

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<b>Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – October 2006</b>
<i>Last Update 9/30/2006</i>				<i>Citizen comments received from citizens submitting comment to the Port and City and through the New Whatcom website through October 2006. Prior month comments can be viewed on the website in separate monthly documents.</i>
264	10/19/06	EIS Public Comment	Frances Badgett <Frances@mac.com>	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I attended this evening's city planning commission meeting about the New Whatcom Draft Framework, and I have a couple of comments and concerns I'd like to share with you. To begin with, the upcoming meetings with Ecology may or may not be public hearings. The Bellingham Bay Foundation, ReSources, Washington Toxics Coalition, among other groups are working to have these meetings be full public hearings rather than just open houses.</p> <p>In contrast to what Commissioner Starcher said about this being "Lucy's bat, ball, and park," MTCA regulations are very clear that public hearings can be required. The regulation reads:</p> <p><b>Public Meeting, Open House or Hearing</b>            Public meetings may be held at key points during the investigation and cleanup process. Ecology also may offer a public meeting for actions expected to be of particular interest to the community. These meetings may be held in an open house format and would be held at a location convenient to the community. Also, if ten or more people request a public hearing during a public comment period, Ecology will hold a public hearing for the purpose of taking oral comments on documents and decisions.</p> <p>I would caution you against assuming this public hearing, should it come to pass, would be sufficient. I encourage you to follow through on Commissioner Auer's suggestion that you create more opportunities for the public to comment and respond to the EIS. I think it's reasonable to assume the public won't be "confused" by additional hearings. The more opportunities people have to comment, the better. Had it not been for the many meetings that opened the public process to new design concepts, we would still have the substandard, Port-driven design concept of LMN. Though I have significant criticisms about the current design, I agree that it is an improvement over the Port's previous proposals. You were instrumental in creating an honest and open discussion in a climate that was only favorable to the Port and the City. I hope you will continue this mission per Commissioner Auer's suggestions and once again invite the public to participate in the redevelopment of the waterfront we all share.</p> <p>Thank you, Frances Badgett</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – October 2006
263	10/16/06	Traffic & Parks		<p>We have other traffic areas that need to be addressed that are worse than this. The traffic flow plans to get traffic in &amp; out of waterfront look disastrous. Leave Cornwall &amp; Laurel ALONE!!! I walked the trail with my kids-we don't need traffic from Western &amp; Water. Let the University figure out how to get people thru. We want to keep our trail! Why spend money moving train &amp; building street the people don't want? 2016 Map comments: What about park for residents? How do we get these people to trail? No place to get people who currently use trail to New Whatcom...they currently cross Laurel. New Parks, Open Space and Habitat comments: Cutting off access to trail just to get WWU to water. We cross Laurel to get to trail.</p>
262	10/16/06	Sustainable Development	math perspectives .com	<p>The Port of Bellingham's website states that the Port of Bellingham believes in bringing community visions to reality and in creating a sustainable local economy that balances the values of environmental stewardship and of meeting the needs of a growing community. This is a wonderful mission. I know the Port and COB are working hard to redevelop the GP waterfront site. I was at the recent meeting and believe we still need more space allocated to a part and we are a little heavy on business and residential development on this site. If we want the city to grow and be a place people want to live and work, we have to give them a reason to come. Businesses do not relocate in a city because there are businesses and condos already in place. They come because of the lifestyle the community brings. If you go to Boulevard Park on any given weekend when the weather is good you will see that this park is filled to capacity. The same is true about our trails. Businesses want their employees and families to have places to see and things to do. In the long-run, a large park area will be helping sustain this property and community and bring economic growth. Having a park next to the University campus area would be ideal. It would accommodate downtown and university residents along with other members of the community. We do not want Bellingham to become like Kirkland. They built up their waterfront along Lake Washington with buildings and now no one wants to live there. If we look at the recent natural disasters that have taken place in our country (and around the world), those homes and businesses near the water are always the ones with the most damage. Why do we want to build in an area that is the most susceptible to damage? The South Bay Trail from downtown to Fairhaven is a well-traveled trail. This trail crosses Laurel Street. It is already a dangerous spot at times and making Laurel a thru-street to the waterfront could be a potentially dangerous and unpopular decision. The local downtown residents will be able to walk to the New Whatcom area and WWU will probably offer transportation to the site so there isn't any reason to open this street. If we are going to spend time and money on street access we need to look at how we can get people in and out of downtown via I-5.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – October 2006
261	10/14/06	Parks, Open Space, and Habitat	Marick	Where's the large park to accommodate the new downtown residents? Boulevard Park is already full during the summer & weekends. Do we really want to open Laurel up to the waterfront? Won't this create a problem for pedestrians & bikers using the trail? Why do we want to spend a lot of money putting businesses & houses on a vulnerable waterfront? We will have to spend tons of money relocating these people & re-building when a Tsunami hits the area. Why not take a sustainable approach? The waterfront should be preserved for marine life & used for recreation. This will bring people & business to Bellingham.
260	10/5/06	Stadium/ athletic facility	Andrew Hartwig	Would there ever be plans to incorporate a stadium/athletic facility (i.e. in cooperation w/ wwu? or other city affiliated organization?) into the plans for bellingham bay and waterfront? I would personally enjoy a location on the waterfront where athletic contests could be viewed while in the midst of the breathtaking bay and subsequent view. What about an open ended facility? Thanks for your time.  Andrew Hartwig
259		General	Peccine38@aol.com	If you build it, they will come.
258		Residential Development & Traffic Safety		Good presentation-I appreciate all of the work and planning. I believe most of this plan will be good for the people who live in Bellingham. I am concerned about the number of residents planned for the project. Also, I'm concerned about some of the street changes. In particular, making Laurel a through- street. Many, many people cross this street as part of the Downtown-Trail connection. Seems like this could be dangerous. There isn't any reason for downtown residents to drive to New Whatcom area as they can easily walk.
257	9/28/06	WWU	Ian Thompson	In the "layout" in the newspaper last week on the site re-development, WWU has been allocated the most prime property in the development. This, then is the most valuable property, so I'm wondering about the financing. Is WWU going to pay a premium price for the land, and how will you mitigate removing that prime land from property tax rolls? I'm sure you have considered this issue and would be interested in your reply. Thank you RESPONSE: Dear Mr. Thompson, The Port has not yet negotiated a lease or property sale agreement with the university. Both the Port and City will ensure that there are adequate charges to reflect the value of the property and the costs of providing services to it. We are working with the university to determine a fee in lieu of taxes to the city to cover costs of providing services. Please know that all of this is in its very early stages and more will be known as the project moves ahead. Thank you for your interest in the waterfront. Carolyn Casey

