

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
<i>Last Update 3/31/09</i>				<p><i>Citizen comments received from citizens submitting comment to the Port and City and through the New Whatcom website through April 2009. Also added are comments and notes collected during the 4/29/09 public meeting. Prior month comments can be viewed on the website in separate monthly document.</i></p>
423	4/29/09	4/29/09 Public Meeting	Community Vision Table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at Dec 2008 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Public Comments • More Park/Green Space/Plenty of parks • Parks in site interior • Soft bank on waterway vs hard edge • Views from site to CBD • Support varied shoreline setbacks • % of parks compared to other cities • Represent first people's use of area – interpretive center / museum, etc. • Economic vitality and marine history • Work with tribes • Locate high pressure gas line • Terraquarium location should be near WWU, not in Marine Trades Area • If not LEED ND pilot, follow intent • Wants Laurel bridge (pedestrian/bikes only) • Pedestrian only areas • Park cars on outside • Don't allow businesses in parks • County-wide vote • Lease vs sell site
	4/29/09	4/29/09 Public Meeting	Structures/WWU Table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marina <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (from NAA) study/remove/eval for other uses, industrial, storm water, etc. in EIS\ ○ Economic driver (2 year wait) • Underground infrastructure, eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Water to GP, gas pipe, etc. • Remediation of waterway

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings – bad reminder – eye sore <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerned about renovation costs ○ AEW good level (max) study • WWU not locked – walk through • Good plan – grade of roads and buildings • Explain how WWU site selected • Explain how students get down to classes • Good downtown connections • Like over waterway walkway • Buildings – adaptive reuse good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be open, want independent study • Position for early reuse of buildings • Excited to make ASB a marina <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SEP issue for other area to South ○ Generate income soon ○ Permit quicker • Want to consider saving buildings for further study
	4/29/09	4/29/09 Public Meeting	Transportation Table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered road options around Granary? • Central on south side of Granary – there – • Passenger railroad in H₂O District • Document assumption to move central in future as part of MP (or XXX?) • Aren't perpendicular bridges over RR cheaper? • Is core infrastructure Phase I? • Bicycle traffic from XXXXX H₂O <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pedestrian crossing at Laurel • Construction materials to site over 20-30 years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider barging to reduce traffic • Consider removing non-descript portion of Granary for central (North side) • Considerations for fill, heights contamination • Keep 2° roads small, quant feeling • Use “historic boats” to cross WW for pedestrians instead of pedestrian

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bridge • Need pedestrian only crossing at Bay Street • Emergency access (2 routes enough for train wreck?) • Transit access for entire site over time (multiple users, not just WWU) • Make sure bridges are wide enough for bike and pedestrian access as they are only Y access points • Concern about expand Wharf for pedestrian access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wouldn't Laurel be cheaper? • E/W road grid better for wind tunnel effect? • Trail access (pedestrian) from South (not a road) • With only ¾ roads to site, seems to support need for pedestrian only access point over RR • Improvements at F'SC to make crossing RxR more efficient and safe
	4/29/09	4/29/09 Public Meeting	Process & Next Steps Table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why was there a rush to approve a plan on April 20 without WAG review? • When will community be able to ask City (Mayor, L. Reardanz) why City shifted some of its waterfront plans/goals? • Process failure because public isn't told when it will be able to made – avoid surprises • Make the process clear – even before dates • Process is not working and it needs to be fixed • WAG process is not working when they have not been given information ahead of decision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shallow opportunities – “train left station” • 1,000 of comments from community disconnect from plan – feedback loop is needed – no connection with comments. How? Town meeting/dialogue • Need clarification of process steps – reinventing the wheel rather than building plan – <u>educate</u> • Define “master plan” – planning <u>criteria</u> – consensus: criteria will be used to measure plans • Set dates and clarify – adapt as needed to stay on track and stay with <u>criteria</u> – (WFG, WAG) – criteria list

