

RECEIVED

SEP 15 2008

LONG RANGE
PLANNING DIVISION

To: David Stalheim

Director Whatcom County Planning and Development Services

RE: DSEIS on the Foothills Subarea (Majority) Plan Revision

From; Carole MacDonald –resident Mt Baker Foothills Community

Because –regarding population projections-328 present private land owners in the Columbia Valley (excluding proposed Balfour Village) could tomorrow apply for and as I understand with relatively little compliance requirements receive building permits to build in the next two years increasing the Columbia Valley population by another $328 \times 2.78 = 912$ - add this to the present approximately 3800 residents and you have a population that is higher than some small incorporated cities yet with no services;

Because there are already 895 completely built homes in the Glacier area that started as recreation ie only part time occupancy and in a very short time 165 of these are now full time occupancy therefore it seems reasonable to assume with baby boomers retiring to eco friendly places such as these beautiful Foothills that within a relatively short time most of those will be occupied full time adding another 2029 to the total Foothills population;

These two figures represent an additional 2941 in total to the Foothills population which as is pointed out in the DSEIS doesn't take into account any platting or subdividing of properties.

Because the Columbia Valley UGA was established more than 10 years ago and was not challenged within the allotted GMA challenging period;

Because the price of gasoline from what I understand will become less and less affordable for trips into Bellingham unless absolutely necessary and because we could serve our present and rapidly growing Foothills community well with commercial services and at the same time manage the growth and diminish our carbon emissions by not having to drive to Bellingham for these services;

Because in our 'rural character' environment we have a School District that is in dire need of tax dollars to sustain a level of education acceptable to most parents and to achieve that we need Light Industrial tax dollars along with Commercial Property tax dollars;

For these and other reasons alternative number one with *mitigation maps excluded* is my choice.

Also I respectfully request that your team revise the population projections and Alternatives comparison figures to reflect a relatively scientific comparison that being 'apples to apples and oranges to oranges'.

Please could you either use the same population projections applied to each Alternative or do nine calculations using the three Alternatives and the three projected population figures.

I have no idea how to fairly compare any other way.

I look forward to seeing thee revised figures .