

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<i>Comments received after February 28, 2006 are located in a subsequent document dated March 2006.</i>
85	2/28/2006	Addendum re: habitat issues for the draft of consolidated plan (See comment # 64 for the original letter)	Wendy Steffensen, ReSources North Sound Baykeeper	<p>Dear Members of the Waterfront Advisory Group: Please consider this letter as an addendum to the letter written on 2-15-2005 regarding the draft plans. This letter is designed to assist you in directing the drafting of the 5th consolidated plan. It consists of direct comments on each of the four plans and on common elements of the plans. Once again, thank you for your time and effort on Bellingham's waterfront redevelopment process.</p> <p>Green Seam</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The wide swath of "green" surrounding the log pond is a great attribute. It is important that the area closest to the pond be planted and maintained as habitat, whereas the outer edges could be parkland. 2) The road adjacent to the proposed marina appears to be a multi-use trail. This is appropriate. 3) The over-water bridge should not be built over the waterway since it will be a pollution source. <p>Green Bank</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A primary street running along the proposed marina is not appropriate. If the marina is built, it is proposed to be a "clean" marina. Clearly, a road should not be allowed at its interface. <p>Pearl Parks</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two roads hug the shoreline in this plan, one along the proposed marina and one along the Waterway and log-pond. Neither of these are acceptable. Roads should be set back wherever possible, even in urban landscapes, in order to prevent pollutant from directly entering the Waterway. 2. The green edge shown along Pine Street is a good attribute. This area needs to be greatly expanded and the existing road at Pine needs to be removed as depicted in the other drawings. <p>Green Fingers</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The green finger along the proposed marina is a good attribute. This area should consist of park and habitat at the two pocket beach ends (G Street and C Street). 2. The head of the I& J Waterway should be designated as "open space" as in the other plans, most preferably as habitat. 3. The southernmost green finger should be located at Pine Street. This "green finger" at Pine Street should consist of park, beach, and habitat. <p>All Plans</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The road that extends from the beach at Cornwall & Pine to the Cornwall landfill hugs the shore much too closely. This road should be relocated during redevelopment if at all possible, given ownership constraints, away from the shore by 200'. 2) The proposed green space at Cornwall Landfill should consist of habitat at the edge of the landfill, as engineered during remediation, using soft-shore techniques. This site should be comprised of habitat and park, waterward from the South Bay Trail. 3) The proposed boat launch should be moved away from the C street pocket beach, into the marina or another suitable location. 4) "Open Space" must be further delineated, such that it is clear where habitat, park, and impervious plazas will be located. 5) Buildings at the edge of the Whatcom Waterway should be considered for removal, as they interfere with the re-establishment of habitat

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>in the intertidal area.</p> <p>6) Green areas envisioned at the head of I& J Waterway, adjacent to the G Street, pocket beach, and along the Whatcom waterway should be widened and maintained as habitat areas.</p> <p>7) The Whatcom Waterway area between Roeder and Holly Street needs to be designated as habitat. This area has the potential to be prime intertidal habitat, pending investigation and remediation, if necessary. This area also represents an area that will connect the Whatcom Creek estuary and the designated habitat at the head of the Waterway.</p>
84	2/27/2006	Waterfront project still lacking solid strategic plan; BBF plan should be given better consideration.	Dan Mahar	<p>Dear Bellingham Bay Waterfront Development Stakeholders;</p> <p>I attended the February 15, 2006 Waterfront Advisory Committee meeting and have the following comments and observations.</p> <p>Bellingham Bay Foundation – I was disappointed that the Bellingham Bay Foundation representatives were given only three minutes to present their alternative design proposal. The Foundation invested extensive time and energy into developing a well thought out plan that includes more public/open/green space, which has been an on-going request by the public. This minimization of Bellingham Bay Foundation’s efforts is poor policy and undue public process. Comments from the public should be encouraged, recognized and addressed in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>Marina – I believe that not building a marina represents the least environmental impact alternative, as boats inevitably foul the water with toxic paint, sewage and oil. In addition, most moored boats sit unused 90% of the time. If a marina is built, consider designing it for live-aboard boats and house-boats, similar to those on Lake Union. This would help infill the city with residents, a key goal of modern urban planning. Also, save some of the lagoon property for a publicly accessible personal watercraft beach park.</p> <p>Personal Watercraft Beach Park – Develop a low bank, personal watercraft accessible beach park similar to the one at Marine Park in Fairhaven. This is an excellent example of a successful design for access by kayakers, canoeist, windsurfers and kite boarders. It has a sandy beach, good exposure to open water and adequate parking for public access with watercraft gear. Downtown Bellingham is in desperate need of such a beach park. An excellent location would be at the lagoon (proposed marine) site with a southwest facing beach. This would provide good exposure to the bay, direct sun exposure on the beach and provide beautiful sunsets over the water. A beach park inside the Whatcom Waterway channel would not provide the same aesthetic or functional value. Properly designed, a personal watercraft beach park would represent the interests of the numerous personal watercraft enthusiasts of the area.</p> <p>Hydropower – Great idea, turn the GP industrial fresh water line into a hydropower generating station. This project would provide for a green energy, sustainable design demonstration by mitigating greenhouse gas emissions. It would also help conceptually connect Bellingham Bay with Lake Whatcom and Mount Baker, and if designed properly, provide a dynamic water sculpture for viewing at the turbine’s outfall. Don’t overlook this unique opportunity while we have it.</p> <p>Strategic Plan – I fear the waterfront project has a vision, lots of public comment, a variety of fragmented planning documents, but is still lacking the formulation of a solid strategic plan; a strategic plan that sets forth the core values of our community and uses them to select individual options/alternatives for the waterfront design. Once this plan is finalized, it should undergo periodic review every five years to incorporate advancing technology and evolving community values. Let’s pull it together, we are almost there.</p> <p>As a long term resident of Bellingham, I hope to see our downtown waterfront evolve into a legacy project that we are honored to pass onto our children and grandchildren. I sincerely thank everyone involved for taking on this complex and challenging task, and for doing their</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				best to balance the diverse interests involved.
83	2/28/2006	Marinas are attractive and draw in residents, tourists, and boater alike.	Pat Sterrett	<p>Dear Waterfront Advisory Committee members and Port Commission:</p> <p>I am strongly in support of using part of the GP purchase for a marina. One of the greatest draws for Bellingham for current and future residents, as well as tourists, is its location next to the vast, amazing NW waters. Boating is certainly a big part of this and boaters need moorage. Marinas support a large network of businesses and jobs for the city. The marinas themselves are attractive and a draw for residents, tourists, and boater alike. The need is definitely here for expanded marina space and the GP settling pond already has several of the most expensive, complicated criteria, i.e., the breakwater. The marina is not a special interest decision, but a balanced use which supports population growth, tourism, recreation, business, and aesthetics. It would be such a shame to let this opportunity pass in a city that is so strongly identified with waterfront and as a gateway to Canada, Alaska, and the Pacific. Please use the GP settling pond for a marina!</p>
82	2/28/2006	Restoring habitat is one of the most important goals in the redevelopment process	Kathy Fletcher Executive Director, People for Puget Sound	<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> <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 tide pool 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

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				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. 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. Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to continuing to work with you on these important plans.
81	2/22/2006	Negotiate with railroad	Henry Schwartz	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.
80	2/22/2006	Parks and trails will make this project a success	Larry Simkins	I really like the Green Fingers one the best. I like the better flow of park and trails around this redevelopment. The others are okay BUT this one is the best. It will ultimately be the parks and trails that makes this project a success and buy in for the citizens of Bellingham and visitors - just my thought. Thank you for the opportunity to have input.
79	2/27/2006	I am all for parks but this thing has got to pay for itself; does not approve of 11 th hour proposals	Carol Mills	I am writing regarding the last minute submission of plans for the waterfront. As a resident that lives within a couple of blocks from the GP land I am very interested in what will be done with that property. I am very disappointed that you are giving this last group validity. There was a time line for submission and review of plans. They came in at the eleventh hour and want you to change everything to suit them. The marina has been an integral part of the plans from the beginning and now they want to eliminate that and make a park. I am all for parks but this thing has got to pay for itself and making it all into parks will not do the job and will only cost us more money. There are plenty of parks in the Green fingers plan. The environmental people seem to think they can disrupt every meeting and if they yell loud enough everyone will cower and do what they want. Another example is the Chuckanut Ridge development; our city and county have more important things to do with our money than buy up every piece of land that someone objects to being developed. I appreciate your time in reading this and hope I live long enough to see this project happen. PS: I am not a boat owner waiting on a slip.
