

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CITY OF BELLINGHAM

BELLINGHAM WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC COMMENTS

2:00 P.M.

Wednesday February 20th, 2008

Port of Bellingham
355 Harris Avenue
Bellingham, Washington

JACQUELINE L. BELLOWS, CCR 2297
WILLLIAM McLAUGHLIN, CCR 3128

I N D E X O F S P E A K E R S

		Page

1		
2		
3	DAVE COURTIS	4, 28
	440 Highland Drive	
4	Bellingham, WA 98225	
5		
6	AL HANNERS	
	3017 Plymouth Drive	8, 22
7	Bellingham, WA 98225	
8		
9	MARIE HITCHMAN	10, 19
	601 16th Street	
10	Bellingham, WA 98225	
11		
12	KEN CARRASCO	12
	P.O. Box 108	
13	Acme, WA 98220	
14		
15	ELI MACKIEWICZ	17
	2733 Lyon Street	
16	Bellingham, WA 98225	
17		
18	SCOTT SANDERSON	20
	808 20TH St, Apt. 108	
19	Bellingham, WA 98225	
20		
21	LYNETTE FELBER	23
	507 14th Street	
22	Bellingham, WA 98225	
23		
24		
25		

1		PAGE
2		----
3	PETER AMBROSE	30
4	1537 Fairview Street	
5	Bellingham, WA 98229	
6	ROGER LAMB	33
7	1503 Fourth Street	
8	Bellingham, WA 98225	
9	SCOTT BARR	34
10	2315 Eldridge Way	
11	Bellingham, WA 98225	
12	LEROY ROHDE	36
13	4961 Noon Road	
14	Bellingham, WA 98225	
15	RODD PEMBLE	30
16	2915 Cedarwood Avenue	
17	Bellingham, WA 98225	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATEMENT OF DAVE COURTIS

My name is Dave Courtis. And I live at 440 Highland Drive. I may want to have a bit more than five minutes, if that's going to be okay. There's just a couple of us that wish to talk.

I'm going to make some general comments, and I'm also planning on submitting written comments.

First of all, in the draft EIS, the public comments that were made were summarized. And I thought rather in a general manner. And it did not provide me or other members of the public the opportunity to really understand what the public comments were. So I would encourage you for the final EIS, that you actually have a section where you list the public comments and then, next to that, how each of those comments was either addressed in the EIS or you felt was inappropriate or whatever your response is. I think just having a general comment is not really very satisfactory.

I also, on a second point, realize that the Port is apparently running this process. As a resident of Bellingham and a taxpayer and someone who is going to be helping pay for any development down there, I'm disappointed that the City is not a cosponsor of the draft EIS.

And specifically, the Port had listed a number of

1 objectives which they hope that would be addressed in the
2 EIS. I'm not sure I have any disagreements with those. I'm
3 not sure the City would have had any disagreements with
4 those. But I think it would have been really pretty nice if
5 the City had also had the opportunity to work with the Port
6 and have a joint objective, Port-City objectives.

7 Thirdly, if a preferred alternative comes out in the
8 future as a result of mixing and matching the three or four
9 alternatives that are in the draft EIS, I would hope that at
10 that point, after the mixing and matching has occurred, that
11 the public would have another opportunity to provide comment
12 and input into that particular document that comes up.

13 And I think also it would be desirable if, in the
14 body or maybe the initial part of the Final EIS, that
15 there's a specific identification of how each one of the
16 alternatives fulfills the vision comment that is there in
17 the -- from the Waterfront Futures and also various other
18 public comments that sorts of says This is what public wants
19 to have in the Waterfront District. And I think by doing
20 that, it should then be obvious as to where there may be
21 deficiencies and, if there are deficiencies, how those
22 deficiencies might be addressed.

23 My final comment -- and I realize that this perhaps
24 is not something that should be part of the EIS process; but
25 I think if it isn't, it's a mistake. We're talking in the

1 Draft EIS as to the impacts on the City as it currently
2 exists, the impacts on the environment, the impacts on the
3 people who currently live here and work here, this type of
4 thing.

5 There doesn't seem to be any concern about the
6 people who are going to be actually living, working, and
7 visiting in the Waterfront District. And people are not
8 going to be coming to the Waterfront District to live, work,
9 or visit; developers are not going to be wanting to put up
10 their money unless the Waterfront District is a very
11 attractive place to be.

