

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				<i>Comments received after January 31, 2006 are located in a subsequent document dated February 2006.</i>
34	1/31/2006	Design Concepts	Dennis Dashiell	<p>Comment: Here are a few key elements I really liked after reviewing the design concepts at the meeting 1-24-06:</p> <p>#1 Need to place the major water front park area at the Westerly end of mainland (right below the land reserved for the deep water port). That is the main asset for the public, looking toward the islands and bay, rather than the marina. Not having a major park along that entire end could be like putting the garage on the view side of your new house. The log pond park area could be kept more slender in favor of more depth of park at the West end where people will want to gather for Ski to Sea and 4th of July etc.</p> <p>#2 Long vista parks running the length of the site (as in Green Fingers) would be GREAT. Really nice for the neighborhoods that will form around those parks and will carry a sense of connection to the water all the way to the existing city center.</p> <p>#3 Highest percentage park area possible. More green is good.</p> <p>#4 Small city blocks as in Green Bank are far preferable, since the streets guarantee that light and views will remain open between buildings. Also, tall thin buildings are environmentally preferable to short wide buildings (more natural light into & between the buildings and better view corridors).</p> <p>#5 Foot Bridge is great. Please try to keep it as far West as possible, since it becomes unnecessary if its too close to Roeder Ave. Please consider a second footbridge to connect to the Bellwether area.</p> <p>#6 Angled Street layout is great. It should allow more light in the afternoons and view corridors in the right directions down the streets and out toward the center of the bay. Having a single continuous boulevard weave through from one end to the other is nice too. Please consider inserting at least one long street of nose-first parking-stalls, so there will be lots of drive up parking for people running quick errands to the area. Esplanade is a good concept to keep the waterfront clearly public.</p> <p>That's my two cents.</p>
33	1/30/2006	Design Concepts	Hamilton Hayes	<p>In the Green Fingers and Green Bank concept, the footbridge if not very high, would significantly restrict access to the new visitor moorage. Visitor moorage needs access to certain kinds of services to be useful. These include sanitation (pump outs) and utilities, parking and access for local marine service vendors. It is not clear on these plans how those would be provided for.</p> <p>The boat ramp also needs services and utilities such as parking, adequate street width and access to handle the launching of fairly sizable boats.</p> <p>The C street channel is currently a deep water channel and potentially very valuable to Bellingham for that reason to accommodate larger vessels. This is especially true if Bellingham wishes to attract more marine related tourism. This could be in the form of increased island ferry services, cruise ship access and local marine tour businesses. There is an inadequate amount of this type of deep water moorage in Bellingham Bay to support any expansion of tourism of this type. Given the strong emphasis on building tourism for this area by the Chamber and Bellingham Whatcom Tourism Bureau, I would think that this kind of infrastructure would be critical and expanded.</p> <p>Currently, building space for marine chandleries and other marine support businesses is either in short supply or poorly sited far from the marinas. Planning should take these limitations and needs into account.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
32	1/29/2006	Design Concepts	Michael McAuley	<p>Comment: I've been attending meetings regarding New Whatcom for many, many months now and find the process fascinating. Given that we are pretty far out from actually moving ahead with anything other than dismantling parts of the GP property; however, I think the public meetings are not really appropriate as they've been structured. I severely dislike presenting a criticism here, but I will, regardless. Time and again I am sent notices regarding public meetings with the surrounding neighborhoods and we sit for hours on end viewing very expensive presentations of something that will probably not look a whole lot like the final iteration. For example, this past meeting was presented in various ways as the following: Jan. 24, 2006 7:00 p.m. Community Open House Bellingham Cruise Terminal Public Open House on New Whatcom Design Concepts, hosted by Waterfront Advisory Group with another of the same slated for Jan. 31 then the same again on Feb. 1 I do not believe that this level of information dissemination is required under GMA; and, while I do appreciate it, I'm not convinced you folks are achieving a doable end goal. For example, the last meeting was not a public input meeting, yet it was billed as such. In that meeting we got to visit a bit with LMN staff and a few folks made points via a public address system. All that really accomplished was a new set of comments about a new set of images. This sort of meeting could go on as long as you folks keep rolling out new images for public comment - to which I wonder to what end? I would offer the following – let's have public meetings on the cleanup and what happens as soon as it's done. Given that we have no assurances our proposed Greenways levy will pass I think our focus on New Whatcom parks is a bit out of whack and may rest on an assumption impact fees will cover the cost of those parks suggested by public comment on Jan 24 - I actually won a bet at that meeting that the Green Fingers plan would get the most support, but how to pay for it? Let's have that discussion now. Furthermore, I would offer several plans regarding the CBD and Old Town that go back decades. Are we to expect different outcomes from the New Whatcom effort? Plans, plans and more plans with hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on the plans with no guarantee that the plans will play out? You'll likely respond just now that, of course, there are no guarantees but I draw your attention to the Pit downtown. How long did the public own that? Or the Sash and Door site...how long have we owned that? And the associated pit behind Sash and Door - yet another eyesore. If we, the public, could afford to do something with it we would. Furthermore, the Bellingham Bay Pilot cleanup program was begun a decade ago.....where has that gone? The Ecology website linked thru New Whatcom dot org has several dates: April 2004, a newsletter from 2003, a Pilot update from 1999, and so on - all woefully out of date. Again, lending strength to my arguments that your efforts are WAY out front of the reality at hand. I would also say that if the City's efforts shift to New Whatcom being as it is becoming the easy cherry to pick when looking for feathers in one's cap, at least one neighborhood will be mounting a significant campaign to get the City to focus on the commitments already made and abandoned. I'm not an obstructionist and will continue reviewing ever more plans (none of which are guaranteed to play out) and presenting my input. I ask, though, that we take one step at a time, please rethink what you are presenting to the public and give us a dose of reality, not best case</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				scenarios having no guarantee of implementation. With most sincere regards a citizen from Lettered Streets
31	1/29/2006	Design Concepts	Dan Bakke	Comment: Of the four waterfront proposals, I favor green fingers. I would prefer to see the terminal turn around road on the south park area to be set back from waters edge by at least 500 ft. Beaches along foot of Cornwall trail should be sandy and natural with driftwood. We need to have lots of beaches where people can touch the water, not just rip rap and walkways.
