i>			
Waterfront access and beach use sites?	12%	18%	69%
Old growth forestland conservation areas?	17%	17%	65%
Open space and scenic area preservation?	14%	22%	63%
Wildlife habitat and conservation areas?	15%	22%	61%
Water resources and watershed protection areas?	18%	20%	61%
Off-road cross-country walking and hiking trails?	18%	25%	56%
Picnic tables, play areas, and shelters	15%	29%	55%
Productive farmland conservation areas?	18%	25%	55%
Youth and teen activity centers?	20%	24%	54%
Senior activity centers?	20%	26%	52%
Historical buildings and sites?	21%	28%	50%
Soccer, lacrosse, baseball, and softball athletic fields?	26%	31%	42%
Tent, yurt, RV campsites, group camps, and cabins?	27%	30%	42%
Handicap accessible trails and facilities within parks?	23%	35%	41%
Cartop boat (kayak/canoe) launch sites?	29%	32%	37%
On-road cross-country bicycle routes?	35%	29%	35%
Off-road multipurpose (hike/bike/horse) trails?	32%	32%	33%
Off-road cross-country bicycle trails?	35%	29%	33%
Dog parks, exercise areas, and trails?	40%	27%	31%
Community classrooms and meeting facilities?	44%	29%	26%
Daycare facilities?	49%	27%	21%
Off-road snowshoe, skiing, and snowmobile trails?	46%	32%	19%
Powerboat launching and moorage facilities?	48%	33%	19%
Off-road cross-country horse trails?	49%	32%	17%
Off-road ATV, motorcycle, and ORV parks?	76%	13%	10%
Golf course and driving ranges?	68%	19%	11%

Note - the overall results indicate the relative rank-order importance the survey participants gave these needs as a general population - and therefore, which needs would likely receive the highest general population approval ratings where general funds, for example, to be used to finance program services.

Conversely, a low rank-order does not mean the need should or does not need to be provided. Rather, that the need may appeal to a more limited age or interest group (off-road ATV and golf course facilities, for example) and may need to be funded by special means or discretionary revenue sources rather than general monies.

F.2.5 Development plan proposal priorities

Survey respondents were asked to rate specific park plan proposals the county, cities, school districts, port, and other park providers may jointly conserve and develop as shown on attached preliminary concept graphics.?

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<i>Specific project proposals in priority sequence</i>			
<i>Conservancies wildlife</i> - protect the proposed wildlife habitat areas of the county in and around fresh and saltwater areas, wetlands, and woodland areas?	11%	16%	71%
<i>Conservancies watershed</i> - protect the proposed water resource and watershed areas of the county?	11%	17%	70%
<i>Conservancies forestland</i> - protect the proposed mature and old growth forested areas of the county from logging in and around urbanizing areas and in backcountry sites?	17%	13%	69%
<i>Conservancies scenic</i> - protect the proposed scenic areas, viewpoints, and vistas of the county along fresh and saltwater shorelines, farmlands, and wooded hilltop and ridgelines (<i>see page 21</i>)?	13%	16%	69%

	Ratings		
	1 + 2	3	4 + 5
<u>Saltwater access</u> - acquire/develop the proposed additional saltwater access sites for fishing, beachcombing, and walking?	12%	22%	64%
<u>Conservancies farmland</u> - protect the proposed historical and productive farmlands of the county from subdivision and development?	15%	21%	63%
<u>Shoreline trails</u> - develop the proposed cross-country network of saltwater beach and shoreline walking areas and trails?	16%	22%	59%
<u>Hiking trails</u> - develop the proposed cross-country network of on and off-road day and backpacking cross-country hiking trails?	20%	22%	57%
<u>Freshwater access</u> - acquire/develop the proposed additional freshwater access sites for fishing, swimming, and boating?	18%	25%	55%
<u>Conservancies historical</u> - protect the proposed farms, sawmills, railroads, mines, and other heritage sites from demolition and development?	16%	30%	51%
<u>Picnic shelters and group activity sites</u> - develop the proposed additional picnic shelters and group picnic facilities at major regional park sites?	18%	31%	49%
<u>On-road bicycle routes</u> - develop the proposed cross-country system of on-road routes using road shoulders and designated bike lanes?	26%	23%	49%
<u>Athletic fields</u> - acquire and lease the proposed network of sites to athletic league organizations for the development of a regional system of public playing fields for youth and adults?	23%	28%	48%
<u>Non-motorized cartop (kayak/canoe) launch sites</u> - develop the proposed additional access and launch sites at salt and freshwater sites?	28%	27%	44%
<u>Water trails</u> - develop the proposed cartop boat put-in, take-out, and overnight campsites along navigable salt and freshwater paddling routes?	28%	29%	40%
<u>Campsites and cabins</u> - develop the proposed additional tent and RV campsites, yurts and cabins, and group camp sites at major regional park sites?	29%	30%	40%
<u>Scenic roads</u> - designate the proposed system of cross-country back-road scenic routes with viewpoints, interpretive signage, and other exhibits?	32%	27%	39%
<u>Meeting facilities</u> - develop and lease the proposed network of community facilities throughout the county to non-profit organizations for the operation of teen, senior, and other public activities and events?	27%	35%	37%
<u>Multipurpose trails</u> - develop the proposed off-road cross-country network of hike, bike, and horse trails?	30%	31%	37%
<u>Enterprise facilities</u> - where user fees and/or self help efforts will support, acquire and lease or develop the proposed gun ranges, equestrian facilities, conference facilities and retreats, at select regional properties throughout the county?	43%	31%	24%
<u>Off-road mountain bike trails</u> - develop the proposed cross-country network of riding trails?	47%	27%	24%
<u>Motorized boat launches - saltwater</u> - develop the proposed additional boat launching facilities at saltwater sites?	47%	29%	23%

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<i>Specific project proposals in priority sequence</i>			
<i>Winter trails</i> – develop the proposed cross-country network of snowshoe, skiing, and snowmobile trails?	48%	28%	22%
<i>Motorized boat launches - freshwater</i> – develop the proposed additional boat launching facilities at freshwater sites?	55%	26%	19%
<i>Horse trails</i> – develop the proposed cross-country network of horse stables, riding areas, and trails?	52%	32%	14%
<i>ATV/motorcycle riding areas</i> – support the continued private party operation of ATV/motorcycle riding areas?	69%	15%	14%

Note - Whatcom County, like all jurisdictions in Washington State, must restructure fiscal policies to reflect recently adopted restraints on the use of property, license, and other taxes for the financing of general governmental services. Survey respondents were asked to rate the following alternative methods for delivering park, recreation, and open space facilities and programs in the county. County Council could adopt some, most, or all of the following ways and methods for restructuring the way the county delivers and finances park and recreation facilities and services depending on the results of this survey, and in some cases subsequent voter approvals.

