

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006
<i>Last Update 5/25/2006</i>				<i>Citizen comments received from citizens submitting comment to the Port and City and through the New Whatcom website for the month of April and May. Prior month comments can be viewed on the website in separate monthly documents.</i>
234	5/31/2006	Kayak launch access	Richard Stuart	My wife and I purchased a condominium overlooking the old GP mill. We both enjoy kayaking and would like to so a facility to allow kayak storage for a fee near the proposed marina.
233	5/31/2006	Details on cost estimates for cleanup of waterfront	Kevin Cournoyer	<p><b>Mr. Cournoyer's question:</b>  In today's <i>Bellingham Herald</i>, Doug Smith indicated that the Port of Bellingham's cleanup plan for the former G-P site will cost between \$75 million and \$85 million. I need all the details behind these numbers----how did the Port arrive at them. Please specify, line item by line item, how the money (\$75 million to \$85 million) will be spent to cleanup the entire former G-P site, including the Whatcom Waterway.</p> <p><b>Port of Bellingham response:</b>  Mr. Cournoyer:  The summary cost estimates referenced in the Bellingham Herald by Commissioner Smith for the Port's cleanup plans in the New Whatcom Special Development Area are based on proposed "remedial plans" for six different state-listed sites.  The Port's "remedial plans" are based on over 100 technical documents that were reviewed during the due diligence period, and made available to the public in 2004, prior to Port acquisition of the GP property. The plans and cost estimates are incorporated in the Port's January 2005 purchase and sale agreement with GP, and the environmental insurance policy purchased by the Port and GP. They have also been summarized in various Port brochures and fact sheets for the public.  All of the technical documents, remedial plans, purchase and sale documents, and the environmental insurance policy are available for review and/or copying at the Port upon request through Mary Matyas. I believe the documents most responsive to your inquiry are the January 2005 Remedial Plans for the Whatcom Waterway, the Cornwall Avenue Landfill, the Central Waterfront, the GP Mill site and the GP Chlor-Alkali site. In addition, the Port has cost estimate information for the I&amp;J Waterway site.  Thank you for your interest in the Port and City plans for cleaning up and redeveloping the community's waterfront.</p>
232	5/21/2006	Cleanup should come first	Frances Badgett	<p>Cleanup Comes First!</p> <p>The People for a Healthy Bay would like for everyone to be included in the decisions about the waterfront. That's why we feel the Healthy Bay Initiative is necessary. If passed, it will make sure the City advocates for the highest levels of cleanup on the former G-P site, as well as the removal of mercury from the Whatcom Waterway. Current proposals would only clean up the site to a 'better-than-industrial' standard, which doesn't exist in either legal or regulatory terms. This industrial standard would mean using buildings as caps, paving over toxic plumes, and regular monitoring of mercury vapor. This lower cleanup standard would prevent the development of residences, daycares, playgrounds, and schools. An industrial cleanup would leave a legacy of toxins for our children. We want an unrestricted standard that would allow for a more thorough cleanup, and a safer, healthier waterfront. We all deserve a waterfront where we can live, play, and work. We're circulating a petition to get the Healthy Bay Initiative on the ballot in November. For more information, please contact us at 527-2733.</p>
231	5/29/2006	Adaptive use of GP	Kolby LeBree	<p>I am a WWU student and lifetime Bellingham resident following the waterfront 's website:  The Port has analyzed 100 buildings and structures on the site and believes that 19 of them have re-adaptive use potential because of their</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center"><b>Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006</b></p>
		buildings		<p>historical character or adaptive reuse. This includes many of the tall brick buildings on the site. The Port reviewed this with a team of architects, structural engineers and historical building preservation experts to understand the costs and benefits. With the right federal historic tax credits in place, there may be an opportunity for an historic mill village concept.</p> <p>As demolition continues, I would like to know more about which 19 buildings are going to be considered for adaptive reuse or where I can find more information related to the historic buildings on the G-P site. I tried the contact e-mail on the Port's webpage but it failed to go through.</p>
230	5/23/2006	Best practices and design requirements	Beverly Morgan, Executive Director	<p>In reading about your futures project on the web site I am most interested in any specific information you have about 'best practices on waterfront developments' which deal with design requirements. In Rockport, Texas we are now dealing with this and would like to learn from other similar communities.</p> <p>Thank you for any information you could share with us,  Beverly Morgan, Executive Director  Rockport Center for the Arts  902 Navigation Circle  Rockport, Texas 78382</p>
