

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
<i>Last Update 3/29/2006</i>				<i>Comments are listed in the order in which they were received with most recent usually appearing towards the top of this document. To Be Continued as public comment is submitted... ➤ Comments #173-219 were received at the Port's Marina Advisory Committee public meeting on 3/28/2006</i>
209	3/28/2006	Consider sailboats	Peter Ambrose	Please consider planning for a sailing center. Recommend designing it for both dinghies and keelboats. Marina should include dry storage area for dinghies and keel sailboats, launching ramp for boats on trailers and 2 small cranes for lifting keelboats up to 4000lbs. Storage (locked) for dingy equipment would be helpful. Feel free to call for comments 303.9084
208	3/28/2006	Suggests amenities	No name	Playground with tire swing - wildlife, areas for dogs (off leash), kids spaces, park – possibly an aquarium or museum. Open air space – public bathrooms
207	3/28/2006	No Park	George Eastoon	We Do Not Need More Parks
206	3/28/2006	More planning for small boats	Ed Clay	Small boat access to waterways “appears” to be very limited. Secure facilities for storage of small rowing and sailing craft appears to be absent. The joy of being on the water is not directly proportional to the cost of your craft.
205	3/28/2006	Don't forget working waterfront	Phil Erickson	As a marine contractor, who doesn't lease from the Port, I feel that you've totally neglected to plan for work space on the water. We work on larger vessels (50-100ft) and require dock space as well as shop space.
204	3/28/2006	Concerned Boatyard at Colony Wharf isn't in plans	Mary Erickson	You have some important information included in your presentation tonight about how the Marina Project can help the local economy and stressing that we want a “working waterfront”, yet at least one ‘notable business’ <u>under water transportation services</u> will cease to exist in all your plans – The Boatyard at Colony Wharf. I think it's important to keep this business where it is and I think having it here enhances the Port. It's important to have real businesses and authentic waterfront activity and employs many and serves many more.
203	3/28/2006	Slow down	No name	Please slow down - You are proposing a 100 yr plan. Why make such a dramatic decision in months?
202	3/28/2006	Keep public ownership a priority	Julianna Guy	I believe serious consideration should be given by the City and Port to retain all ground ownership. Why: 1. For revenue 2. For control of standards
201	3/28/2006	Slow the process, consider other options.	Patty Bean	I truly believe we need to slow this process down long enough to make sure we are making the best possible plans for all of this community. It is easy to become entrenched so deep that it is impossible to hear other view points. I think that is where we are now. The city and port need to look beyond immediate moorage needs to determine widest scope of use for this beautiful waterfront area. We are making decisions today for future generations and access – meaningful access – will improve and enhance the lives of this community. A marina, while offering an evocative waterfront feeling and providing parking spaces for boats, does not enhance the lives of the majority of local residences. Please open this process up to alternatives and compromises and we'll more than likely end up with a waterfront we can be proud of.
200	3/28/2006	Continue to gather input		Whatever becomes of the ASB, two things must be considered: a. public dialogue – This meeting is an excellent start, but more viewpoints need to be addressed - and b. the highest level of cleanup with a consideration for habitat. I'm not convinced that a marina/habitat

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				juxtaposition is best for salmon, seals, etc. I'm not convinced that a marina is the best option for the ASB. Keep up the dialogue.
199	3/28/2006	Shipping terminal should be used for public	Dave Courtis	The deep water wharf and shipping terminal are the most attractive parcels in New Whatcom. I am skeptical that it can generate enough business to support itself and justify its continued existence in the future. I would like to see a signature public presence there instead (e.g. Museum, aquarium, etc.). It could be the "crown jewel" of New Whatcom redevelopment. The Port, the City and the community need to have an in depth discussion about the range of potential uses that area and a well thought out decision how to use it. The Port needs to show the public its current and long term business plan for the deep draft wharf and shipping terminal (e.g. number of jobs supported, number of deep draft ships which will use it annually, potential/actual customers, marketing plan, etc.). I don't think that it is enough for the Port to keep the status quo just on the basis of a hope that someone, someday may want to use the wharf and shipping terminal. If that is the best that the Port can do, it would seem to be a 'no brainer' to use the site as the public center of New Whatcom.
198	3/28/2006	Environment most important	Sam Lax	The port must consider the ramifications of this marina. There cannot be flaws in the environmental integrity of this plan. This property must contain public space and a clean rehabilitate environment to ensure economic vitality for the entire community. Please consider the environment at all costs.
197	3/28/2006	Pro Blethen Plan	James Willson	I have to say the Blethen Plan seems to best address overall issues.
196	3/28/2006	Wants a park for the many, not a marina for the few	Niki Thane	Very effective propaganda tour, and on the public dollar, I'll warrant. Port employees were not volunteering tonight. No one is saying the marina won't "clean up contaminants" "provide jobs" and be an exciting new project. We're only saying – we'd rather own a huge patch of green view instead of 37 acres of expensive, little-used pleasure boats. To please a <u>tiny</u> percentage of citizens who can own these toys we'd have to sell off our inheritance. Please don't trade off the intrinsic community worth of a 'world class' park for the brief desires of a few hundred wealthy patrons. The public owns the land and hires Port officials. Remember this.
195	3/28/2006	No to a marina – yes to jobs	No name	We don't need another marina. We need a waterfront for all Whatcom County that uses the land as best as possible to create living wage jobs – not slips for wealthy yacht owners.
194	3/28/2006	No marina	No name	This is a joke. The ASB should be filled. Your pathetic attempt to usurp the will of the people will not be tolerated. Shame on you.
193	3/28/2006	Wants to see a park in the ASB	No name	I don't think the Port should be considering a marina in the ASB to be the only option. Why not slightly expand Squalicum and also add dry-dock storage for smaller boats (a preferred method by many). I hate to see Bellingham lose the opportunity for a large park in the ASB that would provide maximum public access for our waterfront and provide maximum revenue in the long term because of the destination desirability.
192	3/28/2006	Wants to see a park in the ASB	No name	I'm afraid I will have little or no access to the new waterfront area, particularly the lagoon if it becomes a marina. The area that will need to be devoted to paved parking will rob some people space as well. A marina is for boaters, but a park is for the common man (and woman).
191	3/28/2006	Appreciates this dialogue with public	No name	While I disagree with the Port's determination to turn the ASB into a marina – I believe the public would be better served by containing all the waterway's toxins in the structure built for that purpose – I do very much appreciate this effort and willingness to open discussion to the public in a robust way. The results must necessarily be better if more citizens participate.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
190	3/28/2006	ASB perfect for a marina	Fay Farkas	Perfect use of the “pond.” If this was turned into a park, as some people want, what % of the Bellingham population would use this immense space compared to the use AND income the city and population would have if it were a marina with walking and park space around the marina. Excellent plan. (Think Granville Island if it was all park!)
189	3/28/2006	Good Work!	Mark Brown	Keep up the good work! I’m constantly pleased to see so many agencies working together!
188	3/28/2006	Port meets community & ecological needs	Jim Gibson	Stoner and the others at the Port have done a great job of working with a vast array of consultants and agencies to craft an exemplary plan for our region for generations to come. The marina and park concepts are meeting a tremendous community and ecological need. Thanks!
187	3/28/2006	Marina is reasonable thing to do	Chris Phillips	Don’t back down. You’re doing the only reasonable thing to restore the estuarial environ to Whatcom Creek, create jobs and promote interaction of the community with a new waterfront.
186	3/28/2006	Can’t wait for a new Marina	Karen Bellinger	Can’t wait for a new marina and the logical spot is GP’s Lagoon. There are several parks being planned. Those who have boats deserve a “park” too. An almost five year waitlist for a slip shows the need for another marina. Keep up the good work! Lots of us quiet types support your efforts.
185	3/28/2006	Go ahead with the Marina	No name	Good factual and logical information – not propoganda. Forge ahead with the marina.
184	3/28/2006	Marina, and project over all	George Farkas	Good job. Some of us understand and appreciate your work. Favorite features: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marina in the ASB location 2. Public walkway on the breakwater around the outside of the marina 3. Mixed use nature of the project overall.
183	3/28/2006	Moorage creates jobs. Create RV park.	Bob Plumb	It’s important to add the additional moorage, because it will pay for itself and more important it adds <u>jobs</u> to Bellingham. Also, some space should be considered for an RV park.
182	3/28/2006	There’s enough space 4 all	Sandy Brock	There is enough space to meet everyone’s needs as I see it: Marinas and General Access Parks. We need jobs a marina can generate. Get’er done!
181	3/28/2006	Likes to look at boats	No name	I like the marina plan. Even though I’m not now nor never have been a boat owner, I love looking at them! I walk on the South Bay Trail a lot and the idea of a walkway around the new marina is great. I don’t think we need any more parks on this side of town (I live above Boulevard Park). Just today, I drove by the Boulevard Brownstones, looked toward the water and thought how neat it would be to look out at the boats if you lived there!
180	3/28/2006	In favor of	Tom	I’m in favor of the Port’s plan to build the Marina as planned.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		the plan as is	McGarry	
179	3/28/2006	Marina not grass	No name	Support Water's Edge or Blethen Plan – We need another marina not umpteen acres of grass. Marina will add salmon habitat, park will not.
178	3/28/2006	Loves the marina idea	Susan Dean	Love the idea of a marina in the GP pond – perfect location. Please make it happen soon.
177	3/28/2006	Votes for a Marina. Minimize public tax burden	No name	I vote for the marina! Parks are great but Bellingham is a maritime city with a long heritage of seafaring. We desperately need more moorage and what better spot than the lagoon? We are spending millions on clean-up and development; there has to be a return on investment somewhere in this project and a high percentage of parks and green space will not pay the bills! Our taxes are going to increase big time with the passage of school levies and soon we need to replace the library, and the downtown culture center are going to result in unprecedented taxes in Whatcom County. Let's not add to the burden by creating too much public space on the waterfront.
176	3/28/2006	Likes the marina designs from the charette	Dave Courtis	I like the two proposals for the marina that were developed by the charette on 3/26. The curved shape, the wider walkway, the environmentally friendly aspects are much more attractive than the sterile straight line shape of the ASB as it now exists. Public access to the marina breakwater is a necessity. Use imagination and create a marina area that both boaters and the general public can use and enjoy.
175	3/28/2006	Use land to create family wage jobs	No name	We need to use the land to create family wage jobs. Expand/enhance the deep water shipping facility. We need to use the port for the good of the tax payers of Whatcom County.
174	3/28/2006	Many concerns relating to water access	Mr. R. H. Severson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep marina (GP Pond) 2. WWSU and School water access (Teaching) 3. Connect museum and part to waterfront 4. North Bellingham to Chuckanut walk trail near water 5. Deep water docks (Most important- shipping, cruise ships, etc.) 6. Fishing dock for people
173	3/28/2006	Build the marina ASAP	Rod Dean	Build it ASAP. Using the lagoon as a park makes no sense. We need to utilize the structure.
172	3/28/2006	Marina sounds like a good thing	Tom Olsen	This marina is a project worth doing. The economics look feasible and the esthetics will complement the overall site concept. I don't own a boat, but I still like looking at them!
171	3/29/2006	Moorage draws more	Sears Taylor	As a non boater who appreciates the fact that boating moorage draws more people down town and would actually generate positive CASH flow to the port, PLEASE keep the pond a boat moorage. We have enough park land. We have only LIMITED spaces to dock boats.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		people downtown		
170	3/29/2006	Three areas to really focus on now	Pablo G Schroeder, DBA Curlys flooring	I think that there are some important aspects of this. One of them is to focus on the cleanup now. The other is not to sell it off to development, when the value of this property will only go up. I think that keeping it green or in park space as much as possible is the best avenue to go. Then it will keep for all 'bellinghamsters' and not just the rich or the business community.
169	3/29/2006	Build a park to benefit more people	No name	I strongly urge you to consider building a park instead of the proposed marina in the Georgia Pacific Ponding Basin. The park would benefit many more Whatcom County residents and have a most positive impact on our quality of life. I walk at the existing marina everyday and see first hand the litter, oil slicks and pollution that the pleasure boaters leave. The particular spot being considered would make a spectacular park!
168	3/29/2006	The Port is on the right track with the marina	Rod Dean	I attended the Port of Bellingham/Marine Advisory Committee open house Tuesday evening and came away very impressed and reassured the port is on the right track. Much more planning has happened than I was aware of, and many alternatives to using the GP lagoon as a new marina have been considered. Space for people and wildlife has been well addressed in addition to space for boats. I support the port's concept for the GP site and hope that we will be able to move beyond the planning stage shortly.
167	3/29/2006	High marks to the architects' work on planning process	Jim Young	<p>I would like to first express my support for the planned use of the pond site as a marina. Last night (March 27) I spent the greater part of my evening watching the Bellingham Planning Commission meeting on Channel 10. It left me with a burning desire to write to you – and anyone else who will listen – with my thoughts.</p> <p>First, the presentation by the Bellingham Bay Foundation people: When someone says that all you see when you approach Bellingham from the water is a pile of rocks, obviously he needs to go back to Denver and take his plan for a park at the pond site with him. My question is: who is paying him and who is the lawyer who introduced him? His plan shows no parking, no access and is a joke. When I approach Bellingham from the water I see church steeples, the museum, Mt. Baker, the Coast Guard ships, if it's Friday I see the Alaska ferry, I see two Foss tractor tugs at the deep water dock. This Denver guy says he sees a pile of rocks.... He also put up a chart saying that only 550 people would benefit from the construction of the harbor. Well, if you're from Denver that might make sense but for the rest of us who know the economic realities of the marine support services in the area that is rather idiotic. It also tells you what the rest of his slides were worth. This is just the kind of planning person we don't need to be wasting our time listening to.</p> <p>I would give high marks to the architect the Port and City have hired. It is with his even approach that this project will move forward. He and his people are listening; don't let him be driven off course by the real estate developers that will do whatever they can to take over this property.</p> <p>Regarding the development of an aquarium on the site: I would ask that the planners visit Monterey on a nice July day. That is, if you can get there due to the traffic gridlock that has cars backed up to Seaside. Then go in February when 90% of the stores and shops are closed and you could shoot a cannon down the main street and not hit anyone. Look for year-round sustainability, not a three-month boom then bust. The Monterey aquarium is, I believe, underwritten by the Hewlett Packard foundation, and I doubt we would have that luxury.</p> <p>A final comment on the marina vs. park debate: Who would maintain a park of that size? It would be a burden on every city taxpayer whereas a marina would be self sustaining. We need to have a balance – a marina and open spaces.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
166	3/29/2006	Consider dry stack storage solution	Les Hibbert	I realize that we are still in the 'Broad Strokes'; stage of planning at this time but I would like consideration of dry stack storage to be noted whether a park or a marina is ultimately chosen. Dry stack is more directed to smaller boats of people with more modest means and frees up in- water moorage for larger boats. If growth in Bellingham is going to be accommodated by housing that precludes boat trailer space ie condos, dry stack becomes a very valuable addition to the waterfront.
