

From: [Lilliquist, Michael W.](#)
To: [Jack Petree](#)
Cc: [PDS](#); [PDS Planning Commission](#); [CC - Shared Department](#)
Subject: Re: memo regarding implications of Bellingham's rejection of the multi-jurisdictional process
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 10:15:51 AM

Jack,

That's simply not the case. The county does not need to "assign" numbers from one jurisdiction to another. There is no "dumping," as you claim. They can, and have, simply adjusted the total number.

That total number, by the way, still very close to the original number in the county-wide resolution, very close to the OFM medium number, and very close to the provisional number used in the EIS. So, as you can see, there is really no problem here.

Michael Lilliquist

Bellingham City Council

Representative, Ward 6

360 778-8212 • mlilliquist@cob.org

Per state law RCW 42.56, my incoming and outgoing email messages are public records and are therefore subject to public disclosure requirements.

On Sep 23, 2015, at 9:10 AM, Jack Petree <tradewrld@comcast.net> wrote:

Michael,

The problem is, if Bellingham dumps its number then the other cities must be assigned larger numbers to make up for Bellingham's foisting of population off onto the rest of the county.

Regards,

Jack

From: "Lilliquist, Michael W." <mlilliquist@cob.org>
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 at 9:13 PM
To: Jack Petree <tradewrld@comcast.net>
Cc: "pds@co.whatcom.wa.us" <pds@co.whatcom.wa.us>, "PDS_Planning_Commission@co.whatcom.wa.us" <PDS_Planning_Commission@co.whatcom.wa.us>, CC - Shared Department <cc@cob.org>
Subject: Re: memo regarding implications of Bellingham's rejection of the multi-jurisdictional process

Jack,

It would have been useful for this conversation if you had attended the growth management coordinating council meeting this afternoon. You would have heard that each city, and the unincorporated UGAs, has done its own projections for population growth and for employment growth. You would have heard that no jurisdiction — no jurisdiction — has altered its planning numbers as a result of the City of Bellingham's planning actions. No one is reacting as if the city is "foisting" growth upon them, and no one is feeling deprived of employment opportunities as if Bellingham is "absorbing" all the economic growth. Where you see a zero-sum game, other people do not. Each jurisdiction is comfortable with both their residential population planning and their employment lands planning. Rest easy: Bellingham has spoiled no one's party. The sky is not falling.

To address your specific comments, I whole heartedly endorse the policy that the smaller cities should be of adequate size to allow them to become viable economic centers. And apparently, so do you. That's why it is odd and confusing that you would use the word "foist" with its negative connotations, that Bellingham is "foisting" population growth on the other cities. That's not how the math works. Why you would say that still makes no sense to me. First, as we both agree, planned growth in the smaller cities is a good thing, supported by adopted policy. So why use the negatively-tinged word "foist"? Second, as I indicated above, the smaller cities are planning for growth on their own terms, feeling neither constrained nor pushed by Bellingham. No "foisting" to be seen. Whatcom's cities are doing their jobs just fine, thank you.

If there is a problem with population planning, it is in the unincorporated areas, where the county's math formulas are leading to an necessarily high population number. But that's a separate discussion.

Michael Lilliquist
Bellingham City Council
Representative, Ward 6
360 778-8212 • mlilliquist@cob.org

Per state law RCW 42.56, my incoming and outgoing email messages are public records and are therefore subject to public disclosure requirements.

On Sep 22, 2015, at 11:35 AM, Jack Petree <tradewrld@comcast.net> wrote:

Council member Lilliquist,

Please re-read my submission. Based on the actual submission it is clear you either did not pay attention to what was being said or, alternatively, are being disingenuous in your response.

First, I did not say the smaller cities must be of adequate size to allow them to

become viable economic centers. I pointed out that the countywide planning policies contained in the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan, the Bellingham Comprehensive Plan, and the plans of the other cities of the county **require** that smaller cities **Urban Growth Areas** must be of adequate size to allow them to become viable economic centers.

Second, in your comments you are inappropriately combining the two kinds of growth I discuss and simply labeling the whole thing “growth.”