12 And they're not going to want to be in places where
13 there's traffic congestion, where the level of service for
14 intersections and streets is F and that's considered to be
15 acceptable. I don't think people are going to want to be
16 there if there's inadequate parks; if view corridors are
17 masked by large, bulky buildings; if the access to the
18 waterfront is restricted; if large buildings form a
19 blockade, a wall, that cuts off the rest of Bellingham from
20 the Waterfront District rather than being a nice, inviting,
21 come-here-and-visit, come-here-and-work, come-here-and-live
22 type of process.

23 You know, I think parking is obviously a big issue.
24 And I think it's something where the focus should be on how
25 to make this people friendly, how to make this an area where

1 people want to come, want to work, want to live, and
2 developers want to spend their money to develop the area.

3 And I think a big deficiency in the Draft EIS is a
4 lack of a cohesive transportation plan. It's sort of like
5 business as usual. We're going to run cars in there. We're
6 going to park them; and we'll pay lip service to bicycle,
7 maybe transit, maybe pedestrians. But I think there's a
8 lack of focus on how can we make this once again a very
9 attractive place to live, work, and visit.

10 Those are my general comments. And as I say, I'm
11 planning on submitting written comments as well. Thank you
12 for the opportunity to talk to you today.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF AL HANNERS

2

3 I'm Al Hanners. I live at 3007 Plymouth Drive,

4 Bellingham, Washington 98225.

5 And to begin with, I wanted to say two things: I
6 think Dave just made a number of very good points. And near
7 as I can tell, I don't have any disagreements with him at
8 all.

9 And the other thing I want to say is that I favor
10 the marina. And my concern is the welfare of people here.

11 And I'm a retired geologist. And years ago, I was a
12 member of the Western Washington University Committee of
13 Geologists on Earthquakes. And one of the things that
14 concerns me is tsunamis. And recently a -- how much more
15 time?

16 Now anyhow, we knew that there was some danger of
17 tsunamis. There's geological evidence along the shore of
18 tsunamis in the past. So you can't say they won't happen.
19 They don't happen very often; but when they do, the
20 consequences are pretty severe as I think all of you know.
21 And more recently, some geologists at Western Washington
22 University said more less the same things: They were
23 concerned about it. As far as I know, it's never really
24 been considered.

25 And I think at the very minimum, the buildings ought

1 to be built so that people can survive in them, and they
2 will not be ruined. They've got to have some place to go
3 before it hits. And I think there are now some tsunami
4 warnings around.

5 And I think a lot of you have heard about plate
6 tectonics. One of the major faults is offshore. And that's
7 what the problem is. And I think any construction should
8 take that into account so that wherever the people go for
9 reference is safe, reasonably safe.

10 So that's all I have to say.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF MARIE HITCHMAN

2

3 Marie Hitchman, 601 16th Street, Bellingham 98225.

4 I came to listen, but I guess I'll say a little something.

5 I'm thinking back historically to when the people of

6 the State of Washington passed the Shoreline Management Act.

7 And Mayor Reg Williams at the time appointed a committee of

8 nine people to work up a Master Program for the City.

9 I was one of those nine people. And we met every

10 week for a whole year, and one of the things that was

11 difficult for me was the fact that everything had been

12 pretty much zoned industrial along almost all of the

13 Bellingham waterfront.

14 So as time went by, I've always maintained an

15 interest in the shoreline and in marine issues. I've been a

16 sailor out here for over 40 years. And so I guess, I guess,

17 we do have to compromise with nature and have our marinas.

18 But I guess what I want to say is that right now we

19 have an opportunity to return some of this shoreline to

20 nature and nature's processes. And -- I'm in trouble

21 because I haven't really read the EIS. I remember going --

22 how long ago was that, Mike, when we had the rundown on the

23 latest plans? And I don't -- I guess I came today hoping to

24 know what some of the changes have been.

25 But I just want to say in general that, when we're

1 thinking about redeveloping this area, we need to make as
2 much provision as possible for nature's processes. You
3 know, we used to have an absolutely huge fishing fleet here.
4 We used to have wonderful salmon. I'm focusing personally
5 right now on things that are happening up around Cherry
6 Point. So I'm not up-to-date on the EIS.

7 But I just want to make a general comment that
8 whatever we do, we need to try to do as much as possible to
9 help nature along. Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF KEN CARRASCO

2

3

4

5

Good afternoon. My name is Ken Carrasco, spelled C-A-R-R-A-S-C-O. My address is Post Office Box 108, Acme, 98220.