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WAG – is there a schedule to have their feedback go to City Council and Commission • This is heading to a “train wreck” and “do-over” – no clear process and public participation process • April 20 decision is a “narrowing of options” should have been done in public – smaller meetings not appropriate • Clean ocean marina – not an alternative but is no action alternative – should be broken out as something studied, measured along with other alternatives • 2 <u>Key</u> Issues not being addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clean-up toxins ○ Economic feasibility ○ Must be addressed and discussed • WFG was done to avoid doing what we are doing now – “cherry picking” ideas from Collins Woerman (i.e., arterials within shoreline) • Each table section topics are pulled apart and how was it decided which topics got tables – unhappy with tonight’s meeting format • Would like to be in all of the groups and hear from all groups – additional meetings • Where do economics fit in? • Economics need to be reviewed public needs to be informed • Changing economic climate may call for rethinking of original vision • When will economics be updated? • Can older numbers be trusted? • Rail corridor needed – station – • Use separate rooms for separate discussion groups • Can the public assume that from this point forward the City and the Port will continue to work together cooperatively and work for community as a while – sign an agreement to cooperate? <p><u>Over Arching Issues</u></p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not happy with Port/City April 20 vote before WAG and public comment • Not more process so much as more <u>clear</u> process • Need clear process – it has not been clear about how and when public can authentically comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WAG can participate in meaningful manner • How will economics be measured – how will community be able to comment on economics? • Some key issues are not being included tonight and should be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Economics ○ Clean-up ○ Marina • Past public and WAG comment isn't shown in current plan – feedback loop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How are public and WAG comments influencing the process? • Need clear planning criteria to measure plans against • How are changing economics being addressed? • Should we design a master plan and then have developer execute and pay for it? • Marina discussion has not had a public process and public should be given alternatives • Unclear how we are moving forward – we appear to be looping back • Tonight's meeting wanted to hear and participate in all topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise ○ Not good process
4/29/09 Public Meeting Written Comment Cards				
	4/29/09	WFG Principles/ Central Road	Public Meeting/Anonymous	What is different between this and Collins-Woerman's "Green Fingers" that was so resoundingly rejected years ago? Arterial along Central Ave.-over water-is in complete violation of WFG principles as well as shoreline regulations. What a waste of time! This is a "step forward"?

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009
		Support Clean-Up & Economics ASB Marina Skyway Gondolas Historical Structures/ cars Water Transport Public ownership, sewer line removal	Public Meeting/Anonymous Public Meeting/Anonymous Tip Johnson Anita Ballweg Anita Ballweg Public Meeting/Anonymous Public Meeting/Anonymous	<p>Good Meeting-Good Discussion/ Let's get moving!</p> <p>Why no discussion of cleanup or economics? How can we "move forward" without it?</p> <p>Please either remove the ASB Marina from all plans & documents OR review whether it is more beneficial as a marina, a water treatment facility or a contaminates sediment repository.</p> <p>Portland has a skyway (enclosed gondolas)-like ski areas-up to a hospital. Employees use it heavily, as well as the public. WWU could use a similar way for transportation to the waterfront. Fun for the general public, too.</p> <p>Don't destroy the historic structures! They are part of Bellingham's heritage. Reuse them- even if it is inconvenient. Once gone they can never be replaced (only mimicked-a bad idea). Will automobiles be a large part of transportation 20 to 40 years from now? Plan for pedestrian only areas. Park offsite and use public transportation into waterfront.</p> <p>Given the plans are driven by the Port of Bellingham, why so little emphasis on water transport?</p> <p>Remember that WFG final recommendations included: A)retaining PUBLIC ownership and B)removing or moving sewer line obstructing Whatcom Creek.</p>
		Marina, Parks, Shoreline setbacks	Public Meeting/Anonymous	<p>Glad that City & Port are agreeing on key issues so we can move forward! There's been plenty of "public process". The community, Whatcom County, needs the new marina & not more grass parks, or stormwater retention. Plan has more than enough park land at 33 acres. Quality more important than quantity in parks, open space, & trails. Water enjoyment uses like restaurants should be allowed <u>close</u> to water.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009
		More Moorage	Terry Potter	I'm from Ketchikan, Alaska; and I'd like to come to Bellingham for a winter haven, to spend my winter and moor my 47 foot Crisscraft. Right now I'm on a waiting list. NOT GOOD! I'd like to bring my winter money to support Bellingham's future plans. We need a new start.
		Supports Parks, NOAA, Marina	Public Meeting/Anonymous	Basically I love the plan. I look forward to more park along the waterfront and a new marina. I hope NOAA will become a fixture in our community, as well as WWU expanding to the waterfront. Regarding discussion format; in the future it would help if the tables were more spaced out to we can hear better.
