

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
<i>Last Update 4/30/09</i>				<i>Citizen comments received from citizens submitting comment to the Port and City and through the New Whatcom website through November 2008. Prior month comments can be viewed on the website in separate monthly documents</i>
429	5/14/09	Central Avenue	Mike mike@zervasgroup	<p>Good morning, all. I want to take a minute to address the structural stability issue. These comments are based on my 33 years of experience in the architectural field, 28 of those years licensed. I have been involved in many notable retrofits in this town - the YMCA; the Leopold Hotel; the Mount Baker Apartments; the new Pickford Theater (still under construction); the Firehouse Performing Arts Center; our own offices, and the list goes on.</p> <p>I can say without a doubt that none of the existing buildings are structurally sound in terms of what is required in today's building codes. The costs to rehabilitate any of those buildings will exceed the costs of a new building. The "shaking that has already occurred" during the life of those buildings pales in comparison to what modern building codes require us to design to withstand. We have not had a major earthquake in this area in hundreds of years - January 26, 1700, according to Oregon State University. Those buildings would surely collapse in the event of a major earthquake. New buildings built to today's code would not - they may be heavily damaged, but they should not collapse.</p> <p>The heavy industrial nature of these buildings is not an asset, in terms of lateral structural stability. Lighter buildings perform better under lateral loading. You put that much weight and brick in sudden lateral motion and you have incredible inertia - you have the recipe for disaster.</p> <p>We just had nine experts independently review those structures. They have identified five worthy of rehabilitation. I am satisfied. Time to move on.</p>
428	5/14/09	Central Avenue	Stan Snapp stansnapp@comcast.net	<p>George,</p> <p>Thanks for presenting the chronology of planning and thought that has gone into the Central Avenue entrance as a desired main pedestrian access. It's one of the focal reasons for the Maritime Park and other connection planning and construction that extends into downtown, the arts district and civic center. Those vital linkages, long planned for, cannot be lost in the need for temporary truck access. I took notice that your documents were referred to all through the evening</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>discussion.</p> <p>This is the second public meeting in which Mike Stoner has made structural engineer level comments, using his planning position to make pronouncements about how structurally unsound those buildings are. It's well known that single wall, un-reinforced masonry doesn't stand up well to earthquake shaking. On my many site tours I've looked for signs of cracking and instability and have found none. I suspect it's because of the thickness of the walls, and the inter-ties of structural steel and other buildings with heavy interior structures, necessary for their industrial uses, that has allowed these buildings to withstand the shaking that has already occurred. I look forward to "engineering reports" that will give us the facts about their structural integrity and wish us to stop making decisions before that analysis is done. We have the desire to maintain the historic presence, we have our opinions, now we need to find out if our desires are practical on the ground. Tom's engineering report on access is but one piece of the puzzle. To deliberately lay out a road through 4-6 historic structures before the analysis is done is not, in my view, the way forward. We analyze the buildings, then, if we still want to keep them we design around that objective which includes our necessary construction access.</p> <p>Robyn, your question last night about why the customer, in this case a non-tax generating customer, is at the table for initial site planning has long baffled me. This project is a joint effort of the COB and the Port. I get our taking WWU's location and size interest into overall consideration but they are at the table brokering and have been since we started the planning process. It has always seemed to me that the Port and the COB, owner and regulator, do the planning and then open sites, as appropriate, to the future customers. Most of which need to pay taxes so allowing us to recover our development costs. So far, we're talking prematurely, to two non-tax paying customers, one of which is driving our decisions without having made a firm commitment to their desired prime site location.</p> <p>Sign me still "baffled"</p>
427	5/14/09	Central	George Dyson	John, Robyn, Mike, Dave, Dan, Jeff, et. al.,

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