6

7

8

I'm a fisheries and marine biologist by background and a certified fisheries professional. I served on the board of the Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association, NSEA.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

And I'm looking at the DEIS and this entire project from NSEA's standpoint. For background, NSEA is a community-based nonprofit organization dedicated to restoring sustainable wild salmon runs in Whatcom County. We're partially funded by the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife and also by a number of grants and private donations from individuals and organizations in the community.

17

18

19

20

21

22

So we've been looking at the DEIS from the standpoint that, you know, in the last decade or so the near-shore area, pocket estuaries, small areas along the shoreline have been recognized as very important for migrating, both in-migrating and out-migrating salmon species.

23

24

25

So there's three areas of concern: Habitat, water quality, and education. And we're still looking at the habitat and the water-quality sections. We'll be submitting

1 some written comments.

2 But I'd like to talk today about the marina, which I
3 can see is included in all of the alternatives, including
4 the no-effect alternative. And for background, I'm a
5 customer at the Port. My wife and I own a diesel power boat
6 which we have been keeping at Gate 6, Squaticum Marina. I'm
7 for the Coast Guard Auxillary, marina environmental
8 protection officer. So I am pretty involved.

9 I am speaking purely on the basis from a density
10 standpoint. The DEIS drew an equivalency between removing
11 the watersheds from the Whatcom Waterway and the number of
12 new recreational boats, whether 460 or 600, that would be
13 included in the new marina created. And I would disagree on
14 that based as a boat owner and what I see at Squaticum
15 Marina. I think there's a couple of things that we should
16 keep in mind.

17 One is the fuel usage. Smaller recreational boats
18 can eat up a lot of fuel. I looked on the internet today.
19 I saw a 33-foot gasoline powerboat will burn up, use about
20 0.8 to 0.9 gallons of fuel just to go -- I'm sorry. I got
21 that mixed up. One gallon of fuel will buy you 0.8 to 0.9
22 miles. So just running the transit up and down or just
23 down, one way, from here to Eliza Island will burn about 10
24 or 11 gallons of fuel.

25 Our boat uses quite a bit less because we're diesel.

1 But nonetheless, small boats use quite a bit of fuel. And
2 ignoring the global implications from geopolitics and global
3 warming, that's still a huge impact on air quality and also
4 water quality too.

5 Small boats can put out a lot of fuel into the
6 water, either by what's called [inaudible] where there's
7 fuel going past the rings into the water through exhaust or
8 refueling accidents. This is something that the Coast Guard
9 Auxillary is looking at, the question of refueling part.
10 But that's only part of the answer.

11 The other thing is maintenance, people getting out
12 there and maintaining their boats. They like to use
13 biodegradable ingredients, but they don't realize that those
14 are often toxic to the salmon fry and other animals living
15 in the water. By the way, I do see a lot of salmon fry down
16 in the harbor. I've never used a dip net to find out
17 exactly what species they are. But salmon fry do use
18 Squalicum Harbor to hang out in.

19 Fourthly, I would also include the layer of
20 antifouling paints. There's a lot of people who, by
21 necessity, paint the bottom of their boats with a
22 copper-based antifouling paint in order to discourage
23 barnacles, algae, whatever is growing on their boats.

24 So I've got four suggestions, though. One is that I
25 see in the EIS that live-aboards are limited to 2 percent.

1 And I would suggest that live-aboard boaters can actually
2 provide benefits. I would increase that percentage and
3 include a permit or recertification program to allow people
4 to be live-aboards at the marina. They can be extra eyes,
5 including at night or during storms when nobody else is
6 around. So I think there is some value to live-aboard
7 boaters.

8 Two, more easy and convenient pump outs. I think
9 the Port has been going in the right direction with their
10 new pump-out machines. But there are problems with the
11 machines. Like at Gate 9, there is no easy access to a
12 pump-out machine. So a lot of people will pump their tank
13 overboard out in the water, something we'd like to
14 discourage.

15 Four -- or three, rather, we would like to see the
16 use or encourage the use of bio diesel. Bio diesel, I
17 think, is mature as a fuel. I'm using it as much as I can
18 on our own boat, because the local air quality and also it's
19 a much less toxic fuel than petroleum diesel. I think, as
20 part of the new port, if we could encourage the use of small
21 vessel sea money, tankage dockage in order to facilitate and
22 encourage the use of bio diesel, I think the Port will be
23 much further along in terms of less toxic fuel.