		Criticism of Format	Public Meeting/Anonymous	An appalling lack of process yet again literally dividing the community so that people can't hear each other and no one is answerable to the frustration of the attendees.
		Public Walkway	Public Meeting/Anonymous	I think that as soon as the site is cleaned of dangerous industrial residues, a public walkway & parkbelt should be established connecting both ends of the waterfront. ie: Fairhaven to Bellwether area. The public should have access to this walkway A.S.A.P. The rest of the development may take decades, as suggested.
		WFG Recommendations	Public Meeting/Anonymous	I am very disappointed in Mayor Pike's seeming 180* turn around since Oct 2008 to the April 2009 agreement. Major assumptions such as street grid, historic building preservation and Central Ave. pedestrian/bike accessibility. Also worried about the mercury clean-up. Please go back to Waterfront Futures Group Recommendations.
		Public Ownership	Public Meeting/Anonymous	If the general plan is to take 30-40 years to develop this park; I see no reason to sell any of the land to private enterprises. This is the only time the land is available to the public-it is now owned by the public. DON'T SELL!
		Street Grids	Scott Jones	I still think we should have the continuation of the street grid into the port for view corridors.

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
		Passenger Railroad	Jeff Winslow	<p>Given that; The Port of Bellingham’s mission is to fulfill the essential transportation needs of the region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Rail transportation can sustainably serve the commuting needs of the city, county, and region. -The waterfront site is only a half mile from City Hall, the heart of the city. -WWU’s campus, the county’s single largest transportation demand generator is less than a half mile from the waterfront site. -Western Washington University’s students primarily come from distant counties and primarily migrate to Bellingham in cars. -It’s a perplexing contradiction that college students have few, if any alternatives to driving cars, yet cars kill more college age Americans than anything else, several thousand every year. -The existing Amtrak station is 2 ½ miles from the waterfront site. -The proposed plan calls for moving the existing track. -The use of passenger rail increases steadily while the automobile is proven increasingly unsustainable and air travel prohibitive. -The federal government has designated this rail corridor as a possible high-speed connector from Eugene, Oregon to Vancouver, B.C. <p>Does anyone on the various waterfront panels or committees have an answer to the question: Why is there no provision for a passenger railroad station in the waterfront plan?</p> <p>In my opinion, this is a major oversight that must be corrected if the waterfront plan is to succeed in enhancing the community in a meaningful way.</p>
		Eyesore Removal	John N. Connell johnshq@comcast.net	<p>While heading up I-5 about 35 years ago, I responded to a sign that said, “Gas, Food, Lodging”, and discovered Bellingham. I was very favorably impressed by what I saw, with one notable exception-I was surprised to find a big, ugly, sometimes fragrant old paper mill squatting right in the middle of the city, on some of the most desirable land in the entire area-the downtown waterfront! Finding that eyesore in such a prime location made me wonder about the capability of whoever was in charge of planning and permitting at the time it was</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>built, but everything else was so appealing that I decided to move here, and I've certainly never regretted that decision.</p> <p>Many years later came a second surprise, but this one was at the other end of the spectrum. The City and the Port had just received a wonderful opportunity to eliminate the eyesore, and replace it with a permanent focal point that would draw residents and visitors to the downtown area for years to come- the best-integrated combination of commercial, residential and recreational uses, with maximum visual appeal, that architectural talent and planning skills could devise.</p> <p>But this was followed by one more surprise, and this time in was a bad one. Some people were actually urging preservation of some of the ugly old structures that had been part of the paper mill! If allowed, these would not only serve as permanent reminders of the original bad mistake that had permitted them to squat there in the first place, but even more importantly, they would obstruct the integration of the redevelopment project, and spoil its visual appeal too. If an obsolete sewage treatment plant had been built on the property many years ago, it sounds to me like these folks would be demanding that it be preserved also, simply because it was old- but just because something is old, doesn't warrant keeping it. It is all very well to preserve architectural gems such as cathedrals and palaces, or cultural treasures like statues and monuments, but what good is accomplished by keeping outmoded old industrial buildings with no architectural appeal? I say get rid of the eyesore entirely, and start with a clean slate. Surely that will lead to the best possible result, and that's certainly what we all should be working toward, because whatever is created is going to have a major impact upon what is happening in the center of our city, and upon the appearance of our city, for a very long time to come.</p>