F.2.6 Whatcom County role and responsibility alternatives

County Council could deliver the park, recreation, and open space facilities and programs proposed above under different policy priorities. Survey respondents were asked to prioritize the ***following functions that could be provided by the county for the development of park facilities and operation of recreation programs.***

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<i>Park facilities</i>			
<i>Regional developer</i> – acquire and develop <i>regional</i> facilities, such as multipurpose trails, to be used <i>by all residents of the county on a countywide basis?</i>	23%	24%	47%
<i>Regional coordinator</i> – create plans, financing strategies, and implementation programs regardless of who may develop the facilities?	32%	26%	37%
<i>Local developer</i> – acquire and develop <i>local</i> facilities, such as playgrounds, <i>to be used by residents of specific local areas in the county?</i>	36%	24%	35%
<i>Recreation programs</i>	Low	Medium	High
<i>Local operator</i> – organize, schedule, staff, and conduct programs in <i>local</i> facilities?	31%	26%	36%
<i>Regional operator</i> – organize, schedule, staff, and conduct programs in <i>regional</i> facilities?	32%	29%	32%
<i>Landlord</i> – own, develop, and maintain facilities – but have other agencies conduct and operate programs?	49%	28%	16%

The results indicate survey respondents would prefer the county assume a role as a regional developer of facilities with less emphasis on the development of local facilities or programs of interest to localized areas within the county.

F.2.7 Joint venture opportunity and partner options

Besides Whatcom County – cities, school districts, athletic organizations, private operators, and a variety of other public and private agencies own and operate park facilities and recreational programs within the county. Survey respondents were asked to rate joint venture projects with the following organizations.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
Park facility development			
<u>With nonprofit organizations</u> – for the <u>conservation</u> of sensitive environmental areas or the <u>preservation</u> of historical areas or the <u>development</u> of athletic fields for public use?	12%	23%	62%
<u>With other public agencies</u> – like cities, school districts, and the port for the <u>development</u> of parks, trails, and athletic fields?	11%	31%	54%
<u>With for-profit organizations</u> – for the <u>development</u> of specialized facilities like campgrounds, marinas, and conference centers for public use for a fee?	39%	30%	28%
Recreation program operation	Low	Medium	High
<u>With nonprofit organizations</u> – for the <u>management</u> of sensitive environmental areas or the <u>operation</u> of childcare, teen, senior, or other community programs?	15%	23%	60%
<u>With other public agencies</u> – like cities, school districts, and the port for the <u>operation</u> of recreational programs at regional park sites for public use?	16%	25%	55%
<u>With for-profit organizations</u> – for the <u>operation</u> of specialized facilities like campgrounds, marinas, and conference centers for public use paid with a user fee?	40%	29%	28%

Survey respondents preferred the county joint venture with nonprofit organizations and other public agencies in the development of park facilities and operation of recreation program operations.

F.2.8 Organizational and financing alternatives

The County Council could institute alternative methods of organizationally managing and financing **regional versus local** park, recreation, and open space improvements within the county.

Countywide approach to regional park facilities – subject to voter approval, County Council could institute a property tax levy as a means of financing the acquisition, development, and operation of **regional** park, recreation, and open space facilities and programs on a countywide basis. A countywide approach would share revenues between the county, cities, school districts, and/or other agencies that provide **regional** park facilities and programs. Survey respondents were asked to rate this method.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
<u>Countywide regional park approach</u> – where revenues are shared between county, cities, school districts, and/or other agencies that provide <u>regional</u> park facilities and programs?	26%	27%	43%

	Amount per year
If a levy were to be put on the ballot <u>to finance regional park facilities and programs on a countywide basis</u> , how much, if anything, would your <u>household</u> be willing to pay <u>per year</u> for this source of funding?	Mean = \$79 245 responses from \$0 to \$2,000

Local park facilities using recreational service areas – County Council could institute a limited short-term (3-5 year) property tax levy as a means of financing the acquisition, development, and/or operation of **local** park, recreation, and open space facilities and/or programs within specified areas of the county. Recreation service areas can be established for a single facility for a single benefit area, such as scenic preservation for

county waterfront areas - or for multiple facilities for a specified portion of the county, such as athletic fields and indoor gymnasiums for a city or an urban growth area (UGA).

Once proposed, the county residents within each **local** recreation service area vote to determine whether to assess a limited short-term property tax increment to finance acquisition, development, and/or operation of the proposed facilities and programs within the proposed **local service area**. Survey respondents were asked to rate the following methods.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
Specific areas - organizing recreation service areas to provide a mixture of facilities and programs within a specific local area, such as a city or school district or urban growth area?	33%	26%	35%
Specific facilities - organizing recreation service areas to finance specific facilities and programs, such as the preservation of scenic areas?	38%	30%	25%

	<i>Amount per year</i>
If a levy were to be put on the ballot <u>to finance local park facilities and programs within your local area (which could include a city area)</u> , how much, if anything, would your household be willing to pay <u>per year</u> for this source of funding?	Mean = \$63 241 responses from \$0 to \$1,300

F.2.9 Real estate excise and fuel tax, and license fee options

Subject to voter approval, County Council could institute a variety of optional fees and taxes to be used **instead of or in addition to** the regional/local organizational financing approaches defined in the above (as a way of reducing the use of property taxes for park financing). Survey respondents were asked to rate each of the following optional approaches.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
Optional dedicated fees and taxes			
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET-3) - an additional 0.25% assessment of the sales price of all real estate property (equal to \$250 per \$100,000 of sale price) paid by the purchaser to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of park and open space?	42%	14%	39%
Local Option Vehicle License Fee - an additional \$15.00 per vehicle license registered in the county to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of trail improvements?	57%	12%	28%
Local Option Sales Tax - an additional 0.1% sales tax (equal to \$0.10 for a \$100 purchase) to be paid by residents and tourists to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of park and open space?	52%	16%	29%
Local Option Fuel Tax - an additional \$0.023 per gallon sales tax to be paid by residents and tourists to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of trail improvements?	73%	6%	18%

F.2.10 General obligation bond options

Subject to voter approval, County Council could also propose a variety of optional bonds as a means of financing park, recreation, and open space improvements for specific projects. This option could be used **instead of or in addition to** the options defined in the above. How would you rate the following?

General obligation bond - County Council could submit a general obligation bond for voter approval to finance **acquisition and development** of specific park, recreation, and open space improvements. The bond, which can not be used to finance operation and maintenance, would be financed over a 20-year period.

General obligation bond	Amount per year
If a bond were to be put on the ballot <i>to finance the highest priority projects</i> , how much, if anything, would your household be willing to pay per year for this source of funding?	Mean = \$68 240 responses from \$0 to \$2,000

F.2.11 Population growth impact management options

In the next 20 years the county population is projected to increase by another 60,500 people or 34% more than the existing population of 179,500 persons.