30	1/25/2006	Design Concepts	Perry Fizzano	<p>Comment: I think it's a serious mistake not to consider use and density and building heights BEFORE we commit to what percentage of green space goes into the neighborhood. Once we say an area is for development then we'll never turn it back into green space. I think it would be better to start by saying in 30,50,100 years from now this is how many people we expect to be living in this area and this is the vision we have for its use. For instance, if we say that we want 4000 people to be living down there then we can say do we want (1) a few medium-rise condos to house those people and way more green space or (2) do we want dozens of buildings a few stories tall and little green space.</p> <p>After last night's meeting I think it's clear people are against the Pearl Parks plan (thankfully!) and are for the plans that provide larger green spaces. I think there should have been another option with over half green space. I bet people would have flocked to that one over any of those you presented.</p> <p>All the plans were very similar and none were very progressive. That was upsetting.</p> <p>Foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen. – Emerson</p>
29	1/25/2006	Design Concepts	Noel Pfundt	Comment: Emphasis on parks is excessive. We need commercial space. This is also the best of boating areas and should have good visitor access. There should certainly be a decent grocery for visitor use and the many (planned) downtown area residents Current marina is very unfriendly to visitors. I know of an Everett group that canceled plan to come here due to inconvenience and inhospitable port staff.
28	1/19/2006	We support the work of the Port; Input must be actively sought from all sectors; existing	Ken Oplinger, President and CEO, Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism and	<p>Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism and Bellingham/Whatcom Chamber of Commerce Release Issue Paper Topic: New Whatcom/Georgia Pacific Site Redevelopment Bellingham, WA Jan 18, 2006 At a joint meeting last week, the boards of the Bellingham/Whatcom Chamber of Commerce and Industry and Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism approved a position paper related to the redevelopment of the Georgia Pacific property on Bellingham Bay. Both organizations encourage their members and the general public to attend future meetings on the project and to speak to elected officials regarding their thoughts.</p> <p>Key recommendations of the Chamber and Tourism Bureau: Many vital businesses currently exist in the area which is encompassed by the boundaries of New Whatcom. These businesses, and the jobs</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
		businesses in New Whatcom and the jobs they provide, must be preserved throughout and after this process	Bellingham/ Whatcom Chamber of Commerce	<p>they provide, must be preserved throughout and after this process. We have learned in Fairhaven that we can preserve these businesses, and we must do the same in New Whatcom.</p> <p>The Port's decision to acquire the land was based on a financial plan that calls for private acquisition of some of the land in New Whatcom after it has been cleaned up. Any decision regarding future ownership of any part of New Whatcom must comply with the financial plan created by the Port, which calls for publicly owned spaces, including parks and roads, and privately owned spaces which can be developed. New Whatcom must be developed as a destination for both residents of Whatcom County, as well as the many visitors to our area. The City and the Port must continue to work together on this project with other key stakeholders, including Western Washington University, the tribes, and others. A close working relationship, built on mutual respect and a clear understanding of authority must continue to be developed in order to ensure planning is completed, deadlines are met, and New Whatcom is developed appropriately and timely.</p> <p>Input must be actively sought from all sectors of the community. The project will directly impact many constituencies, including the business community (which will be the main funding mechanism for the clean-up and redevelopment), and all efforts need to be made to bring these sectors to the table directly to gather thoughts, suggestions and opinions. We recommend that the Port, City and Waterfront Advisory Committee adopt creative methods to solicit broad, objective community input, which could include focus groups and scientifically sound, random surveys of community members.</p> <p>"This will be a pivotal year for the New Whatcom site," stated John Cooper, President of Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism. "The Chamber and Tourism Bureau support the work of the Port. We're ready to help create a plan which will ensure a waterfront that all of Whatcom County can be proud."</p> <p>Website: http://www.bellingham.com</p>