		Avenue	gdyson@gmail.com	<p>Thank you all so much for giving the question of the Central Avenue waterfront some of the scrutiny it deserves.</p> <p>What Tom Rosenberg did not say last night, in his otherwise comprehensive and heartfelt presentation, is that the plan (as adjacent landowners were shown the plans by the traffic consultants) to use Central Avenue for heavy arterial access requires decking over the 17 by 120 feet section of intertidal zone between the current pier and the Granary building. Sorry to raise an inconvenient fact, but we are planning to cover 120 feet of existing beach with 120 feet of new road. Would a private developer ever be able to get this past shoreline review?</p> <p>Note that there was "no idea" as to what roadway, if any, would ever replace this "temporary" appropriation of the Central Avenue pier for arterial use. Besides condemning 120 feet of legal beachfront, using the pier for heavy traffic precludes many of the long-envisioned possibilities for rehabilitation of the Granary as a waterfront facility. (Sylvia's comment that "maybe it will fall down while we drive the new pilings" is indicative). It is misleading to talk about "saving" the Granary while making it so pedestrian-unfriendly that it will be difficult to use. We will also lose a lot of the "character" of the existing pier but that is separate and non-quantifiable question.</p> <p>I am fully aware of the engineering and financial realities. But the current proposal is not the framework for truly moving forward that this project needs.</p>
426	5/11/09	Memo to WAG	Jack Weiss zweiss@comcast.net	<p>Jeff-</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to comment. Attached are comments and questions for WAG to consider. There is way more than what you will deal with, but I thought the members should have more information than not - you guys can choose what is important to you.</p> <p>I trust you will forward this to your colleagues.</p> <p>Good luck. See you on Wednesday.</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>Memo: May 7, 2009 To: Jeff Hegedus, Vice-Chair, Waterfront Advisory Group From: Jack Weiss RE: Comments on April 20 Planning Framework/Assumptions</p> <p>Per your request, I am submitting comments concerning the Planning Framework and Planning Assumptions passed by the Council and Commissioners at its joint April 20, 2009 meeting.</p> <p>While I have substantial concerns over the process used in coming to this point, I will reflect only on the substance and consequences of the framework and assumptions.</p> <p>These are comments or questions I have as a Councilmember. WAG members may or may not have similar concerns. I present these as a shopping list for you to use to feel comfortable with the directions the City and Port are pursuing.</p> <p>In addition to my comments, I have also included a Council document prepared last fall by me as the Chair of the City Council Waterfront Redevelopment Committee. It is an extensive list of questions modified by the full Council at two meetings that Council thought should be considered prior to adoption of a Master Plan. WAG is free to use this document as it deliberates its work.</p> <p><u>Proposed Planning Framework Assumptions</u> <u>Waterfront Futures Group.</u> It is important to distinguish exactly what is written. The four principles listed are “overarching” principles, however, unlike the Assumptions declaration, there are really 39 “Guiding Principles.” It is also important to note that the content in parenthesis in the last principle contains one of the other Guiding Principles in it (ie., improve permitting). If one is to do that then maybe some of the other Guiding Principles should also be included, such as, “respect history and culture” or “require sustainable practices in all development” or “provide incentives and credits for “green” buildings.” This section also includes a misnomer. The Guiding Principles do not call for “flexible zoning.”</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p><u>Community Connections.</u> Is this section concerned with connections for people or connections for cars? This distinction is critical for determination of other facets of a Master Plan.</p> <p><u>Street Grid.</u> A more logical method of setting the grid would first entertain the following work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand what buildings should be saved after an adaptive reuse analysis, • determine the end goals of the Central Avenue/waterway/Granary Bldg area, • determine the appropriate Transportation Demand Management program for aggressive multi-modal approaches to moving people, not cars. Once the EIS assesses these parameters, the number of car connections would be known (and probably a lower number of car connections than the old school approach), • create the 100-year street grid with appropriate block sizes. <p>Only after this work is done should there be an “early action” approach to what the first connections and road network should be. The Planned Assumption approach does none of this and creates multiple conflicts and unnecessary expenses. Please note that the more comprehensive street grid flashed in one slide on April 20 (and not provided to Council in its packet) was the exact opposite orientation, street-for-street, of the 2006 Framework Plan adopted by the City and Port.