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – October 2006
256		Economic Development		We need Bellingham to attract new business. We need another park like Boulevard Park on this site, no condos and office buildings. We have enough of those. We can't be sure what we build will be what new business will need/want. We know we can't go wrong with a park. Also, need to connect Zuanich Park, Boulevard Park, and a new park near WWU site together with trails. Let all the people have access to the waterfront. Not just a few who can afford to live and work on the water. Parks will pay off in the long run. Let's grow Bellingham the right way!
255	9/28/06	Dry storage	Robert Kelly" <bobchryl@bigfoot.com>	The latest published masterplan wipes out Hilton Harbor, the only dry storage facility for about 100 boats. The building shown near the new launch ramps can be for dry storage but there is no provision for a travel-lift or method for launching dry stored boats. Many, like me have 6,000 lb. 24 ft. boats without trailers that we dry store. I could not wait 24 months for a slip and I can not at my age handle a 6,000 lb. boat on a trailer. You have three (count them) kayak launching spots. Kayaks do not pay taxes. Boats do. Cities like Everett, LaConner and Anacortes all have dry storage with travel-lift launching. Talk to some boaters. Everybody wants parks. Parks don't generate revenue. Boats and boat owners do. Please re-think some of your ideas.
254	9/27/06	Moving marina entrance	Michael Lilliquist" <lilliquist@comcast.net>	It seems to me that one of the commonly-held goals of the people of Bellingham is to restore and improve the Whatcom Creek waterway, to return it to a state of natural vitality. To this end, it would only be wise for the redevelopment plans to seek to minimize the impact of any new marina and boat traffic. One easy and effective way to do this is to modify the latest redevelopment plan to move the entrance to the proposed marina from the southern corner of the lagoon to the western corner, so that it would face away from the Whatcom Creek waterway and towards the existing marina. It seems to me that breaching the retaining wall would be much the same regardless of location, so cost should not be an issue. What could be better than obtaining a significant environmental benefit at virtually no extra cost? I would appreciate a response to my suggestion, from the appropriate person(s) in the planning departments of the City and Port. Thank you.
253	9/26/06	General		You are <u>so</u> wonderful. Doing a fantastic job!!!
252	9/26/06	Children		What is being done about the children? Schools, play areas, being able to move safely thru the new neighborhood & into the C.B.D. If we have 3k units being planned for New Whatcom, what and how are going to handle the children in C.B.D. and the interaction between them and New Whatcom.
251	9/26/06	Traffic Safety		I am extremely concerned about connecting the University & the waterfront at Laurel Street. This is already a dangerous area & it's not a thru street. Laurel goes thru the City trail so cyclist & pedestrians cross the street. The Bellingham Housing Authority has a large residential area that will go out Laurel to State or Cornwall-one-condominium complex accesses Laurel as do 2 apt complexes

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – October 2006
				on State. This is not a wise, safe idea.
250	9/26/06	Sense of Place	J Casey" <jcasey108@earthlink.net>	Please reconsider the name “New Whatcom”. How about “The Waterfront” or something else?