

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

11/1/08	Waterfront	Dr. James Loucky	<p>I appreciated greatly the opportunity to learn more of the waterfront proposals, during the Oct 29 forum.</p> <p>Hybrid plan: I strongly recommend a hybrid (akin to the proposal brought forward, and mentioned in the Cascadia Weekly), which incorporates the best aspects of both COB and POB plans. A hybrid would continue to provide multiple points of access and link to downtown. It provides new vision (vista), literally aiming out from the natural curvature of the (old) shoreline. It also brings together everyone, symbolically and literally affirming that the future is built on common ground. And a hybrid is do-able. In building on the best of both, it can also rely on the SIAs already completed.</p> <p>Timing: The RR should be moved early, rather than late. This will probably prove to be cheaper, but this also signals that this significant development is fully underway. The question has been raised about "how long the university can wait." Actually, the needs of the university are not so immediate that they cannot be integrated into the development where and when best for Bellingham as well as Western. Keeping some historic buildings helps continue the link between downtown and the Western presence, without a visible gap.</p> <p>Buildings: Some buildings are historic, others less so (this is, of course, in the eye of the beholder). In fact, some have been and may continue to be eyesores rather than resources. The ceramic tanks have artistic interest, the boiler and granary and both historic and usable. But not everything. In any case, the hybrid plan allows for any of these to be retained.</p> <p>Safety: Finally, the public deserves greater assurance of full attention to seismic risk. Early concerns seem to have been swept out to sea, so to speak. When Mexico City rocked in September 1985, 25,000 people perished (and hundreds of buildings fell). It was built on a lakebed, and those lessons must not be minimized as we go ahead. One implication is that it is probably more prudent that building heights be lower rather than higher.</p> <p>I look forward to further opportunities to contribute to this urban transformation.</p>
11/3/08	Waterfront	Janet Harris	<p>I applaud your efforts to assure that the waterfront is developed in such a way that maximizes its use and pleasure for the citizens of Bellingham, instead of for the developers and the port. We elected you because we trusted your good judgment in this regard.</p>
11/3/08	Waterfront	Janet Harris	<p>The people of Bellingham elected Mr. Pike because they trusted his judgement to protect the interests of all its citizens-not just the developers or the port. The waterfront belongs to all of us. The preservation of public lands and waterfront views, as well as historic buildings, should be the number one priority in developing the waterfront. Please record my opinion appropriately, and let me know that you have done so.</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

11/6/08	Responses to Waterfront Connections Handout	Maureen McCarthy	<p>Hello, Thank you for hosting the Waterfront Connections discussion last week. In addition to the comments I shared at the meeting, I wanted to provide my responses to some of the questions on the form you provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questions to be answered about concepts such as "sustainable development" or "triple bottom line"? <p>What impact will street grids have on passive heating and cooling, and overall energy consumption on the site? I imagine it's not as simple as their being a "right way" and a "wrong way" to orient streets for energy efficiency, but I'd feel much more comfortable supporting a plan that was endorsed by an expert in this regard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anything you like in particular about the transportation elements of either plan? <p>Either plan could support facilities needed to make transit, walking and biking truly viable for transportation on the site. Once a plan is chosen, we'll need to get strategic, and codify a minimum standard of facilities for all streets. The LEED-ND standards for walkability and transit friendliness, or criteria in "Complete the Streets," would be valuable here. Regardless of the street orientation we choose, I am in favor of SMALLER BLOCKS and a CONSERVATIVE APPROACH to PARKING. The block sizes currently shown in the Port's plan are too big to be considered walkable. The world's most wonderful urban places are hard to drive to, and hard to drive around!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What Do YOU think? Should there be a high priority on preserving the existing structures on the waterfront? Why or why not? <p>Saving some of the historic buildings and/or structures is important to me. If every new thing we build on the site is perfect in design, scale and visual interest (and of course not everything will be perfect) it still couldn't create a feeling of authenticity. Old buildings ground us, or connect us to the past in a way that simply makes us feel good. They provide a sense of belonging. Even if it's only one or two buildings and one or two structures, and even if it's incredibly expensive, I sure hope we can find a way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What do YOU think? Do you have opinions and building heights? Do you favor one plan over another in this regard? <p>I could get excited about the view corridors of either plan. With regard to building heights, I'd prefer to see the mix-and-match approach, where a few towers accommodate a bulk of the building units so most buildings can be kept at the five or six story level. If we don't have towers, I like what's been done at the Olympic Village in Vancouver. Interesting, attractive buildings of seven and eight stories, along with some that are three or four stories. All surrounding a historic building, The Salt Building, which-though dwarfed by the others-serves to ground these other new buildings to the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Thoughts <p>Bellingham's grid shifts are part of its charm. I enjoy those places where streets "jog" and I sense I'm</p>
---------	---	------------------	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>in a slightly different section of the whole. Though I'm not at all opposed to continuing the existing grid down to the Waterfront, I don't believe that shifting the grid will have a negative effect on "connecting the waterfront to downtown." I also think that views can be stunning in either plan-the orientation will just change the locations from which these views are most impressive.</p> <p>Thank you for your commitment to parks and green spaces! Thank you for your commitment to multi-modal facilities. Thank you for all the thoughtful time and energy you're putting into this process.</p>
11/6/08	EIS and RR	Leslie Langdon	<p>Tim,</p> <p>I was at the Port/City presentation Tuesday evening at Depot Market. I asked the question re: the moving of the RR. I am a former City Council member and have a tendency to be direct but for all my directness I am not getting my real questions answered.</p> <p>I do understand the need to move the RR. I do not have a problem with the whistles/horns, I come from an old RR family. I also know that whistles/horns will cease when there are no longer any at grade crossings which are both good things for downtown Bellingham.</p> <p>What I have asked about is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The moving of the RR will directly impact an existing and growing residential neighborhood. I understand there has been and I support discussion around some type of tunnel or cover that would help mitigate noise from the RR and support a bike trail. This impact and mitigation should be addressed in the EIS. - The moving of the RR will directly impact an existing and growing residential neighborhood. There will be increased, repetitive and ongoing vibration from the passing trains through the sandstone bluff on which our buildings are situated. A horizontal gap of some size could be seen across the center of the bluff prior to the pouring of the first massive foundation. Seismic studies should a part of the EIS in relation to these buildings. <p>I have asked these questions for 2 years and thought they would be included in the consideration of impacts.</p> <p>I have not found it in the EIS.</p> <p>Would you please let me know how I can make certain that our well-founded and profound concerns have been addressed and what mitigations have been considered.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
11/6/08	Waterfront Connection Plan	David M. Courtis	<p>Dear Ms. Mookherjee,</p> <p>Thank you for your presentation at last night's meeting of the South Hill Neighborhood Association. Your comments were very useful in giving me a better understanding of the City's "Waterfront Connection Plan".</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>However, I do have some questions and comments concerning these waterfront related issues that were not fully discussed at the meeting because of time constraints:</p> <p>A. Enhancement of Development Value Developers want to locate their projects either on the water or adjacent to attractive, well designed parks because those are features that purchasers of their properties highly value. Consequently, the Port and the City can sell such locations to developers for premium prices. The City's Plan does not have any features that add development value to the interior of the site. Diagonal green spaces proposed by both the Port's Plan and the Christensen Plan would enhance the economic value in the interior of the Waterfront District.</p> <p>B. Connectivity of the Central Business District to the Waterfront District to Bellingham Bay This is an absolutely critical factor because, if it is not done well and effectively, the Waterfront District will not be seamlessly integrated into the life of our community. While each of the Port's display posters has a statement stressing the importance of connectivity, the angled street grid precludes rather than enhances the desired, easy connection.</p> <p>C. View Corridors I feel that ground level, view corridors down Bay Street, Commercial Street, and Cornwall Avenue from the Central Business District are vital to preserve. However, the views to the northwest towards the Marine Trades Area, the new marina, and the Bellweather Peninsula from along the northwest-southeast oriented streets are not particularly inspiring. Outward views to Bellingham Bay, Lummi Island, and Orcas Island are much more attractive and should be incorporated into any approved redevelopment plan.</p> <p>The Port's Plan proposes façade setbacks of the upper stories of buildings along view corridors in order to enhance the feeling of spaciousness. This seems like a worthwhile concept to consider.</p> <p>D. Park Space I support the City's proposal for a 20 foot wide public promenade along the northwest side of the Whatcom Waterway.</p> <p>I am disappointed that both the Port and City Plans have just an urban street connection between the Log Pond Park and the Cornwall Pocket Beach Park. Even a narrow greenbelt pedestrian/bicycle connection of the two parks would be a substantial improvement.</p>
--	--	--	---