78	2/24/2006	Supports the marina – long wait list proves it's needed.	Douglas W. Sterrett	I would like to go on record as being highly in favor of converting the GP settling pond into a marina. The long length of the waiting list and the very long time that boat owners must wait for a slip in Squalicum Harbor is clear evidence of the need. Providing more slips will also support the important local marine industry which provides many jobs in Whatcom County. If the surrounding area is designed with people in mind as has been done at Zuanich Point Park it will also serve as a public place for those who don't own boats. To have this breakwater already in place and ready to be developed as a marina is an opportunity that very few communities are given. Please, let's make into a marina!
77	2/23/2006	The most beloved cities in the world have huge, major	Brian Tanner	As a new resident to Bellingham, I'm watching the Waterfront Development process with great interest and anticipation. I believe it is important that the project have as much park space, walking boulevards, etc. as possible and not so much of the so-called 'multi-use' spaces. Let's not make the mistake of replacing the old cement G-P structures with newer 'multi-use' cement structures. Bellingham should look past the short-term gain of creating a tax-base via this multi-use concept and create a regional gem that showcases the lushness and beauty of the Northwest environment. Look to your North at Victoria's wonderful gardens and the draw that has. What would New York

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
		parks as the draw to their city centers; try spoke and wheel concept		City be like without Central Park? Or Paris, or London with their huge parks? It is not a mistake that the most beloved cities in the world have huge, major parks as the draw to their city centers. An interesting example is Detroit/Windsor area. The Detroit waterfront is 90% 'mixed-use' while the Canadians on the exact other side of the river left the riverfront as a park. Take a field trip to this area sometime to see which side is more vibrant economically, culturally, etc. (it ain't the Detroit-side!) I'm very afraid that it will be all about the money in the end and the developers and tax-men will get their way and squander a wonderful opportunity to redevelop this area as a major park that would draw people and developers to redevelop downtown Bellingham. Another point I'd like to make is please explore a 'spoke and wheel' concept of street design as it would link up from the redevelopment area to downtown Bellingham (think Washington D.C.!) instead of the grid design that is so persuasive in the 4 designs proposed thus far!
76	2/21/2006	Don't forget needs of fishing fleet	Mary Durbrow	I have read the WAG report and recommendations and applaud the focus on increasing public access to the waterfront. What is not clear to me is what improvements in space and infrastructure are being considered for the commercial fishing fleet. How was their input solicited? I don't hear much from them in the process nor are they mentioned in any detail in the recommendations.
75	2/21/2006	Optimize views; oppose the marina	Tim Davenport	The views looking toward the bay from the park(s) of this site should be optimized. I've been unable to find justification for the proposed marina (which would dominate the bay ward viewing) as I review this New Whatcom website. Will you please offer information about what can and cannot be done with the proposed marina space?
74	2/20/2006	Likes fingerling waterways	Larry Johnson	I liked the suggestion I heard for a park area with fingerling waterways. In addition to being a pleasant public place, fingerling waterways could further simulate a natural estuary which is important to juvenile Chinook salmon. If the park above were to be incorporated, I prefer the green seam design. I do notice that the visitor moorage appears to share space with open space and habitat. Are these 3 uses compatible?
73	2/19/2006	Don't let big developers eclipse plans local businesses may be making to participate in business in New Whatcom	Dr. Joseph Garcia, Foothills Economic Development Association	I am a local resident with homes near Bellingham and the Glacier area. Two other local people (my partners) and I have purchased 7.4 acres in the Glacier area in order to build a boutique motel, pub and lodge. This project is an important step in order to finance a waterfront or downtown project envisioned for the future. I am writing you in order to bring up an important issue as you consider developing the waterfront project. It is often realized that local people, with hopes of saving money to buy a home or starting a small business, find that although they save money, by the time enough is saved, find themselves priced out of the market due to inflated prices and outsider developer "big money" that eclipses the dreams of the locals. Understanding this trend, I decided to begin my strategy by acquiring land and establishing a business that in turn could be used as equity to secure financing for a downtown business project. The first business would be the financial stepping-stone to the second business. However, it is our fear that by the time the Port and City begin to develop the waterfront area, big outside developers will come in and eclipse all the local efforts to establish businesses. I would like to see some effort by both the City and Port to attract and make affordable space for local business people to establish businesses which in turn would generated and then re-circulate money within our community. It would be a shame to have the inflated-cost housing trends become the example for business development at the waterfront. I've seen the Public Market and the Saturday Market maintain sensitivity to the needs of small business and entrepreneurs. As a result, many local people who may not otherwise have an opportunity to start and/or operate their businesses, thrive, and generate economic prosperity as well as offer a colorful cultural environment.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				At this stage in your plans, you should carefully consider how you may remember the local people, their dreams and hopes, and the important roll they could play in the future prosperity of Whatcom County.
72	2/16/2006	Doesn't support marina	David Bourlier	I want to express my support for the Bellingham Bay Foundation's proposal for waterfront development. It should be fully considered by the citizens of Bellingham as an alternative to the other plans. I like the greater amount of land used for parks, and do not think the site should be used for a marina. Thank you.
71	2/16/2006	Need to restore economic opportunities lost on waterfront	Eileen Sobjack	I would urge the city council and port officials to focus on choosing one of the four plans and not accept any components of the fifth plan that has been presented by the Bellingham Bay Foundation. It is important to me, as a citizen and longtime user of port facilities, that any plan incorporate common sense and economic responsibility. The fifth plan removes a much needed marina where it is practical and adds extensive parks. It should not even be considered. I would support a plan that gives some public access; however, we already have several great waterfront parks. Most importantly, the city and mayor have a responsibility to restore a small semblance of economic opportunities that were lost at the closing of Georgia Pacific.
70	2/16/2006	Plan ahead for waterfront transportation	Laura Carter	I want to encourage development that allows for a level of economic revenue to pay for amenities like parks and trails. Tax increase to support a portion of the development may be necessary, but not in its entirety. That places too much of a burden on the folks who live here. I also want to encourage good planning for upcoming transportation issues, so we don't wind up with another Guide Meridian or Sunset Avenue. Ignoring a problem does not make it go away. Planning for it will minimize the impact.
69	2/16/2006	Believes that marinas are a blight	James K. Woodle Commander USCG (Retired)	The Bellingham Bay Foundation alternative plan submitted by Mitch Friedman is the only one so far that provides me with a glimmer of hope for the whole project. Mainly, it drops the plan for the marina, as any worthwhile plan should. The marina is an absolute worthless proposal and waste of precious downtown waterfront space. All it takes is a walk around the port's existing marinas and now they propose to offer up another blight to the waterfront, but this time in a more central location. I trust there will be an outpouring of support for the Alternative Plan, or at least it will generate more plans without a marina. The benefit to the people of Bellingham is not in a marina in that location.
68	2/14/2006	Incorporate habitat in plans	E. Vennos	Regarding your choice of plans for the development: Please incorporate as much salmon and near shore habitat restoration into the design plan as possible.