229	5/8/2006	Supports the marina for various reasons as shown	Wheel and Keel Club	<p>Dear Officials,</p> <p>The leadership of the Bellingham Wheel and Keel power boating club wants you to be aware of our strong support for the new Marina for up to 600 pleasure boats as a major part of the joint Port/City re-development of the "GP" site, as proposed by the Port. Our club has about 100 paid memberships, which represents about 200 active adult members, plus many young people who are part of our boating families. Many others of all ages are often guests on our boats during our cruises and fishing derbies in the San Juan Islands etc. The vast majority of our members live in Whatcom County, and are in the middle-income bracket. We are one of the largest boating clubs locally, and have been a positive part of the Bellingham waterfront since 1956. Along with other boating clubs, we helped the state to purchase Sucia Island as a public marine park in the 1960's.</p> <p>We have reviewed the available information carefully, and have attended some of the many meetings already held. Our position is based on the following facts and reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recreational boating and sport fishing are favorite activities for many persons and families in this county and nearby areas. Not going ahead with this marina will put a cap on this historic and extremely valuable part of our local quality of life for years to come. There are about 240 people on the wait list for moorage in Squalicum Harbor, and some for Blaine too. The majorities are Whatcom County residents; some marina opponents seem to have forgotten that the Port is a county-wide public agency, and thus has responsibilities to all county residents.</li> <li>2. Building a marina in this lagoon with its massive rock breakwater is the most environmentally friendly to provide more in the water moorage anywhere in Bellingham Bay. Other potential sites will have far greater negative impacts, and permits will be much more time-consuming and expensive, if even possible. Dry storage is a good option for some smaller boats, and this proposal will enhance the feasibility of providing it, more so than with any alternative sites.</li> </ol>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center"><b>Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006</b></p>
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Other sites have additional problems. Based on our experience, we have a hard time believing that floating breakwaters as proposed for some other sites will holdup under our strong south winds and common rough water on the bay. Also, the downtown site is much closer to needed infrastructure (arterial streets, sewer, and water) and space for parking.</li> <li>4. This marina will be built by state of the art Clean Ocean standards. As proposed by the port, it will contain extensive, about 30 acres, of aquatic habitat; a typical urban park will not provide any. It is a fact that the most productive salt-water habitat areas, for salmon, shellfish etc, are sheltered inter-tidal areas and their adjacent shallow water areas.</li> <li>5. It is a known fact that many businesses and several hundred good paying jobs in and near Bellingham are based on pleasure boating. Building the new boat harbor will definitely increase the business for this important local economic sector; more guest boaters will spend their money in established and new downtown businesses.</li> <li>6. Besides more jobs and business income, the marina will have other significant long term and wider range economic benefits, by adding considerable value to the new business and residential properties in the G-P area; predicting comparable positive effects from a 30 acre park is much more subjective, and difficult to support based on experience.</li> <li>7. The Port is already providing more public access at its boat harbors than practically any other large marina in the Puget Sound/Strait of Georgia region. The Water's Edge Plan has plenty of access and park space on the very wide breakwater. There are other portions of the GP site, which offer better sites for large parks.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for considering our position and reasons. Frankly, we think to abandon this opportunity for a great new boat harbor for the sake of a large park, which could be built elsewhere, is rather shortsighted and selfish. After all, the anti-marina group no doubt wants the hundreds of members of boating families in the City alone to support the next Greenways levy! Please contact us if yo have any questions. On behalf of the Wheel and Keel Club, Commodore Dennis Peters, Vice-Commodore Jerry Delcamp, Rear Commodore Ernie Brock, and Secretary Roxey Delcamp.</p>