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>Since March 2006, I have been recommending consideration of an elongate pedestrian mall (a Bellingham sized version of the National Mall in Washington, D.C.) along the Commercial Street right-of-way. To date, there has not been any feed back indicating why it would not be feasible to include it in the City and Port's waterfront redevelopment proposals. However, I have received positive comments about the pedestrian mall from members of the public (including two more at last night's meeting). Until someone can demonstrate to me why it is a bad idea, I will continue to urge its adoption in the waterfront redevelopment plan for these important reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * It will enhance the development value in the interior of the site. * It will enhance the connectivity of the Central Business District to the Waterfront District to Bellingham Bay. * It will enhance the social interactions between people who live/work/study/play on the site with other residents of Bellingham, and with visitors to our City. Encouraging that interaction is of vital importance in making the Waterfront District a vibrant, attractive neighborhood in our community. * It will enhance the amount of park space in the Waterfront District. The public has consistently expressed a desire for much more park space than is present in the City and Port Plans. In addition, the current amount of proposed park space is grossly deficient based on the City's Level of Service guideline for parks given the number of people who will live and work in the Waterfront District. * It will enhance the "WOW" factor for everyone visiting the Waterfront District and gazing along the park strip either from the top of the bluff at its northern end or from the edge of Bellingham Bay at its southern end. The "WOW" factor throughout the Waterfront District is critically important in making the site the aesthetic, social, and economic crown jewel of Bellingham. <p>E. Streets</p> <p>I have wondered why the City and Port street plans do not have a curvilinear, ground level branch of Roeder Avenue connecting Central Avenue and Cornwall Avenue just south of the proposed realigned railroad right-of-way.</p>
--	--	--	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>Is it necessary to have as many northwest-southeast oriented city streets cutting across the width of the Log Pond Area and the Downtown Waterfront Area as are shown on the City's Plan? Those streets encourage the use of private cars and make much of the site a less inviting, less friendly place for pedestrians, out of town visitors, and bicyclists. Furthermore without being constrained by that element of the proposed street grid, buildings could be oriented so that their positioning would maximize views of Bellingham Bay, Lummi Island, South Hill, etc. This would substantially increase development value. Judiciously located alleyways would provide adequate service access to the buildings on the site.</p> <p>F. Historic Buildings</p> <p>I have heard that the foundations of the historic buildings are supported only by wood piles. If this is the case, it would seem to me that it would be very expensive and, perhaps, virtually impossible to replace those piles with the more structurally sound piles that would be required when transforming the buildings from industrial uses to mixed use. Any comments?</p> <p>What is the approximate cost range for rehabilitating the historic buildings to the point that their interiors would be ready for new construction? My concern is increased because the developer who refurbished the Waldron Building in Fairhaven reportedly stated that he would never do a similar project again because it was so expensive.</p> <p>Mayor Pike at last week's meeting with members of the City's Advisory Groups at Depot Market Square indicated that a developer had recently told him that a historic district would add substantial development value to Bellingham's waterfront. Has the potential increase in value been quantified?</p> <p>G. Western Washington University</p> <p>Where is the City's proposed location for Western Washington University's presence in the Waterfront District? I did not see that information in the "Waterfront Connection Plan".</p> <p>H. Public Transit</p> <p>The City's street grid seems to be much more conducive to having effective public transportation routes (e.g. Bay Street/Pine Street/Cornwall Avenue circulation pattern) than the Port's concept as shown on page 57 of its proposal. Without easy access to public transportation throughout the site, traffic congestion, because of increased use of private cars, will be dramatically worsened.</p>
--	--	--	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>In summary, we collectively need to be creative and not overly constrained or restrictive in our thinking because once a plan is finalized and adopted, it will be too late to make an attractive, perhaps, project transforming modification.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my e-mail.</p>
11/7/08	Waterfront Development	June & John Vigor	<p>To Mayor Dan Pike:</p> <p>We are very glad that you are not allowing the port authority to bulldoze the city into agreeing to all its plans for the waterfront. It seems to us that the port has a fixed agenda that is not necessarily in the best interests of the citizens of Bellingham. We think that the city is right in its street plan, if only because it is the less expensive option and could be built more quickly. If buildings can be preserved, that would be good, too.</p> <p>We have never been in favor of the marina plan for the lagoon, which will serve only those who own very large expensive boats.</p> <p>We agree with concerns reported in the Herald this morning, about making the waterfront dependent on cars, and allowing such a huge amount of parking. So many cars will spoil the waterfront and downtown. Public transport, pedestrian and bike options would be much better. We can't go on depending so heavily on private vehicles, for reasons of energy use, climate change and quality of life.</p> <p>And of course the collapse of the economy has to be taken into account.</p> <p>We are excited about the possibilities for the waterfront, but want the city to proceed carefully.</p> <p>We appreciate the stand you are taking on waterfront issues and hope that you will not be urged into bowing to commercial pressure from the port.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
11/8/08	Waterfront Redevelopment	Mike & Anne Botwin	<p>Dear Mayor Pike,</p> <p>Although we were unable to attend the public hearing on Nov. 6th, we want you to know that we support your positions vis a vis the Port Authority in developing the waterfront. It seems to us that contentious Port officials are <u>much</u> more focused on making money than in serving the public interest.</p> <p>We agree that having the downtown streets entering the port in a straight line is a good idea. It is more economical, will make the area more pedestrian-friendly, and may preserve more of the water view.</p> <p>We agree that it is <u>very</u> important to preserve as many historical GP buildings as possible, remodeling them for future use. (Just look at the charm of BC's Public Market!)</p> <p>We agree that the current environmental impact statement is inadequate for developing an overall plan for the waterfront, particularly when it comes to water quality vis a vis pollution from development.</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>We agree that beginning construction on a small scale first is much more sensible than continuing to argue about the overall plan, especially in these hard economic times.</p> <p>We believe citizen's enjoyment of the waterfront is just as important a consideration as how much light industry and office space can be crammed into the site. Preserving space for public parks should <u>not</u> be used as a bargaining chip to build taller buildings, as port officials repeatedly contend. We fervently hope that building heights will be limited to 6-10 stories maximum!</p> <p>No one to our knowledge has addressed the issue of a consistent architectural theme for the waterfront, which we believe is an important consideration. We would much prefer to see buildings with a consistent theme, rather than a conglomeration of mismatched buildings.</p> <p>Also, rather than increasing automobile traffic on the waterfront, has anyone seriously considered building 1 or 2 outlying parking structures from which public transit could be provided? (Pedi-cabs and small motorized street cars, such as what we used to have in Fairhaven, would be a charming addition.)</p> <p>Your background in urban planning is invaluable now. You are helping the community's wishes to be heard. We thank you for that. We applaud your continuing courage in questioning the wisdom of the Port Authority officials.</p> <p><u>Stick to your guns!</u></p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
11/10/08	Waterfront District Compromise Plan	Dan Courtis	<p>I have prepared a compromise plan for the Waterfront District. The two most important factors in the proposal are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adding value to the property in the interior of the site 2. Modifying the street grid. <p>I will hand deliver the compromise plan along with a map showing what is proposed to your office today.</p>
11/10/08	Waterfront Redevelopment Comments	Judy Hoover	<p>COMMENTS ON THE WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS</p> <p>I attended the Depot Market presentation October 29 and have subsequently reviewed the Waterfront Connections Plan and my notes from that meeting.</p> <p><u>Planning Areas:</u> The planning areas make sense. I have no particular comments here.</p> <p><u>Green Spaces and the Environment:</u> I particularly like the more centralized open space rather than park blocks in the Log Pond Area. I would be interested in seeing <u>wide</u> variation in building heights and bulk to open up more open space and an interesting “silhouette.” A wall of 4 to 5 story buildings would be discouraging to a sense of waterfront accessibility. Dan Burden’s earlier discussion of Vancouveras an accessible waterfront development could provide good guidance.</p> <p><u>Street Grids and Focal Points:</u> I prefer the Waterfront Connections grid rather than the rotated grid. Alternatively, the proposal by Christensen and Blethen could make sense if the port’s argument is accurate that rotation of streets improves solar possibilities. However, the “connection” between the</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>waterfront and the DT truly seems superior with the city's proposed grid. That grid also seems to be friendlier to walkers and bikers; and it provides a view "connection" to Fairhaven.</p> <p><u>Historic Preservation:</u> There is little about the remaining GP buildings that is unique or attractive; on the other hand, preservation of one or two buildings would be a tangible reminder of Bellingham's past that will be lost if everything is demolished. Restoration/ adaptive reuse of any old structures is costly and generally full of surprises, and the unstable waterfront site would make adaptation and earthquake-proofing especially expensive. Looking at the remaining structures from an aesthetic point of view, I think the high density tanks are worth saving – and would provide that reminder of our history as well as the possibility for storage of on-site storm water.</p> <p>Thank you for enabling the public presentations and these comments.</p>
11/10/08	Redeveloping the Waterfront District	David Courtis	<p>Mayor Pike Commissioner Walker Commissioner Smith Commissioner Jorgensen</p> <p>I am a resident of Bellingham, and I have been actively participating in the public planning process for redeveloping the Waterfront District for the last three years. I have closely examined the City's "Waterfront Connection Plan", the Port's 6/10/08 "Waterfront Proposal", and Dave Christensen's recent "New Whatcom Concept". While I like aspects of each of the three plans, none of them quite captures what I think the public has indicated it wants in the Waterfront District based on testimony at numerous meetings and written comments. I am suggesting a compromise plan for the Log Pond Area and the Downtown Waterfront Area. It has been influenced by the three existing proposals and incorporates some of my own ideas.</p> <p>Take a look at the compromise proposal, and see what you think. If you want to modify anything that I have suggested, please feel free to do so. I have no price of authorship. My only objective in offering the compromise plan is the hope that it will help ensure that the redevelopment of the Waterfront District will create a unique neighborhood that is Bellingham's "crown jewel".</p> <p>These are the important elements of the compromise plan:</p> <p>A. INCREASED VALUE</p> <p>Developers want to locate their projects either on the water or adjacent to attractive, well designed parks because those are features that purchasers of their properties highly value. Consequently, the Port and the City could sell such locations to developers for premium prices. In addition after build-out, the property tax revenues from those parcels would be far greater than less attractively located real estate. Approximately 68% of the buildable</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>property in the compromise plan is on the waterfront, on a park, or faces the Western Washington University Waterfront Campus.</p> <p>B. ADEQUATE STREETS, FEWER CARS The Waterfront District's transportation needs would be supplied by a smaller, but adequate street grid. This could be accomplished by planning for people, not "KING CAR". By implementing an integrated, comprehensive transportation plan that would emphasize public transit, walking, van pools, flex working hours, car pools, bicycling, financial incentives, etc. the number of private vehicles and one person per car trips would be significantly decreased. This would diminish traffic congestion, air pollution, parking requirements, infrastructure costs, and the number of streets required to properly service the people living in, working in, and visiting the Waterfront District. In addition, the smaller street grid would be less constraining for redevelopment. It would be much easier to locate and orient buildings on the waterfront and along parks in order to access views and to capture solar heat and natural light.</p> <p>The building plan would conform to the block size in the Central Business District. Off street access to every building for service and structured parking would be provided by a network of twenty foot wide alleys. A new street, New Whatcom Avenue, would branch off of Roeder Avenue. It would be at ground level, just south of a realigned railroad, and 26 feet wide. It would provide additional service and parking access to the taller, higher density buildings at the base of the bluff. A high speed, commuter bike route would parallel New Whatcom Avenue and connect Roeder Avenue to the South Bay Trail.</p> <p>The Waterfront District would be serviced by an arterial, public transportation route along Bay Street/Oak Street/Cornwall Avenue. The route would be within easy walking distance of every spot in the Log Pond area, the Downtown Waterfront Area, and the Western Washington University Waterfront Campus. The route would not have tight corners. In addition, public transportation could enter or leave the site along Wharf Street and New Whatcom Avenue</p> <p>C. PRESERVATION/CREATION OF VIEW CORRIDORS The traditional, ground level view corridors to Bellingham Bay and Lummi Island from the Central Business District along Cornwall Avenue, Commercial Street, and Bay Street (after demolition of view blocking buildings on the GP site) would be preserved. In addition, important new view corridors would be created along the three east-west oriented park strips.</p>
--	--	--	---

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>D. IMPROVED CONNECTIVITY The Central Business District would be seamlessly connected to the Waterfront District and to the Bellingham Bay by Cornwall Avenue, Bay Street, and the Bay/City Pedestrian Mall along the Commercial Street right-of-way. The three park strips would connect the interior of the site to the waterfront. Residents of, workers in, and visitors to the Waterfront District would be connected to each other as they use the green space, restaurants, shops, etc. to relax and enjoy life. Western Washington University would be more fully connected with the life in our community by the presence of its Waterfront Campus on the Whatcom Waterway near Downtown and the heart of the Waterfront District. Log Pond Park and the Cornwall Pocket Beach Park would be joined by a greenbelt instead of an urban street corridor. Because the historic buildings on the site could be rehabilitated and used for new purposes, they could be an excellent connection to Bellingham's historic heritage.</p> <p>E. MORE PARKS The public has consistently expressed its desire for more park space in the Waterfront District. The Bay/City Pedestrian Mall and the three park strips add approximately 28 acres of new green space. These parks would provide increased, easy access to the waterfront. They would be excellent venues for community celebrations, cultural events, athletic contests, family gatherings, quiet contemplation, etc. Moreover, they would create new development financial value in the interior of the site. A greenbelt connection between the Cornwall Pocket Beach Park and the Log Pond Park would allow walkers and bicyclers the opportunity to travel the entire distance from the Taylor Street Dock to Roeder Avenue without encountering motor vehicles.</p> <p>The smaller street grid in the Waterfront District and the need for fewer parking structures would free up funding which could be used to pay for the new parks.</p> <p>F. ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY Approximately 50% of the buildings in the Waterfront District would have direct southern exposure which would provide unimpeded access to solar heating and natural light. The additional green space would help absorb storm water and decrease carbon dioxide. The reduced dependence on private vehicles would decrease traffic congestion, lessen auto emissions, diminish the use of gasoline, and improve the quality of life.</p> <p>G. PROTECTS THE HISTORIC DISTRICT OPTION The Granary Building, the Barking and Chipping Plan, the Board Mill, and the Digester</p>
--	--	--	---

