


#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2007
<i>Last Update</i> 2/28/2007				<i>Citizen comments received from citizens submitting comment to the Port and City and through the New Whatcom website through March 2007. Prior month comments can be viewed on the website in separate monthly documents.</i>
279	3/26/07	Waterfront acquisition	"Anne-Marie at Bramble Berry" <bramblece o@qwest .net>	Hi All - I'm not sure if you had a chance to see this article about Bellevue buying back its waterfront to try and create an "expanded waterfront park and a pedestrian connection to downtown shops and skyscrapers." It looks like they are trying to correct mistakes made in the past. I'm very glad that we have a chance to start fresh in Bellingham and not have to worry about trying to buy back land from multiple developers! =) Link: http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/cgi-bin/PrintStory.pl?document_id=2003633811&zsection_id=2002111777&slug=meydenbauer24e&date=20070324
278	3/26/07	EIS process	"Frances Badgett" Bellingham Bay Foundation <frances@ bbayf.org>	Dear WAG members, Thank you for your hard work on the waterfront redevelopment process, and particularly the upcoming EIS process. I do encourage you to use the Project for Public Spaces as a resource. They are adept at helping communities identify and create meaningful destinations. They also find great comparisons among many global waterfront redevelopments, so that we have a lot of models and ideas to consider. Thank you for your time
277	3/22/07	Whatcom Creek estuary	"Robyn DuPre" <robynd@re -sources. org>	Response to #274, Whatcom Creek estuary I share this vision. I am also quite concerned over the issue of leakage. I have forwarded this along to Wendy Steffensen so that she can further investigate the leak issue. Thanks for your concern about this.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2007
276	3/22/07	Whatcom Creek estuary	"John Blethen" <jhblethen@hotmail.com>	<p>Response to #274, Whatcom Creek estuary</p> <p>Thanks, George. The sewer line as located has always been a mistake. While it may have been expedient in its time, it is time to fix this problem. It is ugly and it limits the use of Whatcom Creek. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on Whatcom Creek enhancements and plan to spend much more to create an environmentally friendly, people friendly waterway and fixing this problem should be viewed as another piece of that process as expensive as it may be.</p>
275	3/22/07	Whatcom Creek estuary	"John D'Onofrio" <jdonofrio@nwcomputer.us>	<p>Response to #274, Whatcom Creek estuary</p> <p>As another downtown business owner (Northwest Computer), I certainly agree. How can we move forward with any semblance of "vision" if we don't see the obvious?</p>
274	3/21/07	Whatcom Creek estuary	"George Dyson" <gdyson@gmail.com>	<p>Advisors--</p> <p>Attached is a photo (taken within the past year) of the sewer line across Whatcom Creek estuary between the Roeder and BNSF bridges. This non-compliant structure (supported on decaying wooden pilings) presents a serious impediment to the rehabilitation of the central waterfront and restoration of historic small-craft navigability to Whatcom Creek. If anyone is interested in looking at the problem up close I'd be happy to lead a personal tour.</p> <p>Before we launch too far into grand waterfront visions for the next 30 years, we should ask: is this how we want to greet our new visitors--both the transient mariners we are planning to host in the Whatcom Waterway, and the wildlife that habitat restoration is aimed at returning to the creek?</p> <p>At tonight's WAG meeting, you heard Malcolm Fleming affirm the reality: this is NOT on the agenda at this time. You guys are the Waterfront Advisory Group. You should strongly ADVISE both Port and City to get their people together and put this on the agenda, ASAP.</p> <p>We are fixing to set building heights, build bridges, clean waterways, re-open lagoons, soften shorelines, remove pilings, de- authorize federal navigation channels, and even, believe it or not, shift BNSF a bit. In this grand scheme of things (and a new iteration of the ill-fated interlocal) moving a 48-inch sewer line (that blocks maritime access to Maritime Heritage Park) is not that big a deal.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2007</p>
				<p>Continued' I'm a downtown business owner within the LIFT district. I believe it is time to LIFT the sewer line, and I bet others would agree.</p> <p>photo referenced by comment #274</p> 
273	3/21/07	Laurel Bridge	"Frank Schmitt" <frank@frankschmitt.org>	<p>I see in the 2016 master plan, Cornwall avenue is diverted to the northwest where it joins Laurel street. I understand this was to allow the grade of the bridge crossing the BNSF tracks to not be too steep. An alternative that I don't think has been discussed would be to elevate Cornwall avenue between Maple and Laurel streets, with Laurel ramping downward northwest of Cornwall and Cornwall ramping downward southwest of Laurel. Although this will doubtless be more costly and complicated than a ground-level intersection, it has a number of advantages, such as reduced or zero slopes on the bridges over the BNSF railway lines (reducing vehicle noise near the residences on the bluff), and the lack of an unsightly diversion of Cornwall avenue around Laurel street.</p> <p>But the big advantages come from the impact on parking, particularly considering the environmental cleanup constraints on underground structures in the area: Future development on the adjacent land can have the benefit of underground parking (with pedestrian-oriented activity at street level) while avoiding the expense and environmental difficulties of excavation and shoring</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – March 2007
				<p>Continued' (assuming that were even possible). Furthermore, the area under the elevated section of right-of-way could serve as a city-owned parking structure, both now and in the future, effectively increasing the amount of land on the site available for development.</p>
272	3/16/07	Public access/ Environmental Cleanup	Scott Wild Wild Card Adventures <swild7@juno.com>	I would hope the City will throw its considerable weight behind keeping waterfront development wide open to the public and with the highest levels of environmental cleanup now and protections for the future as our primary concerns. Please!
271	3/7/07	Aquarium	"Garey Vodopich" <Gvodopich@aol.com>	<p>I do not believe there is an aquarium or public pool that is not subsidized by the taxpayers in the nation.</p> <p>The Port is just coming off the airline debacle, why seek another crash?</p> <p>My vote "NO AQUARIUM" now or ever!</p>