228	3/16/2006	Does not support the marina	George Drake	<p>Dear Friends,</p> <p>I write to express my views on the design of the property acquired from Georgia Pacific Corporation. Here are several issues that I feel need to be addressed and my comments on some arguments put forth by others.</p> <p>First of all let me make a statement of the obvious: This is perhaps one of the most momentous decisions you will have to make in the time you spend in public service. What is determined now will determine the design of our city for hundreds of years to come. Any decision made now must be seen from the viewpoint of a citizen of Bellingham in the year 2100 or 2200 and not from the perspective of the next five or ten years.</p> <p>My major concern is the planned use of the former waste water treatment pond. Personally, I feel the Bellingham Bay Foundation proposal is the better proposal since it envisions a dramatic part, cultural center and recreational area similar to Stanley Park in Vancouver, B.C., and Canada. Here are some comments on issues relating to the use of that site.</p> <p>Issue I: "There is a need for more boat slips. We have a waiting list." The Port of Bellingham plan calls for a marina at the water treatment site. I personally feel that this is an idea that the Port of Bellingham would have us believe is "non-negotiable", that it is a "given" and an essential part of any future use of the GP land. I do not accept that argument. So far as I am concerned "everything" is on the table.</p> <p>Puget Sound and the San Juan Islands area constitutes a boater's paradise and the need for more boat slips will only increase as the years go</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center"><b>Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006</b></p>
				<p>by. Eventually, even were the GP water treatment site used for boat slips the future demand would exceed even that space. What is needed is a long term solution to the legitimate need of boaters to get their boats into the water. Eventually the solution will be to stack boats on land and move them to the water on demand as needed rather than to continually construct more boat slips. It is logical and appropriate that the Port of Bellingham be concerned with providing access to the water for boats <u>or ensuring that such access is provided by other entities, public or private.</u></p> <p>Leaders of the Lummi Nation have commented that they would be willing to work out a contract with the Port for the construction of such a boat storage facility on their land near the Lummi Island ferry terminal The port also owns land on the Bellingham waterfront that could be used for this purpose. Let us work on a long term solution to the needs of the boating public and not rush into a short term answer that uses space that could be used more creatively.</p> <p>Issue II: When building more boat slips whose needs are we serving, those of residents of this community or the needs of others who see this community merely as a service provider for their personal pleasures? Who now owns the boats in the current slips in Bellingham harbor? Who's on the waiting list? The port can provide information on the residence of all who currently rent a boat slip or are on the waiting list. The Port Authority can also indicate the place of registry for all boats in the harbor. This information should be provided sorted by size of the boat as this information would be useful in noting which boats could be "stackable." Is the demand for slips for big boats generated locally or by distant lovers of the water who house their boats in Bellingham? These questions address the concern that in meeting the needs of distant recreational boaters (from Florida, southern California, Canada and ever from as far away as Europe) we would be precluding the use of the site in questions as an incredible enhancement to the City of Bellingham for centuries to come. I question whether the Port of Bellingham has the moral responsibility to provide that water access to boaters from afar precluding alternative uses of our waterfront for local enjoyment.</p> <p>Issue III: "The marina would pay for itself with revenue generated." The fact that the marina could be self-supporting begs the issue of whether this is the best use of the site in terms of quality of life for all of us who call this place home. The Port gets 3% of the property taxes levied against every property in the county so we all, renters to home owners alike, are subsidizing the Port activities. The needs of the few, those who own boats, and most especially the needs of those boat owners who don't even live here, should not have priority over the needs of the rest of the community of tax payers and local residents especially when the needs of those few (boat owners) can, and should, be met in other ways.</p> <p>I urge our public decision makers to take the long view and consider the impact of this decision on the character of our city one or two hundred years from now. What kind of legacy do you want to leave your grandchildren and their grandchildren? Don't be afraid to dream. Please deny the use of the water treatment pond site for a marina and opt for a dramatic cultural center and park on the site.</p>
227	5/17/2006	Could the GP plant convert to ethanol production?	Chris Symonds	I realize that my suggestion may be a day late and a dollar short, but I was wondering whether the Port of Bellingham had considered possibly converting some of the GP Plant into an Ethanol production plant? Ethanol production is certainly on the horizon in many areas now considering the energy problems we are facing and it would be a way to add jobs to our community as well as being a "green" venture. Just a thought. Thanks for your consideration.