67	2/12/2006	The Port should create long-term impact by reserving more park space on the waterfront	Les Blackwell	I did participate in one of the public meetings on the Design Concepts. I appreciate the effort to provide me with that opportunity to make my wishes known--however, I am a slow thinker and some thoughts came to me after the meeting was over. I noted in the Bellingham Herald that most people chose the fingers design, mostly because it had the largest area of green space. I'm not surprised. I've lived near Central Park in New York City. It is a wonderful and large park enjoy by many everyday. Can you visualize Central Park cut up into ribbons with condos for the rich tucked in between the ribbons of green? That land is priceless but developers for years have wanted to build there. Fortunately, the city fathers have held them off. Closer to home, look at Stanley Park in Vancouver (BC). What a wonderful park--we have enjoyed it on a number of occasions. That park would not be as valuable with condos and apartments within its folds. Size does matter. Indeed, I could give other examples of large parks

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>that were preserved for the people. Little parks are nice but you need space to service the people who will want to enjoy themselves. I do not wish to see condos in this beautiful opportunity that is facing us. I would like to see it all park. I know that the Port says it needs to make money but that is not necessarily correct. They are using my tax dollars and I (and I believe many others) would approve the large park concept. The Port does not need to make money--it needs to provide job opportunities. Make a large park and watch the number of businesses that will abound in the near areas. Downtown Bellingham might even be resurrected.</p> <p>We shape our environment and thereafter it shapes us; I paraphrase Winston Churchill but I believe his thoughts fit this situation. We have something that could be really grand. I think we should shoot for the best--not a compromise.</p>
66	2/2/2006	Several ideas	Rod Burton	<p>I believe the Green Banks draft has the best mix of open space, circulation patterns and pedestrian/vehicle separation. Many Green Fingers supporters seem to be fixated on the percentage of open space, not on how it is arranged. I suggest expanding the open space in Green Banks by: Expanding from the S. kayak launch at Wharf St. with a pocket park and an open space walkway along the S. edge of the shipping pier. This would provide water views, and also provide the views of the working waterfront that were part of WFG. Additionally expand the defined open space to match or exceed the percentage in Green Fingers, and/or adding a 'green seam' from those open space towards downtown. Add improvements to pedestrian access from S. Hill to the mix; the existing connection to S. Bay trail is minimal. Don't forget the Broadway overlook connection to the waterfront. At the meeting I said I liked the pedestrian walkway over the Whatcom Waterway, but now I am concerned it may detract from the open view down the waterway one has from Maritime Heritage Park.</p>
65	2/16/2006	Tourism is not a bad idea for the waterfront	Mark Simpson General Manager, Hampton Inn Bellingham	<p>Dear Commissioners & Port Staff/City Council Members-</p> <p>Regarding the waterfront redevelopment process, it appears tourism is being conveyed (by special interest groups) as a "bad" idea for the waterfront. I am forwarding this email in hopes you will reject that one-sided viewpoint.</p> <p>Tourism is clean, creates jobs, generates tax revenues and is a major economic impact in our local economy.</p> <p>Tourism <u>is</u> and <u>should</u> play a significant role in the redevelopment of the waterfront. I'm not suggesting "Disneyland", however a project(s) that fits our community values and enhances our resident and visitor experience is a valuable component that should be incorporated into the plan. And that plan should be more than a "park" concept! A mix of private and public development is essential to afford clean-up costs and return economic as well as quality of life benefit to our citizens without a huge tax burden.</p> <p>I suggest the Port/Council invite the tourism community to a "work session" to consider how tourism could blend into the proposed design concepts. Inevitably, tourism will play into the downtown/waterfront efforts, thus wouldn't it be proactive to vision and plan for the inevitable? Particularly from a public investment perspective.</p>
64	2/16/2006	Four Design plans need to better address habitat and make it a priority (See	Wendy Steffensen, ReSources North Sound Baykeeper	<p>Dear Members of the Waterfront Advisory Group:</p> <p>Thank you shepherding the vision of the Waterfront Futures Group for Bellingham's redevelopment. It is an important undertaking.</p> <p>As the North Sound Baykeeper, I am an educator and advocate for the marine waters of Whatcom County. My concerns at this stage are focused on ensuring that we preserve, enhance, and restore, where possible, habitat that lies within the redevelopment area. I was intimately involved with the Waterfront Futures Group process and have been following the clean-up process since 2000. My comments reflect my knowledge of Bellingham Bay, and the process for both its redevelopment and cleanup.</p> <p>Restoring habitat in Bellingham Bay is important. Within the last 100 years, the Inner Bay has lost 200 acres of eelgrass and approximately 320 acres of estuary and intertidal habitat. The City's shoreline is fragmented and approximately 40% of the shore is armored.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
		comment # 84 for an addendum to this letter)		<p>In order to start restoring populations of salmon, crab, forage fish, birds and other species to health we must start connecting and restoring habitat where we can. This means that we should ensure nearshore migratory corridors from the north to the south, and that we should provide habitat refuges wherever feasible.</p> <p>The four design plans that the Port has put forward do not adequately address habitat. At this beginning stage of design, it is critical to incorporate habitat considerations, such that they are not precluded.</p> <p>Please note that the draft New Whatcom implementation guidelines, section II, Restore the Health of Land & Water, states the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Enhance or reintroduce natural systems. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A) Continue to work with... to be good stewards of the environment. Identify opportunities for cooperative projects and joint funding for shoreline restoration, habitat enhancement, environmental remediation, and public access improvements. 2. Create and Restore habitat wherever possible. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A) Evaluate sites identified in the WFG "Opportunities and Ideas for Habitat Restoration" ... as shoreline restoration sites... <p>The draft guidelines listed above followed from the WFG's work. These guidelines also make good sense if habitat is a priority. These guidelines cannot be implemented unless habitat is considered prior to design.</p> <p>The bare-bones of what should be considered in the design plans are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) more extensive estuary rehabilitation further up the Whatcom Waterway, to provide additional feeding, rearing and refuge habitat for salmon. 2) the incorporation and restoration of 9 pocket beaches (from NW to SE; I&J, "G" St, "C" St, Roeder St, Central St, GP Log Pond, Cornwall& Pine, North Cornwall Landfill and South Cornwall Landfill), to provide spawning habitat for forage fish, and feeding habitat for other fish, crabs, and aquatic birds. 3) the incorporation of salmon benches along I&J Waterway, Whatcom Waterway, and Pine St, in addition to those already sketched at the proposed marina, to provide feeding and refuge for salmon and crab. 4) A softening of shoreline edges wherever possible and the establishment of native and riparian vegetation along the shoreline to support the food supply for juvenile salmon and nearshore shade for forage fish eggs. <p>Areas near the pocket beaches and estuary are of concern in the draft plans. In these areas roadways and development must be pulled back so that the design of appropriately sized, restored, and functional habitat can be incorporated. (Locations of the pocket beaches can be found in the WFG Environmental Opportunities workshop report)</p> <p>In order to make the redevelopment habitat and fish-friendly, the design should consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5) Roadways in the draft plans should be pulled back from the shoreline so that they do not run close to it, nor over it, as proposed in Green Seam design. Roadways near the shore or over the water will increase toxics loading into the Bay. 6) The proposed boat launch should be located within the proposed marina, rather than in the Waterway or on the C street pocket beach. (Location too close to the "C" St. pocket beach will preclude the function of that area as a pocket beach.) 7) The proposed in-water visitor moorage may interfere with salmon habitat. Prior to deciding upon this option, an analysis of the moorage option and its effects on salmon feeding and migration should be assessed. 8) Parks at the water's should incorporate native vegetation, and overhanging vegetation wherever possible, within the constraints of a

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>park system.</p> <p>9) Sensitive habitat areas should not be considered parks; these should be reserved for habitat. The seal haul out at the GP log pond may be one example where this reservation should apply.</p> <p>10) Habitat area must be maximized and the percentage of actual habitat should also be given to the public to consider. (Open Space in the current designation could mean anything from habitat to lawn to brick plazas; this should be made clearer.)</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work on this important project and for taking habitat concerns into consideration.</p>
63	2/15/2006	Mesh Design elements with habitat protection	Wendy Steffensen, ReSources North Sound Baykeeper	<p>Dear Planning Commission Members:</p> <p>Thank you for taking comment on the strategic guidelines and the four design plans for New Whatcom. I have spoken publicly at the last Planning Commission meeting on the design plans. Attached, as well, are written comments on the design plans delivered to the Waterfront Advisory Group (WAG) on Feb 15, 2005.</p> <p>The following remarks pertain to the Jan 24 06 draft WAG recommendation; section II, of the strategic guidelines.</p> <p>Section II; 1, 2 ,3, 6:</p> <p>These guidelines are worthy, but their implementation may be compromised by the sequencing of events and design steps. These guidelines call for identification of natural areas for protection or enhancement, as well as the implementation of remediation actions at contaminated sites and protection along the shoreline in accordance with the City's updated SMP. The implementation of protection, restoration, or remedial actions may impact and alter design elements along the shoreline. Design elements of parks and streets should not trump the required protection and remedial actions. As well, they should not preclude or encroach upon restoration of more functional habitat. Implementation of the draft guidelines would mean that habitat restoration and protection as well as remediation of contaminated sites would be occur prior to the designation of roads and parks.</p> <p>Section II; 4:</p> <p>This section should be amended to include the other habitat opportunities not included. Please add the following sentence to 4A. Protect and functionally enhance the pocket beaches at "G" street, "C" street, Central Street, Roeder Avenue, the North end of the Cornwall landfill, and the South end of the Cornwall landfill, unless a greater restoration opportunity precludes their enhancement.</p> <p>Section II; 5, 7, 8, 9,10:</p> <p>These sections are strong and protective of the environment. They should be included. The recommendation to include 8B is not an endorsement of the marina per se; it is an endorsement of a clean marina if there is to be a marina. In regard to section II of the strategic guidelines, the guidelines and their implementation strategies are worthwhile. One lingering concern is how do we, the public, know or ensure, the guidelines and their implementation strategies will be used? Thank you for consideration of my thoughts and concerns.</p>
62	2/16/2006	Not happy with the design concepts	Frances Badgett	<p>Dear Mayor Asmundson, City Council members, Planning Commissioners, and members of the WAG:</p> <p>I'm not happy with any of LMN's design concepts. I don't think there's been an adequate dialogue between the Port and the public about what should or should not be on the waterfront. There are too many large roads, there's too much pavement, there isn't enough green space, and a marina may not be the best use for the ASB. At least ONE of the concepts should have reflected something other than a marina in the ASB. A park. A salt marsh. Some way to bring the public to the water, other than forcing people to navigate around the edges of a marina. I feel the concepts lack imagination. Even in Green Fingers, green space feels like an afterthought, not a major component of the</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				design. I don't sense there's been adequate thought put into conservation and habitat restoration. There has been little or no mention of stormwater runoff and environmental remediation. There's been only a cursory discussion about how to navigate salmon around the deep water channels. The build environment is based on blocks, instead of more intuitive and pedestrian-friendly courtyards and angles. I asked one of the designers why they kept the tissue warehouse in every concept, a hulking building with little aesthetic value. He said they didn't want to worry people by tearing down buildings at this early stage. I can understand his concern, but I seriously doubt anyone would crow if the tissue warehouse were a park, or a grouping of smaller buildings around a courtyard. The real answer is that the Port wants dry docking for boats. The Port has driven too much of this process with their "wish list." They directed LMN to put a marina in every concept (despite LMN's advice to the contrary). This process needs to be much more public, much more in keeping with the Waterfront Futures Group principles, and much, much slower.