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>Building would not be impacted by the proposed street grid or buildings. In addition, the Boiler House, the Alcohol Plant, and the High Density Tanks could be protected by modest changes to the building layout. However, the Pulp Storage and Screen Room structures would be demolished during the construction of Central Avenue. Consequently, there would be the option for restoration and reuse of most of the buildings in a waterfront historic district. That would help preserve Bellingham's cultural heritage and potentially add substantial economic value.</p> <p>H. "WOW"</p> <p>The Waterfront District would have all of the important "WOW" qualities of life that would make it the "crown jewel" of Bellingham and a highly desirable tourist destination.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A livable, walk able, bike able neighborhood that would encourage social interaction and recreation. 2. A vibrant commercial district. 3. A historic district 4. WWU's Waterfront Campus 5. Easy access to the waterfront 6. Abundant, well designed parks 7. A people friendly (not "King Car" friendly) environment 8. A stunning stairway entryway to the site from the top of the bluff at the foot of Commercial Street 9. Beautiful outward scenic views of Bellingham Bay and the San Juan Islands as well as inward views of Downtown and the iconic tower of the Mount Baker Theater. <p>Thank you for considering my compromise plan.</p>
11/11/08	Port Politics	John Merrill	<p>Mayor Pike and council members, Please don't let the port push us around. I would much rather look at vacant land then have the port of Bellingham in control. Since no one lives in the Port of Bellingham why are they trying to build our city? And why do they keep bringing up the term "world class"? I along with many I have spoken with am tired of the pomposity and of the port's management and top direction. This is the time to show what you're made of. DLTBGYD.</p> <p>What is the process for the city to take control of the property and project?</p> <p>I cannot find an email address for the City Attorney, if appropriate will you please forward this to her?</p>
11/11/08	Issues with Port	Marcia Robey	<p>Dear Mayor Pike:</p> <p>I have been watching and reading about the waterfront issues since they began. Hang in there! I support your prudence in reviewing the plan. I also support your desire to preserve older,</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>historic buildings on the property when feasible. It would be wonderful if we could preserve a building for use as a community hall by the waterfront. How fabulous would that be? Thanks for your review on this important project.</p>
11/11/08	Waterfront Development	Ray Ballweg	<p>Dear Mayor Pike, I would like to praise you and your staff for offering a viable alternative plan to the Preferred Alternative which the Port of Bellingham supports. I particularly want to voice my support for saving as many of the historic structures as possible. I believe that a waterfront that does not link back to the city and carry the “feel” of the city will not be as nearly successful as one that does. The key for success will be how the area feels to people when they are there and when they are walking around the area. I support access by public transportation and oppose arranging the area for access for massive amounts of cars. Obviously there has to be some parking with hopefully most of it underground or in structures. A concept that I believe works well is remote parking supported by 24 hr trams or automated driverless trains similar to airports and resorts (aka Disneyland). <i>Regards,</i></p>
11/12/08	Support for You	Lora Eckert	<p>Dear Mayor Pike, Thanks for the great work you are doing on our behalf with the waterfront development. Attached is a letter I just sent to the Bellingham Herald. <i>Regards,</i></p> <p>Dear Bellingham Herald, What a relief it is to see our mayor serve as the people’s advocate in the current controversy over waterfront development! The Port does not seem responsive to the needs and desires of the general population of Whatcom County. Rather, I fear the decisions of the Port Commissioners are heavily weighted in favor of those whose primary goal is to use waterfront development simply to make money. It is not in the best interests of most of us to give the Port Commissioners total control with a plan that is “signed, sealed and delivered.” It is in the best interests of most of us, including future generations, to preserve and enhance the special livability of Bellingham. This includes maintaining our remarkable access to the water through view corridors created by simply extending our existing streets. It includes planning to avoid automobile traffic congestion and encourage foot and bike traffic. I am so very glad to see our Mayor doing the right thing, acting as advocate for the majority of residents of Bellingham, working to realize our waterfront’s full potential as beautiful shared space being developed in the interests of all of us who live here.</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

11/12/08	Waterfront	Ham Hayes <ham@hamhayes.com	<p>Dan, Sati, I, and many others I talk to, are terribly disappointed in what can only be described as a failure in leadership, on all sides. Everyone, especially the citizens, present and future, lose because of the inability to figure out a way to resolve differences and align/agree on what is important. Unless I've missed something, there is not enough information available to the public to understand the city's opposition. Please correct the record if I am wrong. One WAG member I talked with this am and who I respect thinks we are headed for warehouses and trucks instead of the manifestation of our community's dream. Unfortunately I have to agree with his assessment. best...Ham</p>
11/12/08	Waterfront	Bob Jacobson	<p>Dan, I am so angry at you and your staff I could spit. So much time and effort have gone into the waterfront development and, at the last minute, you gum up the works. I have seen the plan you do not like. YOU ARE WRONG!!! Get out of the way and let's get on with the demolition and building. I am not sure if we can get the NOAA homeport here but this action by you folks sure can NOT be helpful.</p>
11/13/08	Waterfront	Robert Harris	<p>I hope the waterfront development will include as much public access as possible. Land that is given over to private development will be lost to public access forever. Would it be possible to develop the waterfront slowly as funding is available to meet these goals Sincerely,</p>
11/13/08	Waterfront	John Blethen Jay Bornstein Steve Koch Ted Mischaikov Chris Morgan Doug Starcher	<p>To: The Port of Bellingham; Mr. Jim Darline & Port of Bellingham Commission Members To: The City of Bellingham; Mayor Dan Pike and the City of Bellingham Council Members</p> <p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>The Waterfront Futures Group (WFG) was organized in 2003 to create a fresh vision of Bellingham's waterfront. Its members, who represented a broad spectrum of interests, worked diligently for almost 2 years and delivered a set of design recommendations that have lost little, if any, currency. That design was the "Waterfront Vision and Framework Plan".</p> <p>Almost four years ago, the Port of Bellingham (Port) and City of Bellingham (City) agreed to work as partners to purchase the GP site and execute a redevelopment plan based on the WFG's Framework Plan. The project is large, expensive, complex and <i>absolutely critical</i> to Bellingham's future. Success will depend on many things, but excellent collaboration between the Parties is foundational.</p> <p>Today, after five years of expenditure and public outreach the Port and City partnership is degrading</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>into adversarial positions to the great detriment of our community. Agreement has not been reached on an acceptable master plan for a variety of stated reasons, none of which we believe is beyond resolution. Disagreements appear to fundamentally stem from; 1) Access to the waterfront, 2) Street grid design, 3) Preservation of historic buildings, 4) Commitment by the city for its share of funding, 5) the preferred siting of WWU, and 6) Provide predictability and reduce risk as it relates to future development.</p> <p>The undersigned WFG members recently gathered, of their own accord, out of genuine care for the process and respect for the efforts by both the Port and City; we take no sides between the two. However, we are deeply concerned that the City/Port relationship has become counter-productive and is distracting the parties from issues of <i>real significance</i> that still must be addressed.</p> <p>The <i>critically significant</i> priorities crying out for Port and City attention are: (a) Drawing down state money earmarked for site clean-up to eliminate the risk of legislative reallocation of these funds; (b) Providing WWU with all partner commitments necessary to seek state funding this legislative session for University development in the Waterfront District; (c) Forging the large financial commitments the partnership needs for redevelopment, given the dire economic conditions we all now face and (d) presenting the strongest possible proposal to NOAA from a unified community.</p> <p>None of these challenges will be surmounted without a strong, mutual commitment to working as true partners. The associated risks of a sustained deadlock on the aforementioned issues are becoming a more likely reality with each passing day. The parties must move beyond the stalemate and rededicate themselves to a vision we all embrace; that is, <i>real progress</i> towards the recovery of Bellingham's central waterfront and the creation of a green, dense, mixed-use core for all to enjoy.</p> <p>There are a lot of people that care about this situation; it is critically important to the community.</p> <p>We seek a solution around which the Parties can unify and effectively press forward.</p>
11/14/08	Letter sent to Mayor Pike re: Waterfront	Bob Keller	<p>Dear Mayor Pike,</p> <p>It would be well worth the time and expense for the City to investigate how the town of Lindau, Germany, has developed its waterfront. I believe that certain aspects can serve as an excellent example for Bellingham.</p> <p>A small isle located at the eastern end of the Bodensee (Lake Constance), Lindau has a permanent population of 3,000 which swells by a factor of ten for half the year. The island is completely filled</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>with hotels, apartments, business firms, a rail station, theaters, and public services, yet its entire waterfront remains a park. On a trail around the island one encounters artwork, trees, flower gardens, lawns, play areas for children, benches, statues, beach access, a boat harbor, frequent vistas over the lake and toward the Swiss Alps. We at once realize that we are indeed on an island and that it is a beautiful place.</p> <p>Across the lake is the larger city of Bregenz which has an outdoor theater built on the water. During the summer it draws large crowds for operas, concerns, plays and performances. That, too, offers a model for Bellingham.</p> <p>Former local residents Michael and Suzanne Bode now own a small business on Lindau. They would be delighted to hose someone from the City.</p> <p>Good luck in planning a magnificent asset for Bellingham. It is worth taking the time and trouble to do it right.</p>
11/14/08	Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement – Proposed New Whatcom Redevelopment Project	Chris Moore	<p>On behalf of the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, please accept these comments regarding the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) submitted by the Port of Bellingham for the proposed New Whatcom Redevelopment Project at the former Georgia-Pacific site. The Washington Trust is a statewide, not-for-profit organization dedicated to safeguarding historic and cultural resources across Washington. Given that many of the buildings located at the proposed site comprise a potential National Register Historic District, we have reviewed the SDEIS and find that the Preferred Alternative as described therein has several inconsistencies regarding Historic & Cultural Resources.</p> <p>To begin, it seems disingenuous at best for the Port to submit a Preferred Alternative that claims to decrease the potential to adversely affect historic resources located at the site while at the same time, in a separately issued Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance, seek the demolition of three historic resources on site. Those resources include the Screen Room, the Bleach Plant, and the Pulp Storage Building (identified as building #'s 14, 15, and 37, respectively), all of which are potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.</p> <p>Furthermore, it appears incongruous for the Port to claim that certain identified historic structures could be retained or reused under the Preferred Alternative (Page 1-9, Table 1-1, Historic & Cultural Resources). The primary element of the Preferred Alternative is a rotated street grid that would, according to the Port, provide several benefits, including “efficient connections to downtown and surrounding areas.” As illustrated in Figure 3.11-1 of the SDEIS, however, existing historic structures are situated directly in the right-of-way of the proposed rotated grid. Implementation of the rotated grid would require removal of those buildings, thereby negating any possibility for retention</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>as noted above. (Note – Figure 3.11-1 is entitled “Potential Eligible Historic Resources to be Retained/Reused – Preferred Alternative. This title is in and of itself misleading, given the impossibility of implementing the rotated street grid <i>and</i> retaining the historic resources located in the right-of-way of the proposed rotated grid.) Mr. Andrew Maron November 14, 2008 Page 2</p> <p>An additional shortcoming is that the Preferred Alternative discusses historic resources only as stand-alone structures potentially eligible for <i>individual</i> listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The fact of the matter is that taken collectively, the 13 potentially eligible structures may indeed form the basis for a National Register Historic District. Failure to retain even one of these structures could possibly jeopardize the integrity of a potential historic district. Given this, consideration of historic resources under the Preferred Alternative should include a historic district perspective, as opposed to simply a group of individually-eligible buildings. Moreover, discussion of possible mitigation measures should also include mitigating adverse impacts to a historic district as well.</p> <p>Finally, Section 3.1.15 of the SDEIS (page 3.11-8) suggests that with implementation of the mitigation measures for Historic & Cultural Resources identified in both the SDEIS and DEIS, there would be no anticipated adverse impacts to historic resources under the Preferred Alternative. This is a puzzling conclusion. Under a best case scenario for historic resources, the Preferred Alternative identifies 10 historic resources (out of a total of 13 potentially eligible structures) that could be retained or reused. If retained (assuming “retained” means adaptively reused), they would at least need to be relocated given the rotated street grid. In many cases, the relocation of historic resources itself is an adverse impact as the context in which a building was originally constructed is necessarily altered. Proposed mitigation under the Preferred Alternative also considers reuse, understood to be the salvage and re-incorporation of certain building elements into proposed new construction/interpretive programs on the site. While this might be an appealing way to preserve specific building elements/artifacts, such a course of action nonetheless constitutes an adverse impact.</p> <p>The SDEIS includes discussion of the Straight Street Grid Option alongside that of the Preferred Alternative. Based on the brief description of the Straight Street Grid Option, it would appear that the prospects for reducing adverse impacts to historic resources are greatly enhanced under this option when compared to the Preferred Alternative. The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation encourages the Port of Bellingham to utilize elements of the Straight Street Grid Option in the project’s Final EIS. Doing so would truly minimize the adverse impacts the proposed New Whatcom Redevelopment Project will have on Bellingham’s historic resources. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important manner.</p>
11/14/08	Waterfront Redevelopment	Alan Kemble	<p>Dear Mayor:</p> <p>Thank you for putting on yesterday evening's meeting. I thought the staff had laid out displays well, the presenter was articulate, and most of the audience comments were pertinent. I also thought it was</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	--