422	4/30/09	Hope for Bellingham Waterfront	Donna Merlina otamerlina@yahoo.com	<p>save all the land and money wasted building new roads and parking for cars in the new waterfront neighborhood and instead Follow Portland's latest sustainable transportation leadership!!</p> <p>See attached news release from Oregon's Earl Blumenauer about Portland's new streetcar! **No attachment to email</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
421	4/28/09	Waterfront Connections Plan Development Regs	Joel Plaskon JPlaskon@CityofLewiston.org	<p>I'm researching waterfront plan design standards, development regulations & mixed use zoning (for waterfronts). Your webpage indicates that you were to have completed new development regs for you Waterfront Connections Plan in '08, but I could not locate them. Are they done, & might I be able to review them?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
420	4/28/09	Port Development	Nichol Fritz Frittles@webtv.net	<p>I do not understand why WWU is taking tax dollars to build on the valuable waterfront land especially when they are so short of funds and need to raise tuition. I also do not understand why you and the Port think this is a good idea when a business would bring in more tax dollars and provide us with much needed jobs for the average person. Seems to me like you should continue to focus on the non-college jobs that are vanishing in Bellingham. We have too many people needing to work more than one job to survive in a city that is getting more and more expensive to just exist.</p>
419	4/27/09	Port-City Council Meeting, April 20, 2009	Jean Melious jean_melious@yahoo.com	<p>Mayor Dan Pike Bellingham City Council 210 Lottie Street Bellingham, Washington 98225</p> <p>Port Commission Port of Bellingham 1801 Roeder Avenue Bellingham, WA 98225</p> <p>Dear Mayor, City Council, and Port Commission:</p> <p>These comments address the resolution adopted at the April 20, 2009 joint meeting of the City Council and Port Commission.</p> <p>1. Substance</p> <p>The plan approved at the meeting provides for the destruction of historic industrial</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>buildings on the waterfront without adequate study. No adaptive reuse plan has been prepared for the buildings that would be demolished under the plan. The Architects' Study does not, and did not purport to, constitute a sufficient study of the reuse of historic buildings on the waterfront site.</p> <p>This premature elimination of the possibility of an adaptive rehabilitation that would root our waterfront in history seems to contradict the city's goals for waterfront development. The experience of other communities that used the redevelopment of historic industrial structures to revitalize their waterfronts helps to demonstrate how shortsighted this step could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Along Baltimore's waterfront, an abandoned metal-can manufacturing facility located in a brownfield "was transformed into a vibrant, mixed-use retail and office complex attractive to technology firms and has revitalized the surrounding neighborhood." The developers reused the historic structures to create a 200,000-square-foot commercial center housing 40 businesses, including high-tech companies, restaurants, and retailers. • In Richmond, California, the 1931 Ford Assembly Building, which had closed in 1956 and sat in disrepair for nearly five decades, was rehabilitated to house "green" businesses and a popular entertainment venue, all of which are revitalizing the local economy. <p>It would seem that Bellingham would want to pursue measures that would make it more competitive in attracting technology firms and "green" businesses. Instead, our city is poised to "start with a clean slate," a concept straight out of the bad old days of urban renewal in the 1960s. The many failures of scorched-earth urban renewal projects should have taught us that the perceived need to destroy historic buildings may be based on faulty economic assumptions and a lack of vision. We need, instead, an informed evaluation of long-term benefits to the community.</p> <p>It may be that historic preservation will not succeed on the waterfront.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>Bellingham may not attract the caliber of developer that made Baltimore and Richmond's industrial waterfront preservation efforts succeed. The buildings may sit empty for years. If they are torn down prematurely, however, we may be staring at weed-covered lots for many years. The Port and City should conduct the necessary studies to determine whether the historic industrial buildings on the waterfront site can be adaptively reused.</p> <p>2. Process</p> <p>This process provides only for public feedback, not public consultation. A public process that is scheduled after a plan has been approved is nothing more than window dressing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the State Environmental Policy Act ("SEPA") prohibits approving a plan first and then conducting the necessary environmental review. SEPA must "serve practically as an important contribution to the decision making process;" it must "not be used to rationalize or justify decisions already made." Washington Administrative Code ("WAC") 197-11-406.