226	5/9/2006	Questions	Frances	Stripping Federal Status for the Whatcom Waterway

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006
		about removing federal status from the Whatcom Waterway	Badgett	<p>I watched Frank Chmelik, lawyer for the Port of Bellingham, testify in front of the WAG and City Council that it is illegal to put anything but a marina in the Aerated Stabilization Basin on the former G-P site. I also heard the excellent rebuttals from State Senator Harriet Spanel among others, and read the damning decision from Bricklin and Associates determining that it's perfectly legal to explore options for the ASB. So now, when the Port becomes proactive about removing federal status from the Whatcom Waterway, I sense there's more at stake than just pedestrian structures (which are not in conflict with federal status). I know Mr. Stoner's response in the <i>Bellingham Herald</i> to John Stark's question "What does Bellingham lose if we lose federal status of the Whatcom Waterway" was "not much." Once bitten. I don't trust the Port to determine the best scenario, regulatory or otherwise, for the Whatcom Waterway. There's no reason not to wait for the Department of Ecology to determine the best possible cleanup strategy. The Thea Foss Waterway in Tacoma is undergoing a change in status from federal to local. As Mike Stoner mentioned, it's been a 10-year process. It may, in the end, be the right thing for Bellingham. Or it may be another way the Port is trying to lock in a marina and get away with as little cleanup as possible. Using the Foss Waterway as an example, federal status could provide extra funds for remediation: <a href="http://murray.senate.gov/news.cfm?id=188984">http://murray.senate.gov/news.cfm?id=188984</a> and may give our community stricter monitoring of the post-remediation health of the Whatcom Waterway: <a href="http://www.thenewstribune.com/news/environment/story/5557873p-5002243c.html">http://www.thenewstribune.com/news/environment/story/5557873p-5002243c.html</a> or, it may be, that what we lose with federal status is "not much." But we should take the time to make sure this important decision is made carefully and intelligently, and not just driven by the Port's desire for a marina.</p>
225	5/5/2006	Small boats	Andy Sahlfeld	More small boat space
224	5/4/2006	poll re: cleanup (as paid for by Bellingham Bay Foundation)	Anna Evans, BBF	<p>According to a recent poll conducted by Elway Research in Seattle, cleaning up the toxins in and around the former GP site is by far the most important consideration in waterfront redevelopment for Whatcom County voters. Bearing this in mind, it is clear that the public wants the clean-up to be held to the highest standard -- and it is entirely possible that federal standards related to shipping channel maintenance could be a key element in ensuring this outcome. The Port's proposal to revert the waterway to local control is premature. We need to decide 1) what portions of the waterway will be remediated; 2) how the remediation will be accomplished; and 3) who's paying for it before we make any substantive changes to the jurisdictional structure. We may need the feds to help enforce the best possible clean up.</p>
223	5/4/2006	History of the ASB	Kevin Cournoyer	<p>I think it's important to remember the POB-managed deception that occurred in 2004 with regard to the decision to place a marina in the ASB. Emily Weiner's history of what happened in 2004, which is included below as public comment with permission from Ms. Weiner and <i>Cascadia Weekly</i>, speaks volumes about the POB's fundamental indifference to a real public process. Just like the CollinsWoerman debacle and the LMN debacle, the Port's actions in 2004 were deplorable. The citizens of Whatcom County deserve better than being deceived repeatedly by Port representatives.</p> <p><i>Cascadia Weekly</i>, March 15, 2006, By Emily Weiner  <b>Future of the Black Lagoon</b>  <i>Port says ASB must be turned into marina</i>  Question: When was it decided that a marina for luxury boats will be built inside the ASB? <i>Answer:</i> May 18, 2004.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006</b></p>
				<p>Perhaps in 2004 you were too busy to notice that decision. Perhaps you were busy contributing to “a blueprint to guide waterfront development for current and future generations” — the task of the Waterfront Futures Group (WFG). From the time it was created in early 2003, the WFG was reaching out for public input and comment, extending a huge welcome mat. And the community responded by attending WFG meetings and saying what kind of waterfront we wanted.</p> <p>The City and Port of Bellingham co-sponsored the WFG, each appointed half its members, and each agreed waterfront redevelopment should be guided by its recommendations.</p> <p>But now, as the March 21 date approaches when the Bellingham City Council and the Port Commission are scheduled to vote on a waterfront master plan that will decide where to locate streets, public open space, habitat restoration, boat launches and moorage, Port officials say the master plan must include a marina — because of a series of decisions made by Port Commissioners in 2004.</p> <p>Revisiting 2004</p> <p>On April 8 and April 15, 2004, the Port placed public notices advertising an April 20 public hearing. You didn’t attend? The announced purpose of the public hearing was to amend the “Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements,” including adding property between the I &amp; J and Whatcom Waterways. Those notices didn’t include the word “marina.”