61	2/16/2006	GP Devpm't should pay for amenities so as to limit tax burden	Laura Carter	<p>I'd like to encourage planning that permits the GP Redevelopment site to pay for amenities like new parks & trails, so that the tax burden is not carried in its entirety by residents. I'd also like to see future transportation issues addressed now, so that we don't wind up with another Guide Meridian or Sunset Avenue. Ignoring a problem does not make it go away - it just makes it more expensive to fix in the future.</p> <p>I love the idea of waterfront that represents and champions all of us - a unique place to relax and escape from our nine-to-five lives, a place that pays for itself with festivals, events, museums, dining, offices, and environmentally friendly industries. We are at a pivotal point in the planning. Let's use some common sense.</p>
60	2/15/2006	New Whatcom Design Comments	Jeff Hegedus, WAG Member	<p>Comment: I support the development of the ASB into a marina, and consider this to be an appropriate water dependent land use, subject to the concern that the marina remain available for use by the general public and local boaters, and sets the standard for environmental management and habitat restoration.</p> <p>Comment: I support the use of the deep water moorage to foster the development and maintenance of the working waterfront.</p> <p>Concern: The New Whatcom grid orientation in Green Fingers blocks Bellingham Bay view and light corridors, and results in a significant disconnection between city and water.</p> <p>Reference: <i>Strategic Guideline III6, Enhance visual opportunities for visual access to waterfront areas, and Preserve, improve and create public views to and from the waterfront. Implementation Strategy III6A, Identify important view corridors and align streets or limit building height to preserve water views from street ends and other key public viewpoints.</i></p> <p>Comment: 1. Connect New Whatcom interior with Bay views and light by aligning the New Whatcom grid directly with the points of the compass. 2. Create an East-West primary road, in the form of a two-way boulevard with landscaped medians and water-end iconic turn-around, in the center of the grid [‘Sunset Boulevard’ as per 2020 Engineering public comment]. 3. Align the Green Fingers open spaces with the new grid to further add to view and light corridors.</p> <p>Concern: The road infrastructure in the Green Fingers design reflects neither public comment regarding traffic intensity and land use compatibility nor the WFG Guiding Principles or Strategic Guidelines.</p> <p>Reference: <i>Strategic Guideline I3, Make the waterfront inviting to people on foot, and Implementation Strategy I3A, Design the living, working and shopping areas with a pedestrian scale, which is not dominated by vehicles.</i></p> <p>Comment: 1. Eliminate the traffic intensive primary road along the waterfront and replace with non-motorized multi-use</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>boardwalk. 2. Integrate secondary roads with the above East-West primary boulevard and the waterfront boardwalk. 3. Integrate the multi-use trail into the open spaces, boulevard, boardwalk and secondary road infrastructure.</p> <p>Concern: In the Green Fingers design, the land use set-aside along West Pine Street disconnects New Whatcom from Bellingham Bay and precludes waterfront usage that should not only be public, but also be iconic in nature.</p> <p>Reference: Strategic Guideline III5, Improve Waterfront Access, Create water-oriented parks and open-spaces, Create and connect large and small parks and open spaces with a braided system of pedestrian trails.</p> <p>Comment: 1. Designate the waterfront adjacent to West Pine Street as a public waterfront open space as proposed in the Pearl Parks design. 2. Create an open space multi-use trail connection between this public waterfront and the log pond and Cornwall Park open spaces.</p> <p>Concern: The amount of land designated as waterfront open space is inadequate and short sighted in light of anticipated long-term growth, public open space requirements, and development goals.</p> <p>Reference: Strategic Guideline I1, Make the waterfront a regular part of the lives of more people.</p> <p>Comment: 1. Designate the entire length of Cornwall as public open space.</p>
59	2/16/2006	Supports a no marina option	David Bourlier	<p>Dear Mayor Mark,</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for the Bellingham Bay Foundation's plan of waterfront development. I like the additional park space and do not think the site should be used for a marina. Please help this to be considered by the people of Bellingham as they decide the future of this unique site.</p>
58	2/15/2006	Comments re: design concepts	Cy Lindberg, WAG member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I worry about kayaks, etc competing with boats from the boat launch. ▪ I like location of Transient Moorage as shown on Whatcom Waterway ▪ I support the current proposed location of Boat Launch by ASB ▪ Supports pedestrian bridge over Whatcom Waterway only if tall or operating for boat navigation There is still private property with docks at the base of the waterway – cannot take away their access. ▪ Re: transit access and routes, supports convenient stops near entrances and parking garages and internal loop with frequent trips ▪ Re: bicycle and pedestrian trails supports separate routes for bikes, pedestrians and cars; wants to make enough space to avoid the Taylor Street complaints. Allow some shared routes. ▪ Re: Setback of Roads from Waterway supports a Shoreline Boulevard, such as in Pearl Parks or Green Fingers; Prefers the large open space at NW end of space in Green Fingers. ▪ I like the idea of orienting the street grid – view lines toward the Bay (west). ▪ Habitat Enhancement Areas should include: Log pond, around ASB, and the Hilton Eelgrass bed ▪ Re: Pedestrian Plaza or Public Square supports areas between Historic Buildings, Plazas on top of buildings ▪ Re: Layout of Parks/Open Space supports Pearls (individual small parks dispersed through site); I don't think the presence of large plots such as Green Fingers need preclude some pocket parks ▪ Re: Amount of Parks/Open Space supports 36 acres (22%) as in Green Fingers ▪ RE: Road Access from East supports Laurel Street flyover

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RE: Road access from North (CBD, Old Town) supports Commercial Street flyover
57	2/15/2006	Design concept alternative thoughts	New Whatcom - Parks, Trails, Cultural and Community Space Planning Committee	The New Whatcom - Parks, Trails, Cultural and Community Space Planning Committee submitted a draft concept which the planning commission received at their meeting on February 9. Please see it posted on New Whatcom website at www.newwhatcom.org .