			<p>interesting that most had comments rather than questions. The tone of the discussion also struck me as one of impatience to get moving.</p> <p>I have nothing new to add but would like to endorse some of the comments that were made.</p> <p>I feel strongly that the City's street plan should be the one adopted. Connectivity to downtown, and the view corridors created, are important considerations. Building outward from downtown, and starting early, seems to be relevant. Don't compromise on this one.</p> <p>While I generally support the City's preference on building heights, I take to heart the one person's comments about "saving face" for the Port. Could we not compromise and allow a few (maybe 3?) tall buildings in the 170-180 foot range, perhaps close in against the bluff toward the south end of the "Log Pond" area? And a quick assessment of the rehab potential of the remaining older buildings would probably throw up some that just wouldn't be practical to save. The Port could then demolish to their heart's content. If this is all it would take to get the City/Port commitment back on track it would be a small price to pay.</p> <p>I'm not a developer or planner, and it may be totally impractical, but could work be done early on one of the open spaces to show potential residents and investors a glimpse of what is to come? It might also do a lot to keep the city's population supportive of the program over the years that it will undoubtedly take to get to the final outcome.</p> <p>Bremerton's mayor put on a presentation here last year concerning their city's waterfront redevelopment. Unfortunately it didn't seem to get much publicity.</p> <p>A much smaller project than ours, but his comments about doing "something" early, even before the full project is finalized resounded with my wife and me. This feels even more relevant given the City's stance about not wanting to commit upfront to final design elements that might take 10-20 years to happen.</p> <p>I do have one question. If the site were to be raised by only 3 feet against future sea-level rise I calculate that it would take more than 600,000 cubic yards (have I missed a decimal point?). This would be something like 20-30,000 truck loads. Will the City mandate that the bulk of this will be barged in rather than brought by truck?</p> <p>While this is a wonderful legacy project to give much enjoyment to future generations some of us would very much like to see it happen in our lifetime. Please use every effort to make it happen.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
11/16/08	green building and street alignment	Chris Morgan	<p>Hello Dan,</p> <p>Allow me to strongly support your position on street alignment in the Waterfront Plan. For many years Ralph Knowles, a colleague at USC, has researched the effect of building shape and street alignment on solar access. One of his papers, he has also written several books on the subject, can be found at:</p> <p>http://www-ref.usc.edu/~rknowles/sol_env/sol_env.html#anchor361801.</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>I had a fairly extended conversation (via email) with him last week and we agreed that: A N/S E/W alignment is preferred if the only issue is passive solar gain (better access and control). A skewed or "Spanish" alignment is preferred when it is important to have sunlight on all building facades each day. It also makes more interesting exterior public places because there are no constantly cold facades. In a region where daylight is cherished, the skewed alignment seems best. A further benefit is the summer breezes in the downtown area are from the SW to which the skewed grid offers better access. If you would like to talk further about this, give me a call at 756-0730.</p>
11/16/08	Waterfront Redevelopment Project	Reid Smith	<p>To all concerned about the Bellingham Waterfront Redevelopment Project and with special attention to the question of leadership as of November fourteenth 2008.</p> <p>With my wife and friends I attended the excellent meeting provided for the public's information and participation last night at the Market Depot building. I have been watching this project from not only it's beginning but for more than thirty years that I have lived in Bellingham and Whatcom County. Along with many citizens I have dreamed of the day that Bellingham residents might re-inherit their downtown waterfront and make far better use of it with the glory days of the historical wood mills behind us. And this is that time when we citizens must speak up and support the ideas which improve our beloved town most.</p> <p>I especially want to thank the leaders both from the Port and City government for bravely spearheading this large and complex project. The ball is now rolling thanks to those folks, however last night's meeting made it clear that we are pausing at this moment, at the bluff's edge overlooking the old GP property, to make certain that we have this ball aligned with the will of the people. What a great local government we have to not allow the excitement of industrious change go so fast that we miss any public intentions, already made clear through the process known as the Waterfront Futures Group. This is essential as the meeting last night highlighted major differences in viewpoint between the interpretations of a few key issues that require agreement before proceeding.</p> <p>Many folks last night expressed some worry over this question of agreement between the Port and City government.</p> <p>And I for one thought that the best proposition put forward does two things:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) offers the City the lead role in tracking public input and in making those decisions which will determine the site overview with attention on the means to unifying not only downtown but our community at large with the waterfront, 2.) and offers the Port the lead role in matters concerning the industrial maritime interface, like the new marina, NOAA, and other maritime business opportunities. <p>However, one idea that I don't like is the notion that we the people need to compromise any further than we already have agreed to in order to appease the Port. Two cases in point are the water treatment lagoon and the long term build out. The Port was allowed to push through the marina plan</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>despite the small number of people it will serve. Additionally, the request for six million square feet of building space will limit the potential for true public access and natural aesthetics. Both examples are major compromises for many Bellingham citizens.</p> <p>Furthermore, it was strongly stated by citizens last night that building heights and the street design in general are factors that will determine the degree to which Bellingham as it is today will either feel connected and invited in to the waterfront district or not. I wish to emphasize that if designed wisely this project will positively affect all of Bellingham and Whatcom County in terms of quality of life issues which in turn will improve all property values and tourist trade. I think that it is narrow minded to insist that all costs be covered by the eventual build out even though that's the easiest sell politically.</p> <p>To conclude, let's repair the divide now by delegating proper and separate authority to each entity of this two partner leadership team. Each having their distinct strengths we will all benefit with a unified front that has proven a respect for the goals stated already by the public through the Waterfront Futures Group.</p> <p>Once again thank you to all those working to give the community what it really wants.</p>
11/17/08	Waterfront Redevelopment	Chris Fairbanks	<p>Dear Mr. Pike</p> <p>As I understand, the City of Bellingham and the Port of Bellingham together support the Waterfront Advisory Group (WAG). The mission of this group is to collect public input for and ideas for the redevelopment of the waterfront project. The WAG has done a very good job and I am disappointed that you find it necessary to go outside of this process. By doing so you are doing the community a disservice and dismissing all the work of the WAG, the Waterfront Futures Group and all the public input collected to date.</p> <p>I strongly support the East – West angled street grid. This street grid is aligned with the path of the sun and will allow natural sunlight to reach both sides of the streets in the Waterfront area and stunning views of Bellingham Bay and Lummi Island. Alignment with the sun path will give warm natural light that is inviting to pedestrians on both sides of the street and natural light inside retail shops and cafes. This street grid was developed in response to public input after many public meetings and written comments and will be a foundation for a well-designed community. Using the angled street grid is more efficient for designing sustainable buildings. The sunlight can heat three side of the building more evenly and less energy is needed to heat or to cool interior space.</p> <p>There was a comment at your meeting on November 13th regarding visitors not being able to see the bay from downtown. This is because the streets do not point to the Bay. Using the angled street grid will highlight views of Bellingham Bay and the islands.</p> <p>The downtown street grid was an idea that LMN consultants presented in the early conceptual drawings which was not favored in public comments. Extending the downtown street grid would make the Waterfront Project just another mediocre redevelopment project; something much less than</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>wonderful.</p> <p>As you walk down Holly street you may notice that the sun does not reach the southwest side of the street. The downtown street grid makes Holly Street a canyon. The uneven solar radiation causes an uneven heating of the buildings and the interior spaces must be heated on the north side and cooled on the south side using more energy. This is not sustainable building practices.</p> <p>Regarding historic buildings, I do not find the industrial buildings on the site particularly interesting or attractive. These buildings were built for efficiency of manufacturing rather than for architectural interest. If the buildings were more iconic such as the Mt. Baker Theater or the Whatcom Museum, I would favor historical preservation. I favor removing the industrial buildings and replacing them with new, stronger and safer buildings designed to contemporary building codes and values of architecture.</p>
11/17/08	Waterfront	David M. Courtis	<p>Dear Mayor Pike,</p> <p>Thank you for convening the public meetings on November 13 and November 17 to review the City's "Waterfront Connections Plan" and the Port's "Waterfront District Proposal". I also appreciate the Port's participation in Monday's meeting. The size of the audiences at the two meetings is an excellent indication that the residents of Bellingham and Whatcom County feel that the redevelopment of the waterfront is an issue of major importance to our community.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>1. I am very concerned, like many other citizens that the City and the Port have not been working closely and effectively together. If the City and Port continue to be at loggerheads, the redevelopment of the waterfront will be jeopardized and the residents of Whatcom County and Bellingham will have lost an outstanding opportunity. However, much as I want to see a cooperative effort, I do not want the Port and the City to rush precipitously to an agreement which results in an unsatisfactory compromise plan.</p> <p>2. Ken Hertz made an excellent suggestion at the 11/13 public meeting. He proposed that the Port should be the lead agency for managing redevelopment in the Shipping Terminal Area, the new marina, the small-boat transient moorage in the Whatcom Waterway, and the Marine Trades Area while the City should be responsible for handling redevelopment in the Downtown Waterfront Area, the Log Pond Area, and the Cornwall Beach/Point Area. This split of the redevelopment responsibilities makes a lot of sense because it reflects the reality that the Port and the City have different strengths, focus, and public mandates.</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>My specific comments are primarily for the Downtown Waterfront Area and the Log Pond Area.</p> <p>A. Development Value</p> <p>Developers want to locate their projects either on the water or adjacent to attractive, well designed parks because those are features that purchasers of their properties highly value. Therefore, such locations can be sold to developers for premium prices and property tax revenues will be higher. Consequently, the financial burden on taxpayers will be lessened. The City's Plan does not have any features in the interior of the site east of Bay Street that would enhance the intrinsic value of that property for development.</p> <p>B. Planning Areas</p> <p>For the most part, I think that the five Planning Areas and their boundaries are satisfactory. However, I do not understand why the Port's Plan puts a southeasterly appendage on the Shipping Terminal Area. It seems more logical to include that area as part of the Log Pond Area.</p> <p>C. Green Spaces and the Environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The public at innumerable meetings and in written comments has indicated an exceptionally strong desire for more than the 35 acres of parks proposed for the Waterfront District. In addition, the large number of people who will live in and work in the 4.3 million square feet of buildings in the Downtown Waterfront Area and the Log Pond Area will have easy, direct access to only 13.4 acres of parkland. This would be a totally inadequate Level of Service and in complete conflict with Bellingham's guidelines for green space. 2. I like the Port's concept of park strips (e.g. Commercial Green and Ivey Green) that bring green space into the interior of the site. These features would increase development value and, subsequently, property tax revenue for areas adjacent to the parks. They would also be attractive amenities for the people who will live in and work in this portion of the Waterfront District. 3. I support the City's proposed 20 foot wide public promenade along the northwest side of the Whatcom Waterway. 4. I suggest these modifications of the green space proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Have at least three, east-west oriented park strips extending across the width of the site between
--	--	--	---

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>the Whatcom Waterway and Cornwall Avenue.</p> <p>*Connect the Log Pond Park and the Cornwall Pocket Beach Park with a greenbelt pathway for pedestrians and bicyclers. The proposed urban street connection of the two parks is totally unsatisfactory.</p> <p>5. I realize that parks are not free. However if a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation plan is implemented, there will be fewer streets and parking structures. Consequently, some of the savings generated by building a smaller traffic infrastructure could be used to fund more park space.</p> <p>D. Multi-Modal Transportation</p> <p>"Both plans have been careful to accommodate all kinds of transportation modes-vehicular, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian." This direct quotation from the "Waterfront Redevelopment Discussion Questionnaire" is totally misleading. The statement infers that equal importance has been given to each of the transportation modes. However in reality, the two plans significantly overemphasize the continued use of private vehicles at the expense of other less costly, more people friendly, more environmentally friendly transportation solutions. Mr. Wes Frysztacki has spent 30 years in urban transportation planning. He submitted an eight page comment letter to the SEPA Official for the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The letter demonstrated that the proposed traffic plan is fatally flawed, used outdated analytical techniques based on erroneous assumptions and is totally inadequate. The letter, among other things, recommended the preparation of an integrated, comprehensive transportation plan that would emphasize public transit, walking, van pools, flex working hours, car pools, bicycling, financial incentives, etc. Such a plan would substantially reduce the number of private cars and one person per car trips into and out of the Waterfront District and significantly reduce the infrastructure costs for streets and parking structures. In addition, space not required for excess streets and parking could be used for revenue generating purposes (e.g. more buildings).</p> <p>E. Street Grids and Focal Points</p> <p>1. I support the extension of the straight street grid from Downtown into the Waterfront District. It would preserve and protect the current ground level views of Bellingham Bay and Lummi Island from the City Center. It would allow an arterial, public transit route along Bay Street/Oak Street/ Cornwall Avenue which would put every portion of the site within very easy walking distance of public transportation.</p>
--	--	--	---