</p> <p>The text of the measure approved by the City Council and Port Commission is not available on either website. Both websites state that "final decisions" will not be made until the Final Environmental Impact Statement has been completed. This language, added at the last minute during the April 20 meeting, presumably is intended to provide plausible deniability in the event that anyone points out that the April 20 action violates SEPA. However, it appears to be a matter of form over function. The Port's website includes links to the "April 20, 2009 <u>Approved</u> Port City Waterfront Framework Planning Assumptions" and the "April 20, 2009 <u>Adopted</u> Port City Waterfront Planning Framework Map." The Mayor stated in the Bellingham Herald, on April 26, 2009, that "the planning framework represents a narrowing of choices". The Herald's editorial announces that "Finally a waterfront agreement is made."</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>The “approval” and “adoption” of the plan is being portrayed as a done deal prior to the completion of environmental review, contrary to SEPA’s mandate that the process should not be used to justify a decision already made. This is not a mere technical objection. The problem with approving first, evaluating afterwards is that project momentum is likely to build to the point where the environmental review becomes irrelevant. This problem has been described by the Washington State Supreme Court:</p> <p align="center">Even if adverse environmental effects are discovered later, the inertia generated by the initial government decisions (made without environmental impact statements) may carry the project forward regardless. When government decisions may have such snowballing effect, decisionmakers need to be apprised of the environmental consequences <i>before</i> the project picks up momentum, not after.</p> <p align="center"><i>King County v. Wash. State Boundary Review Bd.</i>, 122 Wash.2d 648, 664 (1993).</p> <p>The Port and the City cannot have it both ways. A plan cannot be “approved” for purposes of advertising the existence of the plan to the world, but not really “approved” for SEPA purposes.</p> <p>The Port and the City should state clearly that the April 20 meeting simply approved an alternative for further analysis. <u>Prior</u> to “approving” or “adopting” that, or any, alternative, the public and advisory groups should be consulted, and the necessary studies of adaptive reuse of historic buildings should be completed.</p> <p>I am a member of the City’s Historic Preservation Commission, but this letter is submitted in my capacity as a concerned Bellingham resident.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
418	4/25/09	Waterfront Development	Sharon Crozier geezwakeup@yahoo.com	<p>Dear Councilors:</p> <p>I clearly recall that, in the very early months of Mayor Pike taking office, he fervently worked at getting council to agree with the Port Commission on building certain access routes on the waterfront. Numerous articles in the Bellingham Herald quoted him as urging the council to work to quickly arrive at a compromise agreement with the Port and begin the contracting process as soon as possible. He then, too, cited missed opportunities and increased later expenses if they failed to act soon.</p> <p>Only when Council repeatedly resisted this rush to build out did he start talking tougher about the Port having to consider the City's positions on the waterfront. I, myself, wondered at his early and sudden urgency. Then I wondered at his oblique u-turn, presenting to the Port their unreasonableness in disagreeing with the City.</p> <p>Most people have short memories; unfortunately for Mayor Pike, many of us learned from his predecessor that we must pay close attention to the seemingly trivial and temporal news of the day.</p> <p>You had enough signatures to put the issue of cleanup before build-out before the voters. The mayor, the legal department and other staff (along with a more complacent council) managed to once more disregard and defeat that process and avoid "knowing" what the people might want.</p> <p>Please don't let the present forward thrust to action catch you up in the devious urgency of the day. Why would the mayor have this so strongly on his agenda? Why would he fabricate mythological partnerships with state officials? Why would someone elected to work with council for the good of the people act so desperately to come to agreement with the Port? They are neither responsible for the success of the waterfront future nor the cleanup (sooner or later).</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>Please stop this fast rolling bomb. Not agreeing with the mayor or the Port is unpleasant and has made councilors very timid in the past. It has never, ever made them successful.</p> <p>With great respect and appreciation,</p>