56	2/16/2006	Design concepts are not enough – lack options	Kevin Cournoyer	<p>I attended the WAG meeting last night, and I am deeply troubled by the direction of the waterfront redevelopment process. It's my perspective that the public has not be given an adequate array of alternative designs for consideration. The people of Bellingham deserve better. The people of Bellingham are being given POB-directed design alternatives and POB-directed guidelines. There's an obvious disregard for public input, the WFG final report, or any competing visions for our waterfront.</p> <p>I saw the Bellingham Bay Foundation's design in the <i>Bellingham Herald</i> yesterday and it filled me with great hope. It's deeply imaginative, thoughtful. It very closely follows the guidance of the WFG final report, which the WAG is required to use as the basis for all of their decision making.</p> <p>The officials in charge of the waterfront redevelopment need to bring more alternative designs into the official process and give them as much consideration as LMN's designs. This process needs to be what it clearly is not---open and fair.</p> <p>By the way, when I asked the architects at LMN why they ignored numerous public comments and the results of the charrette by including a marina in each of the four designs, I was told they were not given a choice. One of the architects described the Port using threatening language. The POB demanded that the marina be in all four designs. This is indicative of the POB's use of outright coercion. This has been a rigged process. And it is lacking in transparency.</p> <p>This process is moving too quickly and the options available to the public are too limited.</p> <p>Ms. Goodwin, I was told by one of the mayor's assistants that you can provide me with a list of all the members of the Inbound Investment Group. Please provide that list of names to me. Also, I would like the minutes from all the meetings of the Inbound Investment Group. I know for a fact you have been asked for this information from others. You have not responded to these requests. The public is waiting.</p>
55	2/15/2006	Focus should be on how the space will be used not just on	Pam Bosch	<p>I attended a public comment session but found that it was not organized in a way that was receptive to the type of input I would like to give. It seems that the focus of the plan is too strongly on the envisioning of physical space and too narrowly on how that space will be used, occupied, and connected to the larger community.</p> <p>A successful and thriving community requires envisioning more than just high dollar real estate potential. There are issues to be considered regarding the health and wholeness for the larger community that are vital to the successful integration of this new use area. The new Waterfront ought to be an opportunity to revitalize the way that Bellingham connects and supports both its inhabitants and visitors. Healthy</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
		physical space planning; offers her recommendations		<p>economy is the consequence of a diverse, interesting, accommodating culture, not just an expensive view. For brevity, I list a few of my own recommendations. I hope there will be dialogue about more than just real estate. Affordable urban housing. Low cost studio space for artists. Input from arts organizations and surveying of that population that is not likely to be franchised but is, nevertheless, vital to the character of successful municipalities. Workspace for condominium and apartment dwellers that allows for such things as sharing of tools. Perhaps some semblance of a “community center”. Collectively owned cars that can be shared by urban residents. Community gardens and areas for CSA drop-off. Public transportation that considers people who need it. (There are many ways to get to the mall, but few ways to get home from work on Orchard street; Bakerview, manufacturing areas,...). Cooperation with the University to explore environmental clean-up options, like...research projects on the use of plants to remove toxins from soil..?</p>
54	2/14/2006	Alternative to the LMN Design Concepts for New Whatcom	James Johnston, Bellingham Bay Foundation director	<p>Dear Planning Commission, We don't think the public has been presented an adequate range of alternatives. We believe the public wants and deserves more parks, more open spaces, and, most of all, more choices about how the area is developed. [Visit our website for a design concept: (http://bbayf.org/) that we've commissioned from a private firm. You asked us about this design at your meeting last Thursday. The Bay Foundation will be inviting the public to attend an open house where we'll give a very detailed briefing on our design ideas on March 1. The location will be the County Council Chambers and the event will begin at 7 PM. We hope you all can make it. We would also be happy to give you a brief presentation at your March 16th meeting. I've also attached a document that lists all of the Waterfront Futures Group recommendations and discussed how our design responds directly to these recommendations. We are hoping all this material can be entered into the public record and considered before you make a decision about what to recommend to the City and Port.</p>
53	2/14/2006	Outline of issues with the four design concepts	Bellingham Bay Foundation (http://bbayf.org/)	<p><u>More parks and more choices!</u> In the open houses, the public seemed most enthused about the Green Fingers Design, in large part we believe simply because it featured the most open space. In fact, this design is the only one that's even a realistic option, considering the astonishingly low open space figures for the other options (between 14-16%). These amounts are well below most municipal standards, and some municipal statutory requirements. The public absolutely wants more parks. <u>Marina</u> The biggest problem with these alternatives is that they don't differ very much. In all four alternatives, the development of almost a third of the site is exactly the same—a marina. What's wrong with a marina? Nothing, if that's what the public wants. But we do not feel like there's been that community discussion and decision. <i>The current public process is the time to have that conversation and make the decision.</i> It is completely unacceptable to represent to the public that they have choices but not give them a choice as to how one third of</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
			Bellingham Bay Foundation (continued)	<p>the site is going to be developed.</p> <p>Some important information that should be put in front of the public about a marina might include:</p> <p>What is the value of a marina as a revenue generating facility for local government (the Port) compared to the value of the land for different types of development and/or contamination remediation? What will be the impact of siting more than 400 new boats (most of them large boats) to the local environment? What will be the impact of siting new boats to the regional environment, for instance, from increased pressure on the fragile resources of the San Juans? What will be the cultural, aesthetic and economic impacts of siting luxury yachts on the waterfront?</p> <p>More importantly, what effect will the marina have on the ability of the public to interact with the waterfront? The best way to connect the community to the water is with strong bike and foot connections to a soft shore. With a marina, there is the obvious impediment of hundreds of boats and support facilities. People will be able to reach the westernmost point of the site—the best opportunity for intimate contact with the water—only by a long traverse around boats.</p> <p>The community has clearly demanded the best possible connections with the water, and deserves choices about how to best accomplish this mandate at the ASB. To repeat: The public needs more choices!</p> <p><u>Marina park</u></p> <p>All of the designs show a green space around the border of the marina. It is very difficult to imagine how the breakwater could be an effective and user-friendly open space. Even if it could be softened with beaches, it would still be a park that is extremely narrow and long in configuration. There are potential access issues.</p> <p><u>Connecting downtowns</u></p> <p>All of the design alternatives show poor connections with downtown. They rely on connection to downtown via Cornwall, but there needs to be more connections, such as Commercial and Champion Streets.</p> <p><u>Tissue warehouse</u></p> <p>All of the alternatives show re-use of the tissue warehouse. Again, the public needs more choices. This is the ugliest building in Bellingham, possibly on the entire west coast. We should not be locked into an alternative that requires us to keep it.</p> <p><u>Marine heritage park</u></p> <p>The absolute best option for connecting Bellingham to the Bay is through a strong connection from downtown to the Whatcom Waterway via an extension of Marine Heritage Park into the bay. None of the design alternatives do a very good job emphasizing this opportunity.</p> <p><u>Foot of Cornwall</u></p> <p>All of the design alternatives show the area from the foot of Cornwall to the shipping terminal as upland development. This misses an excellent opportunity for beach restoration, parks and open spaces. There should be a park from the foot of Cornwall to the shipping terminal along a line of axis drawn north from Pine Street.</p> <p><u>A publicly owned waterfront</u></p> <p>All of the waterfront of this site should be publicly owned and accessible to the public.</p> <p><u>The public process</u></p> <p>We don't feel that there has been a deliberate enough public process. There should be an actual public hearing(s) on these design concepts,</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>not just an open house where people are asked to fill out a form about just these alternatives. It is our understanding that the WAG has not even reviewed these written comments before making recommendations. It's obvious that there could be more done to involve the public.</p> <p><u>Bay Foundation alternative</u></p> <p>The Bay Foundation would like to offer an alternative design concept to help improve the public dialog about this important community effort. The design is shown in an attached document. This design has the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twice as much space devoted to parks and open spaces as any other design alternative released. • Extensive habitat restoration along almost all of the shoreline of the site. • Use of the ASB peninsula as a large Heritage Park. • A cultural center celebrating the areas unique heritage. • A residential neighborhood on the south side of the park. • A mixed use commercial district on the east quadrant of the south side of the side. • A research, institutional, and educational district on the west quadrant of the south side of the park. • A channel to connect salmon habitat from the foot of Cornwall to the old log pond. • A series of waterways bisecting the south side of the park that would bring the water closer to downtown and serve to help people navigate around the site. • A publicly owned waterline, with public right of ways around the waterways. • Extensive bicycle and pedestrian trails. • Parking integrated into buildings. • A large park at the foot of Cornwall and new beaches extending to the shipping terminal. • Maritime Heritage Park extended into the new site, connecting downtown with the Bay. • A unique step down plaza to the water. • Transit center and public multi-use building. • Bioswales to treat stormwater. <p>Extensive moorage opportunities with piers extending into the water.</p>