</p> <p><u>Block Sizes and View Corridors.</u> How is a “view corridor” defined? Simply designating an area as one does not make it happen. Attached is a look towards the water from Blackburn Office at the top of Commercial St. The ceramic silos clearly block most of the view from what should be considered the best “quality” view corridor available because of its proximity to water. Many of the other corridors listed are ¾ - 1 mile away before water is reached and establishes “canyon” views.</p> <p><u>LEED Neighborhood.</u> What does this have to do with the Planning Assumption vote of April 20? How is the establishment of a couple of roads on the Planning Framework map supposed to help meet some “deadline?” A more important question would be what could the hundreds of thousands of dollars paid to the Green Building Council for certification be used for instead? The City and Port have agreed to a more aggressive Triple Bottom Line approach. If TBL is used</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>anyway in the detailed analysis of this redevelopment and further used in reporting back to the community, why create a redundant and less effective exercise? <u>WWU</u>. What are the identified requirements beyond what is listed? Regardless of the university's desire of no arterial through the campus, the City should plat a street grid through all areas of the waterfront as part of its 100-year grid, allowing for future flexibility.</p> <p><u>Historic Structures</u>. Beyond the April 17 motion and April 28 letter of the Historic Preservation Committee which I assume the WAG has, what other metrics should be considered prior to permanently determining the fate of this historic district? Will WAG request a followup tour of the <u>inside</u> of the buildings to be destroyed? I did not appreciate the "windshield" tour of the building exteriors last month without any discussion of the potential that exists on the interior. How would WAG know if they never saw the interiors? Will a Request for Proposals be issued to determine creative or mainstream adaptive reuses?</p> <p>Note that the Supplemental DEIS states, "Final decisions on the removal or retention of buildings would be made in the future by the Port and the City, in conjunction with site developers." (Page 6-26 of the October 2008 SDEIS) How can we choose road layouts when this critical piece of the puzzle is unknown?</p> <p>"Don't it always seem to go that you don't know what you've got till it's gone" - Joni Mitchell</p> <p><u>Financial Analysis</u>. These Planning Assumptions are approved without a clear understanding of the financial impacts. For the very reasons the Laurel Street bridge was removed from consideration for technical reasons, the Commercial Street bridge (or any other assumption) could be removed for financial considerations. We don't know. Why not understand these implications prior to moving forward with adopting "Assumptions?"</p> <p><u>Triple Bottom Line</u>. A TBL analysis is not simply saying anecdotally that the three legs were "considered" or "looked at," it is a real analysis that the community and policy makers can clearly understand the three legs of consideration. That is a precursor in the planning realm. In the area of implementation, a separate tool of community reporting must also be provided. Port, City, and community officials are familiar with this approach in their site</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>visit to Dockside Green in Victoria, BC.</p> <p><u>Other Areas of Conceptual Agreement</u> <u>Large-Craft Marina.</u> How is the word “community” defined in this section? Will the general public have access to the docks or will this be a “gated community?” <u>Building Heights.</u> There has been no WAG or public discussion of heights and it is premature to list this topic under this section. <u>Shorelines.</u> There has been no WAG or public discussion of heights and it is premature to list this topic under this section.</p> <p><u>Proposed Planning Framework Map</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The map is not to scale and provides misinformation to the public and policy makers as to its intent. The Bleach Plant is missing from the map as an important building in the way of the road proposal. 