In your opinion, will existing park and recreation facilities (not including any of the plan's proposals) within the county, cities, and school districts systems be enough to provide for this population increase?	19% yes 60% no 21% don't know
---	--

The *existing* inventory of **county** park and recreational facilities is estimated to be worth about \$900 per person or \$2,000 for an average single family house. ***This amount is the cost required for additional park facilities for new housing residents if the county is to maintain the same standards for park, recreation, and open space facilities that are currently provided existing residents.*** Given this fact, survey respondents were asked to rate the following methods for dealing with the impact of new population growth on parks and the methods existing residents may be using to finance park improvements.

	Ratings		
	1 + 2 Low	3 Medium	4 + 5 High
Growth management financing			
Collect a one-time growth impact fee from new housing development projects - to pay for park improvements?	13%	11%	74%
Lower standards - for the number of park facilities provided to future populations?	67%	21%	9%
Increase county taxes - to acquire and develop park facilities to offset population growth impacts?	56%	26%	16%

Growth impact fees	Amount per year	
If a park growth impact fee were to be collected from new housing development projects , what percent of this cost would you recommend be charged for every new single family house to be developed in the county? (<i>The county does not currently charge growth impact fees.</i>)	22% 9% 17% 15% 22% 9%	\$2,000 \$1,500 \$1,000 \$ 500 \$ 200 \$ 0

Conclusion

In general, the results of the telephone survey indicate resident county voters will support user fees, growth impact fees, general obligation bonds, and joint venture projects if the programs and projects are conceived along the lines indicated in the survey results.

300 survey completions

Whatcom County Park, Recreation, & Open Space Plan

In August 2005 a random sample of resident voter households in Whatcom County were contacted to participate in a controlled sample survey concerning park, recreation, and open space planning proposals.

600 households agreed to participate in the survey and were mailed a copy of a summary description of the plan and a copy of the questionnaire. Survey results were compiled for the first 300 households who completed the surveys by follow-up telephone call - the number planned for in the original survey scope - of which 49% were male and 51% were female.

The resulting survey results are accurate to within 7+/- percent of the opinions of the general population (the statistics are rounded and may not add to 100 percent and do not list don't know responses). The statistics also account for undecided, did not know, or refused a response. Following is a summary of the results for the total sample group.

Recreation program priorities and financing options

5	Have any household members used recreational programs provided by Whatcom County in the last year?	48% yes	52% no
---	--	----------------	---------------

What recreational programs do you think Whatcom County should offer (that your household members would use) on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is the least important and 5 is the most important?

		<i>lowest / highest</i>				
		1	2	3	4	5
Interpretive programs provided in county parks						
6	Wildlife habitat exhibits, walks, programs, and events?	10%	15%	28%	31%	16%
7	Environmental exhibits, walks, programs, and events?	16%	19%	25%	24%	15%
8	Historical, archeological, and heritage exhibits, walks, programs, and events?	10%	11%	31%	28%	19%
9	Farm and agricultural exhibits, programs and events?	21%	26%	26%	19%	8%
Outdoor programs provided in county parks						
10	Outdoor skill and safety instructions in biking, boating, horseback riding, etc?	20%	18%	23%	24%	14%
11	Campfire social and entertainment programs?	34%	26%	24%	10%	6%
12	Rental of bikes, canoes, boats, and other equipment?	20%	17%	25%	20%	17%
13	Rental of campsites and cabins?	15%	10%	16%	28%	30%
14	Rental of picnic shelters and lodges?	14%	10%	21%	27%	27%
Youth/family programs provided in county parks						
15	Youth day use and overnight summer camps?	26%	12%	21%	22%	17%
16	Youth hike, bike, or horse trail excursions?	23%	12%	25%	21%	17%
17	Youth volunteer park construction/work parties?	22%	11%	20%	23%	22%
18	Family or group picnic and camping events?	21%	17%	27%	21%	11%
19	Family hike, bike, or horse trail excursions?	23%	18%	27%	20%	10%
20	Adult hike, bike, or horse trail excursions?	22%	19%	28%	19%	7%
21	Adult volunteer park construction/work parties?	16%	15%	23%	24%	18%
Cultural arts programs provided in county facilities						
22	Hosting of music, drama, art, and other festivals and special events in a park?	11%	13%	20%	28%	28%
23	Roeder/Hovander home historical displays and tours?	12%	19%	29%	26%	13%
24	Rental of Roeder/Hovander homes for weddings, parties, and other special events?	20%	19%	20%	19%	21%

If it requires more money than can be budgeted from **Whatcom County** resources to provide future recreation programs, how would you rate the following methods of paying for them?

County recreation program financing options		lowest / highest				
25	Reduce the number - of programs to control costs?	13%	18%	31%	19%	17%
26	Reduce the content, variety, and duration - of programs to control costs?	12%	19%	33%	20%	13%
27	Increase user fees for non-residents - to finance program services?	9%	9%	16%	28%	36%
28	Increase user fees for everyone - to finance program services?	22%	18%	25%	24%	11%
29	Increase county taxes - to finance needed program services?	45%	18%	18%	10%	8%

Facility priorities in general

In general, how would you rate the **existing** inventory of **all** park, recreation, and open space facilities **provided in Whatcom County** by the county, cities, school districts, port, state, and other park providers?

		lowest / highest				
24	Quantity - the number, size and location of existing park and trail sites to serve the existing population?	4%	7%	27%	40%	21%
25	Quality - of maintenance conditions and furnishings including parking, restrooms, trails, campsites, shelters, cabins, and other facilities in existing parks?	1%	5%	26%	48%	19%

How would you rate the **need** for the following **additional** facilities within the county in general whether provided by the county, cities, school districts, port, state, or another park provider?

Conservation needs		lowest / highest				
26	Water resources and watershed protection areas?	8%	10%	20%	23%	38%
27	Wildlife habitat and conservation areas?	7%	8%	22%	30%	31%
28	Old growth forestland conservation areas?	8%	9%	17%	26%	39%
29	Productive farmland conservation areas?	9%	9%	25%	25%	30%
30	Open space and scenic area preservation?	7%	7%	22%	32%	31%
31	Historical buildings and sites?	8%	13%	28%	29%	21%

Regional park needs		lowest / highest				
32	Waterfront access and beach use sites?	6%	6%	18%	25%	44%
33	Cartop boat (kayak/canoe) launch sites?	12%	17%	32%	20%	17%
34	Powerboat launching and moorage facilities?	25%	23%	33%	9%	10%
35	Picnic tables, play areas, and shelters	6%	9%	29%	35%	20%
36	Tent, yurt, RV campsites, group camps, and cabins?	11%	16%	30%	27%	15%