54	2/13/2006	Avoid piecemeal approach by identifying major uses or these for the New Whatcom Site and	Robyn duPre, WAG member	<p>I offer the following comments to [other members of] the WAG. My primary concerns here are habitat, parks, and bike/ped traffic. I must say that I agree with Ken Raithel that we seem to be missing some important first steps in developing this site design, such as identifying major uses or themes for the site. I think that we can create some nice parks, but without a guiding theme for the site (or set of themes), we'll get piecemeal development, based on whoever can afford to build there rather than on what we as a community envision. Given that it appears that we will not be given the opportunity to have this conversation, I will comment on the alternatives as presented. I will assume for the basis of these comments that the group agreed to use the Green Fingers concept as a basis for comments, and based on that assumption, offer the following comments:</p> <p>11) Park and Open Space: There is not enough park and open space land. This option offers only 22% for parks and open space, and this is much more than the amount offered in the other plans. I do think that the value of parks and open spaces are not just found in amount</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
		othercomments		<p>of land dedicated, but also in its configuration, connections between parks, and how they function as travel and view corridors. I would add the following areas as park and open space land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Foot of Cornwall: the entirety of the foot of Cornwall should be made a park. Placing high-end residential uses on this location, especially at the same grade as the park, may result in the creation of a de-facto private park. As well, having structures at grade will greatly reduce the visual amenity value of any park located on this site. Further, I would not carry the road through the site, but end the road at the park entrance, offering a parking area at roughly the Alder Street right of way. b) Add open space on the south side of Laurel street, with a multi-purpose trail linking this park area to that located adjacent to the light blue street shown to the south and parallel to Laurel (under the word “campus” on the map). c) Whatcom Waterway: Add a strip of park along the north side of the waterway, as shown in the Green Bank concept. <p>12) Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) I much prefer the road and trail grid shown in the Green Seam concept—without a road bridge across the waterway. The reason for this is that Green Seam pulls the roads well away from the water, which has both human and environmental benefits. b) However, in that case, I would make this and all of the trails on the site multi-use, which is the standard for most trails in our Greenway system. Segregating trails by user is a logistical challenge and one that is very difficult to enforce. c) As well, there would be a logical trail connector with the South Bay trail, which is developed for multiple types of use. d) Pine Street offers a logical location for a foot trail, particularly as it is offered in the Pearl Parks concept. <p>13) Habitat: The Waterfront Futures Group and the Bellingham Bay Demonstration Pilot Habitat Action Team have already done some great work identifying opportunities for habitat protection and restoration in the project area. This design shows only in water habitat, which is of concern because shoreline processes link upland and in-water habitats. I would like to see a design that clearly delineates which open space areas on the uplands might be designated as habitat and restored to serve that function rather than human recreational functions. The goal of most of the following suggestions is, from my perspective, not a single species management objective. Rather, it is to enhance and restore natural systems and processes. If salmon come, great, but if there are no salmon, but lots of crab, surf smelt, or other species, it is still a success. I offer the following suggestions, mostly from the above mentioned working groups:</p> <p>Pocket Beaches: Pocket beaches are valuable for surf smelt and sand lance spawning areas, refugia for a variety of species, and an important way for upland species to reach the water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>I & J waterway</u> Forage-fish- surf smelt have been documented here b. <u>G St pocket beach</u> Associated eelgrass bed c. <u>C street pocket beach, Roeder bridge pocket beach, and the Central Ave pocket beach, along with the associated eelgrass beds at the head of the Whatcom Waterway,</u> might constitute a habitat complex, being much more valuable together than separately. We suggest adding shoreline riparian vegetation and restoring this area for marine organisms. d. <u>GP Log Pond beach:</u> The cap that constitutes the log pond remediation appears to be working as viable habitat. Given that harbor seals and a variety of waterfowl use this protected water, the impacts of a large public park right down to the shore should be

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>considered.</p> <p><u>e. Cornwall Ave. beach and the Pine Street right of way:</u> This small beach could be extended and made an important amenity, for people and wildlife. Extending the beach along the Pine Street right of way (toward the shipping terminal) would create a stunning natural shore in an area that would remain stable (according to beach restoration geologist Jim Johannessen). This should be considered a priority restoration site.</p> <p>N. Cornwall Landfill WFG suggested adding forage fish substrate WFG suggested adding shoreline riparian vegetation</p> <p>S. Cornwall Landfill <u>Associated eelgrass bed</u> Suggested in WFG to add Forage fish substrate Suggested in WFG to add shoreline riparian vegetation</p> <p>Salmon benches/ migratory corridors: The WFG and the Pilot suggested the creation of sub-tidal benches to aid migrating salmon. The following locations were suggested: I& J Waterway- North side and head of waterway GP- West side (Hilton harbor) GP ASB: Southeast (Whatcom Waterway) side Port shipping terminal Southwest side (Pine Street area) Cornwall Landfill (S end) to Cornwall Ave</p> <p>Kayak Launches: As a paddler, I appreciate the opportunity to launch my boat downtown. I am concerned, however, about kayak launch sites degrading existing habitat areas. Kayak launch points should not be designated in areas where there is eelgrass or other intertidal vegetation. The following locations should not be designated for launch sites: I& J Waterway (forage fish); Whatcom Waterway (eelgrass present); South end of Cornwall landfill (eelgrass); *The following areas may be appropriate for launches: Cornwall Avenue beach and Zuanich Point Park</p> <p>Other issues of note: Parks and habitat are not the same thing. Lovely green lawns sloping down to the water are inviting to people, but function as a barren and dangerous desert to many wildlife species. If we want to create waterfront parks where people might have the opportunity to interact with wildlife, then we should consider designating restoration areas as separate from parks. To promote habitat opportunities and to increase the infiltration of rainwater it is requested that the majority of open space be pervious and vegetated. Edges near the water should largely consist of a buffered area of native vegetation that overhangs and provides some shading where feasible.</p>
53	2/13/2006	Does not endorse the four alternatives	K. Raithel	<p>Comments and Issues for Feb. 15, 2006 WAG meeting on Design Alternative.</p> <p>Like most everyone I do not endorse any of the four alternatives as they are presented. However, neither do I support a seemingly piecemeal (pick and choose) design elements focused primarily upon modifying street patterns with somewhat arbitrary inclusions of open space. My ideas and issues are as follows:</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>1. Consider, first developing alternative 'Primary Use Themes' with differing degrees of emphasis. Each alternative theme might suggest a slightly different single, "Sense of Place" for the Site.</p> <p>2. Consider one such theme emphasizing the site as a "Gathering Place" for social, cultural, civic, and educational events. This could be a very bold design statement! All other use would be complimentary.</p> <p>3. There could be a central arrival space, or design element that promotes the theme of a place for people to gather, interact, and view outward to the Bay, the Bluffs, and the distant islands. Perhaps there could be several formal or informal viewing platforms?</p> <p>4. Consideration could be given to contouring this artificially constructed, flat, fill site? Changes in grade (even moderate ones) can create interest and perhaps lead to unique design solutions related to buffering the railroad corridor and vehicle parking, etc.</p> <p>5. The designs should give purpose to proposed open spaces. The spaces should be considered more than token elements within a pre-designed street grid system.</p> <p>6. The harbor shoreline should be protected and environmentally enhanced. But open space at this edge should be strongly connected to activity centers throughout the site. Buildings that are to be saved for adaptive use could be buffered by green space to soften their impact and frame their significance.</p> <p>In general, I believe the design of road systems should not be the first consideration. Any road system should be determined much later in the process.</p>