24 Education programs, use boaters like the Coast Guard
25 Auxilliary to educate boaters, help make responsible boating

1 the norm rather than people having to feel that they have to
2 undergo regulatory compliance. I think a peer-to-peer
3 education program with small grants provided to Marine Life
4 Center resources, Coast Guard Auxilliary will go a long ways
5 to teaching people how to be more responsible boaters.

6 I think I see this as a wonderful opportunity to
7 give people a sense of place. This is the moment. This is
8 a real opportunity to provide more connection, better
9 connection, between the people and the community, the
10 natural, marine natural resources. Thanks.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF ELI MACKEIWICZ

2

3 Hello. My name is Eli Mackeiwicz,
4 M-A-C-K-I-E-W-I-C-Z. I live at 2733 Lynn Street in
5 Bellingham. I just wanted to touch a little bit on what
6 Maria said and what Ken has talked about as far as fishery
7 recovery.

8 Reading the Draft EIS, I see a lot of concentration
9 on shoreline development, which is great, and habitat
10 restoration along the shoreline, which is also, you know --
11 will be very helpful not only to make it unique to
12 Bellingham being ecologically friendly but also to aid in
13 recovery of salmon runs in waterways in Whatcom County.

14 Something that I think is significantly missing is
15 alternatives or mitigation techniques that would involve
16 Whatcom Creek if there are impacts to salmon that are
17 determined to be a result of the development. Mitigation
18 techniques are basically concentrated along the shoreline,
19 like I said. I'd like to see creeks- or watershed-based
20 restoration and mitigation.

21 I just want to real quick -- this may be a little
22 corny, but I have this. From 1973, this is Bellingham City
23 Council talking about when Maritime Heritage Park Fish
24 Hatchery was implemented. And this is on the meaning of
25 Whatcom Creek. It's a real short passage here at the very

1 bottom.

2 It says: "Of significance equal to the economic
3 value of the creek is it being nature's biggest gift to
4 downtown. If given any chance, it could be a refreshing and
5 sure source of plant and fish life and a mecca for visitors
6 and citizens alike. This strong natural asset asks for
7 recognition. Today is a good time to restore the creek and
8 its shores and, in doing so, rebuild the strength of this
9 important part of downtown." Again, 1973.

10 So perhaps maybe now is the time to, "a good time to
11 restore the creek and its shores and, in doing so, rebuild
12 the strength of this important part of downtown."

13 I guess my general point point, like I said, I'd
14 like to see mitigation techniques addressed towards Whatcom
15 Creek, @ Patton Creek, the Nooksack River, wherever it would
16 be pertinent to mitigate any damage, where it would be most
17 effective. I agree that the quality of habitat will improve
18 in the redevelopment but maybe not the effectiveness of the
19 habitat. But that I've gotten into in my written statement,
20 in which I will go into more detail on these things.

21 Just my general point is that I don't see the full
22 benefit of creating habitat if you're not going to work hard
23 to restore the salmon runs so that the habitat is actually
24 used. Thank you.

25

1 STATEMENT OF MARIE HITCHMAN (Continued)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

I'm not very good on my feet, impromptu. And I just thought of a couple things that just somehow got lost. And that is when I was telling you about the history, politically, of the Shoreline Management Act, that the two most important features of the Shoreline Management Act, the intent of the people was, one, to increase public access; secondly, to have waterfront developments that are marine dependent.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think as we work our way through this Port of Bellingham process, we need to think in terms of businesses that are water dependent. I know there's the financial constraints and the financial juggling; but if we can keep that in mind, we won't be so inclined to fill it up with condos and things like that.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATEMENT OF SCOTT SANDERSON

My name is Scott Sanderson. I live at 808 20th Street, Bellingham, Apartment 108. I'm not very good at speaking in public. So I'm going to work my way through this as best I can.

This plan will have the greatest impact on the Bellingham region in the last to next 200 years. We only have one chance to get it right. The latest studies from the Department of Ecology indicate a higher sea-level rise than has been spec-ed out on the EIS. This just came up on the 17th. I have copy for you, and left it in the back desk.

Increasing the hydraulic pressure on the capped pollutants, which is proposed as one of the ways to handle these things down there, could possibly drive them into aquifers, through the fractured substrate, thus polluting all of the water table in the region, something that you didn't plan for. Just in case, I always say, plan for the worst; hope for the best.