27	1/12/2005	New Whatcom Dev.	John Cooper President & CEO, Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism	<p>Dear Waterfront Advisory Committee Members:</p> <p>Yesterday the boards of the Bellingham/Whatcom Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism and Bellingham Economic Development Council (EDC) met to receive an update and presentation by the Port of Bellingham regarding the Georgia Pacific/New Whatcom redevelopment.</p> <p>The boards of the Chamber and Tourism Bureau have approved the attached position paper and stand ready to assist you and other interested parties in advancing this important project. The EDC will act on this document at their next meeting.</p> <p>For those unable to open the attached document, I have placed the contents below. Please contact me or Ken Oplinger of the Chamber if you have any questions. The Boards of Directors of the Bellingham/Whatcom Chamber of Commerce & Industry and Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism support the following statement regarding the New Whatcom Redevelopment Project. The Chamber and the Tourism Bureau continue to offer our support to the Port of Bellingham and the City of Bellingham as they move forward with the outstanding opportunity that has presented itself to Whatcom County with the acquisition and redevelopment of the Georgia Pacific site, known as New Whatcom. Both organizations supported the deal which gave the land to the Port, and both are pleased with the progress that has been made to date. As the process continues, we offer the following thoughts, which we believe should be the basis for all decisions made on the site and its redevelopment.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				<p>1) Many vital businesses currently exist in the area which is encompassed by the boundaries of New Whatcom. These businesses, and the jobs they provide, must be preserved throughout and after this process. We have learned in Fairhaven that we can preserve these businesses, and we must do the same in New Whatcom.</p> <p>2) The Port's decision to acquire the land was based on a financial plan that calls for private acquisition of some of the land in New Whatcom after it has been cleaned up. Any decision regarding future ownership of any part of New Whatcom must comply with the financial plan created by the Port, which calls for publicly owned spaces, including parks and roads, and privately owned spaces which can be developed.</p> <p>3) New Whatcom must be developed as a destination for both residents of Whatcom County, as well as the many visitors to our area. This is especially important in light of the huge numbers of visitors expected around the 2010 Olympics.</p> <p>4) The City and the Port must continue to work together on this project. A close working relationship, built on mutual respect and a clear understanding of authority must continue to be developed in order to ensure planning is completed, deadlines are met, and New Whatcom is developed appropriately and timely.</p> <p>5) Input must be actively sought from all sectors of the community. The project will directly impact many constituencies, including the business community (which will be the main funding mechanism for the clean-up and redevelopment), and all efforts need to be made to bring these sectors to the table directly to gather thoughts, suggestions and opinions. We recommend that the Port, City and Waterfront Advisory Committee adopt creative methods to solicit broad, objective community input, which could include focus groups and scientifically sound, random surveys of community members. 2006 will be a pivotal year for the New Whatcom Site. The Chamber and the Tourism Bureau extend our hand in support of the work to date, and offer to redouble our efforts to help create a plan which will ensure a waterfront all of Whatcom County can be proud to call our own.</p>
26	1/4/2006	Moving here; wants to be involved	Bryan Heigert	I LOVE what you guys are talking about here. I want to get involved and play a role in shaping the new Bellingham waterfront. How can I get involved? I am very excited about this. I have lived in WA almost all of my life and visited Bellingham on may occasions. My wife and I are planning on moving to Bellingham and want to get involved and invest in the city.
25	12/26/2005	Tsunami threat	Nancy Rains	In light of all the information we have been given recently of the Cascadia subduction zone, what do we know about the presumed effect of a tsunami from activity at the Cascadia Subduction zone and its effect specifically for the Bellingham Bay area - thus the effect on the Port of Bellingham waterfront?

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
24	12/18/05	Preserve the bluffs along the bay and pay close attention to architecture, building heights, and view corridors	Ralph W. Thacker, MPA	<p>BANKING ON THE BLUFF</p> <p>The Bellingham shoreline was originally defined by an eleven mile sandstone bluff. A series of land fills later added 402 acres of buildable space below the bluff to accommodate industrial activity. Consequently, Bellingham became divided by use as well as by elevation into the waterfront and the uplands. Early in its deliberations, the Waterfront Futures Group (WFG) pondered the challenge of how to affect architectural integrity on such an extensive waterfront. The bluff offers an existential means of achieving unity by prompting sense of place as the consciousness of being either above the bluff or below it.</p> <p>Late in its deliberations, the WFG changed its slogan from “Connecting Bellingham to the Bay” to “Connecting Bellingham with the Bay” in recognition of the value each venue adds to the other. This reciprocity in adding value is symbolized and facilitated by the bluff. Residents and visitors find a sense of warmth, familiarity, security in the uplands and enjoy a sense of refreshment, openness and adventure by the water, both enhanced by investing a few minutes of time and energy in transitioning from one level to the other by moving up or down the face of the bluff.</p> <p>In a January 2004 presentation to the WFG, architect Arlan Collins declared: “Cities which have taken back their industrial waterfronts and devoted them to public use have added more value to the total community than those that have allowed intensive private development to dominate their shorelines.” For Bellingham, one source of generating value for the entire City, and <u>creating a world-class ambiance</u>, is preserving and enhancing the two-level character of our waterfront. This will require taking such steps as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping building heights on the lower level from hiding the vertical differential • Maintaining frequent view corridors between the face of the bluff and the water • Maximizing public access and utilization both from the land and the water • Providing pedestrian and vehicular accesses that preserve the integrity of the bluff • Differentiating architectural motifs between the waterfront and the uplands <p>If we fail to do so, our posterity will suffer an irreparable loss and may never forgive us.</p>