In my submission I point out that **Bellingham wants the county to assign a portion of the POPULATION growth Bellingham should be capturing to the small cities but, the City Council magnanimously declared, we will continue to absorb nearly all the economic growth; Bellingham has put forward the perfect recipe necessary to create a true commuter county!**

Bless you and your fellow council members for your generosity but, that generosity does not benefit the Whatcom County community nor does it comport with the requirements of either the Growth Management Act or the Comprehensive Plans of the County and its cities, including the City of Bellingham.

Regards,

Jack Petree

From: "Lilliquist, Michael W." <mlilliquist@cob.org>

Date: Monday, September 21, 2015 at 8:51 PM

To: Jack Petree <tradewrld@comcast.net>

Cc: "pds@co.whatcom.wa.us" <pds@co.whatcom.wa.us>,

"PDS_Planning_Commission@co.whatcom.wa.us"

<PDS_Planning_Commission@co.whatcom.wa.us>

Subject: Re: memo regarding implications of Bellingham's rejection of the multi-jurisdictional process

Jack,

I read over your message, and it seems like you contradict yourself. Your words don't make sense to me, and they seem like bad advice.

On the one hand you say that smaller cities must be of adequate size to allow them to become viable economic centers, and then you chastise the City of Bellingham for “foisting” growth onto the other parts of Whatcom County. Which do you want? Growth in the smaller cities, or for Bellingham to take most of the growth? No one is “foisting” growth on the smaller cities. They are

asking for a fair measure of growth, and County policy supports it. I cannot tell if you are for or against such modest growth. You can't have it both ways.

You also criticize the City of Bellingham for being the employment/jobs center of the county, as if this is a bad thing because "bedroom communities" are undesirable. It seems to me that you do not understand that businesses want to be where the most customers are, or that businesses want to locate near other businesses (suppliers, dealers, services) which they rely upon for their own operations. The fact that businesses cluster together in population centers is nearly universal, and understandably so; and yet you appear to suggest that the City is unwise in recognizing this reality. Following your prescription would be hardship for businesses, and I am not in favor of that.

Michael Lilliquist

Bellingham City Council

Representative, Ward 6

360 778-8212 • mlilliquist@cob.org

Per state law RCW 42.56, my incoming and outgoing email messages are public records and are therefore subject to public disclosure requirements.

On Sep 21, 2015, at 10:41 AM, Jack Petree

[<tradeworld@comcast.net>](mailto:tradeworld@comcast.net) wrote:

All,

Below, for your convenience, and attached, is testimony for the Whatcom County Planning Commission meeting Thursday, Sept 24th regarding Bellingham's proposal for population and employment projections.

Regards,

Jack Petree

MEMO 9/18/15

TO: Whatcom County Planning Commission

**CC: Bellingham City Council
Bellingham Planning Commission**

**Re: Bellingham's Proposed Population And
Employment Projections**

Commissioners,

August 31, 2015, the Bellingham City Council voted to ignore the unanimous recommendation of its Planning Commission and ask you to recommend to the Whatcom County Council that Whatcom County become a commuter county.

Of course, it would be bad politics to directly ask that we become a commuter county so the Bellingham Council chose a more subtle approach. ***The City is asking you to reject nearly three years of its supposedly cooperative work with Whatcom County and the six smaller cities and impose the responsibility for dealing with population growth on the County and those cities while gifting the City of Bellingham with responsibility for accommodating the vast majority of new jobs coming to Whatcom County.***

In short, the City of Bellingham wants future County residents to live anywhere else but in or near Bellingham but, it wants to force those residents to commute to Bellingham if they want a job!

The approach the City of Bellingham wants you to approve of does not comport with the Growth Management Act (GMA) nor is it compliant with Whatcom County and each of its cities Countywide Planning Policies.

Hearings Boards and Courts have established that Countywide Planning Policies are directive when it comes to growth management planning and implementation. Words like “must” and “shall” actually mean “must” and “shall.”

Whatcom County’s Countywide Planning Policies (D – 1) ***require***, that: “The Urban Growth Areas for the small cities shall be of an adequate size to allow them to become viable economic centers with a balance of jobs and housing. “

You should assign Bellingham the population it originally requested as part of the Multi-Jurisdictional process. If Bellingham wants to throw away three years of work and foist population growth off on the rest of Whatcom County, the jobs needed to support that growth ***must*** follow the population.

Regards and thank you for your time and attention,

Jack Petree

<memo county planning commission re- bellingham
proposal.doc>