This is not something to be rushed into. It's going to take time to get it right. We only have one chance. All possible issues need to be addressed before any change occurs. And because, as I say, once the genie's out of the bottle, it's awfully hard to put it back. So that's my

1 view.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF AL HANNERS (Continued)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second time around. Well, I thought of something; and I want to thank you folks for giving us a chance to say something. And I think there's a lot of good remarks here today. I hope that the authorities who have the power to do something about will listen to it. And that's all I have to say. Thank you again.

1 STATEMENT OF LYNETTE FELBER

2

3 My name is Lynette Felber, 507 14th Street. F, as
4 in Frank, E-L-B-E-R.

5 I have prepared written comments to submit. But
6 since no one is or not everyone is speaking here, I thought
7 I would read some excerpts. And I did read a good portion
8 of the report, being a compulsive reader. And I'm not a
9 scientist; but my concern is mainly with the density,
10 especially with the highest density proposed.

11 The chapters that I spent the most time looking at
12 were the visual projections of what the buildings would look
13 like, the height and impact on the surroundings. So those
14 are the main things that I'd like to address.

15 Mayor Pike had the right idea when he urged the Port
16 to consider a lower level of density for the new waterfront.
17 The mayor's previous caution about urban growth areas should
18 also apply to this project. The development cannot be
19 undone, and therefore we should be cautious about planning
20 an over ambitious overly dense project.

21 The 1300 pages of the DEIS on the waterfront project
22 present a plan with a scope of a metropolis within the City
23 of Bellingham. The least dense option for development is
24 the most prudent course of action at this time. In this
25 case, less is more. Major concerns that must be addressed

1 are the cost to the taxpayers, the negative impacts on the
2 downtown and adjacent neighborhoods, an oversupply of
3 expensive housing, insufficient professional jobs, and the
4 state of the current economy.

5 The draft EIS puts the cost of the waterfront
6 development at \$335 million for 20 years in 2006 dollars.
7 If the community of Bellingham is concerned about the cost
8 of the new library at 56 million, how will they feel about
9 the cost of the new waterfront? There is, in the report,
10 one million of jump-start money from an Innovative
11 Partnership Zone grant. And that money would pay for some
12 of the infrastructure. But if the city is responsible for
13 the cost of most of the infrastructure and the Port reaps
14 the financial rewards of owning the land, how much will be
15 paid for by the developers who might profit from building
16 the new waterfront?

17 The reports states that future developers might
18 contribute the funding for roads and infrastructure. Why
19 not make such contributions a requirement for a chance to
20 build on this unique property? Since the expenses of the
21 Port show up on our property tax statements, which I have
22 received this week, we must ask what are the benefits of
23 this development to the people Bellingham. One of the
24 things in particular that disturbed me about these proposals
25 is that I noticed that the proposal with the largest park

1 and public areas is the one with the highest density. And
2 it seems like we're asked to sort of bargain away public
3 areas for the highest level of development.

4 As the visual projections in the DEIS show, the new
5 plans for the waterfront would dwarf the downtown of
6 Bellingham as it currently exists and significant historical
7 structures such as the Whatcom History and Art Museum. The
8 depictions of the maximum height envelope reveal that the
9 hills and trees that give our city its natural beauty will
10 be obscured by the tall buildings.

11 Bellingham currently has a vibrant mixed-use
12 downtown. Will the new metropolis proposed for the
13 waterfront compete with existing businesses downtown,
14 especially retail and restaurants? As a mixed-use
15 development, the new waterfront also includes housing in the
16 form of condo towers. What's needed in Bellingham, as the
17 plan acknowledges, is low-cost housing for the large
18 percentage of low-income residents. Three large condo
19 towers have already been proposed for urban growth, Morse
20 Tower, Fairhaven Harbors, and so forth. The proposal
21 suggests that yet more expensive condos will be built while
22 those currently on the market remain unsold.

23 Adjoining neighborhoods such as the lettered streets
24 and Old Town need to be protected from rapid overdevelopment
25 of the waterfront. The visual projections demonstrate that

1 many existing residents would see their water views
2 diminished or obstructed. The views of the city from the
3 water are also negatively impacted.

4 The DEIS admits the noise of construction,
5 especially pile driving, would be considerable. They do
6 offer some solutions to mitigate the noise.