417	4/24/09	Waterfront Plan	Frances Badgett frances@mac.com	<p>Dear City Council of Bellingham, Mayor of Bellingham, City Planning Department of Bellingham, Waterfront Advisory Group, Planning Commissioners:</p> <p>I am writing with grave concern over the recent adoption of the Framework Plan by the City Council on April 20th. My concern is both with the quality of the map and planning assumptions presented by some of the architects who came forward to find consensus between the city and port, and with the context and process by which this plan was "memorialized."</p> <p>To begin with, I have spent a great deal of time calling legislative aides and electeds over the past week. Governor Gregoire's office is clear that the money to move the railroad tracks on our waterfront was not restored by Dan Pike. Her office did make it clear that the budget was still in negotiation, but the railroad tracks were not, as of our exchange, in the budget as Pike claimed. Senator Cantwell, Representative Larsen and Senator Murray are absolutely clear that they did not encourage, urge, imply or indicate the funding of a partnership between the City and Port as described by Dan Pike on April 13th and April 20th. Moreover, they were concerned that they were being implicated as complicit in the lack of public process and false urgency engineered by the Port and Mayor.</p> <p>As for the plan itself, I will always state (to the exhaustion of some of you) that without removing the mercury before construction begins—by relying on capping over removal—the City and Port are endorsing a plan that is risky, and endangers all permitting and building predictability, not to mention long-term human health and safety. To endorse the capping of mercury and construction on top of that cap is irresponsible at best.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>The marina is an unlikely candidate for outside funding. Unless the port wins the lottery, the marina is not a foregone conclusion. Just as with the possibility of Huxley not moving to the waterfront, we need to start talking about options and alternative uses for the ASB lagoon. As for the brick buildings, I have personally been ambivalent about whether or not they are of historic preservationist value and worth the price it would cost to restore them. However, I also hold dear and cherish the notion that, whatever happens to those buildings, it should be a result of robust public input and discussion and not something made manifest by a cobbled together, vague map created by a group of warring architects. One of the principles set forth in the planning commission recommendations was that of not having roads right up against the waterfront, which would cut pedestrian and bike traffic off from the water's edge, but rather to allow our waterfront to be solely for bicycles and pedestrians. I see that has been violated by this plan. I also note that Huxley is now sitting either just next to or on top of the chem-fix—a poor idea, even if the chem-fix is capped. We learned from Love Canal that pilings driven through a cap can mobilize toxins. And that was dioxin, not mercury (a far greater danger). I see a boulevard cutting through the site, a plan that defers to the automobile, which has also been broadly condemned by the public. Seemingly created without any reference to earlier public comment, this plan doesn't address or acknowledge that meaningful green space, ample bike and pedestrian access, and a meaningful connection to downtown that were loudly requested by the public. It's a plan created by someone who hasn't been a part of the conversation earlier than last fall. And, as if ginned out of air, the plan condemns to extinction the historic structures, the feasible and intelligent plan of phasing development and starting closer to the head of the Whatcom Waterway and downtown, and not spending tens of millions of dollars on unnecessary bridges and expensive roads.</p> <p>And my comments above are just at first blush. In other words, this plan is just manifestly troubling.</p> <p>I'm not entirely sure why Dan Pike chose this particular moment to push this plan</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>forward, reversing most of his previous statements and positions about the waterfront. And I'm equally unsure as to why the Council approved a plan without any public review beforehand. I do know that the elected leaders who are expected to allocate funds for this project over its lifetime are far happier when a City leads and creates a vision that comes from the citizens. Those same elected leaders are not as happy about having their names attached to a controversial plan that is shoved through council that circumvents public process. Worse than the "Letter War" earlier this year, Dan Pike has now endangered Bellingham's credibility for a plan about which the very architects themselves are not in unison.</p> <p>In closing, perhaps if we focused on real scientists and economists instead of architects, we could create a safe, clean, and vibrant waterfront for all of us to enjoy. Until that time comes, and until we can <i>honestly</i> address the public's needs for this development, this project will not be successful.</p> <p>The only partnership that matters is that of the government and the citizens. Anything else is meaningless.</p>