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>2. I do not support the Port's angled street grid. It would totally block ground level views from the City Center to Bellingham Bay and Lummi Island. It would be a visual and a physical barrier which would disconnect Downtown from the Waterfront. Public transit would be restricted to only a small portion of the site which would make it much more difficult for people to use public transportation.</p> <p>3. I suggest consideration be given to the construction of a new street. It would branch off of Roeder Avenue at Central Avenue, be at ground level along the south side of the realigned railroad, and terminate at Oak Street. The street would provide additional service and parking access to the taller, higher density buildings proposed for the area at the base of the bluff. Also, it would be another entry/exit route to the site for public transportation.</p> <p>4. If there is an effective, comprehensive transportation plan for the Waterfront District, there would be far fewer cars entering and leaving the site. Consequently, a smaller, but adequate, more compact street grid could be developed. Such a grid would be far less constraining for redevelopment. Therefore, it would be much easier to locate and orient buildings on the waterfront and along parks in order to access views, capture solar heat and natural light, and increase development value.</p> <p>F. Historic Preservation</p> <p>I support retaining the option for creating a Historic District in the Downtown Waterfront Area if it makes economic sense to do so. However, I have two concerns. I have heard that the foundations of the historic buildings are supported only by wood piles. If this is the case, it is likely that it would be very expensive and, perhaps, virtually impossible to replace the wooden piles with the new, more structurally sound piles that would be required when transforming the buildings from industrial use to mixed use. Secondly, rehabilitating historic buildings can be prohibitively expensive. I have heard that the developer who refurbished the Waldron Building in Fairhaven stated that he would never do a similar project again because it cost so much.</p> <p>G. View Corridors and Building Heights</p> <p>1. Scenic views and view corridors are extremely important. I believe that the City's Plan is vastly superior for protecting and preserving unimpeded, ground level views from the City Center to Bellingham Bay (e.g. along Cornwall Avenue, Commercial Street, and Bay Street after view obstructing GP buildings are removed) and from the water and the site into the heart of Downtown. The Port's Plan blocks views from and into the City Center. Moreover, the statement that the Port's</p>
--	--	--	---

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	--

			<p>Plan "opens up new views from the Downtown area out to Puget Sound and the mountains" is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile with reality.</p> <p>2. The orientation of the Port's Ivey Green needs to be reconsidered. As proposed, the view to the northwest along the length of the park strip would only show the new marina and the Bellweather Peninsula. A more inspiring view would be out over Bellingham Bay to Gooseberry Point. This could be achieved by positioning the park strip further to the north and orienting it in an east-west direction.</p> <p>3. I definitely like the Port's proposal for façade setbacks of the upper stories along view corridors and on the waterfront. The setbacks would enhance the breadth of the views and increase the feeling of spaciousness.</p> <p>4. Recognizing economic realities, it is probably inevitable that high rise buildings will be constructed in the Waterfront District. It will be important that such buildings do not degrade Bellingham by blocking existing views, casting perpetual shadows, increasing congestion, creating a glass/concrete barrier between the site and the rest of the city, etc. Two hundred foot high buildings are too tall for Bellingham and would dominate everything around them. Shorter, maximum heights of approximately 120 feet would be more acceptable and would better blend in with their surroundings.</p> <p>5. If 100 foot high buildings are allowed in the Cornwall Beach/Point Area, they will block views of Bellingham Bay and Gooseberry Point from the South Bay Trail and possibly from South State Street. That would be unacceptable. Maximum height in this area should be low enough so that the buildings do not block views from further inland.</p> <p>H. Phasing of Development</p> <p>1. I support the early location of a portion of Western Washington University to a prominent location in the Waterfront District. It would be a superb anchor tenant for the project. However, where does WWU want its new campus? Within reason, WWU's preference should be accommodated.</p> <p>2. The City's concern about the potential difficulty of developing the interior of the Downtown Waterfront Area adjacent to Downtown, if early construction is at a greater distance from the City Center, is valid. However, the problem could be lessened if there are public amenities (e.g. parks) in</p>
--	--	--	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>that area which would attract developers to that part of the site.</p> <p>3. I do not think that taller, high density buildings will be among the first buildings constructed in the Downtown Waterfront Area. If that is the case and if those buildings will be located near the base of the bluff, the City's "develop outward from Downtown plan" would be difficult to achieve.</p> <p>4. I support early relocation of the railroad.</p> <p>I. Costs</p> <p>A lot of emphasis has been placed, as it should be, on the costs associated with redevelopment of the Waterfront District. However, I feel that another, vital component of cost has not been properly addressed. What is the cost to Bellingham and Whatcom County if the environmental cleanup and infrastructure are finished, but developers are reluctant to invest their money on the site because the plan of development lacks PIZZAZZ and the "WOW" factor? Neither the City's Plan nor the Port's Proposal have really excited the public and generated a lot of enthusiasm for what they contain. The two Plans are solid, workman like proposals which, if implemented, will create a rather plain vanilla development. Instead, what is needed is an exciting plan that everyone can rally around because it will make the Waterfront District the aesthetic, social, and economic "crown jewel" of Bellingham. We want the developers fighting with each other for the opportunity to build in the Waterfront District because it is such a vibrant, fantastic place for living, working, learning, and visiting.</p> <p>These are some of the "WOW" factors that are needed to make the Waterfront District an outstanding addition to our community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * A livable, walkable, bikeable neighborhood that encourages social interaction and recreation. * A strong, viable commercial district. * Western Washington University's Waterfront Campus. * Easy access to the Waterfront. * A thriving marine trades area.
--	--	--	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>* NOAA</p> <p>* A people friendly, not a car friendly, environment that has adequate streets and fewer automobiles.</p> <p>* A stunning, dramatic entryway to the site linking the City Center to the Waterfront District to Bellingham Bay.</p> <p>* Beautiful outward views of Bellingham Bay and the San Juan Islands from Downtown and from numerous locations within the Waterfront District as well as inward views of the City Center and the iconic red and white tower of the Mount Baker Theater</p> <p>* Etc.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>
11/17/08	Waterfront	Mitch Friedman	<p>Dear Dan,</p> <p>I want to offer some thoughts, unsolicited though they are, in the hope they may be useful to you. Candidly, I've been pretty checked out from the waterfront redevelopment discussions for the past year. So for better or worse, I ain't an expert.</p> <p>First, I'm delighted by and highly appreciative the firmness with which you are dealing with the Port. I believe that posture by the city has long been needed. But seeing as how I've invested my efforts into making clean-up and public ownership the primary foci, I have to find irony that the stand-off is over street angles and red brick buildings. I am aware of that the stand-off may be catalytic, but still, ironic.</p> <p>Second, I would be delighted to see a dense urban community down there within our lifetime, hopefully with something less than five major access points and 13,000 parking spots. And I share the view that the red brick buildings would add great character to what otherwise could be as sterile modern neighborhood. But allow me to raise some contrary considerations.</p> <p>Market: I fully agree with George Dyson's suggestion that we need a reconsideration of the markets for construction, yachts, and financing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the city be willing and able to bond for the upfront investment in this climate? While I believe the state and federal governments will be spending heavily on infrastructure investments for the next year or two as an economic stimulus, that spending is almost certain to fall off precipitously after that. • How will the changing economy effect housing and commercial demand? • I concede to you your point owners of high-end yachts don't care about the cost of fuel. But