7 After construction is finished, the new residential
8 and business population will have enormous effect on
9 adjacent areas. One projection in the DEIS estimates more
10 than 5,700 vehicle trips per day to the new development.
11 The city is already experiencing conflicts between residents
12 and nightclubs over noise. Any further development that
13 mixes residential, retail, and industrial uses needs to
14 consider noise and traffic abatement.

15 One thing that everyone agrees upon is that
16 Bellingham needs more professional jobs. However, except
17 for the proposed inclusion of Western Washington University,
18 the immediate jobs proposed are primarily construction
19 jobs -- temporary jobs. The DEIS claims it will attract new
20 CEO's to office space. But it has no details about actual
21 business or industries with plans to relocate to the new
22 port. Merely building office space does not guarantee
23 occupancy by new businesses or quality job creation. There
24 are a number of empty retail spaces in Bellingham and
25 Fairhaven yet to be rented.

1 In recent years, Bellingham has adopted the
2 if-you-build-it, they-will-come model. It is also
3 necessary, however, to consider our boom-and-bust history.
4 The recent influx of new residents was fueled, at least in
5 part, by the housing and mortgage bubble in places like
6 California and Seattle. The strong Canadian dollar has also
7 played a part. Both the Port's 6-million-square-foot plan
8 and the mayor's 4-million proposed development exceed
9 caution in the recessionary economy and the early aftermath
10 of the real estate bubble.

11 Further, it is essential to consider why new
12 residents have chosen Bellingham. They're drawn here by the
13 natural beauty, the green consciousness of the community,
14 and the quaint, small-city atmosphere. Any new development
15 must respect the history of our downtown as well as the
16 marine history and industrial character of the waterfront.
17 If we become just another Seattle north or Vancouver south,
18 those new residents might as well choose the urban villages
19 of those large cities offering more job opportunities and
20 cultural advantages.

21 Thank you for the opportunity to talk about the
22 proposal.

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF DAVE COURTIS (Continued)

2

3 Dave Courtis again. My last name is C-O-U-R-T-I-S.

4 The previous speaker reminded me of something that I
5 thought I would mention. And that's the section in the
6 Draft Environmental Impact Statement where there's photos
7 taken from various viewpoints and then a building envelope
8 is superimposed on that photo and then the building mask. I
9 felt that was extremely valuable. I thought it was very
10 useful for me and, I hope, other members of the public to
11 get a real idea of what the buildings would look like and
12 how that potentially could impact the view corridors and, if
13 somebody's walking around downtown, what they'd see at the
14 time of development.

15 However, in looking at it -- and unfortunately I
16 don't have the specific photos with me. But I will mention,
17 list those in my remarks that I submit subsequently. When
18 you look at the envelope of building heights and then you
19 look at the building sizes, which are the accompanying
20 photo, it appears to me that in a number of cases the
21 building heights are significantly less than what is shown
22 on the envelope of building height. And I recognize that
23 these are representations of buildings. But it seems to me
24 that, if you're saying that the envelope of building height
25 is, say, 200 feet and the demonstrated buildings are, like,

1 100 feet high, it has a definite impact as far as you look
2 at it without recognizing that's a potential problem and
3 saying, Oh, the view impact is not going to be that great.
4 However, if you look at the envelope, all of a sudden, views
5 of Lummi Island or other areas that I think are scenically
6 important, all of a sudden, they're masked. I would suggest
7 that whoever did that work maybe go back and revisit that
8 and make sure that the representations are accurate and not
9 something where it's misleading the public.

10 Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF PETER AMBROSE

2

3 My name is Peter Ambrose and I'm a sailor. I'd just
4 like to make a comment. 1537 Fairview Street, Bellingham,
5 Washington 98229. And this is a brief statement. I have
6 entered written things, I have also commented before.

7 But I represent a significant number of people in
8 Bellingham that sail sailboats, keel boats, which are boats
9 without retractable keels; and dinghies, and other watercraft
10 and I'm a member of the yacht club. And I've sailed an
11 Etchells which is a 30-foot boat since 1981 and before that, I
12 sailed every year. And I sailed another boat before that,
13 since 76. So I'm very familiar with sailing on Bellingham
14 Bay.

15 The boats, the Etchells, of which there are 10 here in
16 Bellingham now, race every Wednesday from April through
17 September. In most places, they're sailed as dry boats,
18 they're dry sail. That means they're lifted out of the water
19 and stored on trailers. And the reason for that is, they pick
20 up from 50 to 150 pounds of water, and to be competitive going
21 to Seattle or San Diego or San Francisco, you have to have a
22 boat that's minimum weight to be competitive. That's not the
23 only thing. You've got to have a lot of other things too.