165	3/28/2006	Does not support marina	Dave Werntz	<p>Whatcom County is fortunate to have such an extraordinary and historic opportunity to revitalize downtown Bellingham and its shorelines. To build and sustain long-term economic vitality and ensure the highest quality of life for our County's residents, we need to fully clean up the toxins that pollute our waterfront, restore its shoreline habitat, retain public ownership of these lands, remove that ugly tissue warehouse and provide large parks and open spaces, bicycle routes and walkways, and public access to our beaches.</p> <p>A marina, unjustifiably promoted by the Port, would fragment the waterfront and block access to our shoreline for most citizens of Bellingham and Whatcom County. A marina will not generate the revenue or provide the cascading economic influence of a large central park. Basically, a marina on the waterfront would serve the few at cost to many. It's simply a bad idea.</p> <p>Besides, we already have a marina, and if there are legitimate moorage demands, let's consider expanding our existing facilities. What we lack and need is a large public park with access to the shoreline to serve as a magnet for social and cultural activities at our downtown core.</p> <p>Take another look at the proposal from the Bellingham Bay Foundation. With its commitment to public parks and open space, public access, ecological restoration, and responsible development (cultural center, residential neighborhood, mixed-use commercial, and research/educational district), it best captures the vision I have for a healthy economy and community in Bellingham and Whatcom County.</p>
164	3/28/2006	Supports Bellingham Bay Foundation plan	Tom and Celest Gotchy	<p>My wife and I are another two people who think that the Bellingham Bay Foundation's plan for the waterfront is one worth pursuing. We lived on a boat for 11 years, much of that time at Squilicum Harbor, so we have some understanding of the plight of boat owners. We both would rather see the GP lagoon utilized as a park, rather than a boat storage facility. Last weekend's sunny weather had the existing marina park packed with people, to the point that it clearly demonstrated that the amount of land set aside for that park, was indeed short sighted. Please don't make that mistake again. The boats should be stored some other place, there are plenty of other options.</p> <p>When we did live on our boat the best time of day was high tide, that's when we could look over the top of the breakwater, and see the magnificent view that is Bellingham Bay and beyond. That view should be made available to as many people as possible.</p>
163	3/28/2006	Parks have to be taken care of – who will do that?	Richard Sumner	The last thing this City needs is more parks that we cannot afford or take care of. A marina generates income and can be designed and built to accommodate park like facilities and access. I hope that common sense prevails in this case and we don't get another 'Alabama Street Overpass'.
162	3/28/2006	Supports the marina; Questions Bellingham Bay	Jim Young	<p>I would like to first express my support for the planned use of the pond site as a marina. Last night (March 27) I spent the greater part of my evening watching the Bellingham Planning Commission meeting on Channel 10. It left me with a burning desire to write to you – and anyone else who will listen – with my thoughts.</p> <p>First, the presentation by the Bellingham Bay Foundation people: When someone says that all you see when you approach Bellingham from the water is a pile of rocks, obviously he needs to go back to Denver and take his plan for a park at the pond site with him. My</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		Foundation plan		<p>question is: who is paying him and who is the lawyer who introduced him? His plan shows no parking, no access and is a joke. When I approach Bellingham from the water I see church steeples, the museum, Mt. Baker, the Coast Guard ships, if it's Friday I see the Alaska ferry, I see two Foss tractor tugs at the deep water dock. This Denver guy says he sees a pile of rocks.... He also put up a chart saying that only 550 people would benefit from the construction of the harbor. Well, if you're from Denver that might make sense but for the rest of us who know the economic realities of the marine support services in the area that is rather idiotic. It also tells you what the rest of his slides were worth. This is just the kind of planning person we don't need to be wasting our time listening to.</p> <p>I would give high marks to the architect the Port and City have hired. It is with his even approach that this project will move forward. He and his people are listening; don't let him be driven off course by the real estate developers that will do whatever they can to take over this property.</p> <p>Regarding the development of an aquarium on the site: I would ask that the planners visit Monterey on a nice July day. That is, if you can get there due to the traffic gridlock that has cars backed up to Seaside. Then go in February when 90% of the stores and shops are closed and you could shoot a cannon down the main street and not hit anyone. Look for year-round sustainability, not a three-month boom then bust. The Monterey aquarium is, I believe, underwritten by the Hewlett Packard foundation, and I doubt we would have that luxury.</p> <p>A final comment on the marina vs. park debate: Who would maintain a park of that size? It would be a burden on every city taxpayer whereas a marina would be self sustaining. We need to have a balance – a marina and open spaces.</p>
161	3/28/2006	Supports Bellingham Bay Foundation plan and thinks the public should get to vote on the marina issue	Darrel Weiss	<p>Dear Mayor Asmundson -- Thank you for your leadership on the waterfront redevelopment front. I sincerely appreciate your memo of 3/14/06 to the Council, Port, Planning Commission and WAG. This is SUCH an important project, one that will shape our area for many years to come. In an effort to truly represent the interests of the greater public, I think a vote may be in order so that we know for certain the will of the people. I am forwarding the message sent to the City Council Members for your consideration.</p> <p>Dear Council Members: A writer of a letter to the editor in today's Bellingham Herald (included below) makes a good point. We should ask the people of Whatcom County what they want. Having attended several planning meetings, including the 3/28 Port open house, I have the sense that the community is not truly being represented in the decision making process.</p> <p>This is such an exceptional opportunity! My personal belief is that Bellingham Bay Foundation's proposal, in particular, promises a great deal the way of long-term benefit for the city, county, and most importantly, the public. Though the Port has been a major player in the process so far and deserves a ton of credit for getting us this far, I feel their plan does not take the best advantage of the opportunities before us. But that is just my opinion. We should know for sure what the citizens have to say on the subject. .</p> <p>[Bellingham Herald, 3/29/06: Why don't we just let the citizens of Whatcom County vote as to whether we want a marina, a small marina and a park or just a park? My belief is that there will not be full citizen input into the project until we as a community all have a chance to voice our opinions. The select few that go to the city of Bellingham's meetings, and the Port of Bellingham itself, are not representative of the community. - Marcus Schumacher]</p>
160	3/28/2006	The MRC supports preserving, restoring,	Chris Fairbanks, Co-Chair of the	<p>Dear Community Leaders,</p> <p>The Whatcom County Marine Resources Committee (the MRC) is writing this comment letter to you to help inform the waterfront redevelopment planning process. In general our comments support preserving, restoring, and maintaining multiple pocket beaches and intertidal habitat, as these areas provide needed refuge for juvenile and migrating fish. These areas are also critical for forage fish</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		and maintaining multiple pocket beaches and intertidal habitat with specific feedback for areas on the waterfront	Whatcom County MRC	<p>spawning, which is the lifeline for larger marine creatures. Protecting this critical habitat will help support the regional effort to rebuild endangered Chinook salmon and bull trout stocks and provide habitat for the recovering species.</p> <p>The MRC was established by the Whatcom County Council in 1999 to protect and enhance the local marine resources and contribute to the protection of the marine environment of the Northwest Straits. The Whatcom MRC is comprised of representatives from diverse backgrounds and interests representing conservation, business, recreation and scientific perspectives, as well as city, county and tribal government. To find out more about our work, we encourage you to look at our website at www.whatcom-mrc.wsu.edu/MRC. We are one of seven MRCs established in the Northwest Straits region as a part of the federally created and funded Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative. The Initiative is administered through the Northwest Straits Commission (NWSC) made up of representatives from each of the seven MRCs, including Whatcom. The overarching goal of the NWSC, and thus the Whatcom MRC, is to protect and restore the marine waters, habitats and species of the Northwest Straits region to achieve ecosystem health and sustainable resources use. Please see the attached description of the NWSC goals and benchmarks applicable to the waterfront redevelopment project. We encourage you to visit the NWSC website at www.nwstraits.org.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the waterfront provides the citizens of Bellingham and Whatcom County with an unprecedented opportunity to protect and preserve our marine resources for future generations. To accomplish this, the Whatcom MRC recommends the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Preserve and enhance existing habitat features.</u> The MRC urges you to protect the habitat in the development site by preserving those features that already exist. Preservation is the most cost-effective way to protect habitat features and obviates the need for future restoration. Preservation efforts should focus on Whatcom Creek estuary, the log pond, eelgrass meadows and pocket beaches. Enhancement through expansion or addition of riparian nearshore habitat is recommended at the pocket beaches located at the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I & J Waterway • G Street (west of the treatment lagoon) • Central Avenue • Roeder Avenue • Cornwall and Pine Street • North end of Cornwall Avenue landfill • South end of Cornwall Avenue landfill 2. <u>Create or restore natural habitat to restore natural processes in the following highly impacted pocket beaches:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C Street (east of the treatment lagoon) • Cornwall and Pine Street • North end of Cornwall Avenue landfill • South end of Cornwall Avenue landfill 3. <u>Protect and plant native over-hanging riparian vegetation in pocket beach areas</u> to protect spring and summer forage fish eggs from desiccation. Of greatest importance are the pocket beaches where forage fish eggs have been documented:

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G Street <p>4. <u>Enhance the shoreline where appropriate with soft shore protection similar to Marine Park at the following locations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sides of I & J Waterway • G street • Both sides of Whatcom Waterway • Both sides of the existing Cornwall and Pine pocket beach • Along the length of the Cornwall Avenue landfill, so long as the soft shore solution would not interfere with an effective cleanup of the landfill. <p>The MRC recognizes that there are areas where soft shore may not be feasible, but encourages this application wherever possible.</p> <p>5. <u>Remove certain over water structures, creosote piles and associated structural elements.</u> Removing pilings and overwater structures at the following sites will improve the quality and complexity of shallow water habitat for juvenile salmon and their prey species and will increase and improve public access to the water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilings in Whatcom Waterway along Roeder Avenue from Holly Street water ward • Central Street spur from Roeder Avenue water ward • Over water structures on both sides of the Whatcom Waterway, excluding the deepwater shipping terminal. • Pilings between Cornwall and Pine and the Cornwall Avenue Landfill, so long as this action would not hinder the effective cleanup of the remediation site at the landfill. • Over water structure at West Pine <p>The MRC recognizes that there are areas where removal of structures may not be feasible, but encourages this application wherever reasonable.</p> <p>6. <u>The proposed boat launch at C Street should be relocated to support existing and future habitat.</u></p> <p>7. <u>Create habitat and hydrologic connectivity in the following areas so that restored and preserved habitats function individually, as well as within an ecosystem context:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed marina area (if built), via a fish and water passage on the I & J side • Roeder Avenue mudflat and Central Avenue beach (to provide connectivity to the Whatcom Creek estuary) • C Street, G Street and the I & J Waterway pocket beaches (to provide connection for fish that use the proposed marina as a migratory route) <p>8. <u>Clean up all contaminated sites to levels protective of human and aquatic life.</u></p> <p>9. <u>Follow Low Impact Development (LID), LEED or Build Green concepts for managing stormwater.</u> Follow the LID technical manual for Puget Sound for buildings, roadways and paths. Where appropriate, stormwater should be infiltrated on-site and permeable surfaces should be used. The following existing stormwater inputs that drain into the redevelopment area should be treated prior to release into Bellingham Bay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of I & J Waterway • End of C Street

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of Cornwall and West Pine (2) <p>10. <u>Protect Water Quality.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New roadways and structures should be built at least 200 feet from the backshore. This buffer is most critical in land adjacent to or behind pocket beaches so that an area large enough to support riparian communities is created or maintained • Where possible, existing roadways should be pulled back 200 feet from the shoreline. Cornwall Avenue near the R.G. Haley site is a prime example of an existing road that could be pulled away from the shoreline • Native plants and shrubs should be used in landscaping in the 200 foot buffer • Native trees should be used where needed for habitat function • No over-water roads should be built in the new waterfront development • Stormwater from roadways and built areas should be treated to the maximum extent practicable, per the LID technical manual for Puget Sound. • The proposed marina, if built, should result in a net zero input of pollution into the Bay. <p>The Whatcom MRC and the NWSC are only two of the local organizations working on the preservation and restoration of our marine resources. In 1996, a cooperative partnership of 15 federal, state, tribal, and local stakeholders joined together to form the Bellingham Bay Demonstration Pilot Team (Pilot). The mission of the Pilot was to develop a new cooperative approach to expedite sediment cleanup, source control, and habitat restoration for sediment cleanup sites around Bellingham Bay. A subgroup of the Pilot, the Habitat Action Team (HAT), subsequently restructured as the Implementation Action Team (IAT), was created to help implement the habitat component of the Pilot. The HAT (now IAT) is made up of representatives from the Department of Ecology, Port of Bellingham, City of Bellingham, Whatcom County, EPA, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Natural Resources, Puget Sound Water Quality Action Team, Lummi Nation, Nooksack Tribe, and RE Sources. In 1998, the Habitat Action Team developed a Habitat Restoration Documentation Report that examined historic conditions in Bellingham Bay and identified potential habitat restoration and protection opportunities. The opportunities identified are very similar to the ones recommended above by the MRC. A list of the HAT habitat opportunities can be found attached to this letter.</p> <p>Finally, and as you know, the WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan was completed in 2005. Central to the plan are actions to be taken in the next ten years that will jump-start recovery. Because harvest and hatchery management fall under the purview of the salmon co-managers, many of the new actions proposed in the recovery plan focus on habitat, which is under the control of landowners and local city and county governments. In terms of near shore restoration projects in Bellingham Bay, the plan clearly states that focus should be placed on projects that improve habitat diversity and quantity in the near shore areas and non-natal estuaries of Padden Creek, Whatcom Creek, and Squalicum Creek. The proposed actions are similar to those proposed by the HAT and by the MRC. Please see http://www.sharedsalmonstrategy.org for more information on the Salmonid Recovery Plan.</p> <p>The MRC would like to thank you for your consideration of our recommendations. As you know, the redevelopment of the waterfront of a city does not happen more than once in anyone's lifetime. We urge you to consider the future of our precious marine resources in your planning efforts.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				Cc: Mike Stoner, MRC ex-officio member representing the Port of Bellingham Clare Fogelson, MRC ex-officio member representing the City of Bellingham
159	3/28/2006	Supports the Water's Edge and a vibrant working waterfront	John A Cooper, President & CEO Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism	TO: Port of Bellingham and interested parties On behalf of the Board of Directors of Bellingham Whatcom County Tourism, I am writing this letter in support of the latest design by the firm LMN titled The Water's Edge, which includes the proposed marina in the Georgia Pacific lagoon. A considerable amount of work has gone into crafting the current design plans. We acknowledge that more ideas will come forward from the community and should be considered, but we also recognize that the Waters Edge concept incorporates many of the ideas expressed by the community in meetings and in writing. We all want to leave a legacy for our children in the form of a vibrant, working waterfront that incorporates our region's nautical past, environmental concerns and desire for open spaces, trails and parks for the enjoyment of everyone. Also important to this legacy is a fiscally responsible balance between public areas and private ownership to pay for and maintain the infrastructure and public areas. Waters Edge is the first of many future steps in that direction.