</p> <p>At the April 20 hearing, Port staff spoke about a study by Port consultants (Makers and Assoc.) that documented market demand for large-boat moorage slips and analyzed options for locating a new marina. The study concluded the ASB was the best option, based on issues including size, construction costs and the likelihood of receiving timely environmental permits.</p> <p>There were no requests for public comment at the April 20 hearing.</p> <p>On May 4, 2004, the Port passed Resolution 1191, changing the boundaries of Squalicum Harbor to include the ASB and instructing staff to take steps to assure that the ASB be reused for a potential marina. The resolution cites the April 20 public hearing, although the public had not been told the hearing was about the future location for a new marina.</p> <p>But Port officials were not hiding their hope and intention to build a marina in the ASB. Prominent articles appeared in just about every local publication about Port officials’ plan for the ASB.</p> <p>On May 12, 2004, at a special combined meeting of the Port Commission, the City Council, and the Waterfront Futures Group, Port Commissioner Scott Walker announced the Port had been negotiating with GP for six months to buy the whole 137-acre site, and that Port Commissioners would soon be asked to vote to use the power of eminent domain to buy the ASB. Walker said the Port needed to act quickly “before decisions are made to use it as a landfill for contaminated sludge,” and that the Port intended to “remove contaminated sediments from the Aeration Stabilization Lagoon allowing for its ultimate use as a marina.”</p> <p>Later in the same meeting, the Waterfront Futures Group presented a draft of a vision and guiding principles, and solicited public input before the City and Port would be asked to adopt its final recommendations for the downtown waterfront, including the ASB site. Nowhere in the document does it say that the future use of the ASB had already been decided by the Port.</p> <p>Six days later, on May 18, 2004, the Port Commission unanimously passed Resolution 1194, declaring the ASB to be “of public use and necessity” and voting to use the Port’s power of eminent domain to acquire the property, through condemnation. Wendy Steffensen, North Sound Baykeeper, complained of a lack of advertising and public input regarding the proposed condemnation proceedings.</p> <p>Resolution 1194 includes these words: “Whereas the Commission of the Port of Bellingham held a public hearing on April 20, 2004, to</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center"><b>Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006</b></p>
				<p>entertain public comments regarding the amendment of its Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements to include the Property for use as a public marina.”</p> <p>Who knew that the shape of the downtown waterfront was being decided?</p> <p>Late in 2004, under threat of condemnation of the ASB, GP agreed to sell to the Port the whole site, including the ASB. In a series of well-publicized public meetings, Port officials made clear their intention to build a marina inside the ASB.</p> <p>Back to the present</p> <p>“I don’t think we could have been any clearer,” Port Executive Director Jim Darling told this reporter a few weeks ago. “We did countless presentations.”</p> <p>On Jan. 23, 2006, Port Planning and Development Director Sylvia Goodwin sent a memo to the Waterfront Advisory Group, which early in 2005 the Port and the City had jointly established to carry forward the WFG’s work. Goodwin’s memo reviewed some of the history discussed here, and also said, “The scope of work for the New Whatcom Master Plan does not contemplate revisiting the issue of whether a marina will be included.”</p> <p>On March 7, 2006, at a joint meeting of Bellingham City Council and the Port Commissioners, Port Legal Counsel Frank Chmelik listed reasons behind the Port’s position that the ASB must be turned into a marina:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 1977 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit to allow GP to build the ASB on aquatic lands says that if the activity is abandoned, the area must be restored to a condition satisfactory to the district engineer. Chmelik and Darling interpret this to mean a water use would be required, so filling in the ASB to create a park would not be possible.</li> <li>• Because the Port filed a lawsuit to condemn the ASB, and even though the suit was settled out of court, because the lawsuit led to GP’s decision to sell, the Port must now use the property for the public purpose stated in the condemnation lawsuit. (Darling also said “We would not be able to condemn a property for a park.”).</li> <li>• The Port finalized its purchase of the GP site after signing an Interlocal Agreement with the City that says, “it is anticipated that these facilities will include a new downtown marina within the existing ASB treatment lagoon.”</li> <li>• Assuming a marina would be built in the ASB, the Port did not insist GP pay for environmental insurance for cleanup of the ASB, as it did for the rest of the site. Chmelik said the Port believes environmental insurance is not necessary if the ASB is turned into a marina, because the cost of taking out all hazardous substances can be calculated, and because long-term environmental liabilities would be resolved by transporting those substances to a landfill. Future marina income would pay for its construction costs, including cleanup. Chmelik also said that that type of insurance is no longer on the market.</li> <li>• The public’s overwhelming support for the Port to buy the GP site, after listening to public presentations that announced the Port’s intention to build a marina in the ASB, implied public support for building the marina.</li> </ul> <p>Port officials are baffled anyone can think the ASB could be used for anything but a marina, because the Port made so many public decisions that assume a marina will be built.</p> <p>Those decisions were made in plain sight. But the decisions were made at the same time members of the community who wanted to influence what would happen to the downtown waterfront were being told to focus on the Waterfront Futures Group.</p> <p>A skilled magician moves his hands in plain sight, too, but the audience misses many of his moves because flourishes and wand-waving</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006
