

**Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Jon and Dorene Gould Lopez <gouldlopez@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 16, 2013 8:14 AM  
**To:** Grp.PL.Planning And Development Commission  
**Subject:** Public Comment

Planning Commission Public Comment

I want to impress upon the planning commission the importance of maintaining a viable marine trades zone in the new water front plan. Bellingham has a unique and valuable asset in its working waterfront.

I am a marine cabinet maker with more than fifty years experience working in the marine trades. In the course of those years, I have watched one waterfront after another; from San Diego, California to Blaine, Washington succumb to gentrification until there is precious little space left where a skilled marine tradesman can make a reasonable living. The kinds of business I have seen displaced are the very ones that provided the vital services required to build and maintain the vessels needed for commercial fishing, marine research, and recreational boating. In addition, the presence of those trades and the fleets they attract and support have been a vital part of making their communities into "destination" communities that attract both visitors and potential residents. As those trades have been forced out, the communities they formerly supported have become lookalike copies of each other with the same chain restaurants and developer driven boom/bust economies.

A viable marine trade zone needs to accommodate real working marine trades people, not just yacht brokers and maritime attorneys. There needs to be deep water docks and haul out facilities in close proximity to sheltered, secure work space. Work space that can accommodate men and women with the skills and tools to do the sophisticated work required to maintain today's highly technical vessels.

In my view, there is nothing about the need for this kind of working water front, that is incompatible with commercial development or with the larger communities desire to have recreational access to a clean and inviting waterfront. Public walkways and parks coexist with boatyards and maintenance facilities in many of the Canadian ports just to the north of us. That said, it is essential that the planers responsible for the long term growth of our waterfront understand that marine tradesman cannot and must not be expected to compete for real estate with well heeled out of town developers on a dollars per square foot basis for the one thing they must have, which is proximity to the water.

To that end, I strongly suggest that the concept of a "marine trades zone" needs to not only embrace the idea of a physical space designed to accommodate the marine trade activities, but also an "economic" space where a welder, diesel mechanic or fiberglass fabricator can operate secure in the knowledge that if he or she adheres to environmentally responsible practices, and upholds ethical business standards, they will not be subjected to extortionist rent increases just because some developer is lusting after the property on which they must operate.

Are we talking here about some kind of socialist marine workers paradise with guaranteed jobs? Not at all! What I am calling for is an environment where a marine tradesman can expect a stable working situation with a long term lease in a location near enough to the water where he or she can compete for the northwest marine business. Recognizing that a working water front is a community asset, not an eye sore liability will go a long way towards creating that environment.

Respectfully,

Jon C. Lopez



Bellingham Sail & Power Squadron  
P.O. Box 2625  
Bellingham, WA 98227-2625

15 April, 2013

Tom Grinstad, Chair  
Bellingham Planning Commission  
210 Lottie Street  
Bellingham, WA 98225

Dear Mr. Grinstad:

I write this letter for the membership of the Bellingham Sail and Power Squadron in support of the plans to include a Marina in the proposed redevelopment of the Bellingham waterfront on the former Georgia-Pacific site.

Waterfront access for marina development is difficult to find. Having such a site in our city is invaluable. Having the site already enclosed by a breakwater is priceless.

When you look at the Port of Bellingham marinas, you find two quality operations in the Blaine Harbor and Squalicum Harbor locations. Unfortunately, we still have in excess of 200 boats on waiting lists to move into those locations.

I have listened to and read objections made by a few about building Marinas for the 1%, or for the wealthy, or any of a number of other descriptive words. These are not the people we are building the marina for.

We are building the marina for the residents of Whatcom County that would like to be able to dock their boat in their own town. These people have decided that their choice in vacations is to cruise the beautiful waters of our own San Juan Islands, an area that was listed as one of the top 10 cruising locations in the world.

We are a maritime city. We have always had an association with marine related business, be it fishing, crabbing, canneries, boat building, or recreational. For us to pass up an opportunity to enhance our marinas and further our relationships with our heritage seems imprudent.

I am sure there is long term and short-term costs associated with the marina plans. I would hope that the Planning Commission looks at the long-term goals and benefits of a marina in its deliberations.

There is a large body of water surrounded by a breakwater that could be contributing an average of \$5000 per slip per year towards the quality of life we all strive for in Bellingham.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Commander David A. Wright, P  
Bellingham Sail and Power Squadron  
360-920-8428  
boatingneeds@hotmail.com

**Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Brett Baunton <INFO@artscan.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 15, 2013 10:32 AM  
**To:** Grp.PL.Planning And Development Commission  
**Subject:** Waterfront development

I believe strongly that a redeveloped waterfront that includes appropriate art and outdoor open air spaces will draw and hold locals and visitors alike. We need it to be a place that is interesting and inviting for the natural marine environment to be seen and felt. Please consider as much of the waterfront to be accessible to the public as possible. I think we should mix our local art scene and the environment to compliment any new development.

Sincerely,  
Brett

Brett Baunton  
ArtScan.com  
360.734.7390  
[info@artscan.com](mailto:info@artscan.com)

**Aven, Heather M.**

---

**From:** Wendy Harris <w.harris2007@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 13, 2013 11:43 PM  
**To:** Adams, Mark (ECY); Stoner, Mike; Grp.PL.Planning And Development Commission; Aucutt, Gregory R.  
**Cc:** CC - Shared Department; Allen, Douglas R. (ECY)  
**Subject:** Waterfront Cleanup Standards

I was in attendance at the Thursday 4.8.13 Bellingham Planning Commission meeting. I found the discussion regarding clean up standards extremely confusing. I am not clear on what "unrestricted clean up levels based on restricted land use" means.

Can you please confirm that the city and the port will be using MTCA Method B (unrestricted upland uses) for clean-up, which is the default standard for site cleanup, and not the MTCA Method C cleanup standard applicable to industrial property? For example, on the Cornwall Landfill, with regard to dioxin, this would mean that the clean up standard is for 11 parts per trillion, rather than 1500 parts per trillion.

It is misleading to continually refer to the dredged sediment dumped at the Cornwall Landfill site as containing "low levels of dioxin." The Washington state exposure standard (11 parts per trillion) is based on a cancer risk assessment known to be insufficiently protective. The dioxin level in the sediment dumped at the Cornwall site is double an inadequate state standard. I take exception to referring to this as a "low level" and understating the risk to human health.

Contamination levels either meet MTCA standards, or they do not. In this case, the sediment dumped at Cornwall does not. I urge you to be more forthcoming with the public.

I am concerned that you are advising the public that burying dioxin, a persistent bioaccumulative toxin, under 2 to 3 feet of soil is an established safe disposal methodology. I will grant you that it is a common DOE methodology. But I am unaware of single field study that confirms its safety. Were it only this simple, dioxin would not be subject of global concern and vast sums of money would not be spent on research and development of improved disposal technologies.

It is inaccurate to assert that capping dioxin guarantees public safety. Downtown Port Angeles, and many residential properties, have been contaminated with dioxin as a result of the landfill practices of the Rayonier pulp mill. This is not the only example in Washington of dioxin exposure from landfill sites. It is of note that the soil at the Cornwall Landfill lacked anticipated stability once interim construction started, which is a risk factor in dioxin mobilization.

There is a known and virtually inevitable risk to Bellingham Bay because dioxin is being disposed of on a shoreline site rated as a high seismic risk, subject to liquefaction, erosion and an unknown level of sea water rise.

I ask that you provide the public with all relevant facts, not just the facts that support your advocacy efforts. Slowing down and reducing the risk of contamination is different than eliminating the risk and we need meaningful public discussion.

Sincerely,