158	3/28/2006	Marina sites are rare – keep the marina	David F. Miller, Miller Marketing	Please push for the Marina instead of the park at the lagoon location. There aren't many sites left that could house a marina and jobs are created and kept here with a vibrant waterfront.
157	3/28/2006	Convert the lagoon into a marina	Fred Haskell President/ Haskell Corp	I am writing in support of converting the old GP lagoon into a boat marina - obviously for many reasons that have been publicly demonstrated to date.
156	3/28/2006	In favor of marina	Jim Langei	My vote is in favor of putting a marina is this spot. The marina will bring good revenue to the city and to local businesses. I rarely hear from anyone opposed to this proposal.
155				Two questions/comments: 1) Is there one place that lays out all the Waterfront proposals? I have done a cursory look and not found any. I have watched a few cable TV reviews (most recently one meeting (not sure when it occurred) that gave many folks opportunities to lay out their plans: where are all these published on line? 2) We have just heard that the world may be seeing a 20 foot sea level rise by the end of the 21st Century. Who is factoring this into this Waterfront plan? It would seem that most everything planned would be under water by mid century.
154	3/22/2006	Supports yacht basin - it provides habitat, trail, and access	Mark Brown	As a life-time Bellingham resident, and someone who has followed first the Waterfront Futures Group, now the Waterfront Advisory Group, and been involved with as many public input sessions on the New Whatcom Site as possible, I strongly urge continued plans by the Port of Bellingham to expand the yacht basin into the GP Pond location. As with Green Fingers and the most recent plan proposed, a yacht basin with gentler slopes to the water, circumference trails, and salmon habitat restoration enhancements made, will only increase Bellingham's waterfront attraction, skyline view from the water and afar, and

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		to the water		continue to support a vibrant waterfront marine industry. 'Needless to say, there are already enough acres of land-fill on our waterfront!
153	3/22/2006	Supports marina; listen to range of citizens	Holly Barbo	I have talked to several people and know that they have emailed you. I wish to add my voice to that number that want a marina put in where the GP pond was. We don't need another park but we could use a marina. It would eventually pay for itself which a park never would and would tie into Bellingham's rich heritage with boating and maritime activities. I believe we need to look to the economic future of our city as well as to the broader interest range of our citizens, not just the narrow park and trail section of our citizenry.
152	3/21/2006	Don't miss the marina opportunity	Paul Johansen	I wanted to let you know I strongly support the lagoon being used for a marina. To miss an opportunity like this to relieve the crowded existing marina would be a terrible mistake.
151	3/21/2006	Continuous access along Pine Street and use of ASB	Ryan Bergsma	I support the plans brought forth by John Blethen for the following reasons. 1. It provides for a truly continuous access to the largest portion of the waterfront by providing green space along the Pine Street water front, that goes far enough to the northwest and connects directly to the log pond, yet still maintains what is a good amount of space for the shipping terminal. 2. It provides for use of the ASB in a way that provides the level of public access to that portion of the waterfront that will benefit ALL of the people of Whatcom County. I think that the idea of a shallow water lagoon that might be a place to swim in the summer months is great. Clearly the need for boat storage is high but if we use the ASB a marina today there will still be additional demand in the future. We must begin now with viable alternatives to boat storage that, will not only meet the demand of today but, will continue to meet demand in the future and that does not compromise the opportunity of every citizen of Whatcom County to have access to the waterfront.
150	3/20/2006	Because you don't have a boat is no reason not to support the Harbor [marina] project	Bob Kehoe	I'm one of the wealthy boat owners I see mentioned in the discussions about the GP development project. My boat is 27 years old and cost less than most cars on the market today. My recreation has been centered around boating for 30 years. My moorage bill for the present year \$2,388.00 pays for a place to tie up my boat, Zuanich Point Park (a park across the water way from the proposed totem pole park), a paved walk with trees shrubs flowers and lighting around the harbor for all to use. The Moorage fees are a major source of revenue for the Port of Bellingham; with out those fees the Port would not have been able to buy the GP property. Because you don't have a boat is no reason not to support the Harbor project, I pay taxes for a horse park at Silver Lake, I don't have a horse but I'm glad they have a place to use them. I don't have a bicycle but I pay for bicycle trails and paths I don't use. I probably will not use the Chuckanut Ridge area so should I spend money and my time opposing it? The best use for the lagoon is a boat harbor.
149	3/20/2006	Marina businesses contribute to Whatcom County	Roger Long	I would like to voice my advocacy for the use of the "water treatment lagoon" as a Marina. I have worked with many businesses in the Port area and feel that the marina has and continues to be a very positive economic factor in Bellingham and Whatcom County. There are many upland jobs as a result of the many boats stored in Squaticum Harbor. More berths can only enhance that fact. We have many boats in the Marina owned by folks from Eastern Washington, Idaho, and Montana. That in itself may not be a great goal, but the money they spend here on maintenance and supplies for their boats is great. I feel we have many parks already so let's capitalize on this opportunity to expand the Marina!
148	3/20/2006	100% for	Biff	100 % for the Marina. This is by far the best and most logical expansion area in the North Puget Sound. We have more parks than we can

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		the marina	Dickerson	effectively deal with now. The Marina will pay for itself as well. My given name is John L. (Biff) Dickerson and definitely want to go on record for the Marina.
147	3/20/2006	Favors the marina; another park isn't necessary – already three on the waterfront	Jeff Kochman President Barkley Company/Talbot Real Estate	There has been a lot of ongoing discussion on the GP site and the use of the lagoon. Of the two main proposals, a marina or a park, I am in favor of a marina. Bottom line; the marina plan is a great opportunity to use the existing breakwater and infrastructure that already exists to provide something important to this community in an extremely difficult permitting world. It will also help support economic development and will provide a significant amount of commerce to the Port and City. The park plan sounds familiar, but I don't think it's a good idea for plenty of reasons; I would guess you have heard a number of them. For what it's worth, there is already Boulevard Prk at one end, Little Squalicum Park by the plywood mill at the other end and Zuanich Point park in the middle. That's a lot of parks! I don't think another one is necessary. I am normally part of the silent majority that watches these things unfold. In this case, I thought it was important to let you know my thoughts. Please let me know if you have any questions of me.
146	3/24/2006	Marina Advisory Committee	Port of Bellingham, Marina Advisory Committee	<p>Open House Provides New Downtown Marina Information</p> <p>[Bellingham, Wash.] The Port of Bellingham's Marina Advisory Committee is hosting an open house about the planned new downtown marina from 7-9 p.m. Tuesday (March 28) at the Bellingham Cruise Terminal in Fairhaven. This will be a great opportunity for people to learn more about the new marina the Port of Bellingham will be constructing in the former Georgia Pacific treatment lagoon. The Port project will transform the contaminated industrial water treatment lagoon into a community asset creating about 450 new moorage slips, a mile of new waterfront trails and 28 acres of new aquatic habitat. The Port will remove 350,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediments and will design the marina in a way that includes salmon passageways, shallow habitat areas and public access. Cleanup work is expected to begin in 2008.</p> <p>This project will be paid for through moorage and user fees as well as state Model Toxic Control Act funds. Local property tax dollars will not be used to develop the marina. The cleanup is estimated to cost \$34 million and marina development is estimated to cost \$16 to \$18 million depending upon the final design.</p> <p>At the open house, stations will be set up throughout the Cruise Terminal Dome Room that will explain the research and findings regarding marina location alternatives, marina design alternatives, project financing, environmental considerations, Clean Ocean Marina ideas, economic benefits and planned next steps in this project. People will be able to go to each station and meet the Port staff and outside analysts who have been involved in developing this information. There also will be an opportunity for people to share their written ideas and thoughts at a public comment station.</p> <p>The Port's 10-member Marina Advisory Committee was created in 1991 to advise the Port Commission on marina issues including: moorage rates, capital projects, marina policies and special issues. Its membership includes representatives from commercial fishing tenants, recreational boating tenants, commercial boat-related businesses, boating clubs, the tribal community and neighborhood interests. In 2004, after reviewing moorage demand studies and marina location analysis, the Marina Advisory Committee voted to recommend the Port of Bellingham move ahead with developing a new marina in the former treatment lagoon. The moorage demand study forecast a shortage of 683 moorage slips by 2015 unless new moorage was built. The Port plans to complete phase 1 of the new marina in 2012.</p>
145	3/24/2006	Marina is the most	Sandra Peterson	Mr. Aucutt and Ms. Casey, I want to lend my support to those who are in favor of turning this site into a marina. Firstly, a marina is the highest and best use for this

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		financially viable of the many proposals	Realtor	<p>site. Secondly, there is a proven need for another marina. And, thirdly (but not lastly), it is the most financially viable of the many proposals that have been put forth.</p> <p>Parks are wonderful and I am confident that there will be plenty of green space and possibilities for strolling amongst the 137 acres, but we need money in the coffers to pay for the green space and the fees from the marina will fill those coffers.</p>
144	3/24/2006	Supports elements of Blethen plan; Our priorities should be public access to the water, public green spaces, habitat restoration, and a pedestrian-friendly district.	Michael Lilliquist	<p>To: City of Bellingham, Waterfront Advisory Group</p> <p>In my previous letter to the waterfront working group, I wrote in favor of a modified version of the Green Fingers waterfront plan, but in all honesty it was difficult for me to feel much enthusiasm about that plan. Today I switch my endorsement heartily and completely to the Blethen/Christensen plan, which I feel is by far the best of the plans proposed so far. First, I would like to discuss some of the best attributes of this plan, and then suggest a few possible improvements for the city and port to consider.</p> <p>I. Improved Public Green Spaces</p> <p>One of the most consistent priorities for the people of Bellingham, as shown in their comments on the various designs, is a strong preference for more public green space, particularly along the water. The Blethen/Christensen plan does an absolutely superb job of respecting this priority, creating an uninterrupted greenbelt from the Cornwall landfill in the south to the mouth of Whatcom Creek in the north. The 200-foot width of this green belt is more than an aesthetic and recreational consideration. It is well established that a natural shoreline is the single best way to insure against run-off pollution into waterways, lakes, and streams; and the Washington State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife has strongly recommended a 200-foot natural buffer in any salmon bearing estuary, such as the Whatcom waterway and creek. Habitat restoration should be a high priority. The Green Edge plan moved halfway towards this goal; the Blethen/Christensen plan achieves it completely.</p> <p>I also prefer the Blethen/Christensen treatment of the park at the foot of Cornwall Avenue. In the plans proposed by LMN Architects, the parking and vehicle turn-around is deep within the area of the landfill. In contrast, the Blethen/Christensen plan has pulled these facilities back north a bit, thus creating a larger, uninterrupted park in which people will not have to be so close to a road all of the time. At the same time that it provides for a larger parkland, the Blethen/Christensen plan uses the access road and the parking and facilities to shield the park from the railway. The meandering roadway in the LMN proposals does not have this advantage, but instead the roadway breaks up the park into smaller, less enjoyable strips.</p> <p>Finally, with regards to public green spaces, I think that the widened outer breakwater of the marina in the Blethen/Christensen plan is a great idea. IT provides a great park and a beautiful protected sandy beach, which I am sure will become a favorite place to take the kids. If the majority of the restored shoreline is to be devoted to salmon-friendly habitat, such as eelgrass beds, then we need to provide a human-friendly beach as well, to encourage people to leave the restored wilderness areas alone.</p> <p>II. Improved View of the Bay and Islands</p> <p>A guiding principle that has emerged from the work of the Waterfront Futures Group is the need to improve the city's access and relationship with the bay. This accessibility should be both real and psychological, meaning that even people who are not on the shoreline should still feel connected to the bay in some way. The Blethen/Christensen plan achieves this goal admirably by paying close attention to view corridors to the bay and the islands. It also includes functional turnarounds that actually highlight this relationship, by providing a location for civic art and keystone landscaping.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<p>III. Great Street Plan One of the better features of the Green Edge design by LMN Architects is the way that it connects to the rest of the city, with its two major arterials. In contrast, the main problem with both the Green Bank and Green Seams designs was the awkward way that the streets connected with the rest of the city, as both designs sought to create east-east street corridors. One of the nicest features about the Blethen/Christensen plan is that it has the best of both worlds. The access along Commercial and Cornwall, the Laurel Street overpass, and access from Roeder Avenue, while still finding a way to accommodate east-west streets. Indeed, rather than hindering the arterials, the East West streets peacefully co-exist, and help to mark a transition from arterial to local streets very nicely.</p> <p>It is not clear to me from the drawings, but it appears that the Blethen/Christensen plan includes pedestrian-only alleys dividing the small blocks. I certainly hope that is the case, because I think that making a pedestrian-friendly district should be one of the guiding principles of the waterfront's redevelopment. All too often, vehicle traffic and parking drives design considerations. We should avoid this pitfall by providing both places for people to drive and park, and for people to leave their cars behind to stroll and enjoy this new part of our fair city.</p> <p>IV. Re-orient the marina As I said in my previous letter to this group, in the end a marina may well be the best use for the old G-P lagoon. Aside from the pleasure afforded to boaters and boat watchers, there is a very real need to consider the preservation and extension of water-related industries and commerce, to preserve job opportunities that can only be found near the shore. Thus, the economic argument in favor of a marina is not just that it will bring revenue to the port, to help pay for re-development, but that it will bring jobs and revenue to all of Bellingham.</p> <p>Also as I said in my previous letter, the best arguments against a marina are the need for more public green space and environmental concerns for the waterway from unintended boat-related pollution. The first objection is dealt with in the Blethen/Christensen plan creating so much more public green space elsewhere in the plan. The second objection can be dealt with, in part, by adopting state-of-the-art practices. Unfortunately, this may not be good enough. A simple and effective solution would be to re-orient the marina so that the opening faced northwest, towards the existing marina, rather than southeast, towards the salmon-nurturing Whatcom waterway.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments and suggestions seriously. The stakes are high, and we need to get this right. Our priorities should be public access to the water, public green spaces, habitat restoration, and a pedestrian-friendly district. Fortunately, with a plan like the one proposed by John Blethen and friends, we can achieve these goals and also create a vibrant place for businesses and jobs.</p>