416	4/23/09	Waterfront Public Process: Action Alert	Frances Badgett frances@mac.com	<p>I want to share Robyn's alert with all of you.</p> <p>As a point of urgent clarification, Mayor Pike said the Monday April 13th meeting that he had gotten money for moving the railroad tracks put back into the Governor's budget. He went to invoke Cantwell's name in urging a partnership between the city and the port. He claimed that there would be funding if a plan came forward now, and used the pressure of potential funding from the state and federal levels to rush the council into a decision. I have spent a lot of time on the phone in trying to get to the truth about these claims. Not only did the Governor not return the money to the budget, but Cantwell had nothing to do with urging action on the waterfront, much less a partnership. At the April 20th meeting, Pike claimed that Murray and Larsen wanted "a positive outcome" of that meeting and that they had urged a partnership between the city and the port. I have confirmed that they did not as well. There is no funding promised, no partnership urged, no actual urgency at all regarding the waterfront.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>All elected officials encourage partnership as a general concept of good governance. But as Larsen's aide said to me today, only if that partnership has a broad benefit to the community.</p> <p>None of these elected officials endorsed or encouraged this plan. And all of them are concerned about a plan pushed forward with their names attached without any public process, comment, or review.</p> <p>It's hard to encourage people to attend meetings in which public comment is filtered through the port. As Les Reardon said before the city council, the port will weigh the public comment against the plan and determine if the comments warrant any changes.</p> <p>But I still think it's important to show up and be counted, bear witness, and speak your mind. Robyn's right: more important than the relative merits of the plan is the public process, which the city and port are trying very hard to circumvent. The partnership that counts is the one between government and the citizens. Let's remind our elected officials of that fact.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if you have more questions.</p>
415	4/23/09	Historic Bellingham	George Dyson gdyson@gmail.com	<p>Thanks for raising the alarm!</p> <p>Historic preservation aside, it is near-impossible to believe, that, after endless WFG, WAG, RUDAT, COB, POB, etc., etc., studies that unanimously agreed on one principle above all else:</p> <p>PEDESTRIAN access to the downtown waterfront, VEHICULAR traffic to be buffered away from the waterfront....and then we adopt a "Framework Plan" that begins by routing one of the main access roads (nothing in the Framework Plan says temporary) OVER the Whatcom Waterway???? Huh? This is our 100-year vision's first step?? After all the work that went into the Central Avenue amphitheater, and so much else that assumed a pedestrian plaza on the Central</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>Ave right-of way??? (or a complete intertidal restoration instead).</p> <p>Note that the "framework" plan as currently proposed (or approved??) REQUIRES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • driving MANY new pilings into an area always claimed to be critical intertidal (and salmonid) habitat! • installing new traffic-bearing decking over the intertidal beachfront (currently open) between the Granary and Central Ave.!! • this is "Moving Forward"???? <p>George</p> <p>On Apr 23, 2009, at 7:25 PM, Historic Bellingham wrote:</p> <p>Regardless of whether you like the new plan, how do you feel about the process? Does this action encourage your involvement and make you feel that your voice is important or perhaps that your involvement is not really desired? If you think something is wrong with this approach, please come to the following meetings and send a message LOUD and CLEAR that public decision making processes require public input BEFORE council votes.</p> <p>Bellingham City Council: Monday April 27, 7 pm open session Waterfront Open House, Wednesday April 29, 6:30 Bellingham, Cruise Terminal Port Commission Meeting, Tuesday May 5, 3:00 pm, Harbor Center Conference Room, 1801 Roeder Avenue</p> <p>Questions? Contact Robyn du Pré, RE Sources, 733-8307, robynd@re-sources.org</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
414	4/23/09	Larsen	Stan Snapp snapp@cob.org	<p>Frances,</p> <p>Thanks for your informed clarity in this muddle of murk. There is much discussion yet to be had, that's for sure.</p> <p>I just returned from the Green Cities conference in Portland. What an amazing city. While the Mayor was addressing us, there were huge hassles brewing around him on two fronts, a stadium issue and a developer's lawsuit for 25 million dollars on Sam Adams blatant stand against Wal-Mart sighting on the old Thunderbird Inn location. When Mayor Adams spoke to us he spoke of the lively, and vibrant public dialogue so important to how Portland functions as a city. No spin, just acknowledging that dialogue is an important part of how they function and he embraces the process. BTW he pissed backwards the next day on the stadium issue as direct result of the public outcry.....</p> <p>Stan</p>