2. The hard edge depicted on the map is not what the Waterfront Futures Group, or even the Architects group imagined. What will be hard- and soft-edges? 3. Central Avenue is located where the pedestrian promenade is been placed in previous plans. Why cannot there be provisions of moving the Central Avenue entrance to the southeast side of the Granary building? 4. The depicted bike lane deadends into the Granary building. How will that be accommodated? 5. The “trail” system near the Shipping Terminal parcel continues to be shown as a sidewalk. There is no reason why a more complete pedestrian facility cannot be provided. 6. The pedestrian bridge across the waterway connecting the WWU campus and the marine trades area is missing. This bridge is an important multi-modal tool and should be included in the Master Plan. <p>Commercial Street “view” of the water from Blackburn Office. Photo cropped to provide the appropriate dimensions of the “park street” view.</p> <p>Cc: Mayor Pike Les Reardanz Linda Stewart Mike Stoner Tom Rosenberg</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>Tim Stewart City Council</p> <p>ATTACHMENT: City Council Waterfront Redevelopment Committee Worksession Issues</p> <p align="center"><u>Waterfront Issues for Council to Consider</u> Amended by Council November 24, 2008</p> <p><i>Note: As appropriate, Triple Bottom Line information or implications with each issue and questions will be part of the discussion. This approach includes financial, environmental, and social/culture/human impacts of each issue.</i></p> <p><u>Potential Master Plan Issues</u></p> <p><u>Density and Phasing:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the economic and planning parameters of why any density level is chosen? 2. Will the public weigh in on what they feel is appropriate before this number is cemented? 3. What constitutes the definition of “mixed-use” as used with the waterfront redevelopment? 4. What is the proper mix of residential/commercial/industrial/marine/recreational and in what areas? 5. As stated in the City/Port interlocal agreement (page 2), what assurances will there be that this waterfront property will be “held in public ownership ... as it is redeveloped over time” as recommended by the Waterfront Futures Group? 6. What is a realistic phasing plan and what are the key metrics considered for each phase? 7. Will the phasing ensure that development is not leap-frogged and that development holes are avoided? 8. How will this waterfront development be different and/or the same from the downtown? 9. What is the vision of how this development will integrate with the downtown and Old Town? 10. What will happen if the project is delayed because of the economy and market conditions? 11. Do we have more time to master plan in a deliberate way instead of a

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p style="text-align: center;">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>rushed way?</p> <p>12. How does the clean-up plan coordinate with the Master Plan?</p> <p><u>Street Grids and Site Connections:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As recommended by the Waterfront Futures Group, will there be a transportation and circulation element of the master plan that will incorporate mode priorities, internal circulation, and impacts on neighboring areas? 2. Will the grid design protect designated buildings we wish to save? 3. Does the grid design promote transportation mode shifts? 4. What is the size of blocks and do these dimensions make sense for sound human-scale development? 5. Will the Waterway and Broadway pedestrian bridges listed in the Waterfront Futures Group recommendations be part of the master plan? 6. Will a transportation gondola to or near the university from the site be part of the master plan? 7. How many vehicle site connections make sense? Ped/bike connections? 8. Can we do with less vehicle connections and create alternatives (ped/bike access, gondola, dedicated trolley/bus access, etc.)? 9. Is a couplet bridge across the waterway servicing Area 1 with Area 2 a good idea? 10. Should the Master Plan allow for a couplet bridge in the future? 11. Does the railroad realignment agreement incorporate enough bike/ped right-of-ways throughout the project? Does it include the high-speed bike connector? <p><u>Historic Structures:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What will be saved and if not, what mitigation will be taken? 2. What will be the process for assessing adaptive reuse potential? 3. What are the advantages of a Historic District and do they outweigh the advantages of demolishing these buildings? <p><u>Views and Building Height:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is important to look at to and from the site and is it realistic to create those views? 2. Is a view of the marina more important than other views? 3. How do we preserve views of the bay and islands?

