

NEW WHATCOM PROJECT

EIS SCOPING PUBLIC MEETING

C O P Y

6:00 p.m.

Wednesday, April 25, 2007

<<>>

Bellingham Municipal Court

2014 C Street

Bellingham, Washington

<<>>

KATHERINE M. CULLMAN

CCR 3001

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

Page

GEOFF MIDDAUGH	4
PATRICK DUKES	7
DAVE COURTIS	9
WENDY STEFFENSEN	11
JOHN HERITAGE	13
GEORGE DYSON	16
EMILY WEINER	19
BILL GEYER	21
PATRICK McKEE	24
RODD PEMBLE	26
FRANCES BADGETT	29
JACK WEISS	32

* * * * *

P R E S E N T A T I O N

6:00 p.m. Review Informational Materials

6:20 p.m. Introductions/Overview of Meeting Format

Margaret Norton-Arnold

6:25 p.m. EIS Presentation

Andrew Maron, Mike Stoner, Mike Blumen

6:45 p.m. Scoping Hearing

Scoping Official: Mr. Andrew Maron

* * * * *

Court Reporter:

KATHERINE M. CULLMAN

VAN PELT, CORBETT, BELLOWS

100 South King Street, Suite 100

Seattle, Washington 98104

* * * * *

GEOFF MIDDAUGH

Jeff Middaugh. Emily's got the hook. Okay.

Thank

you for the opportunity to present my comments on the draft scoping document. I live at 206 Highland Drive in Bellingham. These comments represent myself, myself as a private citizen.

The New Whatcom redevelopment is one of the greatest

opportunities I've ever become familiar with to provide a balance

of economic development, environmental quality, and environmental

remediation of restoration. I commend the leaders of this community and the effort that they have put into this approach.

I'm also proud to be a citizen of this community who's taking on this challenge. Having said this, I have three major concerns on the scoping: My concern is the issue of the steady elimination of green in your alternatives.

Specifically,

one, scoping should be used to determine the range of alternatives; two, the alternatives are too narrow and constrain

the scoping process rather than guiding it; and three, the alternatives are illegally and improperly constrained by an economic analysis and development form that has not yet been

disclosed.

In regards to my first concern, I refer the SEPA official to the guidelines for state agencies, RCW 43.21C030, paraphrasing, go to Section B: Identify and development methods and procedures in consultation with the Department of Ecology and

the Ecological Commission, which will ensure that presently and quantified environmental amenities and values be given appropriate

consideration in decision-making, along with economic and technical considerations.

I refer specifically to the last sentence where the

Washington legislator [sic] directed this team to consider the unquantified environmental amenities and values, along with the economic and technical considerations. It does not say: As constrained by economic and technical considerations, but along with economic and technical considerations.

The present alternatives are being driven by a secret

economic formula that constrains the alternatives in an inappropriate fashion. For example, having only 33 acres considered for green space or 19 percent of the 175 acre total is

an inappropriate narrowing of the alternatives without proper disclosure and inconsistent with public comment to the point -- to

this point. SEPA says look at the environmental component as well

as the economic.

I do not disregard the economic analysis that must come into play in this process as identified by the creative

interlocal agreement that guides you. But it is not appropriate

to narrow the range of alternatives in consideration by a formula

biased against the environment and favoring development in a secret manner.

Secondly, the draft alternatives are much too narrow.

The 19 percent green space becomes smaller with each alternative

and is constrained by the secret economic formula, for example,
14

and 9 percent, respectively, in alternatives two and three.

Okay. I will go to my last point since the hook's out.

In summary, using the scoping process to frame alternatives and follow the SEPA guidelines. Two, do not use the hidden economic analysis to constrain alternatives at this time inconsistent with SEPA; and three, disclose in this process the economic analysis that's being used. But do not use it to constrain alternatives at this time.

For every human interaction with the environment there is an environmental risk as well as an opportunity.

Let's

use this process to fully outline the opportunity we have and not

to artificially constrain our future.

Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you.

Patrick Dukes followed by Dave Courtis.

MR. COURTIS: Courtis.

MR. MARON: Courtis? Thank you.

Mr. Dukes.

PATRICK DUKES

Thank you. I'm speaking strictly for myself as a citizen.

And this is -- this is -- I picked this up this afternoon, and I want to tell you that I'm begging your moment of

indulgence here because I really haven't had a chance to go through this thing. I sat there and made a couple of notes. You're welcome to these; it's about three points. And this gentleman already covered -- excuse my -- already covered the one.