52	2/13/2006	Questions Strategic Guidelines and limits inherent in current design concepts	George Dyson	<p>I hope to be able to attend your Feb. 15 meeting but if not, or in addition, offer a comment for the record here. These are my personal opinions, and I am not speaking on behalf of the Bellingham Bay Foundation, who will have a representative at the hearing to voice our collective (if eclectic) views.</p> <p>An old chart sitting at my workshop down on Holly Street, shows Bellingham Bay as surveyed exactly 150 years ago in 1856. There are a couple cabins at the mouth of Squalicum Creek, and a half dozen cabins at the mouth of Whatcom Creek. It's a blank slate. And, 150 years from now, hopefully there will be people living here to look back in wonder at the blank slate we had before us in 2006.</p> <p>The current design alternatives were all set in motion long before the "strategic guidelines" that are supposed to govern those design alternatives were even offered for public view. Those guidelines, completely revised at the last minute, have still not been formally approved. The decision to incorporate the WFG principles, established over a full two years of genuine public process, as the backbone of the strategic guidelines was a brilliant step in the right direction. But the design alternatives before you now were all well under way before you and the planning commission, in response to public comment insisted on this.</p> <p>LMN has done an excellent job within the given constraints. But there has been inadequate and incomplete consideration of what those constraints should be. The guidance LMN was apparently given--reflected in the original C-W "strategic guidelines"--was soundly rejected by the public, by the Planning Commission, by the WAG, and even by the Port Commission, yet you are now being asked to choose among four "alternatives" that offer only minor variations on this. What's wrong with this picture??</p> <p>The choices before us are much larger than whether we prefer "Green Seams" or "Green Fingers" and will define the character and well-being of Bellingham for the next 150 years. I urge you to insist on an approach to planning our central waterfront that is more in keeping with this.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
51	2/13/2006	Sunset Boulevard Proposal as drawn	Mark Buehrer 20/20 Engineering	<p>Hello Derek [Long], I want to share with you a concept site plan for the GP area that I prepared as a rough sketch (see also email copied below). One of the main ideas behind this layout is an open core area that provides a big wide-open space that has a commanding view out to the bay (i.e., the "Sunset Boulevard", about a city block wide). The resulting "westerly" orientation of this corridor leads to a street grid layout that allows for south-north building layouts for optimum solar positions.</p> <p>Regarding "green" building recommendations: Redevelopment to utilize “Green Building” practices, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use ‘Neighborhood Development Guidelines’ per LEED-ND (U.S. Green Building Council – http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CMSPageID=148) ▪ “Turn on” the GP waterline (raw water from Lake Whatcom) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Install water turbine for power generation ○ Create water features: fountains and cascading falls flowing westerly down the center of Sunset Boulevard ○ Co-Generation: Central heating of new buildings with the ‘waste’ heat from the power plant (shared ‘free’ heat that used to go to GP’s pulp operations) ▪ Construct a pedestrian bridge across Whatcom Creek waterway ▪ Build recreation boat docks along the waterfront edge, south side of Whatcom Creek waterway ▪ Construct a walkway/bike trail along length of redevelopment bulkhead/shoreline (excluding the Port’s commercial dock area) ▪ Fill and utilize old log lagoon area [known as the log pond] ▪ Create a ‘Grand’ roundabout and view-point park at west end of Sunset Boulevard <p>I'd be interested to hear your comments about this concept site plan and how we could work together to help re-develop this part of Bellingham's waterfront area to be a world-class example of 21st century sustainable urban development... To greener grounds...</p>
50	2/10/2006	Why chop up waterfront area into small blocks?	Larry Johnson	<p>I've viewed the 4 proposed plans online and saw the meetings on channel 10. My question about all of these plans is why do they all chop the area up into small blocks with secondary streets? Consider narrower pedestrian lanes instead. The site is small enough that a main circulation avenue could get someone within 1/2 a block of their destination. Some of the pedestrian lanes could be built wide enough for access of service vehicles, emergency vehicles and mass transit. Some handicap parking might also be allowed in certain places on these pedestrian lanes. However, most traffic would be restricted to the main avenue. This makes even more sense if parking structures are used on or near the site. The smaller lanes allow for larger building footprints and more building flexibility as well as creating a better traffic flow.</p>
49	2/9/2006	Orient Green Fingers to the bay	Rod Burton	<p>The Green Fingers should be view corridors to the bay from downtown. The view should be toward the south or possibly toward Lummi Island, not across the Whatcom Waterway to the new marina. Perhaps they could run on the diagonal, as the street plan does on Green Banks. Having these wide green corridors could alleviate some of the concern about building heights blocking the view.</p>
48	2/8/2006	Allow future public	Annie Naismith	<p>My comment is on the public involvement process. The three meetings held late Jan. and early Feb. were informative and the level of attendance and participation show that the public is very interested. However, the presenters stated in all those meetings that the four</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
		comment re: density and building height options and other process comments		design concepts were the foundation upon which other design layers would be added. To keep up the good work, I think the public should be informed and be able to provide comments on the additional layers, starting with the density and building height options that are due to be presented to the City and Port on March 7th. It is not sufficient to have public comment periods at the few hearings scheduled for the City Planning Commission and City Council. The public should have the opportunity to review information packets submitted to the City Council/Port Commission and the City Planning Commission early on, to allow time to look them over. Hardcopies could be made available at the City for pickup when the packets are available to each Commission. The internet is also a great informational tool, as are the newspapers. Comments should be taken at work sessions and some additional public information sessions could be scheduled. Please include these comments as my submittal for the four design concepts. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
47	2/8/2006	Avoid pressure from folks and ensure development will pay for itself	Kris Ungern	After reviewing the 4 design concepts, I have the following suggestions: 1) Keep no more than 20% of the site as park/ open space. We need a balance of other uses that will pay property and/or B&O taxes to make the project viable. 2) A waterfront boulevard and walkway, pedestrian bridge over the Whatcom Waterway, and connectors to other parks are desirable. 3) Street orientation should be consistent with the surrounding grid. Too much of Bellingham has angled streets, which makes for poor traffic flow. 4) Adequate visitor parking should be provided. This is not obvious on the 4 drawings. Reconditioning old GP buildings could be of historic and/or aesthetic significance but is likely to result in cost overruns. 5) I attended the 1/31/06 public meeting. Thank you for encouraging public input. Be aware that some special interest groups will not be interested in residential or economic development of the site. We need to avoid some of these pressures and ensure that the development will eventually pay for itself and will not be a financial drain.
46	2/7/2006	Preserve concentration of wildlife at Cornwall landfill; proposes options	Rob Rybczyk	I've reviewed the four plans. Good work thus far! I'd like to comment on the site south of Cornwall (the old landfill site). I spend a lot of time rowing immediately offshore of that area. The area is particularly rich with wildlife including; harbor seals, black turnstones, harlequin ducks, long tailed ducks, cormorants, several species of grebes, Bonaparte gulls, scoters, black oystercatchers and eagles. These birds are particularly attracted to the structures that are just offshore, including the booms that surround the landfill site and several semi-permanent pieces of large woody debris. If possible, the character of this site should be preserved. Between Marine Park and Squalicum Creek, this Cornwall site has the highest concentration of such wildlife in the bay. The offshore structures should be retained. Also, I think that is probably a bad idea to develop an over water connector to Boulevard Park. I'm sure that the connector would be popular, but there is already a wonderful on-shore trail that parallels the proposed boardwalk. The over water connector would also displace and disturb the wildlife in the vicinity.
45	2/7/2006	Keep G-P property in public ownership	Janet Harris	Please make the ownership by the public of the Georgia Pacific site a top priority.
44	2/7/2006	More parks; no marina; put public ownership	Jack Weiss	Under any set of circumstances, your Green Fingers plan would be considered the worst and least acceptable option. How frustrating and disappointing to see it as the best of your offerings. Please listen to the will and wishes of our community. Not 22% green. Try doubling that just to start. Be bold, be creative, be responsible to community input. Nobody, but the Port staff, wants another marina; it is a waste of resources to build an aquatic parking lot.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
		issue to the people		Finally, do not sell off any part of this property. The community, through its public Port of Bellingham and taxes it pays to the Port, owns it. If you want to sell it off, put the issue before the voters. Maybe you will see how what a mistake this could be. Please do not go down this road.
43	2/6/2006	Several concerns	Y. Jarvela	I've heard a rumor that you plan to build skyscrapers is that true or false? Also is Maritime Heritage Park going to be destroyed or hurt in any way? Because they've done a lot of beautiful work and a lot of people enjoy the beauty of the park now that all the works have been done. The only other problem I'll see happening if it isn't addressed is the homeless and their destruction of our parks with their camps and alcohol and drug problems. How do we intend on dealing with that so the newly formed neighborhood isn't taken over by those folks since they don't seem to care what damage they do or people they hurt doing it.?
42	2/7/2006	Why is a marina in all of the site plans?	Lanny Little	Why is the marina included in all the site plans? Is it assumed by the Port that everyone is going to want a marina for 50 to 60 ft boats when maybe only 1 or 2 % of us will be able to take advantage of it? We would like to see a plan for that area that would have other uses or maybe restore it to tidelands so that we can see what the bay was like before the influx of industry. We like Green fingers because it has the most green space.