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>we may see fewer wealthy people in the years ahead. Moreover, the Port always defends its luxury marina by arguing that many of the slips are for the smaller boats of local owners. Can't have it both ways. Will there be demand?</p> <p>Seismic concerns: You know that I want a dense downtown, both for the joy of a walkable urban city and as an alternative to sprawl. I myself have even promoted the vision of a spectacular mixed use neighborhood down there. But seismic concerns have since been raised and not addressed. I think it's still entirely unresolved whether the mill site is a cost-effective and safe place for that mixed use. We need to hear more about this.</p> <p>Red brick buildings: I have become skeptical that those buildings will be remodeled and in use in any reasonable time scale. Moreover, at the risk of seeming to agree with the Port on something, some of them probably shouldn't be. The one with the big white smoke stack housed the hog fuel boiler, making me wonder what those porous bricks may have absorbed over the years. Moreover, it's in the shoreline zone. Similar concerns can probably be raised for most of those buildings. Given the market conditions and that the demolition equipment is on-site; I think we should err on the side of removal, lest we be stuck with industrial eyesores for the next two decades.</p> <p>Clean-up: I am inclined to believe that we stand to get a more thorough clean-up of the uplands if that clean-up is unconstrained by existing buildings. The more of the buildings (and pavement) we remove, the more likely we are to have a clean slate.</p> <p>These are the private thoughts of a somewhat informed citizen. I hope they are helpful to you.</p>
11/18/08	Waterfront	Mark Turner	<p>Dear Mayor Pike and Port Commissioners Jorgensen, Smith, and Walker:</p> <p>I attended Monday night's community meeting about the pending waterfront redevelopment. I was pleased to see the strong level of citizen interest in the project and the civility of the discussion. As citizens we care deeply about the opportunity to remake our long-industrial waterfront into an attractive mixed-use area.</p> <p>As was stated on both sides of the current spat between the city and the port, the areas of disagreement are minor in comparison to the work that's already been done in planning for this massive project. It's time to put your differences aside and reach resolution of the remaining details. A mid-December deadline was mentioned last night to take advantage of pools of taxpayer money from outside Bellingham. Personally, I work best under deadline pressure. I hope you do, too.</p> <p>Following are some specific thoughts and questions that came to my mind last night:</p> <p>1) Street grid alignment. Both the port and city plans are workable. Views will be different between them, but there will be viewsheds under both plans. Mayor Pike said that the city alignment would</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>provide views up (and down) the street to the existing central business district (CBD). With the elevation difference between the CBD and waterfront the views are going to be minimal, especially for pedestrians at street level. Mayor Pike also stated that the port's proposed angled street plan would require more fill than the city plan. I don't understand how the street alignment affects the fill, especially if we're talking about basically the same number of streets, buildings, and parks under both plans.</p> <p>2) Moving the railroad. It makes great common sense to move the railroad very early in the redevelopment process to get it out of the way of the rest of the work. I applaud the city for moving ahead with this aspect.</p> <p>3) Regulatory consistency. I asked about this last night, and if I understand the answer correctly the goal is to have a broad blueprint for the site in place up front. Such a plan would provide some assurance to developers that if they propose, for example, a 7-story residential-commercial building for a block on Laurel Street then they don't have to ask, "Can we put that kind of building there and what kind of setback is required and is a brick veneer required, etc.?" The details of individual building permits would still be needed, but the big picture would be in place. That sounds like what the port is asking for and the city is dragging its heels on. While I'm generally leery of the development process and believe careful oversight is necessary, I also don't want to see unnecessary roadblocks placed in the way of redeveloping the prime real estate on our waterfront. The port and the city must work out their differences on this, which I see as the key sticking point at the moment.</p> <p>4) Parking and traffic flow. While we currently live in an auto-centric society, I believe that over the time this project is developed we will see a major shift in that philosophy. I didn't see provisions in the site plan drawings for parking to support 6.1 million square feet of developed space. Underground (below sea level) parking probably isn't a good idea on the site, but I'd hate to see too much area above ground devoted to storing cars. Whatever can be done to encourage bus, bicycle, and pedestrian priority on the site will be a long-term positive for the city.</p> <p>Thank you for engaging the public in this process. Please work out your differences and let's move forward.</p>
11/18/08	Waterfront	Carol Mills	<p>Mayor Pike, I voted for you in your election and am now regretting that decision. I am very disappointed in you stance against the waterfront plan that had been agreed upon by your predecessor. I am 68 years old and was looking forward to seeing some of this development in my lifetime. With your stance I don't</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>see that happening, I don't see anything happening. I think you are waiting for some reason to scuttle this whole thing or you just want it to be your way or no way. I hope you will reconsider your thinking on this and let's get on with this project.</p> <p>Carol Mills</p>
11/18/08	Waterfront	Lincoln Rutter	<p>Jim Jorgensen, Port Commissioner Dear Jim:</p> <p>It was apparent from our discussion just before last night's meeting that you were totally unaware of the fact that real estate developers will <u>not</u> be held responsible for any of their project's "infrastructure" because of the inter-local agreement that the Port is trying to force the City of Bellingham to maintain. As a man of the people, Jim, I am sure that you would agree with me that this policy decision does a serious injustice to the taxpayers that voted for you, like me.</p> <p>As you now know, the financial plan of the Waterfront District calls for \$334 million dollars in expenditures. However, only \$137M will be invested by The Port Authority primarily for environmental cleanup and demolition. The vast \$197M majority of the cost will be borne by city, state and federal taxpayers for "infrastructure" such as roads, utilities and parks. As I pointed out to you, this plan runs completely opposite of one of the fundamental principles of our state's Growth Management Act (GMA) by which our Legislature gave city governments the right to charge "impact fees" for real estate developers to pay the cost of the public infrastructure needs of their projects. This law was enacted to prevent taxpayers from becoming responsible for such costs while developers walk away with the profits. The Port persuaded the City of Bellingham to sign that "inter-local agreement" whereby 100% of this infrastructure will be paid by the taxpayer very early in the planning process before the financial implications were clear to most citizens. In the name of justice, this Agreement must now be renegotiated if we are to prevent possibly the largest single subversion of taxpayer's funds in the history of this state.</p> <p>This Agreement must be renegotiated <u>before</u> a Master Development Plan is adopted and before the Final Environmental Impact Statement is approved or this corrupt subsidy of the wealthy few by the public will become legally fixed and therefore permanent. The Port's motivation, I believe, is simply to use this mostly local taxpayer subsidy to lower the asking price of the properties they are attempting to sell, making a quick purchase that much easier for a national audience of real estate developers. Waterfront property in any other major US city would entail significant public infrastructure obligations on the part of potential buyers. Therefore, Bellingham's Waterfront District will appear artificially more competitive because of this unique, massive subsidization.</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>If you do not believe you personally should contribute to the profit of The Hilton Hotel Corporation, for one hypothetical example, then I suggest you contact the Mayor of Bellingham (mayorsoffice@cob.org), and the Bellingham City Council (citycouncil@cob.org) immediately to tell them that their inter-local agreement with the Port should be changed to require developers to pay at least 2/3rds of their project's infrastructure requirements. The cost of cleanup which is a valid public financial responsibility should not be confused by the Port with infrastructure costs that are addressed by our GMA laws very specifically. The GMA clearly intends for the private sector to bear that responsibility. In this sense, the Waterfront District should be no exception to our laws. There is no place for dual standards in our democracy.</p> <p>Now that you understand the issue and can fully appreciate why the City of Bellingham cannot simply "sign a blank check," they deserve your full support to resolve this matter <u>before</u> the Waterfront District planning process goes even one step further. Thank you.</p>
11/18/08	WAG meeting cancellation - for public input database	Donna Auer	<p>How disappointing it is that the WAG, a panel bright and able individuals, is not assuming leadership regarding the consistency and continuity of its own meetings.</p> <p>The mission of the WAG is to be "a strong community voice in determining the future of the Bellingham bay waterfront" and one of its goals is to "ensure public awareness and participation in waterfront planning, revitalization...."</p> <p>Is WAG upholding its mission and goals when it allows its meetings to be cancelled at important and pivotal times for the community and the waterfront? At a time when only two plans are being touted, but are not being closely examined, because everyone is distracted by the disgruntlements between Port and City or by the pressure to quicken the process with the threat of funding loss (as if funding won't be available when a more firm plan is in place).</p> <p>We need reasoned dialogue and creative conversation in order to build a superior waterfront for the future. WAG should be a prominent body in strengthening the community voice, not quieting it. thank you,</p>
11/19/08	Waterfront	Frances Badgett	<p>Dear Dan,</p> <p>Thanks so much for the leadership you're taking on the waterfront. As Tim pointed out in today's Gristle, it's been a long time coming and there needs to be significant change in how this process has been. It's interesting to note that the second the Port stepped out of the process, the public showed up again.</p> <p>I'm always concerned about the important conversation that is <i>*not*</i> occurring. Though Steve Sundin made an excellent point in his SDEIS comments about the intersection of master planning and the RI/FS process for the upland, I'd like to see the city highlight that concern. How do we plan for the</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>waterfront with so much contamination left behind? The Port's plans for remediation are completely inadequate given both the nature and levels of contamination in the soil (12,000 ppm of mercury in the caustic groundwater plume alone). As George Dyson pointed out yesterday, all of the predictability these developers desire would come from cleanup, not a Planned Action Ordinance. I'm also very concerned about the seismology and issue of liquefaction. How will that be addressed? Is any of this construction actually feasible? It's hard for me personally to engage in planning discussions when the issues of contamination and liquefaction aren't being addressed. All of the plans have development or public spaces on or near the log pond, Chem-Fix, and caustic groundwater plume. And nothing has been said about the extraordinary cost of driving pilings large enough to get buildings to stand up in that loose, soupy fill.</p> <p>I do prefer the logic of the straight street grid, and after all those public meetings, I think the public is generally in favor of saving at least some of the old brick buildings. I assume will have to be addressed as a feasibility/community value issue later on. I'm glad you fought to keep them standing until that decision could be made. I would love to see the city go back to some of the original public comments made during the design concept phase and see what could resurrected. So much public comment was scrubbed, summarized incorrectly, or out-and-out thrown in the trash. The WAG was so hell-bent on delivering for the Port, they didn't seriously entertain any plan that challenged the Port's vision...until the Planning Commission (David Auer being a particularly strong voice) opened up the process and forced the City and Port to consider more park space, public access, etc.</p> <p>I'd love to see the marina permit denied. The Port has been driving this process (badly) for so long, they haven't actually done anything to deserve the huge handouts and public financial support that will go toward something so useless to the rest of us. I know from personal experience that's a tough fight and a long battle. But it'd be for the good of the community.</p> <p>I miss the TerrAquarium and the overwater boardwalk/walkway, two public assets that seemed at least moderately feasible and on-track.</p> <p>The timing on the boardwalk would be tricky given the cleanup (or lack thereof). You don't want to draw people to the Chem-Fix. But at the same time, it'd be nice for people to engage with the property and feel some stake in it before it turns into real estate office, luxury condos and Western classrooms.</p> <p>Again, thank you for the thoughtful, energetic approach you've taken to this process. The public is finally returning to meetings and speaking out.</p>
11/19/08	Waterfront	Dave Wertz	Mayor Pike

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>Just a note to say that I appreciate your efforts to stand up to the Port. Don't stop now. In fact, I would appreciate it greatly if you would do more to ensure that the redevelopment better reflects the needs and values of the local citizens. For instance, while the construction of a yacht marina for the rich might have seemed like a good idea during the era of Hummers, it has no place in today's world. Instead, a large public park and amphitheater would serve as a huge draw and help revitalize the downtown (see e.g. Portland, Or.). Please push to scrap the marina, clean up the toxins, and preserve more open space for Bellingham's citizens. You're all we have to keep the Port and it's big business buddies from ruining the future of our great town.</p>
11/19/08	Waterfront Development Comments	Dan Taylor	<p>Below and attached are my comments. Thank you for the opportunity.</p> <p>Planning Areas No comment other than to hope there will be a way to locate the Maritime Museum in the Log Pond Area just back from the Cornwall Beach area in an early stage of the development. The outdoor aspects of the museum including the canoe carving sheds could even utilize some of the open space acreage. It would tie in nicely with a small boat launch in the area and the canoe carving sheds utilized by the Lummis and Nooksacks partially addresses one of the points under Guideline #9.</p> <p>Green Spaces and the Environment The green space looks good under both alternatives. Assume it meets LOS needs of the City's park plan.</p> <p>The environmental cleanup and the need to raise or berm the site will take some time. But it would be great to have an interim trail along the water front as early in the life of the project as possible.</p> <p>Multi-Modal Transportation Both plans have multi-modal potential. It is going to come down to how much you can limit the parking and tame the cars. Suggestions: 1. Change zoning from minimum parking requirements to maximum allowable parking. 2. Eliminate the curb, gutter, sidewalk approach and allow all modes to mix throughout much of the ROW as a number of cities in Europe are doing. This could also tie in with a LEEDs storm drainage approach.</p> <p>One element of the City plan I particularly like is the high speed commuter bike route, something that will be important in other areas as well to truly make the bicycle a significant mode.</p> <p>Street Grids and Focal Points</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>The rotated grid appears to make a more exciting development. East-west streets should also provide significantly greater solar gain, something that will be important forever and not just something that May or may not be needed in LEEDs certification. It also complements the overall City pattern picking up the north-south, east-west grid of the cultural district.</p> <p>However impact on historic preservation is a serious problem and rotating Cornwall is attractive but forces truck traffic to the shipping terminal area through the mixed use area rather than on the perimeter.</p> <p>I hope a blend of both street patterns can be achieved.</p> <p>Historic Preservation I prefer the City's approach to historic preservation for all of the stated reasons. However, early evaluation of the most doubtful buildings would be appropriate.</p> <p>View Corridors and Building Heights I generally prefer the Port's position on view corridors. Twenty five or thirty years from now, there will be a market and a need for some taller buildings. Therefore it seems the most sustainable approach would be to designate the five or six locations where these would be allowed now and let the height on those be 200' or more.</p> <p>Phasing of Development An important concept infrastructure-wise. But it is important not to be too rigid about it. The university should be allowed to locate where and when they want to.</p> <p>The waterfront needs to be closely linked to downtown, but that will be dependant largely on pedestrian circulation and mass transit, not immediate juxtaposition. It will be a distinct neighborhood despite what the planning commission may have said.</p> <p>Costs Obviously an issue. But return on investment will be higher with quality front end investment. As Daniel Burnham said: "Make no little plans....."</p>
11/19/08	Waterfront	Melvin G. Davidson Barbara A. Davidson	This is to register our support for the City of Bellingham's approach to the development of the former Georgia Pacific site. Your plan seems to be in the best interests of the people of Bellingham. We feel the streets on the former GP site should line up with the existing downtown grid, and it makes sense that we should develop the area progressively over time rather than all at once. Progressive