I keep seeing this -- this reminds me of an architectural build-out, I call it. Or if you want, the max after

square footage for a given area. And I see the same, the balance

-- a concern and a hope we haven't -- perhaps I'm speaking more than just for myself -- in that once again, the greenways go down

as we send the buildings a little bit lower. And I'm confused as

-- I call it the pencil factors is where the square footage comes

in and the return on the square footage or cubic footage or in this case almost -- and the height limitations almost -- and in

this case, looks like we're keeping -- the zoning's a little
confusing to me that we're keeping in some of the writings
here,

that we're keeping industrial height seems to keep going on.
Perhaps it's just my own confusion for not having reviewed this
well enough, and forgive me for not been well-prepared.

No address I suppose is necessary in this
particular

level as to cleanup, and I know everybody's extremely concerned about that. And I do notice that we do have the -- I'm

rambling

here and I apologize.

The time frame looks like it's a 20-year build-out or

a 10 to 20. But I just want to point out that, a thought that I

had, is that this -- this build-out may go 10, 20 years. Our grandchildren are going to be facing this for all into the future.

And I just -- I speak for those guys that haven't come yet in that

regard.

Thank you very much for your time. She didn't even

have to pull one up.

MR. MARON: Mr. Dukes, after you've read it

later you're welcome to submit some written comments.

MR. DUKES: Well, I'll send in some more comments to you at some point.

MR. MARON: Mr. Courtis. And after that, Wendy Steffensen.

DAVE COURTIS

My name is David Courtis, C-O-U-R-T-I-S, and I live at 440 Island Drive.

About -- well, over 13 months ago, then Mayor Mark Asmundson wrote a public letter to the city council, the commissioners of the Port, the planning commission of Bellingham and the waterfront advisory group.

In his letter, he warned of the risk in New Whatcom's development -- or redevelopment, of having the inappropriate become the inevitable. In other words, we get into a process where we end up with what we don't want to have.

After I've looked at the scoping document, I'm very concerned that we have a danger of that happening to us. The low density and medium density alternatives are totally inadequate. They do not reflect the extensive public comment at innumerable meetings or the extensive written record, I'm thinking that especially in respect to parks and open space.

In addition, those two alternatives do not reflect the decisions that the planning commission has made as far as buffer zones and setbacks.

I feel that we need to do something different on
the

alternatives than what has been presented to us. And what I
would

suggest would be another development alternative that would be
including some of the information for parks in the high density

alternative but having something in addition to that.

I think that to the shipping terminal is the prime piece of property in New Whatcom. I know the Port wants to retain

that as a shipping terminal, but realistically it is not economically viable now and it will not be in the foreseeable future. There's about 750,000 square feet of property there.

And

if this were converted to a multi-use type of redevelopment, you

could have anywhere from one-and-a-half to two-million square feet

of developable property there. In addition, rather than not having any job support essentially on that shipping terminal, you

would have an additional significant number of jobs. And I think

this would be something which would be very helpful to the overall

economic development of New Whatcom, would allow additional parks,

and I think it would be something that I would certainly support.

Thank you.

MR. MARON: Wendy Steffensen followed by John Heritage.

WENDY STEFFENSEN

Hello. My name is Wendy Steffensen. I'm with the North Sound Baykeeper with resources, which is located at 1155 North State Street, Suite 623 in Bellingham. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

One of the things that I noticed is that we are talking about probable significant adverse impacts and that's why we're doing this EIS. As the community has come to believe, what we're going to have at the end of this process is something a lot better than we started with. And I know that that's going to happen. And the question really is: How much better are we going to make it?

So I just thought of a few points here. One is regarding the planned action. My understanding of this is that if there was a planned action, then there would be no further significant environmental review for all of the pieces of this planned action, even though the build-out would be for 20 years.

And I caution against that because things change over 20 years,

and so I would say that a blanket planned action level of review

should not be included in this.

It's also unclear on how we the public are supposed

to weigh in on some of the alternatives and as well as on the proposed actions of the Port and City on page six. So in the draft EIS, when it's released it would be great for people to have

a path forward so they can comment on the planned actions by
the

Port and the City, as well as the five -- five elements
included
in the no action alternative.