24 But the point is that up here we don't have that
25 facility now. We have a couple of cranes. They don't always

1 work. They were dedicated to the fishing fleet, so we take
2 second fiddle. You can't reserve them to put the boats in the
3 water. And all this is in the way of saying right now there's
4 five or six Etchells sailors that would immediately put their
5 boats up on trailers if they could.

6 And so this is, looking at the Environmental Impact
7 Statement, there's lots of areas there that I would love to
8 choose to put one of these facilities. And this is not just
9 for Etchells. This is for, there's other keel boats J-24s,
10 Melges, 24's and 30's, dinghies, lots of dinghies, then other
11 watercraft that could use an associated ramp. You've got to
12 have two lifts, you've got to have a place to store the boats
13 and then you have to consider wind and things like where the
14 oil collects.

15 Like, the oil collects, from the commercial fleet,
16 down along -- that usually blows this way so it blows up
17 against the bulk heads. So when there's a little bit of wind
18 but not a lot of wind blowing, which is quite a bit of the
19 time 'cause it's blocked by the other boats, there's a big
20 sheen of oil right around the launching facility. You pick
21 your boat out, it's left with, all the way down, with oil. Of
22 course then you have to wash it off, then you take the oil out
23 of the water and you wash it with a hose and it comes back
24 dawn onto the asphalt. So those types of things have to be
25 all thought out.

1 There's an excellent facility right now for dinghies
2 and small craft in Chicago. It's one of the best in the
3 world, so it would be a useful thing to get ideas from. But
4 this, I want to go on record as other people have of
5 requesting you take a look at this facility. And certainly
6 we'd be willing to help find other facilities that might be
7 useful in comparing this.

8 Thank you.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATEMENT OF ROGER LAMB

2

3

My name is Roger Lamb, and I live about 3/10 of a
4 mile from here. I paddle, surf, ski, and sea kayak a lot,
5 like every day. And I want to make sure that I'm able to
6 carry my boat on my shoulder from my car, less than 50 yards
7 to the water. So what I care about is having a parking
8 space with my car with no trailer and a way to walk into the
9 water. Stairs, ramp, anything at all, just so I can walk
10 into the water. I just want to make sure there's plenty of
11 parking.

12

I'm not sure how the plan is going, but I want to
13 make sure that you know what my interests and a lot of my
14 copaddlers' interests are. That's it.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATEMENT OF SCOTT BARR

My name is Scott Barr and I live at 2315 Eldrige Avenue in Bellingham. And I, of course, brought all my notes except for the ones that pertain to the EIS tonight. So I'll try to do this of the top of my head from what I can remember.

The particular issue I want to speak to is actually the issue of fill on the site. I believe the EIS said there was -- this is from memory -- I think around 700,000 cubic yards of material were estimated to be put on the site over the period of construction. My concern is that the EIS seems to assume that this is going to be evenly divided over the 20-year build-up period.

I think that's extremely optimistic and unrealistic to assume that that's how the fill would actually be put on the site. My guess is that there will be peak periods that would be three, four, five times that much fill delivered as non-peak times.

I believe it said that there would be 34 truck trips per day, assuming this 20-year flat rate of fill delivery. And that was 17 trips in, 17 trips out. I believe that's an unrealistic estimate, again based on the fact that there will be peak periods when there will be fill delivered to the site. The alternative was that -- also presented in the

1 EIS, was that there could be -- some fill material could be
2 delivered by barge. But I don't believe there was any
3 estimate in there of what percentage of it could be
4 delivered by trucks and which by barge. And if some of it
5 was going to be delivered by barge, then we also need to
6 think about what are the impacts going to be from that much
7 barge traffic, which is not currently happening in that area
8 of the city.

9 I think that's it. There will be noise impacts,
10 obviously, from the trucks. If you think about 34 truck
11 trips per day over a 10-hour day, about every 20 minutes or
12 so. And if you think of multiplying that by 3 or 4 times,
13 that's one every 5 or 10 minutes. And these are big trucks.
14 So I wish that would be addressed in the EIS. Thank you.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATEMENT OF LEROY ROHDE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

My name's Leroy Rohde, and I live out on 4961 Noon Road. It's on the county, but it is a Bellingham address. Now, I'm a longshoreman, and I'm kind of walking into this a little blind. I don't know really what you're after; but I guess as a longshoreman and somebody whose made their living off this waterfront for at least the last 28 years, I'd like to see a good emphasis on preserving the availability of shipping down at the port dock.

