

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – June and July 2006
<i>Last Update 6/21/2006</i>				<i>Citizen comments received from citizens submitting comment to the Port and City and through the New Whatcom website for the month of June. Prior month comments can be viewed on the website in separate monthly documents.</i>
246	7/3/2006	Make the move to attract NOAA to Bellingham	Patricia Daniels, Bellingham	Today the pier burned down in Seattle which houses the NOAA fleet. I think it would be wonderful if Bellingham could get NOAA's business. NOAA ships are scientific ships and manned by professionals. We have plenty to offer including less traffic. NOAA has a website and I did find you on a website too so if you are the wrong person for this just pass it on to anyone who might be interested.
245	6/19/2006	Asks for remedial plans and cost basis	Kevin Cournoyer	Hi Mr. Stoner, Your last e-mail compels me to repeat and further clarify my requests. I'm interested in all the summary documents, remedial plans , and supporting technical documents for every site within the NWSDA. Please make sure I'm provided with a detailed breakdown of costs for each remedial plan. And please make note: I need to see the \$34 million remedial plan for the ASB that you described to the City Council last month. Please include a detailed breakdown of costs for this plan, as well as supporting technical documents .
244	6/19/2006	Do not dismiss the need for an initiative	Darrel Weiss	Dear Council Members – I apologize for inundating you with messages, but as is clear from the June 6 Bellingham Herald article repudiating the bay initiative, the Port Commissioner, Port Environmental Director, AND Mayor appear to dismiss the need for such an initiative. An initiative that, in my opinion, speaks to the best interests of the citizens of Bellingham when no one else of influence appears to be in support of a thorough cleanup. At least I have not heard any of my representatives speaking out with that perspective. I know that you all read the paper, but in case you missed it or just to refresh your memories, I am quoting from the June 6 article: "Asmundson also said the bay foundation was spreading false information suggesting that the port wanted a less stringent environmental cleanup of the old mill site that would leave the property unusable for homes, parks and so forth." Either the Mayor has intentionally misled the public with this statement or he was/is not intimate with Port proposals and agreements. A significant disservice is being done when our Mayor comes out so strongly in alliance with Port interests. Mayor Amundson goes on to say, "...Of course it's going to be cleaned up to a mixed-use standard. It's been that way from the very beginning." How can we be assured it will be cleaned up to a "mixed use standard" when the Port actually has not stated that the entire area would be cleaned up to anything higher than industrial standards? Under their proposal some areas will be cleaned up to "mixed use standard," but certainly not all areas. (I also wonder what "mixed use standard" actually

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – June and July 2006
				<p>means in this context.)</p> <p>Further, the Port Environmental Director, Mike Stoner said, in the same article "...the process of developing a Whatcom Waterway cleanup strategy will include lots of opportunities for public involvement, even without an initiative process." Yeah, right, as if the Port would depart from their plan, even if they could. Again, this is a misleading statement from a high level official at the Port who is attempting to reassure the public that additional checks and balances of the cleanup process are not necessary.</p> <p>WHEN IN FACT, THE PORT HAS ENTERED INTO AGREEMENT WITH THE SELLER OF THE PROPERTY THAT LOCKS THEM INTO A REMEDIATION PLAN THAT IS NOT NECESSARILY THOROUGH NOR COMPREHENSIVE.</p> <p><u>What harm would the initiative process cause if stringent environmental cleanup plans are already in place?</u></p> <p>If any of you are, indeed, in favor of going beyond the Port's agreement with Georgia-Pacific, time is of the essence because the initiative process (deadline 6/30) appears our best (if not only assurance) that we will get what we deserve.</p> <p>I hope you will consider speaking out on this issue.</p>
243		Asks about abandoning development plans entirely, if cleanup gets too expensive	Darrel Weiss	<p>The Bellingham Herald Urges support for bay initiative</p> <p>Dear Council Members –</p> <p>You have probably all seen this recent letter to the editor. I think the writer makes an excellent point. Unfortunately, the Bay Initiative IS necessary. It appears to be the only tool the public has to have any significant influence on the cleanup process. I hate to think about the health of our bay if it fails and the Port proceeds along their current path. Even agencies like Ecology will not require cleanup beyond minimal "industrial" standards if the Port does not ask for it. And they have not asked, will not ask, cannot ask (under the terms of their purchase agreement) for cleanup to standards we truly deserve. Thank you for helping us move far beyond the Port's current cleanup plan. (Is it too early to start thinking about abandoning development plans entirely, if cleanup gets too expensive?)</p>
242	6/9/2006	Do cleanup up to unrestricted cleanup standards	Darrel Weiss	<p>Dear City Council Members:</p> <p>We the people of Bellingham believe the Whatcom Waterway and all of the waterfront development area should be cleaned up properly, to <u>unrestricted cleanup standards</u>.</p> <p>Much as the Port has led us to believe in all of their public proposals, the entire development area should be cleaned up to the level that can be used safely by people -- not just industry.</p> <p>It is going to be an enormous challenge and the costs may very well exceed all current estimates. Permits should be denied and development should not move forward until cleanup issues are fully resolved.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – June and July 2006</p>
				<p>Time is of the essence because the Port is moving ahead at full speed with their plans, and it is becoming clear that their plans do not include the comprehensive cleanup that we deserve and should demand. I appeal to you, honorable council members, to represent the best interests of the citizens of Bellingham, present and future. Please help to assure that the cleanup is done right</p>
241	6/5/2006	Retain public property	Darrel Weiss	<p>Dear Council Members –</p> <p>An interesting perspective that came out of the Bellingham Bay Foundation’s proposal was that other cities that have retained ownership of their waterfront properties are at a distinct advantage when it comes to long term land use. Ownership could reap significant long term economic benefits.</p> <p>Are we looking at the possibility of retaining ownership of the land the Port is developing?</p>