In addition, we talk about different densities,
and

it'd be great to have examples of what do those densities mean.
I'm more of a visual person. Just given four million square
foot

doesn't mean that much to me. What are similar cities for low,
medium, and high density, so we should have some reference
point

there, and we should also talk about livability. What's the
livability of cities that have those densities?

In regard to the earth, water resources, and
plants

and animals, I find that what is said is that we're going to
discuss things; we're going to talk about the existing
conditions

and potential description of something that is proposed. For
earth I would say we don't want a discussion of seismic
problems;

we want an actual analysis.

In terms of water resources, we don't want to
describe and analyze what exists. We want to address potential

stormwater impacts, and we want to make sure that those
stormwater

impacts are not just mitigated but completely eradicated. How
are

we going to basically go beyond the bar? We need to start
addressing how are we going to make it better so that there is
no

net loss on this project. Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you very much. John
Heritage and then it's George Dyson.

JOHN HERITAGE

Hi. My name is John Heritage, 2223 Williams Street.

I appreciate the expanded scoping format that we've got rolling here, and that I'm hopeful that public input is considered.

And

I'm also hopeful that a lot of the work that the waterfront advisory group and also the planning commission, in the form of recommendations that have already been made, I hope that they are

considered as we all move towards a creation of a master plan.

I also don't want us to be constrained by the alternatives that have been presented this evening. I hope we can

maybe take bits and pieces of those, but ultimately it sounds like

create a new alternative.

I'm an advocate for access, and I'd like the scoping -- the scoping process to take a close look at access throughout the entire site. I'm a resident of the Columbia neighborhood, and on proposal one or alternative one it includes

an access, a pedestrian access point, from the end of Broadway Street over the train tracks and over Railroad Avenue. So I think

that's a real positive access point and would enable residents
in
the Columbia neighborhood, the lettered streets, to be able to
access -- have a pedestrian access point.

So I'd really like us to take a close look at what
are going to be the negative and positive impacts of having or
not
having an access point there or at a similar point. Maybe

H Street I've heard is a possibility. But certainly, something other than the current access via F Street.

I'm also really interested in us testing some of those assumptions that Mike was mentioning earlier. It seems to me one of the assumptions that we need to test thoroughly is that increased density requires increased parks and trails. I'd like us to think about could we test an alternative that has perhaps medium density and parks and trails that are more in line with alternative one, which is 33 acres or maybe even higher.

Again,

not being constrained by these alternative. So could we have medium density and higher parks and trails?

You know one thing that I'm just going to throw out

there, I guess another assumption is, is the marina the best alternative for the ASB site? And I don't have a strong opinion

either way, but I think this could be an important way to look into that more.

Another assumption that seems to be made is that the shipping terminal, keeping it as a shipping terminal of some sort,

is the best alternative and I'd like us to look into that as well.

And I'll start wrapping up here.

One thing that I've always been curious about is the -- in all the alternatives I see some of the existing buildings, including that monster building on, I think it's on Maple Street and it runs east west. I'd like us to analyze the negative impact -- or the impact that it has on view corridors and

light and glare and at all that kind of good stuff.

And then finally -- let's see, finally I'd really like us to analyze the impact of a buffer between the water and whatever development that we -- that we create. The planning commission last year recommended a 200-foot buffer, 200-foot open space trail buffer, between the waterway all the way around on any development. And I'd like us to really analyze that carefully.

Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you. George Dyson followed by Emily Weiner.

GEORGE DYSON

George Dyson, D-Y-S-O-N, 435 West Holly Street,
which

is pretty much ground zero, right in the middle of all of this.

And I've been there 19 years waiting for this to
start happening, so I'm happy things are moving forward, but I
think the words of caution are in order that we don't want, as
our

mayor said that, you know, for the wrong thing to become
inevitable.

I'll just start with some specific -- I think that
the point is we want to address this document as to what the
scope

should be. It seems odd to me that the no action alternative
includes -- and I should preface it by saying I -- I'm a
boater;

I'm a boat builder. I work in the marine industry, and I'm on
the

waiting list for a slip at the new marina, but I think that
should

be part of the scope that if I'm correct, and I believe I am
correct, that the legal status of the ASB currently is upland
not

aquatic. And we're supposed to be looking at zoning changes
and

changing 30 acres from upland to aquatic, I think that's a
change

and that should be looked at. It may have positive
environmental

impacts; it may have negative, but in 30 years from now we want
to

look back and say we did our homework and check that out.