				<p>suggest it is more important to look elsewhere.</p> <p>The community was told the Port and the City would jointly decide how to redevelop the waterfront, through a public process that began with the WFG and continues with the WAG. Meanwhile, the Port locked itself into building a marina in the ASB. If that locks the community into the marina decision, many people will feel tricked.</p>
222	4/17/2006	Consider luring tall historic ship to establish anchorage here.	Glen Gelhar, Vice-Commodore - Corinthian Yacht Club	<p>Wouldn't it be wonderful to provide slips/moorage for historical tall ships? These graceful ladies have very few places on the entire west coast to 'put down'. The Lady Washington now resides in San Francisco. 'Historic Tall Ships' bring the public, in huge numbers, to the waterfront. An economic plus, they would make the marina environment welcoming for everyone. These vessels used to line the shores from the end of Cornwall to Fairhaven; it would be wonderful to see even a few have a place, once again, on the Bellingham waterfront.</p>
221	4/16/2006	Consider a community garden as a way to provide some open space and a community gathering spot.	Joel Wilcoski	<p>As Bellingham grows up instead of out, there is a risk of alienating people from the natural environment which draws them here in the first place and while multi-story living does mitigate urban sprawl (an even greater threat to the environment) it lacks some of the features of rural and suburban living sought by those making Bellingham their home. The one obvious feature lacking in many urban settings is open space. Through the current planning process I have little doubt that open space necessary to help maintain the character of Bellingham will come about, however to magnify the benefit of those open areas, perhaps the idea of community gardens should be considered.</p> <p>The most obvious advantage to community gardens is the manner in which it allows people, in ways to complex to explain here, to establish and maintain a connection with the natural environment. Furthermore, as the name implies, community gardens would provide a place for otherwise isolated urban residents to connect with each other, thus helping to preserve the sense of community which we are familiar with in Bellingham.</p> <p>From a fiscal standpoint, community garden plots could be had for a yearly fee small enough to make it viable for residents who would like to garden, yet sufficient enough to offset the city's costs to maintain the gardens or even provide a minor source of income for the city. Should the community gardening endeavor fail as a whole, the city would have land which could be simply be reabsorbed in to the general open space plan or offered as land for further commercial or residential development.</p> <p>Although the benefits and concept of the community garden are not unheard of, the advantage we as a city have of planning for their inclusion is.</p>
220	4/12/2006	WWU won't pay property tax on use of valuable waterfront property they develop	Ian Thompson, MD	<p>Like most people, I'm following the development of the waterfront with interest. One thing you need to keep in mind is government revenue potential as the years go by. (This is another reason to keep a marina in the plan.) Also, it ought to be remembered that WWU would not pay any property tax on the incredibly valuable property they wish to use in the waterfront development. When they were having space issues in the 1990s it was suggested that WWU utilize some of the vacant downtown space, and they scoffed at leaving the main campus. Seems hypocritical of WWU to now expect prime waterfront space and not pay ongoing property taxes.</p>
219	4/12/2006	Build it.	Don C.	Build it. Income is much better than higher taxes for a park.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006
			Perrine	
218	4/12/2006	It's far better to phase in development over several decades to ensure a well-balanced waterfront.	Jeff Bodé	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>While I appreciate the Commission's recommendations for a smaller marina and a street layout that discourages pass-through traffic, I am much more concerned about the implementation of any plan for the waterfront. Compared to other issues, planners have said relatively little about how and when any adopted plan would or should be built. Therefore, I must use my imagination, and like most humans when I do that I usually imagine the worst.</p> <p>I imagine the Port, if unbridled, would divide the land into parcels and lease or sell them quickly to developers who would then engage in a race to build. The result would be a single age-class of structures, which inevitably would grow old and out of style all at the same time. Meanwhile, these structures would be occupied by only one economic class at a time.</p> <p>A better implementation would phase the development over several decades. The aim should be to promote a diversity of building age, use, and bulk. Look at the mix in the rest of downtown, which accommodates (albeit imperfectly) a broad range of economic activity, from start-up businesses in low-rent walk-ups to established firms in the newest buildings. As structures wear out they are replaced, but meanwhile other maturing buildings preserve the mix. This does not describe downtown with precision, but does describe the normal, healthy process to promote on the waterfront, less planned than evolved. Thank you for considering these comments.</p>