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>4. What building landmarks are important for views and can they be accommodated?</p> <p>5. What are the parameters used to decide how building height will be designed?</p> <p>6. How many, if any, tall buildings will be proposed and how do these tall buildings integrate with the rest of Bellingham when examined in a comprehensive “skyscape” view?</p> <p>7. Will building heights be compromised by engineering fixes necessary to mitigate potential liquefaction issues on fill?</p> <p><u>Park Development:</u></p> <p>1. How much should be set aside given the City Level of Service (LOS) in the updated Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan?</p> <p>2. How much should be bought or negotiated with impact fees?</p> <p>3. How does the Port current plan for privately-owned, publicly maintained parks fit into the master plan and development agreement?</p> <p>4. Will there be a stronger park and trail connection between the Cornwall Landfill Park and Log Pond Park?</p> <p>5. Where is the most appropriate placeholder space for the <u>Terraquarium</u>?</p> <p><u>Climate Change:</u></p> <p>1. What will be the fill height of the site to address potential/expected sea level changes?</p> <p>2. Are there technical alternatives to filling the entire site?</p> <p>3. Will fill height be different for different uses such as parking structures or parks?</p> <p>4. How will historic buildings be addressed?</p> <p><u>Triple Bottom Line:</u></p> <p>1. How will this method be incorporated into the master plan and development agreement process?</p> <p>2. Will TBL be used comprehensively prior to any infrastructure improvements to ensure coordinated systems will be in place for early actions as they are incorporated into future developments?</p> <p><u>Potential Development Agreement Issues</u></p> <p><u>Shoreline Setbacks and Buffers:</u></p> <p>1. How much of a setback and buffer should there be and where should it be</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>located throughout the site?</p> <p>2. Will there be horizontal setback articulation in the development?</p> <p><u>Area 1 Zoning (Marine Trades area):</u></p> <p>1. Will there be housing in this area as indicated in the SDEIS and also in the City staff Waterfront Connections Plan (the Port's latest plan does not include housing)?</p> <p><u>Cornwall Landfill Subarea:</u></p> <p>1. How much housing is appropriate in this area?</p> <p>2. How will railroad noise, vibration, and diesel exhaust be mitigated with housing?</p> <p>3. Will these or other condos be high end at the exclusion of other income levels in town?</p> <p><u>Affordable Housing:</u></p> <p>1. How will this be accommodated throughout the site?</p> <p><u>Impact Fees and Socially-Created Value:</u></p> <p>1. Will new waterfront development pay for itself as traditionally expected elsewhere in town and will provisions be made to share in the benefits of upzoning from industrial to mixed-use?</p> <p>2. What are the short-term and long-term financial impacts to City and County taxpayers with this development?</p> <p><u>Streets:</u></p> <p>1. What are the cross-section designs of streets?</p> <p><u>Planned Action Ordinance:</u></p> <p>1. What projects or improvements will qualify for inclusion to the planned action ordinance and what is the justification for each item listed?</p> <p><u>Miscellaneous</u></p> <p>[In response to Mayor Pike's request, this issue will not be discussed as part of the Council's worksessions.]</p> <p><u>Marina:</u></p> <p>1. Will there be a published updated proforma?</p> <p>2. How strong is the waiting list in this economy and for what kind of vessels?</p> <p>3. Why would we allow this project to be exempt from the SEPA analysis?</p> <p>4. Should a dry-stacking study be conducted before committing a permit for a</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p align="center">marina? 5. Are there better community uses for the ASB area than a marina? Document prepared by Jack Weiss</p>
425	5/9/09	Waterfront District Master Plan- "Crown Jewel" or Disappointment	David Courtis dcourtis@msn.com	<p>I have actively participated in the public planning process for the Waterfront District since 2005. I think that redeveloping the former Georgia Pacific site in the "right" way is critically important for the future of our community. Because I will be out of town, I won't be able to attend your May 13 meeting. However if I was at the meeting, this would be my public testimony:</p> <p>"The Master Plan will control the redevelopment of the Waterfront District, and its preparation will realistically be the final chance for the public to influence the redevelopment of the site. If we are not careful, the unprecedented opportunity represented by the former Georgia Pacific property could be squandered, and redevelopment could be a major economic and aesthetic disappointment. On the other hand, thoughtful, exciting suggestions have been made which, if implemented, would make the waterfront the dynamic, "crown jewel" of our community. Unfortunately, I feel that the Port/City's "Proposed Planning Framework" has only paid lip service to the extensive public written comments and testimony which have indicated what the public wants and doesn't want. It seems to me that the underlying philosophy behind the "Planning Framework" is: Give the public the bare minimum of what it desires, just enough to keep them off our backs, so that we can then do what we want to do.