Trail needs		lowest / highest				
37	Handicap accessible trails and facilities within parks?	9%	14%	35%	23%	18%
38	Off-road cross-country walking and hiking trails?	10%	8%	25%	32%	24%
39	Off-road cross-country horse trails?	23%	26%	32%	11%	6%
40	Off-road cross-country bicycle trails?	16%	19%	29%	21%	12%
41	Off-road snowshoe, skiing, and snowmobile trails?	22%	24%	32%	13%	6%
42	Off-road multipurpose (hike/bike/horse) trails?	17%	15%	32%	19%	14%
43	On-road cross-country bicycle routes?	20%	15%	29%	19%	16%
44	Dog parks, exercise areas, and trails?	23%	17%	27%	19%	12%
45	Off-road ATV, motorcycle, and ORV parks?	58%	18%	13%	5%	5%

Recreational facility needs		lowest / highest				
46	Soccer, lacrosse, baseball, and softball athletic fields?	14%	12%	31%	25%	17%
47	Golf course and driving ranges?	45%	23%	19%	7%	4%

48	Community classrooms and meeting facilities?	20%	24%	29%	21%	5%
49	Daycare facilities?	29%	20%	27%	13%	8%
50	Youth and teen activity centers?	9%	11%	24%	32%	22%
51	Senior activity centers?	11%	9%	26%	36%	16%

Development plan proposal priorities

Under the proposed park plan, the county, cities, school districts, port, and other park providers may jointly conserve and develop wildlife and open space preservations, waterfront parks, picnic and camping facilities, trails, athletic fields, meeting facilities, and other activities within the county. How would you rate the following proposals – as shown on the attached preliminary concept graphics that correspond with the question numbers?

<i>Conservancy parks – see pages 9-10 and 21</i>		<i>lowest / highest</i>				
52	<u>Conservancies watershed</u> – protect the proposed water resource and watershed areas of the county?	5%	6%	17%	21%	49%
53	<u>Conservancies wildlife</u> – protect the proposed wildlife habitat areas of the county in and around fresh and saltwater areas, wetlands, and woodland areas?	5%	6%	16%	29%	42%
54	<u>Conservancies forestland</u> – protect the proposed mature and old growth forested areas of the county from logging in and around urbanizing areas and in backcountry sites?	7%	10%	13%	26%	43%
55	<u>Conservancies farmland</u> – protect the proposed historical and productive farmlands of the county from subdivision and development?	6%	9%	21%	24%	39%
56	<u>Conservancies scenic</u> – protect the proposed scenic areas, viewpoints, and vistas of the county along fresh and saltwater shorelines, farmlands, and wooded hilltop and ridgelines (<i>see page 21</i>)?	4%	9%	16%	29%	40%
57	<u>Conservancies historical</u> – protect the proposed farms, sawmills, railroads, mines, and other heritage sites from demolition and development?	7%	9%	30%	28%	23%
<i>Regional parks – see pages 11-13</i>		<i>lowest / highest</i>				
58	<u>Saltwater access</u> – acquire/develop the proposed additional saltwater access sites for fishing, beachcombing, and walking?	6%	6%	22%	26%	38%
59	<u>Freshwater access</u> – acquire/develop the proposed additional freshwater access sites for fishing, swimming, and boating?	8%	10%	25%	29%	26%
60	<u>Motorized boat launches - saltwater</u> – develop the proposed additional boat launching facilities at saltwater sites?	26%	21%	29%	12%	11%
61	<u>Motorized boat launches - freshwater</u> – develop the proposed additional boat launching facilities at freshwater sites?	33%	22%	26%	9%	10%
62	<u>Non-motorized cartop (kayak/canoe) launch sites</u> – develop the proposed additional access and launch sites at salt and freshwater sites?	13%	15%	27%	24%	20%
63	<u>Picnic shelters and group activity sites</u> – develop the proposed additional picnic shelters and group picnic facilities at major regional park sites?	9%	9%	31%	30%	19%
64	<u>Campsites and cabins</u> – develop the proposed additional tent and RV campsites, yurts and cabins, and group camp sites at major regional park sites?	14%	15%	30%	24%	16%
<i>Trail systems – see pages 14-22</i>		<i>lowest / highest</i>				
65	<u>Water trails</u> – develop the proposed cartop boat put-in, take-out, and overnight campsites along navigable salt and freshwater paddling routes?	12%	16%	29%	23%	17%

66	Shoreline trails – develop the proposed cross-country network of saltwater beach and shoreline walking areas and trails?	6% 10% 22% 25% 34%
67	Hiking trails – develop the proposed cross-country network of on and off-road day and backpacking cross-country hiking trails?	8% 12% 22% 27% 30%
68	Horse trails – develop the proposed cross-country network of horse stables, riding areas, and trails?	27% 25% 32% 8% 6%
69	Off-road mountain bike trails – develop the proposed cross-country network of riding trails?	27% 20% 27% 15% 9%
70	Multipurpose trails – develop the proposed off-road cross-country network of hike, bike, and horse trails?	13% 17% 31% 18% 19%
71	Winter trails – develop the proposed cross-country network of snowshoe, skiing, and snowmobile trails?	22% 26% 28% 16% 6%
72	On-road bicycle routes – develop the proposed cross-country system of on-road routes using road shoulders and designated bike lanes?	15% 11% 23% 19% 30%
73	Scenic roads – designate the proposed system of cross-country back-road scenic routes with viewpoints, interpretive signage, and other exhibits?	14% 18% 27% 22% 17%
74	ATV/motorcycle riding areas – support the continued private party operation of ATV/motorcycle riding areas?	50% 19% 15% 7% 7%
Facilities – see pages 23-24		lowest / highest
75	Athletic fields – acquire and lease the proposed network of sites to athletic league organizations for the development of a regional system of public playing fields for youth and adults?	11% 12% 28% 27% 21%
76	Meeting facilities – develop and lease the proposed network of community facilities throughout the county to non-profit organizations for the operation of teen, senior, and other public activities and events?	12% 15% 35% 22% 15%
77	Enterprise facilities – where user fees and/or self help efforts will support, acquire and lease or develop the proposed gun ranges, equestrian facilities, conference facilities and retreats, at select regional properties throughout the county (no graphic provided)?	25% 18% 31% 17% 7%

Note - Whatcom County, like all jurisdictions in Washington State, must restructure fiscal policies to reflect recently adopted restraints on the use of property, license, and other taxes for the financing of general governmental services. The following questions outline a number of alternative methods for delivering park, recreation, and open space facilities and programs in the county for your evaluation. County Council could adopt some, most, or all of the following ways and methods for restructuring the way the county delivers and finances park and recreation facilities and services depending on the results of this survey, and in some cases subsequent voter approvals.