413	4/23/09	Larsen	Frances Badgett frances@mac.com	<p>Dear all,</p> <p>I spoke to aide who was present at the recent meeting between Larsen and Dan Pike. (She has since watched the council meeting at which Dan Pike claimed Larsen had urged a "positive outcome.") Larsen and Pike did meet recently. Larsen met with Dan Pike for 15 minutes. Pike presented the stimulus request. Larsen thanked him. 15 minutes in and out. Larsen did not at any time mention council meetings, partnership, nor did he promise or even mention the promise of funding. Funding, in fact, was never discussed. And certainly not a local council meeting.</p> <p>The refrain I've been getting from Murray and Cantwell is this: We do not urge any sort of outcome about local council meetings. Or, to quote Sally Heintz at Cantwell's office: "Maria always encourages people to build partnerships and work together. Having said that, I can't see her suggesting to a local authority how they should conduct their business and no one that I've been able to talk to has heard her say any such thing either."</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>I'm figuring out how to proceed with this.</p> <p>Messing with public process is one thing...it's kind of an old habit in this town, the fake public process, the signs around the room, the public comment that "disappears." But lying to the public, short-circuiting even basic public process, and creating a false urgency to speed an outcome that is out of step with the community? Are there laws against this?</p> <p>Thank you again for your leadership.</p>
412	4/20/09	Public Process Funding	Kevin Cournoyer kjc@mac.com	<p>Dear City Council Members:</p> <p>You're having a "Special Meeting" today at noon regarding the waterfront. But the public has still, as of this morning, not been shown any of the supporting materials (pages of assumptions, your new map, et cetera) that will be discussed. (I can't find them on the City of Bellingham website. They're not attached to the agenda, which is remarkably vague.) Also, you're having this meeting----a meeting, mind you, wherein Mr. Pike has stated he wants to "memorialize" an agreement with the Port---in the middle of the workday. Is the Council Chamber going to be filled with concerned citizens? No. It will be filled, for the most part, with Port and City employees. Will public comment be allowed at this meeting? No.</p> <p>This is deplorable public process. Has the waterfront process been protracted? Yes and no. Critical decisions (the ILA, some of the ILA's supplementals, today's proposed agreement, et cetera) have been extremely rushed and rigged to result in a predetermined outcome. Shameful.</p> <p>Three mayors and various councils have spent years trying to unscramble eggs (the original ILA and its associated EPS). All these years and all this planning have been a waste of time and money because the <i>fundamental</i> assumptions about this project (capping contamination and the marina) are dead wrong. If you don't <i>completely</i> walk away from the ILA, the EPS, and the associated</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>supplementals, this project will go absolutely nowhere. No real funding. No State money. No Federal money. No Stimulus money. No "second" Stimulus money. Nothing.</p>
411	4/15/09	Waterfront Development Plans	Lynette Felber llfelber@comcast.net	<p>Council Members Barbara Ryan and and Jack Weiss were correct to ask for a postponement of the April 20th meeting on the Waterfront plan. The Waterfront Advisory Group should be offered a chance to weigh in on any plans. What is the purpose of forming such groups or seeking citizen input if those opinions are then ignored? Many in the community would like to know what the Port has contributed to this new compromise other than to allow (under court order)four of the historic buildings to stay.</p> <p>What happened to the Waterfront Connections Plan that Mayor Pike's office forwarded last fall? That plan had many strengths including a grid that connects with downtown Bellingham and preservation of the historic Georgia-Pacific Buildings.</p> <p>I attended many of the hearings and meetings about the Waterfront over the past two years, and from the comments aired at those meetings, I do not see evidence for the Mayor's statement that the public's main concern is to move forward quickly. There were a variety of opinions expressed at those meetings, including the desire on the part of some for "no action" at all, but it was the developers and the Port who argued we must move quickly, not the general public.</p> <p>This is a huge project for Bellingham, and it is important to do it right rather than just do it soon. The use of the historic buildings offers an opportunity to give the Waterfront a unique historic district as its center. The adaptive reuse of historic buildings for the University of Washington, Tacoma campus offers the Huxley College an attractive model to emulate.</p> <p>Moreover, it is crucial that the Waterfront development not undermine the hard-won progress for Bellingham's downtown. Many businesses there are having a tough time in this economic downturn, and the rapid replacement of the city</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – April 2009</p>
				<p>center with a new destination could signal the end for many downtown merchants.</p> <p>Thanks to Council Members Ryan and Weiss for reminding us of what is at stake with this important new development for the City, the Port, and the citizens of Bellingham.</p>