23	12/14/05	Want to be on mailing list	Don Hall and Sherri Backstrom	<p>We are interested in being on your mailing list for current and upcoming events regarding the waterfront development groups. We have attended the recent Waterfront Advisory Group Meeting that was held on Dec. 8th and are interested in staying involved with this process. As “born and raised” locals of Bellingham we are excited to see the advancement of these plans and we also have business interest in the marina side of our community. Thank you for your time and we look forward to working with you all in the future.</p>
22	12/11/05	Small motor-less boat facility needed	Larry Bussinger	<p>I would like to comment that the future of the Georgia Pacific / Port project should include a small boat facility; for motor-less craft-kayaks, surf skis, row boats, outrigger canoes, small sailing dinghies etc. There should be launching facilities and a rest room / changing room to get out of wet clothes. A boat house for those boats not easily transported by car would be nice. There are very vital paddling clubs that would support/use a facility like this. WAKE, Bellingham Canoe/Kayak Racing club.</p>
21	12/9/05	Marina needed	Paul Sorensen	<p>I am in support of a new marina at the lagoon site. After all this is the waterfront and we need more slip space for pleasure craft. Smaller craft in close with deeper draft sailboats on the outside docks. I also like the artists concepts on page 20 and 21 of the WFG plan, showing the placement of boats and docks.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
20	12/6/05	General interest.	Mary Mele	I am watching this site, and the other site with interest. Nothing specific, thank you - I am still educating myself, trying to get a sense of what this is about, and it seemed appropriate to let you know that folks are actively interested, watching, trying to form an opinion.
19	11/30/05	Ideas re: density, marina, open public spaces	Kay Schumacher (Blaine)	Dear Mayor Asmundson, I have been wrestling whether to send in my comments about the Waterfront Project or not. Sometimes I have the suspicions if my comments would catch anyone's attention to make my time spent worthwhile. I decided to share my ideas with the city, the port and the county planners. After all, an ordinary individual can have some good, creative ideas. My husband and I have traveled through some well-acclaimed cities and the harbors around the world. If we wish to develop the urban city and the port, we need to have a planning director who has well-established urban center design background. And it helps if she or he has at least one proven record, as "show and tell"! The most important part of the development should include the construction of open space for the public, boardwalks, bike-paths, underground parking and the connecting roads to the center. Near the Marina, should be the public park, where the open-air concerts, the open market, and the open-air art exhibits can take place over the weekend. The shops, the commercial business, and the restaurants should be the back of the open area. No moving, or parked vehicles! For once, we must detach ourselves from the cars, without traffic congestions, and we can breathe the cleaner air walking and biking! The underground car parks should be built a few blocks away. There should be the public transit, which runs often; if possible they should use none polluting fuel. Even better yet, the carriages? It would be clean, less expensive, and the public may love it? As for the urban housing, many citizens showed reluctance to have high-rise buildings, and wish to keep the old city look. We certainly can have the old (restored) and the very modern, beautiful contemporary design buildings co-exist. We simply must have high rises to create vibrant city. It is the best way we can accommodate population increase. Large constructions such as high-rises, and hotels should be constructed toward the back. They will have the good view sites; they can enjoy the area side by side with the old neighbors. Vancouver, B.C. has a nice Harbor but too many cars create the terrible congestion near the Grandville Market, but it is nicely put together. The best urban city waterfront design is the City of Brisbane, Australia! The Marina in the center of the city has fantastic design, it is surrounded by two Bridges and many large parks with safe walking, biking trails. A long beautiful Board Walk is decorated with arts and sculptures and very nice amenities. The best part is this. The developers fund many of these amenities, boardwalk, the benches, and many art works!! Their high-rise multi-unit townhomes and condos are built in the back but with the commanding views of the busy marina. In the end, they get reimbursed from the sales of the homes by providing such beautiful surroundings. This marina is the engine of a booming economy.