Whatcom County role and responsibility alternatives

County Council could deliver the park, recreation, and open space facilities and programs proposed above under different policy priorities. How would you prioritize the **following functions that could be provided by the county for the development of park facilities and operation of recreation programs?**

Park facilities		lowest / highest
78	Regional coordinator – create plans, financing strategies, and implementation programs regardless of who may develop the facilities?	15% 17% 26% 20% 17%
79	Regional developer – acquire and develop regional facilities, such as multipurpose trails, to be used by all residents of the county on a countywide basis?	12% 11% 24% 27% 20%

80	Local developer – acquire and develop local facilities, such as playgrounds, to be used by residents of specific local areas in the county?	19%	17%	24%	19%	16%
Recreation programs		lowest / highest				
81	Landlord – own, develop, and maintain facilities – but have other agencies conduct and operate programs?	27%	22%	28%	11%	5%
82	Regional operator – organize, schedule, staff, and conduct programs in regional facilities?	19%	13%	29%	23%	9%
83	Local operator – organize, schedule, staff, and conduct programs in local facilities?	15%	16%	26%	21%	15%

Joint venture opportunity and partner options

Besides Whatcom County – cities, school districts, athletic organizations, private operators, and a variety of other public and private agencies own and operate park facilities and recreational programs within the county. How would you rate joint venture projects with the following organizations?

Park facility development		lowest / highest				
84	With other public agencies – like cities, school districts, and the port for the development of parks, trails, and athletic fields?	4%	7%	31%	27%	28%
85	With nonprofit organizations – for the conservation of sensitive environmental areas or the preservation of historical areas or the development of athletic fields for public use?	5%	7%	23%	30%	32%
86	With for-profit organizations – for the development of specialized facilities like campgrounds, marinas, and conference centers for public use for a fee?	21%	18%	30%	15%	13%
Recreation program operation		lowest / highest				
87	With other public agencies – like cities, school districts, and the port for the operation of recreational programs at regional park sites for public use?	5%	11%	25%	31%	24%
88	With nonprofit organizations – for the management of sensitive environmental areas or the operation of childcare, teen, senior, or other community programs?	7%	8%	23%	33%	27%
89	With for-profit organizations – for the operation of specialized facilities like campgrounds, marinas, and conference centers for public use paid with a user fee?	22%	18%	29%	17%	11%

Organizational and financing alternatives

County Council could institute alternative methods of organizationally managing and financing **regional versus local** park, recreation, and open space improvements within the county. How would you rate the following alternatives?

- **Countywide approach to regional park facilities** – subject to voter approval, County Council could institute a **property tax levy** as a means of financing the acquisition, development, and operation of **regional** park, recreation, and open space facilities and programs **on a countywide basis**. A countywide approach would **share revenues** between the county, cities, school districts, and/or other agencies that provide **regional** park facilities and programs. How would you rate this method?

		lowest / highest				
90	Countywide regional park approach – where revenues are shared between county, cities, school districts, and/or other agencies that provide regional park facilities and programs?	15%	11%	27%	25%	18%

		Amount per year
91	If a levy were to be put on the ballot <i>to finance regional park facilities and programs on a countywide basis</i> , how much, if anything, would your household be willing to pay per year for this source of funding?	Mean = \$79 245 responses from \$0 to \$2,000

- **Local park facilities using recreational service areas** - County Council could institute a limited short-term (3-5 year) property tax levy as a means of financing the acquisition, development, and/or operation of **local** park, recreation, and open space facilities and/or programs within specified areas of the county. Recreation service areas can be established for a single facility for a single benefit area, such as scenic preservation for county waterfront areas - or for multiple facilities for a specified portion of the county, such as athletic fields and indoor gymnasiums for a city or an urban growth area (UGA).

Once proposed, the county residents within each **local** recreation service area vote to determine whether to assess a limited short-term property tax increment to finance acquisition, development, and/or operation of the proposed facilities and programs within the proposed **local service area**. How would you rate the following methods?

Recreation service areas		lowest / highest
92	Specific facilities - organizing recreation service areas to finance specific facilities and programs, such as the preservation of scenic areas?	21% 17% 30% 15% 10%
93	Specific areas - organizing recreation service areas to provide a mixture of facilities and programs within a specific local area, such as a city or school district or urban growth area?	19% 14% 26% 24% 11%

		Amount per year
94	If a levy were to be put on the ballot <i>to finance local park facilities and programs within your local area (which could include a city area)</i> , how much, if anything, would your household be willing to pay per year for this source of funding?	Mean = \$63 241 responses from \$0 to \$1,300

Real estate excise and fuel tax, and license fee options

Subject to voter approval, County Council could institute a variety of optional fees and taxes to be used **instead of or in addition to** the regional/local organizational financing approaches defined in the above (as a way of reducing the use of property taxes for park financing). How would you rate each of the following optional approaches?

Optional dedicated fees and taxes		lowest / highest
95	Real Estate Excise Tax (REET-3) - an additional 0.25% assessment of the sales price of all real estate property (equal to \$250 per \$100,000 of sale price) paid by the purchaser to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of park and open space?	29% 13% 14% 17% 22%
96	Local Option Vehicle License Fee - an additional \$15.00 per vehicle license registered in the county to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of trail improvements?	45% 12% 12% 11% 17%

		lowest / highest
97	Local Option Fuel Tax - an additional \$0.023 per gallon sales tax to be paid by residents and tourists to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of trail improvements?	61% 12% 6% 5% 13%
98	Local Option Sales Tax - an additional 0.1% sales tax (equal to \$0.10 for a \$100 purchase) to be paid by residents and tourists to be dedicated exclusively to the acquisition and development of park and open space?	41% 11% 16% 12% 17%

General obligation bond options

Subject to voter approval, County Council could also propose a variety of optional bonds as a means of financing park, recreation, and open space improvements for specific projects. This option could be used instead of or in addition to the options defined in the above. How would you rate the following?

- **General obligation bond** - County Council could submit a general obligation bond for voter approval to finance acquisition and development of specific park, recreation, and open space improvements. The bond, which can not be used to finance operation and maintenance, would be financed over a 20-year period.

		<i>Amount per year</i>
99	If a bond were to be put on the ballot <u>to finance the highest priority projects</u> , how much, if anything, would your <u>household</u> be willing to pay <u>per year</u> for this source of funding?	Mean = \$68 240 responses from \$0 to \$2,000

Population growth impact management options

In the next 20 years the county population is projected to increase by another 60,500 people or 34% more than the existing population of 179,500 persons.

00	In your opinion, will <u>existing park and recreation facilities (not including any of the plan's proposals)</u> within the county, cities, and school districts systems be enough to provide for this population increase?	19% yes 60% no 21% don't know
----	---	--

The existing inventory of county park and recreational facilities is estimated to be worth about \$900 per person or \$2,000 for an average single family house. This amount is the cost required for additional park facilities for new housing residents if the county is to maintain the same standards for park, recreation, and open space facilities that are currently provided existing residents. Given this fact, how would you rate the following methods for dealing with the impact of new population growth on parks and the methods existing residents may be using to finance park improvements?