143				<p>I strongly urge you to consider building a park instead of the proposed marina in the Georgia Pacific Ponding Basin. The park would benefit more Whatcom County residents and have a most positive impact on our quality of life. I walk at the existing marina everyday and see first hand the litter, oil slicks and pollution that the pleasure boaters leave. The particular spot being considered would make a spectacular park!</p>
142	3/24/2006	We have only LIMITED spaces to dock boats.	Sears Taylor	<p>Dear Carolyn, As a non boater who appreciates the fact that boating moorage draws more people down town and would actually generate positive CASH flow to the port, PLEASE keep the pond a boat moorage. We have enough park land. We have only LIMITED spaces to dock boats.</p>
141	3/23/2006	Creating a sense of	Bellingham Arts	<p>TO: Mayor Asmundson, City Council, Port Commission, Planning Commission, Waterfront Advisory Group FROM: Bellingham Arts Commission</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		place that honors the arts	Commission	<p>RE: New Whatcom Master Plan Project: Creating a Sense of Place</p> <p>The Bellingham Arts Commission (BAC) received a presentation by Port and City staff on the four conceptual plans for New Whatcom at our February meeting and we appreciate being asked for input at these early planning stages. We will be more involved as City funded projects move forward, but offer three requests at this time for your consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate and integrate art into all City and Port capital projects by requiring a minimum of one percent of the particular project budget be designated for public art. “One percent for the arts” programs have been adopted and successfully executed in many cities throughout the State, including Seattle, Redmond, Edmonds, Olympia and Kent. The goal of these programs is to incorporate art in projects that are wholly or in part paid for by the jurisdiction. One percent of the project budget is designated for art. Incorporating art into our waterfront parks, streets and buildings will help us create a vital sense of place. It will be a challenge to create this sense of place as our waterfront transforms from a very heavy industrial waterfront to one with a variety of uses. We must call on the creative thinkers to help us achieve this. Artwork can help communicate who we are and what we are about whether it relates to our natural surroundings, history or future. It tells us that this is a special place, one that is cared for by the people that live here. It builds pride in the community and provides a sense of belonging. This is especially so when the art is unpredictably found in elements of walkways, lamp fixtures and flooring. Art incorporated within architecture is a wonderful opportunity to share the spark of creativity with our community. It allows artists, developers and citizens to come together and make decisions about the look and feel of their community. We believe the most important reason for public art is the impact it has on the local community whether it is the artist creating or the passerby exploring and reflecting. However, it can also have a positive economic impact. Integrating art into the environment, on one of the most desirable sites in downtown Bellingham, will draw locals and out-of-towners to the waterfront. 2. The final master plan should highlight how and where key artistic components should be installed and integrated in order to strengthen the redevelopment project. Parts of the waterfront (particularly the Georgia Pacific Mill site), are practically blank slates. Our waterfront has changed and no longer do we have the hustle and bustle of an industrial waterfront. We are left with a great challenge to reveal our personality and values in these unused spaces. Art alone will not make this a special place. A park by itself, no matter how large, will not make this a special place. In order to succeed, we need great planning, great public spaces, great streets and most of all a dynamic combination of activity to succeed. Because we have this great challenge/opportunity in our hands, we must ask the creative members of our community to be a part of this master planning work. We are so fortunate to have so many historic structures on this site that can be reused. We ask that as many historic structures as possible be redeveloped. That will give us an initial sense of a real place (our history), a starting point for redevelopment, and a little bit of “grit”. After all, what is a waterfront without some rough edges? 3. Consider incorporating an arts facility into the first stages of redevelopment. Bellingham is ranked second in the country in the number of arts businesses with 3.89 per 1000 residents (according to Sante Fe Arts and Culture Magazine). In addition, per the 2000 census, there is 1 artisan per every 65 citizens. With so many established art businesses and

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<p>artists, the opportunity for employment and production of art on a site with such potential, is paramount. Having “creative thinkers” working to build our community makes Bellingham unique and desirable to everyone who is touched by it.</p> <p>The recently completed Community Strategic Art Plan, written by members of the community, calls for public art facilities in our community. Cultivating artists is achieved by ensuring there are proper workspaces for them. Bellingham has a limited number of workspaces available to local artists. This creates a challenge, especially with the rising real estate prices.</p> <p>New Whatcom provides an opportunity to construct (or rehabilitate) a large facility where artists can create, show and/or sell their work. It could be used by several artists at once versus each artist struggling independently to find space. We understand a variety of uses are planned for this site, from residential to light industrial, and having an art facility in close proximity to these uses ensures an element of diversity.</p> <p>And, artists are unique in that they can go into an area before it’s redeveloped. They don’t mind the construction and they love the grit. But! As often happens, artists are the ones that spark revitalization in run down areas (look at Bell Town in Seattle), and then are the first to be pushed out of the market place. We must make sure they are a permanent presence on our waterfront.</p>
140	3/22/2006	Supports more marina with park-like setting	Richard Montgomery	<p>RE: GP Ponding Basin / Park vs. Marina</p> <p>I would like to see more marina space and smaller "park-like" settings could enhance the overall new marina.</p>
139	3/22/2006	Stay the course on the marina	Scott Sutton	<p>I encourage you to hold the course on the new marina it is more needed than a new park.</p>
138	3/22/2006	strongly urges to expanding the yacht basin into the GP Pond location	Mark Brown	<p>Greg Aucutt, Carolyn Casey ~</p> <p>As a life-time Bellingham resident, and someone who has followed first the Waterfront Futures Group, now the Waterfront Advisory Group, and been involved with as many public input sessions on the New Whatcom Site as possible, I strongly urge continued plans by the Port of Bellingham to expand the yacht basin into the GP Pond location.</p> <p>As with Green Fingers and the most recent plan proposed, a yacht basin with gentler slopes to the water, circumference trails, and salmon habitat restoration enhancements made, will only increase Bellingham's waterfront attraction, skyline view from the water and afar, and continue to support a vibrant waterfront marine industry.</p> <p>'Needless to say, there are already enough acres of land-fill on our waterfront!</p>
137	3/22/2006	Do not fill the ASB	Bill Henshaw	<p>Greg [Aucutt] and Carolyn [Casey],</p> <p>The proposal to fill in the Georgia Pacific Ponding Basin would not be in the best interests of the citizens of Bellingham. The project was sold to the City on the basis of maintaining a working waterfront and now to change that would be a total reversal on why people were excited about the concept. If that is all park then we have been misled and it leaves the project substantially less viable. Until there is a definite understanding on the unfunded liability portion of this whole Georgia Pacific site we need to proceed very cautiously.</p> <p>Furthermore, Bellingham currently is taking so much property off the tax rolls for parks 4 times the national average and in addition buying 1085 acres in the watershed. All of this is on the backs of the citizens and I believe it has to stop.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
136	3/22/2006	GP Ponding Basin to be used as new marina	Charlynn Sutton, Gone Diving	I would like to voice my opinion of having the old GP Ponding Basin to be used as new marina. We need more slips for moorage to bring in more visitors by water. The San Juans is an important part of area that should be considered to bring in more people to our area.
135	3/21/2006	Why he supports the marina – we need access to the water; locals use the marina and most aren't millionaires	Tom Britton	<p>To: Waterfront Advisory Group, Port of Bellingham Commissioners, City of Bellingham Councilors, Planning Commission Re: New Marina Considerations</p> <p>I am a boat owner and I sell boats in Squalicum Harbor, so I am, of course, in favor of a new marina. I just wanted to address a few of the issues surrounding this decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boats are luxury items owned by millionaires – false - most of the boats we sell are between \$10,000 and \$200,000. They are purchased mostly by residents of Whatcom County, not by out-of-state millionaires. And these people would like to be able to find moorage near their homes. Currently there is no available moorage for these people in or near Bellingham. 2. Dry storage could accommodate boats as people do not use them very much – false - boat owners use their boats a lot in Bellingham. While they don't always leave the dock, they sit on their boat, sleep on their boat, or just have a meal. It's enjoyable to do on a nice day. It would not be fun to sit on a boat in dry storage. It would not be practical to launch a boat for a few hours and then put it back. I think dry storage may be a good option for "out of state" owners as they will plan their trips over here, but for local people, it precludes spontaneous visits. 3. From an economic and tax standpoint I feel a marina is a very wise decision. The moorage fees will pay for the marina, staffing, security, and upkeep. A park will require staffing and upkeep paid for through taxes. Ideally, more slips will also provide more guest moorage. This will bring visitors to spend money locally not only on boat related items, but also restaurants and other stores. And more boats support the vibrant boating industry within Bellingham from boat builders to repair personnel to boat chandlery stores. 4. I moved to Bellingham 8 years ago and a big reason was the access to the water. Fishing, visiting the islands, or just cruising is just fantastic! I think a lot of people move here for the same reason. They want to own a boat and enjoy this spectacular area. The Port will never be able to provide slips for everyone, but we should take advantage of this opportunity to build a marina in this area that is ideally suited for one.
134	3/21/2006	Supports marina – income generator	Ellen Shea Whisper on the Bay, A Shea Spa	I believe that putting a marina into the old GP site would be a better use of the land than another park as well as help generate income.
133	3/21/2006	Why he supports the marina – we need access to the water; locals use	Tom Britton	<p>To: Waterfront Advisory Group, Port of Bellingham Commissioners, City of Bellingham Councilors, Planning Commission Re: New Marina Considerations</p> <p>I am a boat owner and I sell boats in Squalicum Harbor, so I am, of course, in favor of a new marina. I just wanted to address a few of the issues surrounding this decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boats are luxury items owned by millionaires – false - most of the boats we sell are between \$10,000 and \$200,000. They are purchased mostly by residents of Whatcom County, not by out-of-state millionaires. And these people would like to be able to find moorage near

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		the marina and most aren't millionaires		<p>their homes. Currently there is no available moorage for these people in or near Bellingham.</p> <p>2. Dry storage could accommodate boats as people do not use them very much – false - boat owners use their boats a lot in Bellingham. While they don't always leave the dock, they sit on their boat, sleep on their boat, or just have a meal. It's enjoyable to do on a nice day. It would not be fun to sit on a boat in dry storage. It would not be practical to launch a boat for a few hours and then put it back. I think dry storage may be a good option for "out of state" owners as they will plan their trips over here, but for local people, it precludes spontaneous visits.</p> <p>3. From an economic and tax standpoint I feel a marina is a very wise decision. The moorage fees will pay for the marina, staffing, security, and upkeep. A park will require staffing and upkeep paid for through taxes. Ideally, more slips will also provide more guest moorage. This will bring visitors to spend money locally not only on boat related items, but also restaurants and other stores. And more boats support the vibrant boating industry within Bellingham from boat builders to repair personnel to boat chandlery stores.</p> <p>4. I moved to Bellingham 8 years ago and a big reason was the access to the water. Fishing, visiting the islands, or just cruising is just fantastic! I think a lot of people move here for the same reason. They want to own a boat and enjoy this spectacular area. The Port will never be able to provide slips for everyone, but we should take advantage of this opportunity to build a marina in this area that is ideally suited for one.</p>
132	3/21/2006	Supports marina – income generator	Ellen Shea Whisper on the Bay, A Shea Spa	I believe that putting a marina into the old GP site would be a better use of the land than another park as well as help generate income.
131	3/21/2006	Marinas make waterfronts vibrant	David F. Miller Miller Marketing	Carolyn [Casey], Please support the proposed marina at the GP lagoon site. Water access will be provided around the outside for the public to enjoy. A marina should also provide jobs and a vibrant waterfront.
130	3/21/2006	Supports ASB marina	Fred Haskell, President, Haskell Corporation	Carolyn [Casey], I am writing in support of converting the GP lagoon to a boat marina.