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>development seems especially appropriate in this difficult and unpredictable financial period. Your plans also seem to preserve existing views of the Bay better than those of the Port of Bellingham.</p> <p>The Port of Bellingham seems to be disregarding the needs of the citizens of Bellingham in this issue and appears to be acting as if it were just another profit-hungry developer rather than the public agency it is.</p>
11/19/08	Waterfront	David Marshak	<p>Mayor Pike,</p> <p>I write to urge you to continue your current efforts to engage the Port Commission in a collaborative process for the redevelopment of the waterfront. Please do not surrender to the Commissioners' demands or manipulations. You have struck exactly the right tone so far and have offered a reasonable, thoughtful means for joint engagement of COB and the Port.</p>
11/19/08	Waterfront Redevelopment Comments	Judy Kleinberg	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the waterfront redevelopment. Thank you, too, for your firm and outspoken leadership in what continues to be a contentious 'conversation.' My concerns in particular are:</p> <p>Multi-Modal Transportation</p> <p>I feel both plans are making a grave error in anticipating and planning for what is most certainly a disastrously auto-centric development. This is pandering to future developers, who will 'insist' that they cannot build without adequate provisions for parking.</p> <p>Having lived in Los Angeles and Seattle—cities that, through short-sighted planning, have been nominated and aesthetically ruined by traffic and parking problems—I think that Bellingham is on the verge of making a mistake that it will regret for decades to come. In the interest of haste and dollars rather than the health of our community and its residents, we are, literally, putting the cart before the horse.</p> <p>The waterfront site is ideal for shuttle service—in and out of downtown, the WWU campus, remote parking, and even Bellis Fair. In a time when energy resources are ever more limited, and for the long-term protection of the adjacent downtown streets and businesses, instead of assuming that residents and visitors will reach their destination by car, the City and Port should take a forward-thinking stance and build the waterfront on the assumption that visitors will be served by easily accessible shuttles, light rail, moving sidewalks or other modes of mass transportation.</p> <p>I am not suggesting that we abandon parking altogether, but rather that the parking be kept to the periphery and vehicle traffic be minimized as much as possible to residents and service vehicles.</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	--

			<p>This is a quality of life issue. Instead of revitalizing our downtown, the number of in-and-out vehicle trips suggested by the proposed parking is certain to destroy the charm and attractiveness of our community. Why would anyone want to live in or visit a downtown that is constantly impacted by through traffic and gridlocked intersections? Why would Bellingham residents bother to patronize downtown businesses when every trip into the city center means competing with thousands of additional vehicles?</p> <p>Our city streets were not designed for such volume; to ignore that important fact--or to devise convoluted routes through the neighborhoods--could mean the end of the city we know and love.</p> <p>Street Grids and Focal Points I am strongly in favor of the 'third' plan, which combines the City and Port alternatives and provides for a second long parkway while preserving the more-human scale of the City's design.</p> <p>Historic Preservation I agree with the City's stance: that every possibility of preserving and reusing existing structures should be considered.</p> <p>View Corridors and Building Heights I agree with the City's proposal and feel very, very strongly that there is absolutely no place for 200-foot buildings on the waterfront. "View corridor" is a euphemism. We don't want view corridors; we want views—of the water, the islands, downtown and the adjacent hillsides. The tallest buildings should be kept as close as possible to the cliff contours to minimize disruption of the views. (I also think it is disingenuous on the part of both the City and the Port for all of the renderings to show 50 or 60-foot buildings—or impossible aerial views—rather than the maximum 125 or 200-foot buildings proposed!)</p> <p>Even with the urgent need to capture existing funding opportunities, the City must avoid making hasty decisions that will turn the waterfront into a blight instead of a healthy and beautiful destination for future generations.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
--	--	--	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	--

11/19/08	Waterfront Plan	Colleen Schacht	<p>I would like to provide input to the Waterfront Plan.</p> <p>I strongly support the City's Proposal to keep the same street grid that is currently in place downtown.</p> <p>I think it is vital to the health of downtown Bellingham to keep the connection to the new waterfront neighborhood on the existing street grid layout. Beside connecting downtown to the waterfront district, I think it also contributes to efficient traffic flow both into and out of the new waterfront district. (Of course it seems no one wants to promote driving in Bellingham, but it is still the reality.)</p> <p>I also support the size of the "city blocks" on the city proposal versus the huge "Vegas Style" blocks proposed by the Port.</p> <p>I believe the open/green space as planned is sufficient.</p> <p>I support the attempt to Preserve Historic sites and buildings. It is important to provide a "historic personality" of the Waterfront District to differentiate Bellingham from any other cookie cutter re-made city.</p> <p>I support starting development phases close to downtown and then to grow toward the waterfront.</p> <p>Thank you for asking for input. Please let me know if I can assist further.</p>
11/20/08	Waterfront Redevelopment Discussion Community Meetings	Cathy Cameron	<p>Dear Mayor Pike,</p> <p>Thank you for providing another opportunity for public input on the Waterfront.</p> <p>I believe this site is currently the largest waterfront development project in the State of Washington, and may be the largest on the west coast of the United States, and possibly the largest on the west coast of North America.</p> <p>I don't think there will be problems attracting developers to this site at any time.</p> <p>Making the site a neighborhood is another matter.</p> <p><u>Street Grids:</u> The city's straight grid creates greater efficiencies in public transportation: buses can navigate more easily on straight rather than angled streets. The connection to downtown would be more seamless by extending the downtown street grid.</p> <p><u>Transportation:</u> Rather than building 12,892 parking spaces in this neighborhood, let's create a neighborhood of walking and public transportation. Public transportation increases when services increase. By implementing the WTA GO Lines and WWU Student Night Shuttle, public transit ridership in Bellingham has increase significantly in the last year. Cars and parking are necessary. Traffic impacts on surrounding neighborhoods need further public discussion. Sustainability</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>discussions should continue.</p> <p><u>Preservation of Historic Buildings</u>: Whenever possible, yes. Cost should not be the primary factor in decisions of historic preservation.</p> <p><u>Preservation of Focal Points / Views</u>: Yes, always. This new neighborhood should transition well from the existing neighborhoods. Preservation of views for the current population of Bellingham and future populations should be a primary factor in planning.</p> <p>Our climate can be dark and cold. Tall buildings can create shadows, wind tunnels and block views.</p> <p><u>Green Spaces</u>: The more green spaces - the better. Are the play areas for children in addition to the current green spaces?</p> <p><u>Location of WWU</u>: The waterfront should be public land and as large as possible. WWU should be further away from the waterfront.</p> <p>Thank you for holding 4 community meetings to discuss this topic. Too bad Port Commissioners were not in attendance at 2 of the meetings. Port Commissioners not attending public meetings held by the City where they are featured speakers is very unfortunate and jeopardizes public process. Maybe if we had an opportunity to elect more Port Commissioners it would help</p> <p><u>Is this true?</u> The Waterfront Redevelopment site is currently the largest waterfront development project in the State of Washington, and may be the largest on the west coast of the United States, and possibly the largest on the west coast of North America.</p>
11/20/08	Waterfront	Kelly Mielke	<p>Dan,</p> <p>Thank you for holding your ground and not letting the Port walk all over you and the citizens of Bellingham. Having a mayor who truly represents the people of the city of Bellingham is so important and welcome. I commend you for your calm and even-keeled approach to dealing with the Port who it seems is out of control.</p>
11/20/08	Port and City	Hugh Fleetwood	<p>Dear Mayor Dan and Sati,</p> <p>I urge you to maintain your position in the present dispute between the City and the Port. In my opinion the Port's position is primarily economic and in a sense dictated by a desire for revenues. The City's position is and ought to be dictated by broad cultural concerns which go far beyond economics which extend far into the future.</p> <p>Perhaps, most important is that in the Port's view the need for revenues dictates the urgency and direction of development and surely this is important. However, the City's first task is to understand the directions and values which proceed from the size and variety of the Waterfront.</p> <p>I think it is false that the City and the Port have the same goals; those of the City are richer and more diverse than those of the Port and it is absolutely imperative that the City maintain its authority in these matters.</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

11/20/08	Bellingham Central Waterfront	Bernie Waltz	<p>To the Mayor of Bellingham, To the Port of Bellingham Commissioners,</p> <p>I appreciate all the hard work that all parties evolved have extended to date. But we must continue to proceed post haste! Please do not squander this once in a lifetime opportunity. Time is of the essence to leverage development funds from the State & Federal Governments. NOAA may have second thoughts about relocating in Bellingham with the current uncertainty. With agreement is so many areas, there must be a compromise on this few sticky points. Let's back away from your individual positions & take a look from the other side of the fence.</p> <p>The following is my response to the handout from November 17, 2008:</p> <p>Street Grid & Focal Points One of the published drawing "Draft Framework Plan 2026" which was distributed during the Ports tours of the site last summer, shows streets aligned with down town in the north portion, until you reach the Historic Building, then the street gird rotates East/West. Beyond the Historic Buildings, I believe there is very little original street gird in any direction to worry about. Is a there possible compromise?</p> <p>Historic Preservation Historic Building in addition to the industrial equipment & material reuse are important to draw interest to the area, but must be at a reasonable cost.</p> <p>Views & Building Heights Is there a compromise between 200 feet & mostly 75 feet? If sky scrapers are built in new waterfront, it will appear that this is the down town of Bellingham. Sucking the life out of the down town again, like Bellis Fair did for so many years!</p> <p>Development Phasing Is it possible to start development near down town, so as not to create a divide between down town & the new Waterfront Development? Then as WWU is ready, proceed with that phase simultaneously to spur private investment there also.</p>
11/21/08	Thank You	Carol Oberton	<p>Mayor Pike & Council</p> <p>I was unable to attend the recent meetings regarding the Waterfront.</p> <p>I would like to express my concern that our lovely potential waterfront jewel will be lost as a community resource. We need strong vision here. How many times will our community be given a</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>chance like this one? We are at a cross roads and you can be our strongest voice. Please keep your stance as the Port pressures the City Council & community with their short sighted schemes. We DO NOT need the Port to bully us out of our waterfront. Its potential as a beautiful, cultural, accessible, educational, unique working family oriented landmark will take a community to forge, not ONE entity. Please do your best to keep the site of our grand harbor becoming Bellingham's showpiece and not a bedroom marina for Seattle.</p> <p>Thank you for all your efforts.</p>
11/24/08	Bellingham's Waterfront	Larry Mansfield	<p>This past Thursday, 11/20/08, I listened to presentations from the City and Port on the current state of plans for the waterfront at a Silver Beach Neighborhood Association. Though there appeared to be Considerable agreement on basic principles, the two street plans could not have been much different. Neither looked pleasing to me. The City's grid looked plain and uninviting. The Port's plan seemed to run out of inspiration after a bit of diagonal streets near downtown. It appeared that a rectangular grid had just been plopped in for the remainder of the site. I believe the Blethen/Christensen proposal to contains a superior street layout. It is esthetically pleasing with good view corridors toward the Bay while tying in nicely with downtown Bellingham. I would strongly encourage choosing a street plan following the ideas of Blethen and Christensen.</p> <p>I cannot write about the waterfront without making another plea for reconsideration of the marina. [I wrote the original WAG about this while it was still active.] Both the City and the Port representatives said that they support a triple bottom line for development. Only one of these bottom lines, the financial, has a chance of being fulfilled by the marina. Even this appears to require raising current moorage rates. However, there is no way the other two bottom lines can be satisfied by a marina right in front of our City. I have never seen a marina that is esthetically pleasing or ecologically sound. The water in marinas is always filthy. Full of oil, gas and flotsam. One need only walk around a marina to see an environmental disaster. Unless one takes particular pleasure in looking at the large boats envisioned for this marina, the little strip of "park" around it will not likely be an attraction. I understand that the previous Council signed off on the Port's marina idea, but I believe this was done without clearly informing the public about it actions and their consequences.</p> <p>Finally, it has been mentioned that the University would like to have a presence on the site. There has also been talk of an aquarium. I would like to see these ideas put together by constructing a research center similar to the ones in Newport, Oregon and Monterey, California. Both of these centers do important research on local marine ecosystems while providing a great place for people to visit. They provide opportunities for local residents to volunteer their time and learn about marine life. Of course, such a center cannot be created overnight, but the development plans seem to envision</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>decades of work. A nationally recognize research center might even provide more revenue than a boat basin for the rich.</p>
11/24/08	Waterfront Redevelopment	<p>NORMAN SCHEAFFER" <nnscheaffer@msn.com</p>	<p>Mayor Pike, Thank you and your staff for the time spent in preparing the two community meetings. My wife and I found last Monday night's meeting very informative and very even-handed with regard to the presentation of Port and City project concepts. My guess is that the final build-out will incorporate the most sensible features of each plan.</p> <p><u>View Corridors and Building Heights</u> No matter how the area develops, the existing city will be looking out over a lot of building roofs. View corridors will be the result of the street grid selected, and neither proposal will please everyone. Street orientation should be decided on the basis of other criteria.</p> <p>Building heights in all planning areas should be limited by zoning regulation to a 75-foot maximum (unless a lower height is dictated by other criteria as in Shoreline Overlay areas). Exceptions up to 120 feet should be limited in number and permitted only by special review. In exchange for the height variance, the building should step back from the street frontage at the third floor roof level and the high-rise portion should cover no more than 25 percent of the building footprint.</p> <p><u>Phasing of Development</u> I favor the City's approach over that of the Port. In particular, I agree that the realignment of the Burlington Northern main line is one of the first items that needs to be addressed, and I was pleased to hear that the railroad and the City had already signed an agreement to facilitate the move. I would suggest that the existing trackage across Cornwall Avenue be left in place to serve the site during the site cleanup and early stages of the buildout. (Twelve to fifteen railcars of fill material per day make a lot more sense than 100 10-yard trucks per day!)</p> <p>Also, I favor the City's proposal for development from the edge of downtown since it allows a logical phasing of infrastructure construction. The City's approach will keep early development projects away from areas requiring cleanup.</p> <p><u>Area Fill</u> With regard to the depth of area fill required for the site, I believe that the Port is closer to the mark than the City. Both proposals agree that the shoreline park areas should be raised to prevent inundation in northeast storm events, Spring tidal surges, and long-term sea-level rise. I suggest that the whole site be raised so that surface runoff can be treated in the park areas or on the way to the park areas. There is no point in raising the shoreline and creating an empty pond that nature will find a way to fill (as in New Orleans).</p> <p><u>Street Grids</u> I favor the City's proposal for the street grid, at least on the eastern end of the site. It avoids any irreversible decisions on demolishing the remaining industrial structures and provides a logical basis</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>for the extension on underground services into the development area.</p> <p>In assessing potential solar energy, please note that the City's street plan allows "equal time" for sunshine in all streets in support of the "great places" concept. While the Port configuration is best for south-facing solar gain, it leaves the south side of east-west streets in permanent building shadow. In both cases, there will be plenty of flat roof areas suitable for east-west oriented solar arrays.</p> <p><u>Historic Preservation</u></p> <p>I favor the City's "further analysis" approach to preserving portions of the remaining buildings. Dave Ebanol would not want to do another Waldron Building, but he showed us what can be done in stabilization and reuse of unreinforced masonry buildings.</p> <p>An exception to the above concerns the need to preserve the granary building for adaptive reuse. It is poured concrete and has no architecturally redeeming features other than "an interesting roofline". (Turning the two-story section along the waterway into a gallery gateway to the site will be an expensive exercise in structural analysis and awkward concrete sawing.) I suggest that it be demolished and ground on site for reuse as crushed surfacing base course. The Central Avenue site would then be free for a more inspired gateway to the new waterfront.</p> <p><u>Approval Process</u></p> <p>Prospective developers would like an approval process with no surprises. However, they also tend to want variances from development standards or zoning requirements (or both) without allowing any time in the project schedule to obtain them. If the City is clear on the ground rules and the developer's submittals are in compliance, that should be as streamlined as the approval process gets.</p>
11/24/08	Waterfront Redevelopment Discussion Community Meetings	Michael E Smith	<p>Mayor Pike:</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to provide input. Let me start by saying I am very disappointed in the recent turn of events. The City and the Port are partners in this historic project, and instead of cooperation and leadership we are getting lawsuits and threats. Asking the citizens of this community to choose which plan is preferred in asking them to choose sides, which is divisive and counterproductive. What we need is for the City and the Port to work together, in the spirit of the 2005 inter-local agreement, and lead this community towards a preferable future.</p> <p>That being said, as a professional architect that has lived and worked in Bellingham since 1976, I believe I have a perspective that could be of value. The following comments follow the same format as a questionnaire handed out at the Community Meetings:</p> <p>Planning Areas – I believe NOAA needs access to the deepwater portions of the site (the shipping terminal) because of the size of ships they use. And because of the relationship between WWU's</p>