		<i>lowest</i>				<i>highest</i>
01	<u>Lower standards</u> - for the number of park facilities provided to future populations?	49%	18%	21%	6%	3%
02	<u>Collect a one-time growth impact fee from new housing development projects</u> - to pay for park improvements?	8%	5%	11%	27%	47%
03	<u>Increase county taxes</u> - to acquire and develop park facilities to offset population growth impacts?	38%	18%	26%	11%	5%

		<i>Percent of cost</i>		
04	<u>If a park growth impact fee were to be collected from new housing development projects</u> , what percent of this cost would you recommend be charged for every new single family house to be developed in the county? (The county does not currently charge growth impact fees.)	22%	9%	\$2,000
		17%	\$1,500	
		15%	\$ 500	
		22%	\$ 200	
		9%	\$ 0	

Your characteristics

05	Which area of the county do you live in?	1% Point Roberts area 1% Lummi Island area 3% Blaine area 2% Birch Bay area 8% Lynden area 6% Sumas/Nooksack area 11% Ferndale area 57% Bellingham area 11% Other county area
----	--	---

06	How long have you lived in the county?	0-1 1%	2-5 10%	6-10 11%	10+ years 78%	
07	What type of housing do you live in?	own 96%	rent 4%			
08	What age group are you in?	18-24 1%	25-34 5%	35-49 27%	50-64 40%	65+ 27%

Comments - do you have any specific comments or recommendations to make about the proposed park plan or this survey?

149 or 50% had following comments:

- Stay within the current budget without raising taxes.
- The future is to be funded. I can't support any new tax sources.
- Enjoy taking kids to the park
- Any time you have any type of construction there should be some kind of park there.
- Some things could be private enterprise like boat launches. Shortage of meeting areas.
- Great plan--need more bike trails.
- Ask children, teens, seniors and disabled people what they think feel about current and or proposed park plans. Provide quiet space when building Grey's Community spaces, i.e., yoga, tai chi, meditation rooms, or build spaces that can be partitioned into smaller units. Provide open pavilions and pagoda like spaces where people can gather protected from the elements yet still enjoy being outside (rain, wind, sun, snow...). More art in the parks using fences to have art shows for people of all ages. Safety issues: would appreciate more police on bikes, horses patrolling our trails, and especially women walking jogging alone without a partner or dog.
- In 10 to 20 years we will need open spaces to get a way from the increased population.
- No new taxes.
- Utilize volunteers for major clean up. Authorize park personnel to issue citations for pollution. Don't want to pay any more taxes.
- We should have volunteers to work on parks. Also street people could work on park clean-up at minimum wage.
- No.
- How much land would be acquired by eminent domain and would love to be enacted over landowners' rights to allow the public access to scenic trails and hiking trails in front of peoples' homes. We are looking at a lot of trails.
- Impact fees should be paid by developer.
- Additional fees tied to new construction and automobile use more accurately reflect the through cost for these items. If proceeds from her impact fees for education or parks and trails and conservation, then I rarely endorse them.
- I am pleased you are taking a survey and are thinking about our future growth. Considering current holdings and what can be done to improve them.
- Some limited activities such as horseback riding--pay for it.
- Ownership and acquisition of park and wilderness land should be the primary goal.
- We are doing a great job as a family. We have dinners here and have walks.
- I appreciate you asking for my input. I love the quality of life here.
- Build more trails to connect population centers to schools and recreations areas. Reduce or eliminate user fees for state parks. Pay for acquisition and maintenance of parks with taxes. Trails and parks are forever and must be acquired whenever and wherever available.
- If the people want more, then people pay for it and have the people participating in creating a park instead of hiring a company to do it for them
- Park system adds to our quality of life.
- Developers should pay impact fees.
- In the time of increasing demand on household income and families, the park program should work within fees, collected donations, time donation and smallest impact on individuals.
- We need parks; that is one of the important attributes of Whatcom County.
- As a senior, I believe that parks and recreational facilities be made user friendly to seniors and handicap persons of all ages.
- Thank you very much for engaging in such planning.

F-22

Appendix F: Public Opinion

Whatcom County Park, Recreation & Open Space Plan

- I like the parks the way they are.
- It would be wonderful to have more in the Nooksack area.
- Emphasize and give priority to walking, running, and bicycling trails in conjunction with natural settings when possible. Note: cost little to maintain and enjoyed by people of all income and ages. If people have the resources to buy pickup trucks, trailers, boats, snowmobiles and horses, then have them pay for the facilities they use. County needs off-road bicycle trails that cover long distances.
- Please improve power boat facilities at Lake Samish and add dock.
- More swimming pools.
- Park programs to deliver training should be paid for by the trainee. County owned land and parking and bathrooms should be free access.
- Better maintenance of what we have rather than focus so much on new park and recreation areas to be paid more by users than the general population.
- Survey is not address existing problems. Example--management of current parks boat launch areas and parking. Survey does not address the issue and impact of proposed areas being removed from the property tax roll.
- Plan system looks good. Looks like huge amount of trail to maintain for hiking, horse and off bike trail.
- Confusing survey.
- This survey asked financial questions I could not answer. I do not know enough about present cost, financing, and administration structure to answer. A citizen committee could study these questions and make recommendations. We have great parks and I am taxed to the max. New developers should pay their share. We need better service for teens like basketball
- In allowing a residential development of more than 10 or group of development near to or adjacent to access of 10 acres. Development should be required to include either a park or at least a green area where resident could at least go for a break or kids can play baseball, catch, shoot basketball, or have a mini soccer game plus swing sets . Very few areas of development have included park area in their planning. Ex. Northwest Avenue near Chucks Middle School--all apartments and asphalt.
- Leave area as natural.
- Regarding the survey: the information was much too complex and the maps where not helpful.
- People are willing to pay for specific projects in there own local area.
- We very seldom use the park but our property taxes are high because of location.
- I'm really happy that the county is trying to come up with a plan for future trails, parks and open space, conservation districts. I would like to see the developers putting in a lot more and having to do a lot more as part of the permit process. Planning for trails and buffer zones. Having to pay for neighborhood parks. They should take advantage of the Reed funding and working in conjunction with other agencies, profits and non profits. It would be good to prioritize trails that have originated in Bellingham and going out into the county. Extending the bay to Baker Trail. Extending the Millennium trail. We need them to keep going.
- No snowmobiles separate from cross-country and snowshoes. Only a limited number of snowmobiles and separate trails from skiing trails.
- Future growth should include all related costs.
- Parks and greenbelts should be included in every development. Developer should provide property and purchaser provides funds for upkeep.
- I believe that the people will invest in a bond where nobody likes taxes, especially if you own property.
- Regarding the annual tax amount, I put down 100 each because the survey implied they would be added together.
- Raise money through bonds with voter approval. I would want them to buy bonds at that time. Or if you can sell the citizen the idea they need to buy the land now for the future, then they will approve a bond for it. Suggestions for survey: survey seemed way too long not simple enough. Seems like it's aimed at college level people that are majoring in community planning or park and recreation or whatever class that would be. Instead of asking ordinary citizens about this very complex issue, it seems educated people with degrees on this subject hopefully have studied many other cities counties, parks, in other areas and learned from their successes. Might be the ones to hire.