217	4/10/2006	Legal opinion on marina from BBF	James Johnston, BBF	<p>Dear James Johnston, Bellingham Bay Foundation:</p> <p>From David A. Bricklin Attorney-At-Law, Bricklin, Newman, Dold, LLP:</p> <p>You have asked our firm to provide you with a legal opinion regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Georgia Pacific property in downtown Bellingham. Apparently, the Port of Bellingham attorneys have stated in public meetings that the City of Bellingham and Port of Bellingham are legally obligated to build a marina in the 37-acre treatment lagoon at the former Georgia Pacific mill site. Apparently, the Port's attorneys cite three documents as the basis for the claim that the Port and City are legally obligated to build a marina at that site: the Interlocal Agreement between the City and the Port; the Purchase and Sale Agreement between the Port and Georgia Pacific; and the Insurance Agreement that the Port has taken out with AIG to cover the environmental cleanup of the site.</p> <p>I have reviewed these three documents and other related documents and can find no basis at all to substantiate the Port's claim. None of the documents create a legal requirement that would force the City and the Port to build a marina in the area of the former treatment lagoon (or anywhere else). Conversely, there is nothing in these agreements which precludes the City and Port from building a marina in that area. It appears that the issue of whether a marina should be included in the plans has been left to resolution as part of the City's and Port's ongoing planning process. That process should be used to arrive at appropriate planning decisions. The following is my analysis of the three pertinent documents and an explanation of the basis for my conclusions.</p> <p>To view the entire document, click on this link: <a href="http://www.bbayf.org/qu5_marina.html">http://www.bbayf.org/qu5_marina.html</a></p>
216	4/6/2006	Pleased to see more habitat and green space recommenda	Frances Badgett	<p>Dear Planning Commissioners:</p> <p>I attended last night's work session, and I am pleased that you recommended more habitat and green space than LMN created on their concept. I am curious, though as to why the BBF and Sunset Boulevard plans weren't in consideration for your recommendations? You've all been very vocal about community involvement in the process. So I'm not sure why you chose just one of the many concepts to challenge the LMN design?</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006
		tions. But... Why aren't Sunset Boulevard and BBF plans being considered?		<p>Some of the problems you brought up were things the BBF plan in particular had solved. For example, the "hiccup" the shipping terminal causes in the continuity of the waterfront. This would have been an excellent opportunity to talk about the salmon stream and green space the BBF proposes around the terminal. You discussed the problem of bike and pedestrian traffic in conflict. The BBF plan allows for maximum bicycle and pedestrian access with plenty of right-of-way for both. The road layout of the BBF plan keeps traffic out of the site, and keeps it friendly on a human scale. The problem with the Blethen "circulation" routes is that you're now faced with either creating traffic traps or direct through-routes. In addition, the BBF view corridors are from parks and pedestrian/bike areas, whereas in the Blethen plan, the views are primarily from the center of roads---a problem this plan shares with LMN's. There should be an option for green space on both sides of the Whatcom Waterway. When we talk about a 100-year-plan for the waterfront, I think we can consider that the private property around the site won't be private in perpetuity. There's nothing wrong with a gradual "greening" strategy of the waterfront. No one would suggest evicting private business owners. I also think there should be a consideration for the BBF's ample transient moorage, and an exploration of sites for a marina outside the ASB. My personal research indicates that the ASB is an important tool in remediating the Whatcom Waterway and the rest of the site. We should all consider public ownership for the site as well.</p> <p>As this conversation in our community continues, I hope you will maintain the open, accepting tone you've had so far. Last night was an unpleasant surprise.</p>
215	4/6/2006	Any waterfront plan should work to improve access between downtown and our waterfront	George Dyson	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>As most of you know, I am a downtown Bellingham central waterfront property/business owner (as well as a boat builder and marina user) who has been pushing to improve access between downtown and our waterfront (in *both* directions) for 17 years. During this entire 17 years, despite ample opportunity to do so, the Port of Bellingham has done precious little to address the interests of downtown. Despite calling the proposed new marina a "downtown" marina, the Port's plans really do *not* focus on how to encourage a truly thriving downtown waterfront. Our future as a waterfront community deserves better than that.</p> <p>I urge you to insist on firm plans for waterfront redevelopment (including not only habitat restoration but preservation of working waterfront) that step back a bit and take a big-picture view of what's right for downtown (and all of Bellingham). Maybe these plans should include another marina and maybe not. I urge you to insist on a true accounting of the benefits vs. costs, for long-term as well as short-term, and considering all of us as stakeholders, not just the Port.</p>