You know, a person just commented about all the truck and barge traffic. Well, just a few years ago, there was a whole lot more activity and noise and everything else; but there was a whole lot more good-paying jobs down there too, and somehow we survived.

I'd just like to make emphasis that that's a facility that can't really be replicated anymore, as we all know. You couldn't build a new port facility if you wanted to, practically anywhere on the coast. So let's concentrate on preserving that. Keep that available for good jobs.
Thank you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATEMENT OF RODD PEMBLE

Good evening. Rodd Pemble, 2915 Cedarwood Ave. in Bellingham, and I'm here on behalf of myself. I haven't had a chance to look at the report in detail, but I've been part of the process for the last several years and would like to offer some kind of overarching not detail-related comments.

But -- and the first one I'd like to make is that I still haven't seen an economic analysis. And I think that it's gonna be, perhaps not impossible, but very difficult for the community and policy makers to decide what are appropriate factors in the Environmental Impact Statement as we go forward if we don't have some way of including the economic picture as part of that.

My suspicion is that somebody has done some analysis in that regard, probably with tax money. So that's why I feel like I have the right to ask for taxpayers to see that.

Secondly, I'm frustrated again with just the presentation of this phase of the process. As I look at the drawings over here -- I'm fairly familiar with the site. I'm familiar with some of the alternatives that have been discussed in the past, but I feel like if the average citizen of Bellingham looked at these, they aren't gonna be able to make sense out of them very well for several reasons.

1 And again, these don't have anything to do with the
2 detail of which building goes where, how many square feet
3 for housing and things like that. There's no record on
4 there, for each area, of what the green/open space is. How
5 many acres is it? How does that compare with the site as a
6 whole? There's no way to look at those and tell that. Now
7 maybe that's in the report but chances are that requires
8 wading through and tracking that down; where, if this is
9 supposed to be the public interface with this part of the
10 process, I think people are gonna be frustrated by it.

11 Secondly, I think there's things that just don't
12 make sense when the least dense alternative clearly, just
13 looking at that drawing, has the least amount of park and
14 green space acreage. That just doesn't ring with common
15 sense. If you have less development, you should have more
16 open space and yet we're saying No, the least dense
17 alternative is gonna have the least amount of open space.
18 Without some kind of explanation and supporting clarifying
19 information for folks, I think it's just another potential
20 hurdle that people have to becoming and staying involved in
21 the process. And I think you can look out in the audience
22 tonight and see people are already pretty fatigued with this
23 process.

24 And finally, I guess I would offer that the height
25 of buildings is clearly something that's considered in these

1 density alternatives, anybody who's looking ahead
2 understands that if you take, let's say, 40 acres of this
3 site and you build buildings that are two stories high, you
4 get so much square footage. 42,000, 43,000 square foot an
5 acre times 50 acres, that's a couple million square feet.
6 If you go up two floors, well now you've got twice as many
7 square feet to work with. If you go up six floors, you have
8 six times that square footage.

9 But there's no way to look at the drawings and have
10 a sense of, well, what are we talking about. When it says
11 least dense, does that mean everything is 1 story high or
12 does it mean there's big open spaces between 8 to 10 story
13 buildings? Those I think are important considerations in
14 the environmental impact statement because it's going to
15 impact how much surface there is, the impact of traffic,
16 parking, the ratio of housing to employment.

17 Which these, some of these numbers look very, very
18 different to me than early discussions I had with developers
19 in the community in terms of ratios that they envisioned for
20 the waterfront. And so it's hard for me to have been to
21 those meeting and now look at these and come to some kind of
22 sensible understanding of that.

23 I understand that building heights haven't been set
24 but I think if you're creating scenarios for people, just
25 simply saying it's the least dense, it's the mid-dense it's

1 the most dense. I don't know that these are very helpful to
2 people to evaluate a long-term decision. I understand Mayor
3 Pike thinks 4 million square feet is enough development but
4 I think that's much too vague and broad a way to make the
5 decision.

6 I think you have to have more detail in there about,
7 well what does that mean, 4 million square feet at a height
8 of 60 feet above grade, or we can allow 30 percent of the
9 buildings to be taller than that? I think that it just
10 doesn't allow the citizens to participate in an intelligent
11 way and make comments. Thank you.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25