- Park funding where does funding come from currently. Any proposed should increase based on the number of people living in the area.
- I will never vote for a park issue. Richards Campground was purchased by the Parks Department in 1976 and they have never developed the land. They said they would when they purchased it. The same is for my family and friends. As a taxpayer, I should use any land they purchase. Too many people in the management department. The Acme RV Park purchased is just sitting there and not being used. The survey was too complicated and confusing. They won't open the river for camping.
- Out of county should pay fee.
- See where the money can be best utilized considering the income of the majority of the people in the area. One third of the population is retired and there is not much money from those people.
- I've seen so many things in the county and they spend millions every year and nothing ever happens. Like asphalt on the road. Too much money spent and nothing to show for it. I can't see paying for something in the future that you and I will never see. Schools and special interest groups should have nothing to do with parks. You can't police all of the area. It all sounds good on paper, but when you count the cost, there is no way to keep up.
- Events such as bakers' cookies triathlon should not be able to close major streets or parks. Possibly bus people from parking area to events and not close the roads without posting. Need lifeguards at all public lakes.
- Changes in the Silver Lake Park in the last year--I go up there many times a year. The last year has been many changes and it is getting less attractive. My wife and I both work. I take RV with tent trailer and park the RV. My wife takes the car up later--several hours later and she is charged \$10 for the car, which is grossly unfair. I used to be able to talk to certain people but that is no longer the case. More stringent rules and the rules will not be bent.
- Support public programs.
- Collect higher fees for out-of-state visitors..
- We really enjoy Silver Lake. We go there every summer.
- I believe Whatcom County and the towns have plenty of access to fresh and salt water, ample walking trails, and enough parks and open spaces for well into the future. I do not believe we need to buy tracts near the water with park funds to protect them from development. What I would like to see is good maintenance of the facilities, trails and roads we already have, and better access to state and national forest lands instead of allowing brush to choke trails and roads keeping the citizens who pay for the parks out. Thank you for considering my opinion.
- I am more interested in general use rather than specific use.
- No new taxes.
- I am in favor of impact fees for land development, particularly commercial land development. I think it is particularly important we protect our environment, wildlife and watershed.
- User fees for all recreation.
- Do not want my property taxes raised.
- I just feel we have ample parks in this area. There are pieces of land in the Blue Canyon area that are not being used for a darn thing. There used to be people that would mow it and then they put fence up dividing the two pieces of land and they couldn't come in and mow it anymore. And that is stupid.
- Should have put snowmobiles separately and I would have voted differently.
- All round I would promote doing the best job possible with the facilities already owned.
- Cordada Park area would be good place to add a new park.
- Boulevard Park needs updating playground only
- It wasn't clear. Northwest Bellingham needs more parks for young children. There is nothing now.
- If we must have trails for snowmobiles, motorcycles and ATV, they must be segregated from bikes, snowshoes, and cross-country skiing. Additional fees must be charged on a per vehicle basis. The same is true for motor boats and power water craft, etc. Low impact users should not have to subsidize extensive damage by high impact users. Please provide dog bags stands.

- Because we have not lived here a long time, my ability to pay is perhaps different from others. We live in Sudden Valley where there are parks which we tend to use. I do not know much about the parks in other areas.
- On the joint venture opportunities, the county needs to convey how it is doing it today. I did not have sufficient information to adequately respond.
- I love parks, scenic and historic sites. Homeowners pay enough in property taxes for maintenance. All new development is costly to everyone and should be restrained. We are in danger of becoming another California and that is not good....been there done that, it is no good. Constant push to develop. It needs to go slower. Road wear is one example.
- Parks and recreation should not tie skiing with motorized snowmobiles in same questions. School systems are all ready over burdened with mandate and not enough funding to take care of parks and recreation.
- Suggest you restructure the current budget system to see if it can be done better before you try to impose a new levy. Put yearly budget before a non-paid citizen board for review before making any changes.
- Motorized recreation should be contained apart from traditional ones. Golden opportunity to volunteers carefully integrated into structure at all levels. If plans blossom I would want law enforcement and vandals prosecuted.
- Park facilities in Cordada area don't exist land growing population is being ignored
- I needed more information.
- Particularly sensitive or scenic area should by all means be preserved. This not rocket science but simple truth. Set a higher standard. If people choose to live here they will have to accept the standard. Growth at the expense of the characteristics that make this area unique are self defeating. Growth needs to be carefully planned so the impact is positive. I believe sustainability is not only possible but necessary. Resources are limited and greed is a bottomless cesspool.
- This time do not ask people for more taxes.
- I recommend a countywide levy for parks for acquisition of land and open space for park facilities. We need protection of watershed, especially Lake Whatcom. Please, no power boats on Lake Whatcom. Increase salt and fresh water access.
- Greater use of volunteers would be desirable. The current parks are adequate and well managed.
- I think it's very fine that you are looking at all of this.
- I think the new developer should be the ones to pay for these new projects. I feel very strongly about the people that are making money off these new developments. They will be responsible for the funding of the new projects. They should be responsible for the parks, recreational area and any environmental damage as a result of their building--especially watershed.
- I think it should have been more financial information regarding the state regional and local and where the money is coming from in terms of taxes and where it is being divided up. In Whatcom County due to overcrowding in the jails, there should be a choice of doing county service versus jail time. I would like to see the development of recycling areas and the state and county can make money on the recycled materials.
- No, we really enjoy Bender Field and very parks and recreational areas here in the area.
- I'm more concerned about jobs than parks. It seems they are making more parks and fewer jobs. In particular, the GP area also the Bellingham shipping terminal next to the GP site. It seems to me that they are going to turn in a motel or park. There has been no shipping for three and a half to four years.
- I think we should be better stewards of what we have. The developers should set aside for public use.
- It's good that it's being done because we can see everything being stressed the researches are stressed.
- The maps are not comprehensible. I had a difficult time associating the maps with the questions.
- Regarding conservancy: not enough is proposed for farmlands and not enough for salt water access. We need more salt and fresh water access to keep working forests working and growth should pay for it.
- The maps were helpful but it would have been helpful to have had some narrative. Regarding the levy questions: More specific questions would be helpful.
- The NPS and the USFS have great facilities and untaxed land in the top scenic areas; don't try to compete with them. They should take the lead. Don't compete with state

facilities. Sometimes I'm not clear whether you are asking whether I'm support existing facilities " yes " or whether I'm in favor of expanding these facilities which is "no."