18	11/30/05	Happier with the process as it's unfolding; concerns	Frances Badgett	I was at the meeting today, and, as with last night, I felt that the meeting went very well. It seems that the Council is on board with the work of the Whatcom Futures Group, and that the Collins Woerman Strategic Guidelines are losing their prominence in the discussion. I had a couple of fruitful conversations after the meeting with members of the Council and the WAG, and they supported a lot of the concerns I've been voicing to you. Fortunately, several members of the WAG were available at the meeting to deepen and clarify their recommendation to the Council. The disappointment over Collins Woerman's Strategic Guidelines from the citizens, the Planning Commission, and the WAG weren't clear without the WAG's comments. It's important that those in the decision-making process understand that Collins

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
		about consultants		<p>Woerman's guidelines are of great contention in the community and, despite public comment, not much improved from the first draft to the second. This is an opinion held not just by a few citizens, but also by the Planning Commission and the Wag, and now, apparently, the Council as well. The Port of Bellingham is wasting money on these thin, useless guidelines, particularly if the design concepts are already underway. The Strategic Guidelines as outlined by Collins Woerman become completely useless to us as a community when LMN unveils their conceptual models taken from the Whatcom Futures Group recommendations. I'm not sure, and neither are people I spoke to on the WAG and the Council, exactly why we need Collins Woerman in this process, particularly if their work is so sub-standard. It's very exciting to see the process working, and though it's a shame the community has wasted good comments on Collins Woerman, some of those comments will be added to the guidelines of the Whatcom Futures Group. It's really good to know that the consultants don't have the last say, and that the citizenry is being heard at all levels.</p>
17	11/30/05	Design guidelines of buildings - top to bottom	Mason Adair	<p>With respect to guidelines for the New Whatcom development, I was wondering whether architectural regulations for rooftops for new development in this area have been specified as part of your group's recommendations. Given the trend towards taller buildings in the existing downtown area and the fact that Sehome and downtown are at a higher elevation and therefore look down New Whatcom site, it makes sense to define and enforce design standards on new buildings from top to bottom.</p> <p>Effective guidelines would prevent the view from above from consisting of rooftop heating and refrigeration units that are common to contemporary box-type construction as well as most of the older buildings in downtown. Requiring rooftop facades and/or green roofs would be visually preferable to what might be the cheapest way to build new structures in this area. I'd appreciate any information you can provide relating to design guidelines for new development at the site as well as opportunities for public input on this topic.</p>
16	11/29/2005	Concern re: adding website links and Collins Woerman	Frances Badgett	<p>I attended the Whatcom Advisory Group's meeting last night, and it was really disheartening to see the second draft of Collins Woerman's Strategic Guidelines. The second draft didn't reflect the Planning Commission's feedback, nor that of the public, nor the feedback from the neighborhood meetings. Fortunately, the Whatcom Advisory Group rejected the guidelines and is asking the City Council today to follow the guidelines already set by the Whatcom Futures Group. Either Collins Woerman did not receive nor review the tapes of the Planning Commission, or they were not given proper direction by Sylvia Goodwin as to their charge in this revision. It was clear to anyone in attendance at the Planning Commission meeting that the direction and perspective of the guidelines was as much rejected as the guidelines themselves. Is it possible for someone to pressure the Port into removing Collins Woerman from this process? It became clear last night that whatever the Whatcom Futures Group hammered out was more specific and more in keeping with the public's interest than either draft of the Strategic Guidelines. I still remain concerned that Sylvia Goodwin is not communicating the passionate and important debate going on in these public meetings, and is not straight forward about her approach to this process. For example, she was asked for the third time if the Port could link www.newwhatcom.org directly from the Port's website. I've heard her say thrice now, "That'll be taken care of." It has yet to be done. If the Whatcom Futures Group has been adopted, has the backing of the public, and has covered the approach and vision of how to develop the waterfront, I don't understand the role Ms. Goodwin and Collins Woerman are playing in this process. Thank you for listening to my concerns.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
15	11/29/2005	Questions many of the strategic guidelines	Paul Sorensen	<p>I was relieved to see the article in this mornings Herald about the so-called "Strategic Guidelines" for the waterfront development. It echoed my sentiments exactly. The Strategic Guidelines presented in the New Whatcom Draft, (in many cases) duplicate excellent work already done by the Waterfront Futures Group in 2004. Many of these "new" guidelines are questionable if not completely unnecessary. I would suggest that a review by the formulates of these "new" guidelines be done by reading pages 23 through 25 of the 2004 Waterfront Framework Plan!</p> <p>Guideline #1 - is a negative and questionable statement.</p> <p>Guideline #2 - I recommend p23 of the WFG booklet.</p> <p>Guideline #4 - this is unnecessary and cumbersome. We have too many people coming here already. We don't need to promote this as a destination - the word is out!</p> <p>Guideline #5 - Bellingham doesn't need an "identifiable and memorable heart" (whatever that is?) That is a small town attribute in my opinion - our emerging city has definable neighborhoods with a central civic and business center.</p> <p>Guideline #6 - again this is enumerated in the "guiding principles" of the WFG p23 - 25.</p> <p>Guideline #7 - again a duplication of the WFG p25.</p> <p>Guideline #8 - unnecessary.</p> <p>Guideline #9 - a given!</p> <p>Guideline #10 - not really.</p> <p>Guideline #11 - again this is outlined in the WFG p24.</p> <p>I would rather have seen these guidelines incorporate the wording used in the WFG publication. The new language is not conducive to a full understanding of the intent of the guideline principles! Too much is left out and is very vague in many instances, leaving room for the wrong interpretation of the ideas agreed upon. I fear developers of this area will greatly take advantage of the loose wording and openness of these "new" guidelines. This worries me greatly and I suspect that it worries a great many other people in Bellingham as well.</p>
14	11/29/2005	Ideas for waterfront: museum, marine related industries; supports auditorium/ convention center for waterfront	Paul Sorensen	<p>As a follow-up to first e-mail to John Watts:</p> <p>I have a few recommendations (if I might). High rise (over 4 stories) buildings should not be allowed in the new waterfront development, which means a limit on building height. Tall buildings such as the proposed 20 story condo bldg. on State Street ideally should be clustered together in the central downtown area. Bellingham should not look like someone just threw darts at a map on the wall! State Street is OK though, since I think it will become the new Cornwall Ave. of Bellingham. The artist's renderings in the 2004 Waterfront Futures group booklet should be followed as to layout of pedestrian walkways, parks, facilities, recommendations, etc. A maritime museum in one of the existing buildings on the site would be a welcome addition and attraction to the waterfront, after all - it is our heritage! The Whatcom County Museum now has stored away all of Harold C. Hansens' drawings and memorabilia from his career as a famous naval architect. His father had a shipyard on Eliza Island years ago. Fascinating large scale drawings of classic purse seine fishing boats, tug boats, war ships and pleasure craft are in the collection. Many residents of Bellingham still have materials which could be in the museum.</p> <p>Marine related industries in a mixed use zoning of the area should receive first consideration. An auditorium/convention center serving the</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				city for meetings and special events, and concerts would also be a good use of the land. As it is now, the Bellingham High School does not allow any use of its auditorium when even a wrestling match is going on. They want all that nice close-in parking for themselves (probably as it should be).