129	3/21/2006		David Moody, Realtor	<p>Potential income from leasing remedial waterfront and view property for vacated Georgia Pacific Pulp Plant site in Bellingham, Washington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumption out of 140 acres total (approx.) to lease out 50 acres. ▪ 50 acres X 43,560 (square ft. per acre) = 2,178,000.00 square feet ▪ Valued at \$80 per sq. ft. (current land in Fairhaven is \$80 to \$100 per square ft.) ▪ The Port Of Bellingham guide for Land Lease is 9% of value of land. ▪ 2,178,000.00 X \$80 per sq. ft. = \$174,240,000.00

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$174,240,000.00 X .09 = \$15,681,600.00 ▪ \$15,681,600.00 annual return from lease of 50 acres. ▪ With 10% vacancy \$14,113,440.00 <p>Other factors to consider; Length of time to solicit and secure land leases; to get these rates would require zoning that allows tall buildings. The Port also has accelerators (Property reappraised every 5 years and tenant to pay 9% of reappraised value). Potentially this waterfront property could be \$200 per sq. ft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Or \$39,204,000 income per year. <p>All leaving 90 acres for parks, water features and other public non income producing elements.</p>
128	3/21/2006		Darryl Weiss	<p>Dear Executive Director Darling – Though I know your mind is made up to have a marina in the lagoon, I am nonetheless writing to express my support for the Bellingham Bay Foundation’s well-conceived proposal. I believe it delivers more bang for the buck and serves the interests of more Bellingham citizens than any other plan (including, I hesitate to say, the Port’s). It deserves your close consideration. I also support expanded marina activities in the Bellingham Bay vicinity, just not in that location.</p>
127	3/21/2006	We should be attracting the best to design and invest in public access	Phyllis McKee	<p>Because we have a rather blank slate at the moment, I think that we are at a point where we could do some wonderful, creative, people-friendly things along the water front, and what people seem to be focusing on is parks & trails. (Same old....) Such things could be incorporated in to privately owned property as a perc for being about to go tall -- and getting that stuff off the City budget for maintenance - - plus collect taxes on it. We should be attracting the most creative and the best to design and invest -- and pay the bills for full public access to the waterfront. Unfortunately, once we start building, that sets the direction for years to come.</p>
126	3/21/2006	Response to city’s response re: waterfront redevelopment process	Stan Snapp	<p>Thanks for your reply Nicole [Oliver], I think the public when it talks about percent of public space it's not talking about streets, educational facilities, etc. I think "public space" is considered by most to mean, "parks, open, accessible green space, trails, etc." Roads are for cars and education facilities are exclusive to those that are involved with the institution. I am a Parks Board member and I've been told that the design company hired by the Port has and continues to refuse to meet with our City Parks Staff. Why would that be? I'm aware of the Parks sub-committee but I'm unaware that their efforts and advice will be taken into account, ditto the various private efforts like the Blethen Christianson proposal. The Bellingham Foundation proposal may have lacked public input at it's creation just as did the "fingers proposals that came from Seattle", but they've held public hearings and made modifications as a result. Everyone is aware that the marina will produce revenue. What's less clear is that everyone wants that use for the most prime visibility site location. What's even less clear is why the Port refuses to consider dry storage in the mix if they have large numbers of boaters on waiting lists. Why do we have to use the very best water front for yacht storage for a select few of our wealthiest citizens? What's most unfortunate is the way the Port tried to "spin" this project from the start by hiring a Seattle firm and holding open houses to only consider their paid for proposals. Next the Seattle firm criticized their own designs in bringing yet another design that adds token</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006</p>
				<p>amounts to the green space percentages. No one apparently has told them that this community doesn't buy into canned process orchestrated by a very non-responsive to public input Port.</p> <p>Thanks for your time in writing a response and I will keep attending meetings and I'm still waiting to have a public entity, City or Port spell out a process that will get us the best use of this space.</p> <p>CITY RESPONSE that prompted the above reply:</p> <p>Thank you for your letter to the City and Port regarding the Waterfront Master Planning process. I am the Communications Coordinator for the Planning Department, and will address some of your points and attempt to answer some of your concerns on behalf of the City.</p> <p>In regards to the inclusion of a marina in the design concepts, this direction is supported by the city. It is not a result of a back room deal, but actually was stated as a likely scenario by the Waterfront Futures Group work, as well as in the interlocal agreements between the City and the Port. The fact that folks are feeling like this decision was made without enough public process is something the Port is working to address. There will be a meeting of the Marine Advisory Committee on March 30th, wherein the Port will explain the need for, and the economic benefits of, a new marina. I hope you are able to attend this important meeting.</p> <p>The Port and City consultant's latest version of the design includes 30% park and open space. When you add the rights-of-way for streets and utilities, the total is just over 50% for public space. WWU is committed to locating a facility at the site and this land will be public as well. The newest infrastructure design is still under scrutiny and will be refined based on feedback from the public, as well as City and Port staff, including the work of the Parks Sub-committee that Paul Leuthold chairs. In fact, staff is reviewing all the design schemes submitted to date and we are committed to recommending the best plan regardless of which group or individual developed it.</p> <p>Typical of most private development proposals, the Bellingham Bay Foundation did not include any public involvement in the drafting of their plan. They rolled out a finished master plan that had zero public input in its creation. The New Whatcom Master Planning process has been full of public input opportunities, and we are only at the infrastructure design stage. To date, we have had over 25 meetings with various citizen groups, neighborhood associations, the Waterfront Advisory Group, Planning Commission and City Council. The actual Master Plan development is Phase II of the process, and will include numerous additional opportunities for public involvement and input throughout the rest of the year. We do not anticipate rolling out a master plan until early 2007.</p> <p>The Bellingham Herald continues to offer the Port and City a weekly article that provides updated information on the project's progress. As Phase II details are finalized, the public will be well-informed of the plan for how this part of the process will evolve.</p> <p>This project is not a simple one by any means. It involves two distinctly different public agencies, and has been challenging for all involved. The level of public passion and participation is great, which adds to the dimension of the project. I would urge you to continue to be involved, voice your concerns, and ask questions. Thank you for your input.</p>
125	3/21/2006	Supports public ownership and park	Jayme Curley	<p>I would like you to add mine to the voices advocating <u>public ownership of a world-class open-space park</u> at the heart of our plans for the new downtown (ex-GP) site. I like what the Bellingham Bay Foundation is proposing.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
124	3/21/2006	Strongly	Paul	<p>I wanted to let you know I strongly support the lagoon being used for a marina. To miss an opportunity like this to relieve the crowded</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		supports marina	Johansen	existing marina would be a terrible mistake.
123	3/20/2006	Marina of great benefit to all people in Bellingham	Don Wight	I would like to go on record as supporting a new marina in the GP Lagoon site. Having been involved with many marine trades I feel it would be of great benefit to all people in the Bellingham to have additional marina space. Bellingham is so ideally located to the Canadian Gulf islands and the San Juans that the spending of people using this facility would increase exponentially with our great marine facilities we now have. Please consider the potential for an additional facility.
122	3/20/2006	Build the marina	Randy Cross	Hello Carolyn, It sure would be great, if a MARINA was built, and NOT a park. Please, listen. A Marina is a very good idea. It makes the MOST sense.
121	3/20/2006	A big YES for the marina	Pat Rowe	Carolyn [Casey] and Greg [Aucutt]; Hello! Just a short note to say I strongly support the Marina Aspect of new port/city plan on the waterfront. Please know that the people making the most noise don't speak for the majority so I am getting my voice in the mix. A big YES for the Marina.
120	3/20/2006	Safe ped access from Broadway; park design	Barbara Alten	1. This requires a safe elegant connection of Broadway to the waterfront - over the RR. Similar to the elevator/Stair in Seattle over the RR to the waterfront. We have a stair at Boulevard Park - we need one connecting other neighborhoods to our city's greatest asset. 2. Design a Park for more than roller bladers and kites. We need playfields! A few soccer/multipurpose fields would be great. Not just fountains and hardscape.
119	3/20/2006	moorage demand forecasted to increase rapidly	Matt Mullett, CEO, All American Marine	Hello Greg [Aucutt] and Carolyn [Casey]: I wanted to weigh in on my support for converting the Georgia Pacific lagoon into a marina. As an owner of a boat building business (located on Port property in Fairhaven), I am aware that there is a very strong market forecasted for new vessel sales of all sizes for the next five years. As a result, the demand on local moorage will continue to increase at a rapid rate. I believe that incorporating the existing GP lagoon into the long range development plans for additional boat moorage is a phenomenal opportunity that shouldn't be missed.
118	3/20/2006	Is a marina geared towards a specific economic segment of our community leaving out the majority?	Katherine Lebioda	Dear Mayor/City Council, Firstly, I would like to thank you for delaying the joint waterfront meeting you had scheduled for tomorrow. It is my hope that you will be open to having a public comment session on the Bellingham Bay Foundations plan for the development of Bellingham's waterfront or other proposals that look at alternatives that provide access for everyone not just the small percentage of people who can afford to yacht/own a boat. While there has been a public comment period, the previous designs open for public comment all focused on designs with a marina as the focal point. My questions for the council to think about include... What percentage of the Whatcom County population will the marina serve? Is a marina geared towards a specific economic segment of our community leaving out the majority? Will the marina serve Whatcom county residents or be more geared to those who are not Whatcom county residents and who do not have a vested interest in our community? Please take this opportunity to allow other proposals that more accurately reflects the needs of ALL citizens of Whatcom County not just the small percentage who can afford to yacht/boat.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
117	3/20/2006	Wants a dialogue about the use of the ASB	Frances Badgett	<p>Dear City Council, Mayor Asmundson, WAG, Planning Commission:</p> <p>As many people said at the Planning Commission meeting Thursday, a park can go in the ASB just as easily as a marina. I've done my own homework. It is not, as Frank Chmelik testified before the Council, a regulatory problem. Nor is it a case of eminent domain, nor is it a problem with insurance, or any of the other spurious arguments the Port is trying to make. If the community requests a park, it is not only possible, it is your duty as public servants to provide one. The question is not whether or not a marina can go in the ASB, the question is whether or not you are fostering a proper dialogue about the uses of the ASB. A "Marina Advisory Committee" meeting doesn't count. An ASB Advisory Committee might, if sponsored by the Planning Commission, the City Council, or the WAG. Given that members of the WAG have stated publicly they support a marina, they seem an unlikely vehicle for this discussion.</p> <p>At the same Planning Commission meeting, many people presented their own concepts for the waterfront, including a revision of the BBF concept. Instead of staying for all the presentations, Mark Hinshaw of LMN left early. This indifference shouldn't be tolerated. Almost everyone in that room had sat through repeated presentations by LMN. It was only fair for him to listen to (be educated by?) the plans of other groups. It is equally deplorable that the Port didn't send any representatives. The WAG, the BBF, City Council, the County Council all had members present. Even if the Port didn't want to attend as officials, they were welcome to attend as members of the public. They chose not to. This says a lot about the Port's attitude toward public process.</p> <p>The mayor's letter is an excellent and necessary document in this process. He was unambiguous about the need for time and process. I see little indication that the Port and Mark Hinshaw are listening.</p>
116	3/20/2006	Supports marina as an economic driver	Mike McEvoy	<p>Greg [Aucutt] and Carolyn [Casey],</p> <p>I am writing today to express my support for the GP property to be developed as a marina. First of all as everybody knows the need is great and there should not be any problem filling up the slips. Also what an opportunity to bring people to Bellingham that generally would have money to spend with other businesses. As Bellingham grows this is another way that we can make an economic impact in our community. Thank you for your consideration on this.</p>
115	3/20/2006	Please consider the Bay's health in any planning	Libby Hazen	<p>Whatever plan you adopt, please consider the health of the bay – Bellingham's greatest asset. This is an opportunity to incorporate important safeguards for the water e.g. :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Protection and restoration of pocket beaches * Engineering soft-shores where feasible, in places where hardened shorelines exist * Buffering and vegetating shoreline 200' from the water line, except where water dependent uses already exist <p>This last point is especially important and could and should be part of any plan.</p> <p>Thank you for soliciting public input.</p>
114	3/20/2006	"Fighting the man" has gotten in the way of common sense."	Rick Black	<p>Sometimes I'm shocked at the ideas that find a following in Bellingham. As long as an idea is perceived as "fighting the man" it will attract a following. The latest pertains to not using the ASB as a marina in the downtown waterfront redevelopment. The "man" is the Port of Bellingham and all the "rich" people ruining our city. Critics of the marina would like to see the ASB filled and used as a park. They say we should not cater to the wealthy by building 50ft slips. "Fighting the man" has gotten in the way of common sense.</p> <p>A marina satisfies many of the core objectives required to make the waterfront successful. 1) Boats are the quintessential connection between land and water. 2) A marina would bring people to the waterfront – required for a successful redevelopment. 3) It offers a live-</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				aboard community bringing life, safety, etc. to the area 24/7. 4) Marinas are clean, beautiful businesses offering hundreds of related jobs. For the record, I'm not rich and the only boat I have is a kayak. We should maximize park space on the downtown waterfront - but not at the expense of a marina.
