

#	Date Rec'd	Subject	Citizen/ Group	<p align="center">Citizen Comments on New Whatcom Waterfront Planning – July 2009</p>
<i>Last Update 5/31/09</i>				<p><i>Citizen comments received from citizens submitting comment to the Port and City and through the City of Bellingham website. Prior month comments can be viewed on the website in separate monthly documents</i></p>
430	7/22/09	Central Avenue DNS - SHR2009-11 / SEP2009-29 / CAP2009-21	<p>George Dyson gdyson@gmail.com</p>	<p>Dear Steve (and colleagues):</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the application for permits (and optional DNS process) to proceed with an expansion of the Central Avenue bridge deck.</p> <p>How can covering 117 feet (I measured it) of existing intertidal beach front (however derelict) with a new roadway, at the mouth of an active salmon-producing estuary, possibly be determined to be nonsignificant?</p> <p>Supposedly the expansion is "temporary"--but has temporary been defined? And are the projected expenses for temporary access a wise use of funds? What will be the removal costs? The proposed project, and the required pile driving (and future removal) happens to be in an area that Anchor Environmental has determined to have significant subsurface mercury contamination. This matter alone should preclude any casual issuance of a DNS.</p> <p>A fundamental assumption of ALL waterfront planning so far, going back 30 years, has been the rehabilitation of the Whatcom Creek estuary. Further encumbering the intertidal zone with an expanded roadway (expanding over the intertidal zone is just as bad, if not worse, than expanding over the waterway) is against both the letter and the spirit of numerous regulations that have been adopted at great public effort over many years. Whether the SMP for the new Waterfront District ends up stipulating 50-foot buffers, 200-foot buffers, or in some exceptional cases, no buffers, one thing is sure: new roadways OVER existing beaches are not the intent of anyone currently trying to establish the ground rules (and a level playing field).</p> <p>I am as eager as anyone to see waterfront redevelopment move forward. But spending a significant amount of money on a project that further degrades the Whatcom Creek Estuary, however temporarily, is not a cost-effective place to start.</p> <p>with all best wishes, and hope for an alternative plan,</p>