13	11/28/2005	Funding Sources	Scott Pratschner and Jennifer Hennessey	I wanted to bring the following grant opportunities to your attention. They certainly seem like good opportunities for Bellingham. Please have a look at the following email & attached PDF files when convenient. I've included the Department of Ecology's announcement regarding funding sources and technical assistance for smart growth and low-impact development projects for local jurisdictions. A wide range of projects could apply for funding and/or technical assistance. The announcement below discusses the details regarding the various opportunities available from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and American Institute of Architects (AIA). View the attached pdf files for more information. Since Ecology is not directly involved with this effort, please consult the contacts listed for more information. (actual documents not included in this document)
12	11/28/2005	Inbound investment and consultant qualifications; supports community based involvement	Frances Badgett	Frances' subsequent response: Thank you so much for your kind phone call and e-mail. I've been out of town, or I would've responded sooner. I really appreciate your response to my feedback. I'm currently going over the interlocal agreement between the port and the city, and I must say how delighted I am that so much information is available to the public about the project. Though I would like more transparency about the inbound investment group and whatever other groups are consulting on the New Whatcom project, I'm impressed by how much information is out there. I'm also happy that the mayor has demonstrated a real interest in more public process for Bellingham development. I plan to attend the Whatcom Advisory Group meeting this evening at 5:30. In preparation, I did some quick cursory research into Collins Woerman's portfolio, upcoming projects, awards, etc. I'm still concerned they these are the consultants for the waterfront development. I don't see anywhere in their work the kind of community-based development that the G-P site needs. We aren't just converting a warehouse; we're building a new neighborhood. I'm very excited by this process. My reservations are only a sign of my deep enthusiasm and abiding trust that if left up to Bellingham and the people, we will create a lovely and functional new neighborhood. Thanks again for your time and attention.
11	11/22/2005	open space; earthquakes	Diana Davidson	Please keep some space open for people to walk, and groups of kids to play and picnic. Also, what are you doing to ensure safety in case of earthquake? Being on an old landfill the site seems vulnerable.
10	11/22/2005	Providing for human-powered craft	Victoria Dale McKinnon	Is access for human-powered craft being addressed by the WAG, city and port? So far, I've seen only the terms public access. And I read about a new marina. However, the needs of the rowers, kayakers, surfskiers, etc. are not specifically addressed. Rowers, kayakers, surfskiers, etc need parking to unload their boats from roof racks, low docks to launch their boats, and ROOM to maneuver their boats in a docking area without interference from larger power boats and their wakes. Affluent retirees are the fastest growing segment for the open-water rowing and row-touring industry. The demand for facilities and access for human-powered craft is going to grow from the 40-60 year age group. People with money, time, and a need for non-impact, highly aerobic activities along the waterfront are arriving here. I would like to see the waterfront organizing groups plan for such facilities... Inside Taylor Avenue dock would be a perfect place to put such a facility. Cornwall Beach, and Boulevard Park dock and beach would also be

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				excellent places to install low launching docks and storage facilities.