- Just keep the trails, that's the main thing. When they do something with the waterfront, I hope they don't turn it into high rises and keep it recreational friendly.
- I don't think 300 is enough survey for an area this big. A few things on the survey weren't real clear like they ask how much money. I guess I needed a bigger picture. I wasn't really sure what to put there. The bottom line is I know we need more money for parks. Our family would be willing to pay an annual park fee through usage or yearly pass or something, once a year.
- The questions were really good and they made you think. They covered it from all angles.
- Regarding growth impact fees: condos and apartments should be included as well as single family houses. Places such as hundred acre wood should be protected. Some parks should be left with simple trails and open spaces. Not all parks need to accessible to everyone. It is preferable to have natural open spaces rather than wide paved trails.
- There needs to be more campsites along the saltwater areas. North Lake Whatcom trailhead bathrooms are very disgusting. These bathrooms need upkeep:
- Planning with vision for the future promotes the quality of life, decreased crime, and increases sustainable and decent-paying jobs (ones that don't harm our valuable natural beauty and resources.) Then acting with commitment to acquire such land and projects is our highest concern. The land can be developed and maintained later. Acquire land now before it is developed.. It is known that there is an ideal city size. Beyond that ideal and or urban sprawl, there is degradation of lifestyle. Acquire land now for open spaces, preservation and recreation. It will pay for itself in quality of life, decreased crime, increased tourist economy and increased good jobs.
- Some of the questions are a little bit hard to answer but I know that it's important to have the programs and the parks. I have kids so I know that we need the parks.
- I am pleased to know this planning and forethought is being done. I am also very pleased to be a part of this survey.
- Connecting trails to downtown and from Lake Haven to downtown. More community bike trails.
- I think it's a good idea to ask residents about their opinion, even though I don't understand it completely. It gets a little complicated with the maps and questions about levies and bonds.
- The cross country and ski trails are not for snowmobiles.
- We feel there is already plenty of taxes being collected. Any additional funding should be by fund raising rather than taxes.
- Looking at the grass from Page 6 on shows a big blank space on the north part of the city until you get up to Nooksack area, there is nothing--no trails or parks, nothing through the Mt. Baker area we have a lot of trails through private property but nothing sanctioned.
- 100 acres should become a park and not a housing development
- Respect the need and support the need for green space. Make sure you don't put an onerous tax on the folks that have been here for a long time or new people.
- What if the proposed plan is not implemented? I love the parks we already have. I don't want any of the parks diminished in any way. We love the parks are they are and we love to camp.
- I support the parks and the development of the recreation areas.
- Large development without parks and recreation areas must be allowed a residential area to be developed. Much maintenance of existing parks could be done in developments or senior groups. This is true in Japan. People apply to maintain the parks that live in the residential areas.
- 1) Do it with private industry as much as possible. 2) Protect the habitat, but don't shortchange landowners in the prices. 3) Honor the U.S. Constitution concerning landowner rights, no matter what the U. S. Supreme court or any other court may rule.
- Park space and hiking trails should be added in the meridian area between Bellingham and Lynden.
- Some parts of the survey were hard to interpret. The coordinator and developer. The landlord was not clear as to what we were looking for.
- I think what it comes down is that the county is sleeping. We need to save some space. They are charging little old ladies for new homes that are 100,000 or more. Charge the new developers and make them create parks for the homes they create.

F-26

Appendix F: Public Opinion

Whatcom County Park, Recreation & Open Space Plan

- It all costs money. I don't want to pay for it. Let the other guys pay for it. I have deer in my backyard and rabbits in my back yard and it all will go away.
- The word acquisition bothers me. I think we have adequate parks and recreation at the time.
- I don't like to see the county residents paying user fees for parks..
- Do you ever get any volunteers to do any work on the road. Why can't they do it regarding the parks? This is for painting and raking. Boy scouts campfire and churches could be involved.
- It is good to get ideas from people. The parks need to be available.
- I think doing a survey like this is a really good idea; that's what I think people would be responsive to.
- Impact fees for development in local areas should be for new parks.
- My son was involved with an after-school program with the school system and the county parks program. We need a teen center or something for teenagers. Whatcom County wages do not keep up with the population and growth rate. Therefore increased taxes would be a hardship on most residents.
- Dollar amounts are always hard. I don't mind paying taxes. People on fixed incomes have it tough.
- The more open space that we provide to protect our children's future is very important.
- We only live a half mile away from the County Parks Department. Canyon Lake is incredible. The parks are fantastic. I would like to see more saltwater access. Work with the oil refineries to do that.
- In general I want government to be small and more efficient. More creative in working with non profits and for profits. Incorporating consumption-type user fees. Also the volunteerism that had contributed so much to the maintenance of the trails should be fostered. Work a trade with volunteers giving them some special benefits.
- I think we live in a beautiful area. The parks on the lakes and fresh water are more important. We use both. We do a lot of biking and I think biking is going to be more and more. Make it easier for anyone to bike. The fuel between boating and power boating is being eaten up. I think it is important for people to have boat launches.
- We live and walk the trail in Lake Tabb. It is not being maintained like it used to be 30 years. We would like to see the parks kept up before new parks are being considered.
- We like to see the waterfront preserved.
- Bring back the cross-country trips they used to run. It is a huge loss to the community not having those trips. Need more recreational sites in the Deming particularly near the Nooksack River Bridge.
- Maps were unreadable and I need a magnifying glass.
- Basically, make a budget and stick to it. If somebody doesn't spend their whole budget, then reward them by putting it aside for new projects or future improvements.
- My recommendation is to not have the county government give themselves raises
- Sell property at Lake Samish north approximately 40 acres. It is a dangerous location for pedestrians and traffic and it's overused in the summer for the size of it. Take the money from the sale and use it to develop Lake Samish East. It is easy access to Lake Samish east off the freeway, no woods for the drug dealing going on in the summer. Lake Samish east would have large parking and a swimming area, low neighborhood impact. Would be easy to patrol at night. Take into account the safety of the local citizens when you maintain or create new parks. Maybe think about going into East Lake Samish Park with Skagit County since it is right on the border.
- More parks in the North Bellingham area. Also develop parks east of Hannigan Way.
- The more parks the better.
- New population needs to pay more to come to what is so lovely now in order to accommodate the growth impact.
- My highest priority is to acquire open space and trail land now, before it is all gone. Development of parks can come later when there are funds for development and acquisition will be completed or nearly completed and we, our household, our willing to pay for acquisition.
- It was very thorough; I wish all counties did this type of thing.
- We don't really use the parks that much. My husband does walk the dogs on the trail, and that's about the extent of our use.
- I support the Whatcom County Parks system. I lived in Whatcom County since 1966, since time I've been impressed by the number of parks and also the quality of the parks.

- I thought the survey was very difficult to do. The survey addresses and educated public, and not necessarily the layperson.
- I'm particular interested in a community center with a swimming pool. In the Ferndale area. I would suppose that facility with an increase in tax, otherwise improvement to current boat launch facilities, some are unusable.
- There are no park areas in Custer. They should have something for the young people.
- A great need for good car-free transportation (walking, biking) routes connecting all park and recreation areas and other popular destinations throughout the county. If ever the Parks & Recreation Department needed creative leadership to help prepare us for the turbulent future we face - the time is now.