214	4/6/2006	Sufficient park space can be created as well as building the marina.	Robert K. Graham	<p>City Council Members,</p> <p>Based on the studies that have been completed concerning the development of the old GP property, the results clearly support the development of a marina in the old lagoon area. The demand for additional marina space exists and would be difficult to develop in other areas. Environmental conditions are favorable and the creation of a marina would likely be a tremendous asset for the city. The revenue that would be generated by the proposed marina would also enhance Bellingham's financial condition by creating a cash flow.</p> <p>While I am in support of building park space, I feel that sufficient park space can be created as well as building the marina space. Therefore, I am in strong support of building the marina in the old lagoon area. Thanks for your consideration and support.</p>
213	4/6/2006	Laments the City Council decision on	Tim Davenport	<p>Hello Mayor Mark,</p> <p>In a word, anguishing is how I'd describe the news that city council has decided to support the POB's marina plan. For our young Sehome Hill family, this decision sacrifices what could otherwise be the most stunning portion of the entire waterfront.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April and May 2006
		ASB		What's more, shoreline waterfront views for the non-marina property will consist largely of a marina wall and boat masts. This, to benefit relatively few boat owners and the short-term financial returns of the Port. What a shame. Not just for our children, but others yet to be born. We're hoping you can help,
212	4/4/2006	To claim that a marina only serves wealthy boat owners makes for a great sound bite, but is simply false	Todd Obermeyer	I'd like to add my voice of support for including a marina as part of the New Whatcom development. As a boater and customer at Squalicum Harbor I'm disturbed by some of the comments that I've read on your website. To claim that a marina only serves wealthy boat owners makes for a great sound bite, but is simply false. Neither I nor any other boater I know is wealthy. But we do feel the pain of rising moorage rates, a condition exacerbated by a shortage of slips in the region. And it is not only boat owners who enjoy the marina. A marina provides a pleasant environment for anyone to enjoy. Strolling the docks is a pastime that many non-boat owners enjoy. A marina in conjunction with park space would be an ideal use of this land. I do, however, have a number of concerns about a new marina. My first is that in the ports rush to meet the demand for larger slips they not cause a shortage in the smaller ones. Many marinas are creating larger slips (which generate larger moorage payments) by eliminating smaller ones (thus creating larger moorage payments for owners of smaller boats by forcing them into a larger slip). I would hope that the Port of Bellingham does not follow the example of the Port of Everett by creating a new marina solely for larger vessels. The new marina should provide a variety of slip sizes to allow for a broad cross section of their customers to utilize. Second, the new marina potentially creates an excellent tourism opportunity for the city. We all recognize that Bellingham is a wonderful city to visit, but not necessarily for boaters. Access from current facilities to downtown is limited at best. I would hope that as part of a new marina transient facilities are located such that they will provide easy and pleasant access to downtown for visiting boaters.
211	4/4/2006	Park and Syre's plans	Bob Kehoe	Did I read in the paper that parks boost property value, and this from the same Mr. Syre that just bought up too large pieces of view property (of the lagoon). And has plans for a large boat marina at Birch Point. Could his plan to help with the park selection process be tainted?
210	4/3/2006	Wants to see "green space" on both sides of Whatcom Creek at ReStore site	Harry Sturmans 1301 W. Holly, #102 Bellingham, WA 98225 360-752-2434	Dear Mr. Mayor: As you are no doubt aware, the Re Store, currently located on W. Holly, is contemplating either a remodel on its current site or a move to another location. Assuming, as those connected with the store are already hinting, that building on the current site will be prohibitively expensive, given the "soft" soil in the area, may I urge you to see this as a golden opportunity for the City of Bellingham to reclaim this area for an extension of Maritime Heritage Park, which is presently really only half the park it should be, situated as it is on the east side of Whatcom Creek but not on the west side. Imagine what a magnificent thing it would be to see "green space" on both sides of the creek all the way from the falls to Holly and perhaps even beyond, considering that the Hertz Rental store has also recently relocated. Imagine what a magnificent thing it would be if this enhanced "green space" could ultimately be connected to the GP site and the waterfront! Please do what you can to help make this dream a reality.