9	11/21/2005	Questions the Strategic Guidelines; Need to look long-term; retain public ownership	Garth Hammond	<p>After attending the presentation by the Consultants Group responsible for creating the guidelines for the proposed development of the Georgia-Pacific property I came away dismayed by the quality of the presentation. My dismay was based both on the nature of the presentation and by the biases evident in the some of the guidelines. There was a complete disconnect between the document and the work of prior groups. The vague guidelines in my estimation were a recipe for the massive influx of investment capital that would maximize density by creating a “regional center” that would in reality translate into a massive growth engine for corporations and the destruction of the unique qualities that make Bellingham so unique. You do not have to demonize developers to understand that as a group they have different goals than the average citizen. The sale of public assets to private individuals is not a long term best idea. The impact of this development on neighborhoods was not addressed. The mention of fixing the difficulty of access from I-5 sent shivers down my back. I hope that the product of the work group headed by the consultant is a result of lack of understanding of our city and a certain big city attitude that you can always build more. The “More is Better Syndrome”. The following pages are a proposed rewrite of the Development Guidelines for the Georgia-Pacific property. The intent of this effort is to refocus all of us on the long-term vision. My intent is to promote the retention of the property in public ownership and to focus the process on maximizing the values of community and long term benefit versus short-term development based on corporate profit. The best planning happens from clear guidelines and clear statements of what is not acceptable. Leaving the rest open allows for creativity and opportunity. I double spaced the text for your working convenience. Please feel free to contact me if you are so moved. I hope you will work to stop the destruction of Bellingham. We are the one of the last Great Places left. We can create a waterfront that reflects our values. We must create a living trust for those who follow us. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
8	11/18/2005	Questions public process; B’ham waterfront should not strive to be a regional destination or be sold to investors	Frances Badgett	<p>Dear Mayor Asmundson,</p> <p>I am a resident of the Columbia neighborhood, and a proud constituent of yours. I've just recently joined in the discussions of the New Whatcom development, and I have some concerns. I attended the November 15th meeting where Sylvia Goodwin and David Spiker presented the Strategic Guidelines for the development of New Whatcom as outlined by Collins Woermer. Fortunately, not only was there high turn-out, but a great deal of public discussion. Goodwin informed us that our feedback would be culled and given to the Planning Commission before their November 17th meeting. When I attended their meeting, no such work had been done. The boards, on which people had commented, from stickers or— at some length — on tablets of paper and sticky notes, were not in evidence. The Commission received WAG's suggested revisions just before they sat down. They were expected to read over them during the meeting while people were providing feedback and voicing concerns. One of the guidelines put forth by Collins Woermer suggested that Bellingham take advantage of the current development cycle and that time was of the essence, yet neither Ms. Goodwin nor the WAG representatives had anything on hand for the Planning Commission on which to base their decisions. Because of excellent public testimony by representatives from the community, including those who serve on the board at the Bellingham Bay Foundation, the Planning Commission delayed the</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				approval process. Ms. Goodwin was exceptionally bitter about this, and said to a colleague, "I wish they'd just do it." This kind of rush-rush attitude runs counter to the wishes of the people of Bellingham for good reason. We need adequate input so that we see a Bellingham that we created, not a "regional destination" broken up and sold off to "inbound investment." ...
7	11/17/2005	Opposed to regional destination idea	Don and Michelle McNeal	<p>My wife Michelle and I attended the New Whatcom Public Meeting for the Strategic Guidelines on November 15. We agree that the waterfront development is a fantastic opportunity to further enhance Bellingham's vitality. In general, we were both pleased with the guidelines, but there was one theme which was common to several of the guidelines to which we are opposed. Namely, the idea that the waterfront should be developed with the objective of making Bellingham a regional destination. This idea is expressed in 4 of the first 5 guidelines:</p> <p>Guideline #1-Bellingham will know it's a regional destination when the regional conversation is: Vancouver, Bellingham, Seattle and Portland.</p> <p>Guideline #3-New Whatcom must capitalize on....the regional infrastructure of I-5.</p> <p>Guideline #4-The Whatcom Waterway and its adjacent access must be developed as a destination amenity....</p> <p>Guideline #5-The new town center should be a regional destination....and Downtown needs a "destination of character"....</p> <p>It seems to us that there is a disproportionate emphasis on making Bellingham a regional destination. It is our hope that the primary emphasis will be placed instead on developing the waterfront in a way that will make the city of Bellingham an even better place for its residents to live. We hope the planned development will generate good-paying jobs, that it will contain needed housing, that services (markets, cleaners, pharmacies, etc.) required by the residents of those homes will be located close by, that there will be parks for them and their children and all of the residents of Bellingham and the surrounding area, and that there will be good access to the water for all of us. If we do this, Bellingham will continue to attract tourists, which is good, but attracting tourists in itself should not be a priority for developing the waterfront. Michelle and I are recent Bellinghamsters. We bought a house on South Hill and moved here from California in July of this year following a three-year search across the country for the "right place". We plan to live here for the rest of our lives. Bellingham has the right mix of what we were looking for—a medium-sized university town offering ample cultural, musical and artistic opportunities, nearby outdoor recreational opportunities in a beautiful natural environment, excellent restaurants, and much, much more. And we liked the fact that Bellingham was a "real town"; i.e., its primary industry was not tourism, instead it was just a wonderful place to live. Sure, there are tourists that arrive during the summer because Bellingham is such a great city in a wonderful setting, but the city's focus has been and should continue to be adding on to what it offers its own citizens, not on making the city more attractive to tourists.</p>
6	11/16/2005	New Whatcom Master Plan	Ian Thompson, MD	<p>I read in the Herald this AM re. some of the comments at the public meeting last night. The quoted meeting comments were typical NIMBY comments. I would like to thank you for your work, and would encourage the planned development for the entire site. I think Yaletown in Vancouver is the best example of a great outcome from the development of an abandoned waterfront industrial site with its mix of condominiums, apartments, white collar businesses, and retail. All of which is tied into the magnificent seawall which encompasses Stanley Park. Other good models would be the Marina District in SF if low rise developments is all that is allowed. I don't think that the view would be blocked by a few high rise buildings, nor should that be a determining factor. I would not support WWU taking up much of</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				the new space, unless they pay property taxes. We can't afford to give the land away.