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>Huxley College and NOAA, I believe Western's portion of the project should be in close proximity to NOAA. I appreciate the City's concern and desire to start growth adjacent to the existing downtown core, but it should not be at the expense of the unique working relationship between NOAA and WWU.</p> <p>Green Space and the Environment – The City and the Port need to place a high priority on this project being a LEED-ND pilot project, and demonstrate to the world how to create a sustainable future.</p> <p>Multi-Modal Transportation – I have not seen any comments from Whatcom Transit Authority. They need to be engaged in the planning process, and develop a plan for bus transit in this area.</p> <p>Street Grids and Focal Points – As mentioned above, this project needs to be a model of sustainable development as a LEED-ND pilot project. Accordingly, quoting from the United States Green Building Council's LEED for Neighborhoods Rating System's Green Technology and Construction Section:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Intent – Achieve enhanced energy efficiency by creating the optimum conditions for the use of passive and active solar strategies.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Requirements – Locate project on existing blocks, or design and orient project, such that for 75% or more of the project's blocks, one axis of each block is within 15 degrees of geographical east/west, and the east/west length of each block is at least as long, or longer, as the north/south length of the block.”.</p> <p>The reason for this is simple – streets and buildings that are oriented with their long axis on an east-west orientation can maximize the amount of solar energy available. In an urban environment such as this, the buildings will most likely be built property-line to property-line, similar to what currently exists in Downtown Bellingham, and in virtually every urban downtown in America. To quote from Edward Mazria's seminal work <i>The Passive Solar Energy Book</i>:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Buildings blocked from exposure to the low winter sun between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM cannot make direct use of the sun's energy for heating. To take advantage of the sun in climates where heating is needed during the winter, (my emphasis) find the areas on the site that receive the most sun during the hours of maximum solar radiation. Buildings shaped without regard for the sun's impact require large amounts of energy to heat and</p>
--	--	--	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>cool.”</p> <p>In other words, a building that faces south, oriented to a street that runs east-west, will make the most efficient use of the sun’s energy.</p> <p>Again, quoting from Mazria:</p> <p>“When deciding on the rough shape of a building, it is necessary to think about admitting sunlight into the building. A building elongated along the east-west axis will expose more surface area to the south during the winter for the collection of solar radiation. This is also the most efficient shape, in all climates, for MINIMIZING (Mazria’s emphasis) heating requirements in the winter and cooling in the summer.”</p> <p>Ed Mazria is one of the primary authors of the 2030 Challenge, a global initiative stating that all new buildings and major renovations reduce their fossil-fuel greenhouse gas-emitting consumption by 50% in 2010, incrementally increasing the reduction for new buildings to carbon neutral by 2030. This challenge has been endorsed by the US Conference of Mayors (Resolution #50), the American Institute of Architects, US Green Building Council, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), Environmental Protection Agency, Royal Architecture Institute of Canada, International Council for Local Environment Initiatives, World Business Council for Sustainable Development, Union Internationale des Architects (UIA), and many, many others. Implementing alternative energy strategies like solar is a fundamental way to partially achieve the goals of the 2030 Challenge.</p> <p>I have heard some argue that simply rotating a building on the site will accomplish the same result. This is not true. Only the southernmost building on any given block can use this strategy – and that building will block the next building, which will block the next building and so on. I have detailed solar shading studies available that illustrate this point.</p> <p>The preferable future that the City and the Port need to lead us to is one wherein the streets are oriented east-west for maximum solar gain. Continuing the existing downtown grid does not achieve this result.</p> <p>There is a nice architectural consequence where these two grids meet – you end up with a triangular block and a “flatiron” style of building. We have two examples in Bellingham currently – the building at the corner of Holly, Bay and Champion that houses CH2M Hill, and the old brick building at the corner of Champion, Commercial and Magnolia. These buildings, like their cousins</p>
--	--	--	--

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>in Seattle and Vancouver BC lend a unique architectural quality to the streetscape.</p> <p>Historic Preservation – I have been involved in many renovations of older buildings. There is no doubt in my mind that it is more expensive to renovate than it is to build new. Historic Preservation should be a priority, but not a high priority like the LEED ND goals and the street grid. Efforts should be made to keep as many of the usable buildings as possible, but it is very conceivable that these buildings may be some of the last projects, because of the costs involved. The City should implement strategies to encourage redevelopment of these buildings, like tax reductions, waiver of fees, loan assistance and so forth. The City could lead by example and develop one or more of these buildings for a municipal need, like the proposed Library.</p> <p>View Corridors and Building Heights – the view corridor issue is a moot point in light of the overriding east-west street grid preference. 75' is too short for most buildings – this is only 5 or 6 stores assuming the ground floors will have the higher ceilings mandated by the Downtown Design Guidelines. I believe there should be a third height option – 75' would be the lowest, 125' would be the middle, and 200' would be the highest. The 75' limits would be at the water's edge – the west and south sides of the site. The 125' limits would be on the rest of the site, with a few selected areas for 200' limits. The 200' limits need to be separated from each other in such a way to preserve views between them, similar to what has been done in West Vancouver, BC.</p> <p>Phasing of Development – as mentioned above in "Planning Areas", I believe WWU and NOAA need to occupy the areas closest to the International Shipping Terminal and the deepwater port. Other developments can be encouraged adjacent to the downtown core, but in reality there is going to be tremendous interest in the waterfront for initial development. Restricting initial development to areas that are not on the water may delay development and hinder progress. The City can help "Infill" the areas between by locating the proposed library between the waterfront and the downtown core. Other government funded buildings should also be encouraged to locate in this zone.</p> <p>The railroad should be relocated as soon as possible. I am sure the Port would agree with this prospect. I have a question – have the costs of enclosing the railroad in an above-grade tunnel been explored? This would be safer than an open rail line, significantly reduce noise levels, and create the opportunity for development, or at least additional green space, above the railroad.</p> <p>Costs – I understand the primary difference in costs between the City's plan and the Port's is that the City is choosing not to raise the site a level above anticipated sea level rise (6'). Rather, the perimeter of the site would be constructed as a dike, with the rest of the site at or near existing levels.</p>
--	--	--	---

Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – November 2008
------------	---------	---------------	---

			<p>I appreciate the City's concerns over traffic impacts and costs associated with raising the entire site, but I believe that raising the site is in the better long-term interests of this community. Insurance premiums for building owners will be higher in a diked situation. Views from the pedestrian level will be partially blocked. Streets between the existing downtown core and the waterfront will be steeper. The City and the Port need to take a long-term view of all planning decisions, and do what is best for this community 100 years from now, regardless of short-term costs.</p> <p>I would also like to comment on the entitlements being sought for this project. I believe it is possible to approve an EIS for the entire project. There are many larger, more complex projects across the nation that have such approval. The mix of uses for the waterfront is already predetermined – retail, office, residential and educational. These are not high-impact uses, and very compatible with any urban Central Business District. It should not be difficult to prepare development standards for this mix of uses. Future projects will still have to prepare a SEPA checklist, and if the project is found to not be consistent with the vision of the EIS and the development standards, then an EIS can still be mandated.</p> <p>In closing, let me repeat my opening statement – it is counter-productive and divisive to ask the community to choose between two plans. This City is being torn apart by the debate, creating animosity and bitterness instead of uniting towards a common goal. It is also a waste of taxpayer's money. The City and the Port need to reconvene and work together and develop a single plan. There will be some who disagree with the final plan – that is the price of being a leader. So I implore you, Executive Director Jim Darling, the City Council, the Port Commission and the respective staffs to put aside your differences and come together and lead us towards a preferable future.</p>
11/25/08	Thank You Mr. Mayor	James Lourie	Dear Mr. Pike, Thank you for standing up to the Port concerning the Waterfront Redevelopment.
11/28/08	Waterfront Development	Jim Green	Hello Mayor Pike, I think the Port will probably always insist on developing the waterfront with its own interests at the forefront. Perhaps the city of Bellingham could initiate condemnation proceedings against the Port of Bellingham, and acquire all the property south of the Whatcom waterway, leaving the Port in ownership of the future marina site and the adjacent marine related industrial mixed use area. That might force a sharing of the cleanup costs and free the city to develop the waterfront along its own lines. Thanks for your leadership on this issue.