113	3/16/2006	Supports the lagoon being a marina; tie plans to Old Town and Lettered Streets; create small parks	Harry Stuurmans	<p>I will not be able to attend tonight's meeting, but I would like to share some thoughts related to the redevelopment of the G-P site. First, although I am not a boat owner and have no plans to become a boat owner, it seems to me that common sense dictates the use of the G-P lagoon as a marina rather than as a park. Indeed, if my memory serves me correctly, this whole thing owes its genesis to the Port's looking to add marina space in this area. Let's not lose sight of that. It's a 'no-brainer.'</p> <p>Second, it seems to me that the plan described on the front page of the 8 March 2006 Bellingham Herald outlines a happy middle ground. The Port gets the marina it wants and those hoping for ample 'green' space along the waterfront (and I count myself in that number) get that too.</p> <p>Third, I would like to stress the importance of extending this project to and linking it with the Old Town/Lettered Streets neighborhoods and ultimately with the Bellwether complex and Squalicum Harbor. The Port has already done a beautiful job of creating a people/pedestrian friendly environment in and around Squalicum Harbor and the Bellwether area. Not to link this achievement in a meaningful way with the G-P project would be a tremendous mistake. The plan illustrated in the March 8 Herald seems to suggest that somebody recognizes how important this is. It shows a park space at Broadway Cove (at the end of the I & J Inlet), which I heartily support, and substantial 'green' area in and around the marina/lagoon. I very much applaud the inclusion of these features and would like to see even more effort made to 'stretch' the project in this direction.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to argue for the creation of many small parks, as the plan depicted in the Herald shows, rather than the creation of one large park, which I am afraid will happen if the so-called Bay Foundation people get their way. Numerous smaller parks or 'green spaces, reduce traffic congestion and parking problems and provide more interest than a single larger park would provide.</p>
112	3/16/2006	Supports the marina, but wants more information	Annie Naismith	<p>I understand the Port is going to have a public information session on March 28th to provide the research they have done into the need for a marina. I think that's a great idea and I support the marina. I would like to request that the Port also provide some other info at the March 28th meeting; specifically, their reasons for reserving the deep water port and the environmental clean-up studies they have done on the ASB and other locations. I think that Environmental Director Stoner can answer a lot of the environmental questions that come up at the public meetings and I encourage his participation.</p> <p>I also have a couple of process questions: Has the March 21st meeting been cancelled, or is it going to proceed? If it is to be held, what is the agenda? Also, what is the status of the draft strategic guidelines? Thank you.</p>
111	3/16/2006	Questions the reasoning behind the legal arguments around the	Kevin Cournoyer	<p>I attended the WAG meeting on Tuesday night. I was surprised to see Cy Lindberg still presiding over this advisory group, given his self-evidently deplorable conduct during the WAG meeting on February 15th. (I was expecting him to be removed from the WAG.) His regard for public input, at least on the surface, appears to have improved dramatically. All speakers and viewpoints at this WAG meeting were respected. I hope Mayor Mark Amundsen's recent letter that encourages a more open and publicly driven process that welcomes new ideas will set the tone for the future of the waterfront redevelopment.</p> <p>I encourage everyone to carefully listen to the POB's legal reasons for a marina in the ASB. (And not, mind you, the reasons for a marina. But the POB's legal justifications for a marina in the ASB. This is an important distinction.) Their reasons could be the basis for a high</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006</p>
		marina		<p>comedy. If Frank Chmelik, the POB's lawyer, had been sitting before a tribunal on Tuesday night, he would probably be counting his days as a lawyer in the state of Washington. (Mr. Chmelik, I encourage you to review the Rules of Professional Conduct for lawyers in the state of Washington.) He was deliberately misleading. He stated outright falsehoods. He dissembled constantly. Here's a sampling of POB's legal arguments:</p> <p>A permit was issued in 1974 that does not mention a park in the ASB. Hmmm. Well, that fact does not, ipso facto, preclude the issuance of a new permit for a park in the ASB. A representative for the Army Corps of Engineers has recently said that. A permit for a specific purpose is not something that can't be superseded by a new permit for a new purpose. The POB's "permit argument" is a deliberate attempt by the POB to mislead the public and city officials.</p> <p>According to Mr. Chmelik, the POB's intention to lay claim to the ASB by means of eminent domain forever precludes a park in the ASB. This is completely bogus. The case was settled. No judge ever ruled on it. The judgment never happened. The POB would like you to believe that it did happen. It didn't. (And if it [an eminent domain judgment] had happened? The POB would still not have a case. Anyone who's fully [not selectively] studied all the laws and all the precedents associated with eminent domain would know that the greater public good associated with creating public parks is highly valued. But this is beside the point. There was no judgment.) The POB's "eminent domain" argument is another deliberate attempt to mislead the public and city officials.</p> <p>Mr. Chmelik claims that Ports do not build parks that are not contiguous to marinas. That is categorically false. The POB manages three parks and they built Marine Park in Fairhaven, which is not contiguous to a marina. The POB's "building parks" argument is another attempt to mislead the public and city officials.</p> <p>Mike Stoner, Frank Chmelik, Sylvia Goodwin, Jim Darling, and Cy Lindberg have repeatedly referred to the "public process" related specifically to a "marina" in the ASB that took place in 2004. On this issue, I encourage everyone to read the article by Emily Weiner about the history of this particular "process" in the premiere issue of the Weekly. This article is a remarkably careful distillation of the sequence of events that resulted in the Port's expressed intentions to place a marina in the ASB. Any reasonable person will put down this article with a profound contempt for the POB's shameless trickery and indifference to public input. The public has never been given an opportunity to weigh the merits of putting a marina in the ASB. Never. To have them now refer to the events of 2004 as the "public process" about a marina in the ASB is beyond the pale. This is yet another deliberate attempt by the POB to mislead the public and city officials. The POB's legal arguments are a complete and total sham. They in no way stand in the way of alternative uses for the ASB, including turning it into a park. Shame on all the Port officials involved in this masquerade, this deliberate attempt to mislead the public and city officials. They have once again violated the public's trust.</p>
110	3/16/2006	<p>Asks for changes to the website</p> <p>See city response</p>	Kevin Cournoyer	<p>Last night at the city planning commission meeting, I suggested that, given the emphasis on inclusiveness in recent weeks, all submitted site designs be included on www.newwhatcom.org. Well, many of these designs are already on the site. (This must have happened recently. I had not noticed it.) Excellent. But I have major problem with how these designs are presented to the public on this official Web site. Newwhatcom.org does not suggest to anyone that site designs are being considered seriously from sources other than LMN. There's still the implied distinction that there are "official" designs from LMN (to be taken seriously) and "unofficial" designs from everyone else (not to be taken seriously). Please create links to all designs right on the homepage of newwhatcom.org. Please do not perpetuate either an explicit or an implied hierarchy of importance among the designs at this stage in the process. Please don't make people look for BBF's</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<p>designs or Blethen's designs---these and others should be front and center on the homepage, along with LMN's designs. On the Project page, please look beneath Project Components to the sections called New Whatcom Design Concepts and Preferred Design Alternative. These sections need to be completely rewritten, taking into account all the new designs that will be given as much careful consideration as the LMN designs. Furthermore, the two FAQs that deal with a marina in the ASB need to be deleted immediately. You cannot claim an open and fair process that welcomes all ideas (cf. Mayor Mark Amundsen's recent letter), but also claim that a marina will in fact go into the ASB. You cannot.</p> <p>CITY RESPONSE: Staff working on the website already planned to revamp it next week, for many of the reasons you describe, and your comments will be helpful. The website originally was built anticipating infrequent updates. We did not anticipate updating it daily, which has become necessary to keep it current. The number of meetings, the pace of the project and the number of different conceptual illustrations and presentation materials needing to be posted have significantly increased as the process has unfolded. Please know that we share your interest in hosting a website that is easy-to-use, informative and current, and are taking steps to do so within limited staff resources.</p>
109	3/16/2006	Supports Bellingham Bay Foundation plan	Diana M	<p>Dear Mr. Aucutt, I would like to urge the adoption of Bellingham Bay Foundation's design for the Port of Bellingham. I recently retired here, after travelling much of the U.S. in search of a community that realized the intrinsic value of nature, and would do whatever it takes to support this value. Bellingham seems well on its way to doing so. Please don't let anything change this.</p>
108	3/15/2006		John Blethen and friends, Member of WFG; New Whatcom Interiors owner; community activist	<p>Highlights of the Blethen and friends plan: (needs to be seen in context of the drawing posted at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two options for the rest of the ASB would be used either as a marina or as restored wetlands. ▪ As a marina the inside edge of G-P's water treatment lagoon (often called the ASB, short for Aerated Stabilization Basin) would be filled in, to create expansive public green space that would be connected to a trail corridor around the ASB. ▪ The breakwater of the ASB would be opened in three places, to improve water circulation for habitat and better fish migration passage. ▪ Georgia-Pacific's tissue warehouse would be turned into dry-stack storage for 600 boats or more, with call-ahead service that could move any boat into the water with one hour's notice with other ancillary services. ▪ Commercial Street would be extended onto the former Georgia-Pacific property all the way to the water, providing a view of the dome of the Mount Baker Theatre in one direction and Eliza Island in the other. ▪ One half of streets on the G-P site would follow the same grid as the downtown tying the waterfront to the existing downtown. ▪ To offer the best sight lines for water, islands, sun and sunsets, the street grid on the portion of the G-P site closest to the log pond would be rotated about 45 degrees from the grid that includes Laurel and Commercial streets. ▪ A pedestrian bridge would cross Whatcom Waterway, as an extension of Laurel Street. ▪ A Public green space at least 200 feet wide would line most of the east side of the Whatcom Waterway, with a much wider triangle of green space near the log pond in compliance with shorelines setbacks. ▪ The east side of Whatcom Waterway, inland of the Laurel Street pedestrian bridge, would be softened and naturalized. A shallow bench

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<p>for salmon would be built.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Federal Channel on Whatcom Waterway would be maintained at 30-foot depth next to the current Port Shipping Terminal, but the rest of Whatcom Waterway, starting at the outside edge of the ASB, would be removed from Federal jurisdiction and be shallowed subject to contamination studies. ▪ A breakwater would be built partially across Whatcom Waterway, at about the outside edge of the ASB (on the shipping terminal side), to calm the water for small boats and a smaller breakwater would be installed at the pedestrian bridge. ▪ Land along Laurel Street would be offered to Western Washington University or another educational facility. ▪ Land next to the current Port Shipping Terminal would be designed to accommodate the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the federal agency that has held discussions with City and Port officials about plans to move its Seattle operation to either Bellingham or Everett. ▪ Land that is not covered with fill would be reserved for a Native American site subject to tribal interest and approval. ▪ No channels would be carved through the G-P site because of numerous environmental considerations. ▪ The sandy beach at the end of Cornwall Avenue might be expanded. ▪ A location for a marine research/educational facility such as Terra Aquarium is identified. ▪ The shoreline would be appropriately softened from the end of Cornwall Avenue to the cove near Wharf Street now crosses the railroad tracks. ▪ The railroad tracks would be moved toward the bluff parallel to Cornwall Avenue, leaving enough space for two tracks. ▪ A sandy beach would be created in front of the I & J Waterway. ▪ Space for small hand carry boats would be designed at the foot of Cornwall Avenue, on Whatcom Waterway near Roeder Avenue, and on the inside of the ASB near the I & J Waterway. ▪ Several stops for water taxis would be created. ▪ Boat launch and marina parking would be moved away from Whatcom Waterway. ▪ An over-water path to Boulevard Park from the foot of Cornwall Avenue would be constructed. ▪ A bioswale marsh would be constructed inland of the Cornwall Landfill, to capture stormwater that moves down from Sehome Hill and provide for habitat.
107	3/10/2006	Supports turning ASB into a park; also work to support marine industrial businesses	Tom Chisholm	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the redevelopment of Bellingham's waterfront. As you plan I encourage you to do so with a regard for the history and tradition of Bellingham as a city whose heart was a 'working waterfront'</p> <p>I strongly support the Bellingham Bay Foundation's advocacy for public ownership of the majority of the 137 former Georgia Pacific site. Because the Bellingham city council has already committed the taxpayers of the city to paying up to 90 million dollars for roads and other infrastructure, the port should likewise commit to public ownership as a guarantee for this public investment.</p> <p>I also support the BBF's recommendation that 40% of the land become park. Filling the water treatment lagoon for park creation would definitely serve more citizens' needs than a marina for relatively few large pleasure boat owners. Environmental enhancement of the waterfront can be accomplished as these green areas are created.</p> <p>Finally, I urge the port and city planners to create the proper zoning and infrastructure for continued marine industrial business and</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				commerce. The history and tradition of Bellingham's waterfront has been one of economic opportunity for working people. Please plan carefully to provide a location for long term family wage employment opportunities.
106	3/8/2006	Supports marina and revenue it will bring as well as alleviating moorage shortage	Douglas Bianchi, President, Bianchi Group Inc.	Mr. Aucutt, It has come to my attention that the City of Bellingham is considering omitting the Port's plan for a Marina in the former GP lagoon. As a boat owner who has tried to obtain permanent moorage in the Marina for 3-years, and witnessed other boaters experience the same difficulties - due to unavailable moorage spaces, I urge you to reconsider this issue. By upgrading the waterfront to better accommodate our boating community, it will serve as a constant revenue stream. Additionally, our City will be more inviting to the vast numbers of destination boaters who regularly demonstrate an eagerness to visit local establishments in the ports they visit. Thank you for your consideration.
105	3/6/2006	Convert lagoon into a marina	Jim Lindout, Cascade Radio Group	Mr. Aucutt, My wife and I are born and raised in Bellingham (60 years) and have boated for 30 years. We strongly recommend the use of the lagoon area be converted into a marina as the future growth of Whatcom County coupled with the already 3 year waiting list now at the port for permanent moorage suggests a strong need.