5	11/14/2005	View preservation	Anne Botwin	I am very impressed with the amount of thought and planning that has gone into the New Whatcom project to date. However, I do not see ANY guidelines regarding view preservation and maximum building heights in the new areas to be developed. Nor do I see any Guidelines suggesting that building heights should remain lower near the waterfront and only gradually increase in height as their distance from the bay (or Whatcom Creek) increases. I would appreciate some statement about view preservation and building heights in the Guidelines. I also feel strongly that Guidelines should be more specific in regard to our stewardship of the environment, particularly the waterfront, stream buffers, and the protection of wildlife corridors. How will wildlife habitat (including salmon runs) be protected while all this development is going on? I would like to see more than lip-service to environmental concerns in the Guidelines. Lay out some specific parameters consistent with SEPA and WDFW requirements. (MANY developers are insensitive and clueless unless given specific guidelines!) I believe my comments reflect the concerns of many fellow citizens. Thanks for giving these suggestions your careful consideration.
4	11/14/2005	Environment	Robert Christman	Too little attention is being paid on that fact that underlying material is fill or sediments. This make the area very damage by earthquakes when (not if) the Pacific NW is hit by a major earthquake. In reality the area is only good for soccer fields and parks. Any structures should be low and able to survive an earthquake. In addition there is a potential danger of a tsunami.
3	11/14/2005	Public Process	Reis Southworth	Reiss called the Mayor's office. She recently received the Waterfront mailer. She has two concerns. She wants to discuss the remediation of toxins on the GP site - both in the water and on land. She feels the environmental aspect has been downplayed by the City and the Port and feels it deserves more emphasis. Secondly - she did not like the tone of the pamphlet. Feels the community communication is poor - that people are only being asked to be involved after the fact. Would like to know who is responsible for the community communication outreach.
2	10/26/2005	Student wants to research waterfront redevelopment	Jillian Martin	Dear Futures Group, I'm a planning student at Western and I'm going to begin researching "Waterfront Redevelopment in Bellingham." I am hoping to specifically focus on design aspects of the redevelopment. I am looking for information sources on this topic, and possibly an opportunity to meet with one of the members and talk about the redevelopment. Could you put me in contact with someone who would be able to meet with me? Thanks for taking the time to respond.
1	9/23/2005	Sharing architectural ideas	Dan Welch	(This was sent from the Waterfront Futures website and not previously included) I am currently in my third year of architecture school at the University of British Columbia. I lived in Bellingham five years before attending school and have had a great interest in the waterfront GP site for many years. It is a great resource of infrastructure that may by

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – 2005 through January, 2006
				<p>lost as the development plan sits.</p> <p>I have looked over the sketches and read some of the documents on the future plans. They are a straight forward look at the site as a tabula rasa development. Agreed, the GP warehouse will be used but this seems to be the only structure considered for reuse. In place of these historic (and possibly very modern buildings with retrofits) is a generic take on waterfront development, applying a nostalgic view from the past, producing exactly what is expected. where is the design??? What do we see as the future for Bellingham? Are we going to keep Bellingham in the past, using conventional strategies producing conventional results? We need a NEW Bellingham that is designed around the community's mentality. There are numerous examples to pull from across the globe. Some of these that I find interesting:</p> <p>Duisberg Nord http://www.landschaftspark.de/en/home/index.php http://www.latzundpartner.de/L3/eng/e-4-du.htm#Blast</p> <p>Highline New York http://www.thehighline.org/design/prelim_design/index.htm</p> <p>Gas Works Park seattle http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/GASWORKS.htm http://www.vrseattle.com/pages/browse.php?cat_id=64</p> <p>These projects show the innovation that can help lead Bellingham into a design that gives distinction to the city. Obviously the development of residential, retail, and industrial needs to have a focus (as in Duisberg Nord).</p> <p>In the past few years Bellingham has been making some bad decisions and I would like to see a change in the way the city planners/developers approach their projects. the farmers market is a good example. Building a nostalgic steel and glass parking garage echoing the old railway station....please. right across the street in the now demolished Morris Hardware building a great design could have been accomplished. new cladding with hanger style doors to turn a beautiful timber building into an open air market would have reflected the community attitude much more than a glass covered asphalt parking lot.</p> <p>I do like the idea of mixed use planning on the GP site. Bellingham is in desperate need of numerous types of downtown living. Facing the fight of the Chuckanut Ridge development, retirees need an alternative which could be met in this new development while still meeting the demands for students and low income. Retail and commercial on the ground levels would restore the ground plane, something that is void and will create dead spaces in the city (like the new condos at the end of railroad).</p> <p>Another project to look at which will eclipse Bellingham (unless Bellingham rises to the occasion) is Dockside in Victoria. http://www.docksidegreen.com/</p> <p>As I am approaching my thesis all these things are very interesting to me, as a topic of study and a general interest in Bellingham. Bellingham NEEDS innovation. Being responsible financially, socially and environmentally takes a serious look at design. The present is much different than the past. Let's take a step forward rather than standing still.</p>
				<p><i>Beginning of public comments taken on this website.</i></p>