</p> <p>I suggest that the preparation of the Master Plan be guided by the extensive input received at the four community meetings hosted by Mayor Pike between October 28 and November 17 of last year. A total of 525 people attended the meetings, and 44 written comments were submitted. Margaret Norton-Arnold facilitated the four meetings. In a December 5 letter to Mayor Pike, she summarized the oral testimony/written comments and compiled all of the written statements. I encourage you to read or reread the documents prepared by Ms. Norton-Arnold. I feel that the people at those four waterfront redevelopment meetings were the most concerned, best informed, and most engaged members of the public. I believe that their opinions should be heeded and given paramount consideration. Consequently, I urge the members of the WAG to assertively, proactively exercise their advisory role by continually reminding the Port and the City what the public's</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>expectations are."</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>
424	5/6/09	Waterfront Plan	Warren Sheay wsheay@msn.com	<p>I've been a strong supporter of you, Mr. Mayor, but I am disappointed in the latest waterfront plan. It is a far cry from what citizens have told you that they want, over and over again, for the past many years.</p> <p>I feel that you've caved in to the Port and to WWU, when in fact this entire undertaking should be driven by COB.</p>
423	5/4/09	Proposed Planning Framework for the Waterfront District	David Courtis dcourtis@msn.com	<p>I attended the Proposed Planning Framework public meeting on April 29th. My "take away" from the meeting was that NO ONE- not the Port, not the City, not the public-is happy with or satisfied with the compromise Proposed Framework Plan. Why is that the case? The approach that the Port and the City have been following is similar to mixing oil and water together in the expectation of getting a homogeneous fluid. With respect to the redevelopment of the Waterfront District, the Port and the City have (and rightfully so) different objectives, different focal points, different developmental expertise, different public mandates, etc. Trying to seamlessly meld the competing, incompatible ideas of the Port and the City together hasn't worked in the past, isn't working in the present, and probably won't work in the future. If the current paradigm isn't changed, former mayor, Mark Asmundson's prescient observation in March 2006-that the inadequate will become the inevitable- will, unfortunately, become reality.</p> <p>What to do? It is time to step back and adopt a new approach, one that will be successful. In business, companies form joint ventures all of the time to pursue projects of common interest. One company, typically the one with the most extensive and pertinent knowledge and expertise, is jointly selected by the parties as Operator. The other company becomes the non operator. Although the Operator consults with the non operator, it is responsible for formulating operational plans and managing the joint venture project. The non operator has influence, but it doesn't get involved in the day-to-day activities. Consequently, I propose that the Port Commission and the City Council achieve a meaningful, effective and proper kind of compromise by jointly designating the Port as the Operator (City, non operator) of the marine and marine trades areas of the</p>

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – May 2009</p>
				<p>Waterfront District (e.g. Shipping Terminal Area, new marina, small-boat transient moorage in the Whatcom Waterway, and the Marine Trades Area). At the same time, they should jointly designate the City as the Operator (Port, non operator) of the urban development portions of the site (e.g. Downtown Waterfront Area, Log Pond Area, and the Cornwall Beach/Point Area). Such a division of responsibility would reflect reality and formally recognize and capitalize on the specific, but different, strengths, expertise, development experience, etc. of the Port and the City. This approach would minimize conflict and bickering while at the same time it would substantially enhance the expeditious, thoughtful redevelopment of the Waterfront District, the "crown jewel" of Bellingham.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments</p>