41	2/6/2006	Design Concept basemap	Annitra Accetturo	Is it possible to get a pdf of the basemap that was used for the design concepts presented at the public meetings for the New Whatcom Master Plan? I see on the website the 4 presented design concepts are available in pdf format, but not the basemap itself- this was printed with the other handout to 'create your own design concept', of which we'd like to do electronically if possible.
40	2/7/2006	Praise for the coordination in this project; Likes Green Fingers	Jennifer and Aidan Woods.	<p>First, I want to thank the Port, Planners and City Officials for the many hours of extra work that has gone into this development. To get a project this big moving forward, and then keeping it in motion, plus addressing all the private and public concerns does take dedication and lots of support/understanding from family and friends.</p> <p>My family and I are very grateful and supportive of this project and all of you. Your hard work will strengthen our community, not only with the completion of the development, but by the openness in which the public has been invited to participate. Well done.</p> <p>My family supports the Green Fingers plan because it offers the most park space to the public. I realize this project does have to pay for itself at some point, and taking land away from commercial development for public use is a financial concern. I can add my two cents to the emotional side of the Green Fingers plan, and say with certainty that my children and children's children, and beyond will enjoy the additional open space a thousand times more that any building that may take its place.</p> <p>To help address the financial concerns my family is willing to commit \$200.00 a year to Port expenses, for the next twenty years. My belief is that there are many people in our community who are willing to support the additional open space of the Green Fingers Plan, with a commitment of money.</p>
39	2/7/2006	Showcase the best of arts and crafts from Whatcom County – include fiber	Judith Blount, Whatcom Weavers Guild	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Whatcom Weavers Guild Executive Board. Our guild is comprised of the finest fiber artists and craftspersons in the Pacific Northwest, with membership approaching 100 women and men. Our annual Fibers and Beyond sale draws shoppers from around the state.</p> <p>We are presently expanding our vision to present fiber art education to schools and health facilities. Our future goal is to obtain a permanent location where we can establish a studio to offer demonstrations, workshops, and educational seminars to the community.</p> <p>We are rapidly outgrowing the local church social hall that we presently meet in.</p> <p>In conjunction with the 1/24/06 DRAFT Waterfront Advisory Group Recommendation, Section I.1.A, we are interested in being a part of</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
		arts		<p>the vision for the New Whatcom redevelopment site. The Whatcom Weavers Guild would enhance the "educational and cultural" concept presented in that recommended strategy.</p> <p>Our driving question is, will there be studio sites allocated within the new development to showcase the very best of the arts and crafts that Whatcom County has to offer? If so, we would like fiber arts to be considered as a part of the future vision.</p> <p>We are willing to submit a formal proposal to show how our Guild would benefit the Waterfront Redevelopment Project. If there is a more appropriate person or office to direct questions, please advise me.</p>
38	2/6/2006	Greenways, Chuckanut Ridge and New Whatcom planning – how they could work together	Cathy Cameron	<p>Dear Bellingham Port, City Council and City Planning Commission members:</p> <p>This letter is regards to the Greenways proposals and the Bellingham waterfront (“New Whatcom”).</p> <p>For a variety of reasons, the north end of Bellingham has been developed without corresponding infrastructure as tangibly seen in parks and trails. Greenways proposals are trying to rectify this problem by designating Greenways funding to unknown locations on the north end. While at the same time citizens are earnest about purchasing a specific site, the Chuckanut Ridge. Citizens have wanted to purchase the Chuckanut Ridge area since the first Greenways level was worked on.</p> <p>Now we have the new Waterfront area in which housing will play a significant role. In order to provide housing in “New Whatcom” and to preserve the Chuckanut Ridge area could the Port and City negotiate an agreement with the Chuckanut Ridge developer to build in New Whatcom rather than Chuckanut Ridge. The Port and City are working with Western Washington University to develop a quality educational component to the “New Whatcom” area. Why not work with the developer of the proposed Chuckanut Ridge site to develop quality housing in the “New Whatcom” area instead of the Chuckanut Ridge. Possibly the developer would be very interested in obtaining rights for the first selection of land for housing in “New Whatcom”.</p> <p>Possibly this solution, combined with a Greenways levy and impact fees, would allow quality housing in “New Whatcom”, preservation of Chuckanut Ridge, and funding for additional land acquisitions to the north.</p>
37	2/2/2006	Strongly supports ASB conversion to a marina; many other thoughts and ideas	Wayne Ogren	<p>My office window overlooks the waterfront scene; I observe substantial boat traffic and marine related activities. Barges/tugs/fishing boats, recreational boats, these are the lifeblood of the waterfront. Their owners/operators bring large economic investment and benefit to the waterfront. Boatyards/marinas providing services and living wage jobs are necessary at the waterfront, and are necessarily located at the waterfront. Small boat facilities say 100ft and less, are in short supply and should be given preference where the waterfront meets the city. The railroad is and will be where it is, this is an industrial area, waterfront area, and should preserve and enhance the opportunities for industry and jobs in the area. Driving out living wage opportunities like those of Georgia Pacific seems a luxury that is not affordable.</p> <p>Whatcom county is a nice place to live, but it is a hard place to make a living.</p> <p>Parks and kayak launches don’t provide much opportunity for prosperity to increase the number of living wage jobs that can grow at the waterfront. The already prosperous can feel good about preserving/protecting the environment with the parks and open spaces. But that is hurtful to those most in need of prosperity.</p> <p>Your boat launch is on the North side of the channel, the south side is more sheltered when the wind off the bay is strong. That location would offer more opportunity for marine related boat services to expand, perhaps giving the weekender crowd and the larger boats / cruisers more space to maneuver and avoid interference. More parking space for boat trailers as well. The few kayaks I observe, mainly nice summer weather, are served by 3 sites, perhaps those will be cheap to provide, but then their economic payback is nearly nil as well.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – February 2006 to March 2006
				<p>Providing similar number of sites for sailors and power boaters would provide a much higher benefit, and what is to prevent kayakers from using those same sites?</p> <p>I keep my boat at Hilton Harbor, which appears doomed in all your plans. What are your plans to facilitate an alternative to wet moorage? Will there be a dry-stack or other boatyard for dry storage/launching provided? Hilton Harbor is unique for the low maintenance (dry storage) low pollution potential (boat can't sink or pump the bilge overboard) low cost (minimal infrastructure cost). I strongly support converting the lagoon to a marina. While I understand larger boats will be accommodated, small craft moorage from 24 feet to say 44 feet is also difficult to obtain. Please consider providing as many slips as possible for this size range.</p> <p>The two channels offer unique opportunities for boatyards/lifts/marine services. Making the channel edges into park frontage would seem a waste; who cares to walk/look at a dock front across the channel - boring recreation.</p> <p>Green Seam seems best to my perspective, offers a 'greenway' to the water with sufficient width to feel park-like.</p>
36	2/2/2006	Supports Green Banks	Rod Burton	<p>I believe the Green Banks draft has the best mix of open space, circulation patterns and pedestrian/vehicle separation. Many Green Fingers supporters seem to be fixated on the percentage of open space, not on how it is arranged. I suggest expanding the open space in Green Banks by:</p> <p>Expanding from the S. kayak launch at Wharf St. with a pocket park and an open space walkway along the S. edge of the shipping pier. This would provide water views, and also provide the views of the working waterfront that were part of WFG.</p> <p>Additionally expand the defined open space to match or exceed the percentage in Green Fingers, and/or adding a 'green seam' from those open space towards downtown.</p> <p>Add improvements to pedestrian access from S. Hill to the mix, the existing connection to S. Bay trail is minimal.</p> <p>Don't forget the Broadway overlook connection to the waterfront.</p> <p>At the meeting I said I liked the pedestrian walkway over the Whatcom Waterway, but now I am concerned it may detract from the open view down the waterway one has from Maritime Heritage Park.</p>
35	2/1/2006	Supports Green Fingers	Tim Nagle	<p>I'd like to comment on the Green Fingers Concept for the Project. It appears to me to have the most aesthetically pleasing flow to it than the other plans. Giving the Project a real sense of contour and place. The green space just behind the Marina also helps to give that area emphasis and tie it into the southern section. Are the bike paths intended to be restricted to the roadways? If so are there designated lanes for bikes?</p>