104	3/13/2006	Supports the marina – provides economic info Supports the marina – provides economic info	Steven C. Ross, Secretary, Bellingham Yacht Club on behalf of Bellingham Yacht Club Steven C. Ross, Secretary, Bellingham Yacht Club on behalf of Bellingham Yacht Club	To the Commissioners of the Port of Bellingham and Councilors of the City of Bellingham: The Board of the Bellingham Yacht Club has asked me to communicate to you, via this letter, our support for the proposed “Downtown Marina” – to be built in the area commonly known as the “Georgia Pacific Lagoon.” We offer the following in support of the project. Unique opportunity afforded by existing rubble-mound breakwater. The breakwater that surrounds the Lagoon was built to specifications that exceed the requirements of a typical marina. Our experience as tenants and visitors to other marinas in Washington and British Columbia is that a solid rock breakwater offers protection that is far superior to other forms of breakwater or other wave attenuation device. We feel that it is highly unlikely that a comparable structure could be built anywhere else in the vicinity of Bellingham due to the environmental impact: both loss of habitat and impact of construction. Even if other forms of breakwater were acceptable, we expect that it would be difficult to obtain a permit for any breakwater. We encourage the use of this existing structure for a purpose consistent with its original construction – and fear that any other use is a waste of a precious asset that could not be recovered in our lifetime. The Lagoon site is the only area in the Northeast portion of Bellingham Bay (referred to by the name “New Whatcom” in the current planning process) that is suitable for a marina. We take no position on the advisability of any specific park, or the theme for any park. We do note however, that there are many other sites in the New Whatcom area and elsewhere that are suited for parks. We join other citizens in taking great pride in our civic parklands, especially the string of parks and walkways that ring Bellingham Bay, from Marine Park on the south to Little Squalicum Beach on the north. If more parkland is desired by the planners and the public, we encourage you to consider using more of Georgia Pacific and adjacent sites, which are already above sea level, instead of filling in sea bed. Economic impact of a new marina. Expanding the available moorage on the Bellingham waterfront makes good sense for everyone in Whatcom County, whether the person is a boater or not. The construction of the facility will offer a one-time boost of more than \$15 million to the economy. We expect that local companies and trades persons will participate in this project.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<p>Once the marina is in operation, there will be direct impacts on the local marine trades – those who build, sell, charter, maintain, and equip boats. Many of these are locally owned businesses. All employ our friends and neighbors and contribute to the tax base of the city and county. In addition to those who work directly on the boats, visitors to town (e.g., those who are using or chartering a locally-berthed boat) will spend additional money for dining, lodging, and sight seeing before and after their charter.</p> <p>Those who choose to own boats and berth them in local marinas will also benefit. The Port of Bellingham is a leader in setting moorage rates for public marinas. The Port's rates reflect the cost of building and operating those facilities – as well as an appropriate contribution to the overhead of the Port operation. The current level of the Port's waiting list, coupled with expected growth, leads us to believe that the new marina will be fully subscribed when it becomes available in five or six years. If the marina is not built, then local boaters will be forced to take their business to other – probably private – venues. Decreased supply leads to increased demand with attendant higher prices and increased profits to private operators (whose costs do not increase with higher demand). The most dramatic impact will be on those middle-class families who will no longer be able to afford this form of recreation.</p> <p>Current Port statistics state that more than 80% of Squalicum Marina users are from Whatcom County, with only 6% from outside the State of Washington. On the waiting list, 66% are from Whatcom County and 17% list their address as out of state. The marina would be an investment that has the majority of its impact directly on local citizens, but also would bring in outside revenue as well. Those from out of the local area will provide year-round employment for the local businesses that supply and maintain their vessels.</p> <p>Public access. Marinas managed by the Port of Bellingham are designed to accommodate both boaters and non-boating public. The docks at Squalicum Harbor and Blaine Marina are open to the public during daylight hours – unlike most public and private marinas in Washington and B.C. Persons young and old, as well as families, are often seen walking the docks in almost all kinds of weather. Many of the strollers stop and talk to the boaters, who usually are happy to discuss their boat and the hobby in general. Marina grounds are expressly designed for public enjoyment. Tom Glenn Commons and Zuanich Point Park are great spots for fresh air, sightseeing, picnics, and even weddings. The plans for the Downtown Marina appear to continue that tradition, completing a ring of parks and walks around the Bay.</p> <p>One feature we find most interesting is the planned public access to the breakwater and park areas around the marina. This is made possible by its massive construction, a unique size and shape that is rarely the case on breakwaters constructed specifically for marinas. Advocates of a park in the lagoon site have emphasized the spectacular view that would be available from the park. In fact, the view will be available from the walkway and parklands planned to crown the breakwater, regardless of whether there is parkland or moorage in the lagoon area.</p> <p>Marina decision and land-use decision. We understand the many conflicting opinions that must be considered in the decisions concerning the New Whatcom area. There are many nuances that must be analyzed in regards to the land area. It may not be possible to reach consensus on a desired configuration of the infrastructure <i>for the land area</i> at your March 21st meeting. On the other hand, there is only one alternative to building a marina in the lagoon, and that is to not build the marina. We urge the Port and City to continue the process started more than ten years ago to plan for this marina and initiate the permit process. The discussion to build a marina has not been rushed and March 21st is the day to make a decision.</p>
103	3/10/2006	Supports marina	Drew Schmidt	Please add my name to the list of supporters of building a marina in the place of the GP lagoon. I believe there is a real and specific need for more marina space in Bellingham and that this site is the best suited, both economically and ecologically, for a new marina.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		Continued	Donna Auer President, South Hill Neighbor- hood Assoc.	<p>Introduction: The New Whatcom development at the Georgia Pacific site lies adjacent to the South Hill Neighborhood, and at one time included a portion of the neighborhood. As such, the development of this site will impact the neighborhood and the daily lives of its inhabitants. For this reason, South Hill neighbors are invested in contributing to the design concepts of this project. Most importantly, we wish to present a basic philosophy shared by the neighborhood that we believe should be the basis of development on the waterfront.</p> <p>Purpose: We would like to persuade the Port and City planners to more completely incorporate the desires of the citizens into their plans.</p> <p>Philosophy: Our bay is a precious and finite natural resource. It not only represents a deeply aesthetic and beautiful feature of our City, it is part of the larger ecosystem of the Puget Sound and Salish basin. We have a unique opportunity to preserve and restore the natural beauty along the bay. This is important not only for the environment but for the personal experience enjoyed by all who live here and those who visit the area. We could produce a waterfront design that is an outstanding addition to our City.</p> <p>Although the Port has stated that they want this area to be a “regional center”, the citizens have made it clear that they prefer a lower profile, not dominated by structures that block views or traffic and noise that intrude into the personal experience of being at the waterfront. Citizens envision a relationship with the environment in this area: where walking paths, biking, beaches and parks abound, where boating and other recreational activities are allowed, where (clean) marine industries are appropriate, and where natural habitat areas predominate. This area demands a thoughtful, environmentally sensitive design philosophy.</p> <p>We Are Moving Too Fast: Clearly, it has been recognized by a great number of citizens, our public officials, and design professionals that the development of this special and unique area requires a thoughtful, tasteful, intelligent, creative, visionary, and sensitive process. To move the design concepts at a hurried pace will sell us short, and will undermine the future for us all. The design concepts should be an enjoyable community-wide experience that is dominated by mindful action. These concepts are important because they will set the stage for what is built here. Building well and right will only enhance our City’s attractiveness, and result in increased desirability and property values.</p> <p>Priorities Of The South Hill Neighborhood Association The South Hill Neighborhood Association brings forward these design concepts for your consideration, as we promised at the public meeting for adjacent neighborhoods. These concepts pertain to how they will affect South Hill neighbors and the community as a whole.</p> <p>1. View Protection And Preservation: The first priority for South Hill neighbors and for a majority of the city is the protection and preservation of views. This is supported by the city-wide Citizen View Survey of 2002, a valid survey whose outcome found that the majority of Bellingham citizens and nearly all who have water views believe view preservation and protection is the most important issue in our city. Though the Port and City claim that issues of height and bulk will be dealt with “later”, we believe that it is imperative we address height and bulk now – at the beginning stages of design conceptualization.</p> <p>We must develop the waterfront in a way that not only preserves views of residents who live on the hill, but allows views for all people who visit the area. These must be wide-scope views to take in the water, islands and mountains beyond. We must not develop buildings whose height or bulk blocks views. We should not create a “wall on the water” when looking out or when looking in from the water. The concept of “view corridors” is inappropriate when buildings erase open, sweeping views of the bay and beyond. Blocking views for neighbors and visitors decreases life-style pleasure and devalues homes. Beauty and aesthetics of the urban environment must be</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		Continued	Donna Auer President, South Hill Neighbor- hood Assoc	<p>considered a priority in the design concepts.</p> <p>2. Minimize Streets And Traffic: The City and Port have emphasized a dense street grid in all of their New Whatcom designs, and have stated that this is for the purpose of “attracting developers”. But the majority of citizens have determined that they want less traffic within this area, and particularly do not want roads along the waterfront, except in designated places where small streets allow access to the water. A street grid overlay that enables access to facilities within the development would be acceptable, but should not include through streets. Additionally, a quiet main boulevard running perpendicular to the water, in the center of the area, with sidewalks and a lively turn-around circle (e.g. Seaside Oregon) would be a low-impact, appealing addition. We recommend street location to be set back at least a block away from the waterfront, except in designated places where small streets allow access to the water. This would create a unique design element that gives invitation to view the water from afar, and at the same time safe-guards the enjoyable experience of being at the water’s edge. The open space between streets and the waterfront would be minimally built (if at all). Any plans for arterials to enter and exit the development area, including connections to I5, must be carefully scrutinized. The proximity of South Hill and other neighborhoods to this area requires that serious consideration be given to minimizing traffic impacts. Increased traffic brought into the area would likely create an overflow into the surrounding neighborhoods. This would result in safety concerns and disturb the tranquility and character of the neighborhoods.</p> <p>3. Experience At The Waterfront: Open and natural spaces and abundant habitat areas should be a dominant characteristic of the water’s edge. This is what is best for the marine ecosystem, and what has been requested from the citizen stakeholders. The building and road setbacks should allow people to enjoy the waterfront without dominant noise intrusion. Numerous areas for boating, kayaking and other water pleasures should be provided. Beaches and parks should be plentiful. Strolling and biking promenades, boardwalks and paths should be an unbroken necklace near where land meets water – providing continuous public access. Habitat restoration and indigenous planting should be a priority and landscape development should be based on the best available science. The Port, City and citizens should utilize individuals who are leaders in environmental protection, to provide the best methods for preserving and creating habitat.</p> <p>4. Building Density And Design: Buildings and other structures should not be built in the open space area between the water and the street grid; but if some are necessary, such as restroom facilities, they should not exceed one storey in height. Development of structures should be delegated to the center portion of the property, directly in line with the Central Business District. Buildings should not be on slopes where they may block the views of neighbors who reside behind them. Strict height and bulk limitations should be placed on all buildings in this development. Building design should include open, public areas, like piazzas and open-air cafes. At no point should bulk or a conglomeration of buildings impede views or access to the water. The addition of large buildings, like a convention center or arena should be discouraged. These mega structures tend to create sterile spaces that cut off views, create wind tunnels that make walking around them unpleasant, and detract from smaller, more intimate businesses and settings. They benefit only large crowds, create traffic congestion, parking problems, and then remain empty much of the</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<p>time.</p> <p>High rise condo parks should not be built. We should not repeat the mistake of many cities that have over-built with concrete and asphalt, that detract from the natural beauty of the waterfront. What other architectural and urban design elements could we consider? It would benefit us to learn more from a broader range of examples, such as European restoration projects and other American historic cities.</p> <p>5. Revitalization Is Best When We Are All Interested And Fully Involved</p> <p>Public hearings and presentations of the guidelines and design concepts for the waterfront project have not allowed adequate time for the stakeholders to consider, digest, dialogue, and draft responses and ideas. In the case of neighborhood associations, the process requires a vote of support from the neighborhood, before returning the results to the City and Port. After results are received, there should be a feedback mechanism to demonstrate that good ideas have been thoughtfully considered or utilized – or why they are not applicable should be established. This would let the citizens know that public process is truly valued.</p> <p>It is imperative that citizens be fully involved in the formulation of land use codes as they are developed. This is an important and very integral element of good design. Additionally, design details and architectural standards for this project would benefit greatly from input by those citizens who are invested or interested in the aesthetic and functional uses of the built environment on the waterfront.</p> <p>At its March 1, 2006 general membership meeting, the South Hill Neighborhood Association voted to support these design recommendations for the New Whatcom waterfront development. We thank you for considering them.</p>
101	3/10/2006	Before you endorse the plan presented, you may want to review other plans that are on the table	Earl Hutchins Past President of the Blaine Chamber	<p>Dear members.</p> <p>As a fellow member and past president of the Blaine Chamber, I ask the following: The plan presented is not the only plan for the Bellingham Waterfront that the people of Bellingham and Whatcom County are looking at. It appears to be the only plan the COB and Port of Bellingham want to consider however. Before you endorse the plan presented, you may want to review other plans that are on the table. Talk with, and give your input to Jim, our elected Port Commissioner and also Sylvia Goodwin (Woman of the year, Blaine Chamber), she is the planner in charge. This should not be a done deal. As pointed out, this is a new plan and has only been presented to a noon meeting of the City of Bellingham and Port. As it is a new plan, it should also be presented back to those who had input on the original plan, well over 1,000 people, who have had no input to the revised plan or had a chance to speak about it in public meetings etc.</p> <p>The Bellingham Bay Foundation has created a plan which was presented at the Whatcom Court House, with probably 500 in attendance. Other than mine, no real objections were presented to the Bay Foundation at this meeting. You might want to have speakers from both groups, plus other individuals and Bellingham Neighborhoods discuss the Port of Bellingham plan with the Blaine Chamber before jumping too fast. The PEOPLE who live in Bellingham are proud of our City, just as I'm sure you are proud of the City and County where you live, and many feel that this project is moving too fast and not in the direction that will benefit the people of Bellingham and the County (taxpayers) the most. As a Bellingham resident, living in a home that overlooks the bay, I sure want to know more. Please consider the people and residents of Bellingham, just as you would like to be considered if something was constructed in your front yard with the possibility of obstructing views, more traffic, more taxes etc. (I believe the City has agreed to pay for streets, sewer and water installation) and no one knows what other impacts in the future.</p> <p>As a Bellingham resident and tax payer and you, as a Whatcom County taxpayer...</p> <p>Yes..... you to as a Whatcom County resident are taxed by the Port for this projects.... and the project that will probably take most of the</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				Port funds for years.... I encourage us all to look closely at this plan. The Port needs to be watching out for ALL of the people of Whatcom County.... not just BELLINGHAM, and not just boat owners with boats that exceed 40'. Also, currently the Port only has three directors. Would you, as a resident of Blaine, the County or the COB (City of Bellingham), be comfortable with three directors watching over a budget that is about the size of Blaine's? If your answer is no, please write your the director and ask HIM to bring on more directors so that we, the TAXED people of WHATCOM COUNTY can be better represented. Please, count to a few million and then be SURE to give your input.
100	3/10/2006	Provide a fishing pier	Richard Sullivan	Edmonds, WA has fishing piers, for the public to fish. The waterfront project is the way to provide family fun here.
99	3/8/2006	Likes the Water's Edge model	Carol Mills	I love the new design for the GP property that was in the paper a couple of days ago [Water's Edge], I think it is the best by far. (NOTE: The Water's Edge design concept can be found on the website's homepage.)
98	3/8/2006	Marina vs Park	Yvonne Bianchi, President Cartwright Creative Group, Inc.	Mr. Aucutt, I'd like to weigh in with my feelings about the park only vs marina issue on the waterfront. I am definitely pro-marina. When I think of the cities I've visited on both coasts, the ones that were most interesting included a prominent marina facility. Marinas are bustling activity centers, and they bring people to the water. It's fun to take walks on the dock, even if you aren't a boater yourself. And the industry that is associated with marinas provides additional diverse interest - shops, restaurants, marine products stores, marine repair services, etc. All of these businesses are employers of local people, and there can be a significantly positive economic impact because of them. It is my opinion that in omitting the marina, the city would be doing a tremendous disservice to our community both today and in the future.
97	3/7/2006	What's the economic impact waterfront redevelopment? City Response re: economic and financial modeling	Megan Watt, WWU College of Business & Economics' Small Bus. Development Center	Hi Mark and Jim, I attended the joint City Council/Port Commissioner Meeting on Tuesday (March 7th) and found the background and overview of the waterfront planning process to be very helpful. However, in the slideshow presentations that outlined the next steps, I did not see any mention of an economic impact analysis with regard to what the future impact of the waterfront project/plan would have on our community. I saw that there was a very clear place in the process for an environmental impact analysis, and understandably so...but the economic impact of this plan seems to be an equally important piece. Can either of you comment on this or if not you, can you please refer me to someone that can address this question? CITY RESPONSE: The City has contracted with Financial Consulting Solutions Group (FCSG) to prepare a financial model to measure the economic impact of proposed Waterfront Development scenarios. Initially, the primary focus will be to estimate the impact on the City of Bellingham as an entity and also to estimate the impact on the community in terms of jobs, total revenues and housing. The model will incorporate costs of infrastructure as estimated by LMN Architects based on development of a "preferred alternative" from the initial concepts. This will include estimated costs for City utilities, streets, parking and development of public open space and trails. The City will utilize this information to develop an implementation schedule and financing plan to pay for these capital costs. FCSG partnered with Northern Economics to create metrics to estimate revenues including taxes and utility revenue to the City and the

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
				<p>operating costs for City departments, such as Fire, Police and Parks, to provide services to the redevelopment area. These metrics will be used to estimate the impact to the City's operating budget for various development scenarios.</p> <p>The estimated infrastructure cost and operating impact will depend on; 1) the type of development, 2) how much total development will occur, and 3) the length of time for development to occur. These variables are all currently being discussed by City and Port staff and consultants. We expect to have initial information about a preferred alternative on which to run an initial financial model in the next few weeks.</p> <p>City/Port staff are contemplating a public meeting this summer on Waterfront Development "Economics" to review the results of the financial model based on preferred alternatives for development. We intend to update the model in the future to incorporate actual development as it occurs and revise assumptions about development as needed.</p>
96	3/7/2006	We need the marina; what is Syre's motive to not support the marina?	Arne Cleveland	<p>I pay high Port Taxes to develop sea and air transportation in Whatcom County. I am not paying those taxes to develop parks in Bellingham. A marina in the Georgia Pacific area will bring additional boats and high paying jobs to Whatcom County. We need the marina space to satisfy demand. It is the best use of that waterfront. Remember, our taxes for the Port Authority are about economic development. I do not trust Syre (sp?) who wants to keep the marina demand for his plans. Also, a Denver design company does not know what a waterfront is and how to use it. I lived in Denver five years and really missed the sea, visiting our Birch Bay house every summer. The Platt River and a small lake in Denver is not a good knowledge base for port design.</p>
95	3/7/2006	Incorporate places to see breathtaking waterfront views	Cindy	<p>This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to decide what to do with the future of the Bellingham waterfront.</p> <p>I am a lifetime resident of Whatcom county and I hope that final decisions for the waterfront will include a great amount of public access to walk or drive along the shoreline. What we have is a breathtaking view that is now barely accessible because of the industries that make it almost impossible to truly enjoy. A park similar to Boulevard would be wonderful with an accessible 'lighthouse' for the public to get an experience of an even greater view for a few moments. Something similar to the look out at Hovander Park but a tad bigger.</p>
94	3/7/2006	Keep the marina – it shouldn't be a bargaining chip	Rod Dean	<p>The marina expansion is a vital part of the plan.</p> <p>We can quibble about how much green space is included elsewhere but the marina should not be a bargaining chip.</p>
93	3/6/2006	New Whatcom needs direct access to waterfront and should integrate/ connect with	Bill Gorman, President Downtown Renaissance Network (DRN)	<p>It is exciting that you are now at a decision point about the future of New Whatcom and the Bellingham waterfront. It means that at long last we can soon begin to build, not just dream. The waterfront and your impending hearings were a topic of vigorous discussion at the Downtown Renaissance Network Board of Directors meeting on February 24th and we know you are confronted with some very challenging issues and decisions. We would like to offer our opinions in the matter.</p> <p>We believe that the center and the heart of Bellingham, downtown and the waterfront, stands poised to achieve true greatness as one of the best places to live on our planet.</p> <p>In the opinion of the Downtown Renaissance Network Board, two things are essential for this to occur.</p> <p>1) The development of New Whatcom must ensure easy direct access to the waterfront. For the first time since the founding of this</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		city center		<p>community we are offered easy accessibility to Bellingham Bay. The bay has always been a working harbor and the general public could not access the shore. We believe that if your plan ensures access to the Bay and from the Bay into downtown by walking, driving, bicycling, public transportation, paddling, sailing and cruising, the first key to a transformation will be in place. This access includes multiple road connections into the site, as well as transient moorage within Whatcom Waterway.</p> <p>2) New Whatcom is an urban place and needs to be completely integrated into the center of our thriving city. This includes physical connections with roads and trails. Greater still is the opportunity to create new architecture and designs that honor Bellingham's past and celebrate our future.</p> <p>Great cities are great because they are dense places where art, architecture, culture, determination and fortune all conspire to make us more than ourselves. They are unique to their areas and their people. In Bellingham, our spectacular environment is the stage. What we do as the players on this stage is what can make Bellingham great and make us proud that we have chosen this city to be our home.</p> <p>Let's work together to join our revitalized downtown to an inviting and thriving waterfront for all.</p>
92	3/6/2006	Critical of the waterfront planning process	Stan Snapp, former Greenways Committee chair, currently a City Parks Board member, taxpayer and voting citizen	<p>I won't be able to attend the Tuesday meeting in person so I have a few comments for you to consider.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The designs the Port commissioned that included the new yacht basin as a given was in terrible violation of the public trust. We elect Port Commissioners to represent the best interest of the public. In this case they are representing a very few, mostly absentee yacht owners in committing the jewel of the entire site in terms of esthetic potential for park uses. This waterfront project needs to have recognized the fact that our decisions will stand well into our grandchildren's children's lives. ▪ 16 to 22% parks dedication is insulting and the community simply will not stand for it. Shame on Jim Darling, the Port Commissioners and any representatives from the City and County that struck this back room deal and then tried to cram it down the public's collective throat with a holiday scheduled open house in a rush to judgment. The only urgency here was to try and get this to be a done deal before the public had a chance to ask ourselves if this was the best we could come up with. ▪ It's not even close and the Bellingham Bay Foundation's proposal isn't perfect but it calls for a Master Planning process. Gosh folks we master plan regional parks in this city, how could we even consider not master planning something with this kind of lasting impact? How can a populace that has so little access to its fabulous waterfront sit by and let this happen. The answer is we can't and we won't. The hive has been kicked and you will have to address the results. ▪ I understand John Blethen has hired Dave Christiansen to develop a design concept for consideration. ▪ There needs to be way more discussion and public opportunities to comment as was demonstrated by the huge turnout to the Bellingham Bay Foundation presentation this week. The Herald was way low in its count of 200 people; it was standing room only in the County Council chambers. ▪ The public has the right to know what the process will be in deciding our water front's future. I thought we appointed a Waterfront Futures group to help. Then we have the WAG, and now, a group that wasn't happy with the process has formed, yet another group called the Bellingham Bay Foundation and they are beginning to make some sense. What happened to a public process that involves the folks that we elected to represent us? I'm sick of the rumors of back room deals involving Port Commissioners, the Port Executive, the County Executive, the Mayor and some members of each council. The City Parks Board was presented a variation on the Green Fingers concept that a group of staff members have been working up and when and how will that idea get considered in the mix.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
91	3/2/2006	A case of 'green fatigue'; supports density and infilling; supports marina; thoughts on BBF; and more	Stowe Talbot	<p>Please use our local media to announce an orderly, thoughtful, systematic process that all of us can feel good about.</p> <p>With the constraints of work and family life, I am an infrequent guest at the public meetings. However, I have been following the planning process through BTV 10 and the media, and am anxious to submit my comments on the current draft plans:</p> <p>1) This Bellinghamster is developing a case of 'green fatigue'. When the project was first proposed I was concerned that enough space be devoted to a substantial park (for habitat, recreation and 'centering' the urban grid). Since then all I've heard from citizen activists is about green space and reserving as big a share of the property as possible. I know green space is important to Bellingham, but I can't help but wonder if the percentage of people who show up for the public comment meetings is skewed disproportionately.</p> <p>2) Green spaces and trail connections are critical to the project, but let's not forget we are in the absolute geographical center of the largest city in the county. The opportunity for infilling should figure at least as important as the open space, if not more. Ultimately, whether the public realizes it or not, the project will be judged by how successful the 'built environment' is. By success, I mean how we can create the basis for a vibrant, mixed-use street life, successful businesses, and high density residential.</p> <p>3) High density residential will help our City's goal of infilling, and also supply the critical mass of people to ensure successful retail/service businesses at New Whatcom. The residential component can be accommodated by going up: Taller, thin towers block less light and views, while anchoring the site aesthetically.</p> <p>4) Water treatment lagoon: As the last opportunity for the Port to expand its lucrative moorage business, I feel this should be a marina.</p> <p>5) Bellingham Bay Foundation. Although I have concerns about who is funding this organization and what might be some of its unstated goals, I was impressed by the some of the aspects in their 'alternative waterfront design concept':</p> <p>a) The street grid was more cohesive, interesting, and grander than any of the LMN designs;</p> <p>b) I thought the idea of introducing internal waterway fingers (perhaps on a smaller scale than they show) would be a great way to create higher value, and more intimate, water frontage.</p> <p>On the other hand:</p> <p>a) I don't think the lagoon should be filled for a park;</p> <p>b) I would like some kind of residential development on the far south 'Foot of Cornwall' property to put eyes on the park.</p> <p>c) I would put another street connection into State Street at the south end of the project as LMN has shown.</p> <p>6) GP buildings reuse: If some of the old buildings can be renovated and fit into the proposed street grid, let's try our best to accommodate them. If some of them can't, tear them down - let's not wallow in nostalgia. Don't let the tail wag the dog.</p> <p>7) The foot bridge can be a wonderful iconic element eventually, but first priority should be on creating as many street connections as possible with downtown and the surrounding neighborhood.</p> <p>8) Public vs. private: I feel that most, if not all, the concerns about 'control' of the property if it is sold can be addressed through zoning, covenants and the disbursement process. Make sure that the property is sold to a diverse group of experienced property developers. The chance to own fee simple property in New Whatcom will attract a much bigger pool of potential developers than leased land. If we look at the best examples of successful urban cores around the world, they are almost invariably made up of private property.</p>
90	3/1/2006	Habitat features	Kathy Fletcher	<p>Dear Members of the Waterfront Advisory Group,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals for Bellingham's Waterfront Redevelopment.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
		must be incorporated as part of the concept designs; not added as an afterthought	Executive Director	<p>People For Puget Sound is a nonprofit, citizens' organization whose mission is to protect and restore Puget Sound and the Northwest Straits, including a specific goal to protect and restore the 2,000 miles of Puget Sound shoreline by 2015.</p> <p>We support the North Sound Baykeeper and ReSource's position that restoring habitat is one of the most important goals in the redevelopment process. The physical, chemical and biological condition of the nearshore of Puget Sound is of vital importance to the health of the Sound as a whole.</p> <p>Features that must be included along the new waterfront are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continuous fish migration corridor along edge of the bay. Juvenile salmon and other species need shallow water along the water's edge for protection from predators and for respite. Piers and other over water structures (where they cannot be removed altogether) must be constructed in such a way to reduce the shadow effect that will effectively block or disturb juvenile salmon movement. Grating, optic light systems, or pulling the pier back from the shoreline are all methods that can be used to allow light passage. Softened shorelines, artificial structures (where a vertical seawall can't be removed), and other means of allowing shallow water areas continuously along the water's edge are needed to create the fish migration corridor. ▪ Native vegetation at the edge. Sufficient areas of vegetation to allow shading and leaf litter and insect drop into the water are also beneficial to fish and other species. ▪ Areas of high quality habitat. Pocket beaches, larger beaches, salmon benches, estuarine restoration areas, and tidepool zones should be incorporated in as many locations as possible around the bay. Roadways must be pulled back in order to allow adequate room for these habitat areas. ▪ Bring people to the water. Bulkheads and high docks and piers do not allow people to touch the water. The sensory ability to interact with the water is important for creating the human connection to the Sound. Beaches and tide pool areas, therefore, should be incorporated into the design in as many places as possible. ▪ Clean water. Stormwater and urban runoff treatment through natural systems can be incorporated into the design of parks and rights of way at the beginning of the design phase. Clean, fresh water inputs into the Bay are important for the health of aquatic life. <p>These habitat features must be incorporated as part of the concept designs; not added as an afterthought. Careful planning will benefit both the aquatic species and humans, as an environmentally sensitive waterfront will make Bellingham a draw for both residents and tourists. We look forward to continuing to work with you on these important plans.</p>
89	3/1/2006	Make sure to negotiate with railroad	Henry G. Schwarz	<p>I have seen or heard next to nothing about the railroad which needs to be re-routed long before any redevelopment of the GP site starts. Given that negotiations with freight companies like BNSF are notoriously slow, the smart thing is to start working toward negotiations with BNSF now.</p>
88	3/1/2006	Let's get ALL the ideas together	Rob Sanabria, Electrical/ Control Systems Design	<p>I have attended the meetings with regard to our new waterfront and thought all the 'designs' were just very similar variations of the same theme. I like much of BBF's ideas and feel they should be considered into the design, and published for all to see and to comment on. Let's get ALL the ideas together. Here's some of what I like:</p> <p>more publicly owned spaces (including an amphitheater); eliminating the seemly 'set' idea of the Marina (yet still providing additional moorage); more focus on environmental implications; pedestrian only areas; like some of the access ideas and feel it could connect well to downtown (so as not to leave it out)</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2006
87	3/1/2006	Similar message to below.	Sherrie Park	I am in favor of the latest suggestion submitted by the Bellingham Bay Foundation. It would serve the community at large much better to turn the "Lagoon" into a park for use of the many than to build a new marina for use of a few. I would rather see benefit for the entire community as well as the community maintaining ownership of much more of the New Whatcom area.
86	3/1/2006	Turn ASB into a park; more community ownership	Keelbolt	I am in favor of the latest suggestion submitted by the Bellingham Bay Foundation. It would serve the community at large much better to turn the "Lagoon" into a park for use of the many than to build a new marina for use of a few. As a current Port of Bellingham customer, the Port does not have, what I would consider, a stellar record addressing the concerns of many of their current customers. Therefore, I am not in favor of seeing any more money diverted toward projects not addressing those current customer concerns. I would rather see benefit for the entire community as well as the community maintaining ownership of much more of the New Whatcom area.