I think the assumption that industrial, the
alternative that no alternative -- no access -- all industrial,
no

parks, I don't see where that comes from. I don't see anything
in

the zoning law that prevents having parks in an industrial area.

I think we need -- our community needs places to work more than we

need places to live, and we should look at an alternative that is

both green space and working waterfront. That would be -- that would be my ideal. And it may not be yours, but at least it should be on the table.

The whole premise of the shoreline management plan is

to preserve the waterfront for water-dependent uses. Other specific things that should be looked at their impact, which I think maybe not have been mentioned, is the impact of de-authorizing the federal waterway, making a decision that will

last forever that Bellingham gives up having a navigable -- federally authorized navigable waterway into the heart of our downtown. That has very big environmental impacts on how we move

things around, how we are transported in and out of our community.

Relocating the railway also has impacts, probably favorable; but

on the other hand, where it will be relocated to is currently a greenways corridor, so that -- that has to be taken into the

balance.

I think that many of the speakers have said that
the
alternatives are -- are sort of inadequate. They don't -- they
just seem to be the same thing that we got with the LMN plans,
which were criticized heavily by our planning commission and by
a
lot of the public.

So in closing, I'd say it feels a little bit like
the

book Green Eggs and Ham, where Sam keeps -- keeps trying to get the public, you know, to take green eggs and ham and he doesn't like it. You know: Would you, could you on a boat; I could not, would not on a boat; I will not, will not with a goat; I will not eat them in the rain; I will not eat them on a train; not in the dark; not in a tree, and it goes on and on. I do not like them here or there; I do not like them anywhere.

And I think that's how some people feel about -- about some of the plans that keep coming forward.

Thank you very much.

MR. MARON: I'll look at the record and make sure we have that transcribed properly.

Okay. We have Emily Weiner then Bill Geyer.

EMILY WEINER

Emily Weiner. Unfortunately I have no poetry. Thanks for bringing some poetry to this, George. I live at 2729 North Park Drive.

First of all, I would like the scoping to add the assumption of the number of people who would live in the square footage for any alternatives that are presented. Certainly, for the traffic studies and for other things, that assumption will have to be part of the analysis, and I think it's important the public get to see those numbers so the numbers for 3.69 million square feet; for 2.82 million square feet; and 1.59 million square feet and whatever alternatives are added.

It says in the New Whatcom, that the New Whatcom Master Plan will be consistent with the comp plan. The comp plan requires a certain acreage of parks per person. None of these alternatives tell us how many people will be there, so we can't do that arithmetic yet.

However, I am skeptical of whether these would meet the comp plan requirements. I do not think it is healthy for a new neighborhood to be built below standards for parks. So I

request that once that analysis is done, number of people multiplied by how much acreage is required in the comp plan, that for any density that is proposed another map be drawn with an alternative with the required acreage of parks, because the EIS

has to be done for any development, so if the EIS doesn't have
an
alternative that has, that follows, that meets the guidelines
of
our comp plan for parks, then once the EIS is accepted we
cannot -- we will not -- it'll be too late to have a master
plan
that is not substandard for parks. I don't think the citizens
and
the residents of Bellingham can afford to build a new
neighborhood
that is substandard for parks.

And in terms of counting the people, I think it's
important to count, you know, ask the planners, you know, in
this
amount of square footage, whatever assumption that's going to
be,
and plus the Port needs to also add an estimate of the parks.

Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you.

Bill Geyer and after that, Pat McKee.

BILL GEYER

Good evening. My name is Bill Geyer. I've handed my

card to the transcriber. My address is 1008 16th Street.

My background, I have 30 years as a professional planner, certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners

and also served for a six-year period as the director of planning

and the SEPA official for the City of Bellingham. I'll submit some written comments within the time period, but I have three main points to address to the SEPA official tonight:

First and foremost is the description given by Mr. Stoner of the project being a planned action. I would suggest

that some re-thinking be done on the process that is undertaken tonight and hereafter, in that we have a proponent making a land-use decision -- or excuse me, land-use proposal, and in the

past the sufficiency of the information for reviewing land-use applications and the decisions on them has always been by our city

planning commission and city council.

I'm concerned then that the sufficiency of the land-use analysis done by the proponent may not meet the

standards

that have been set by the City over the past 40 years in its
planning jurisdiction.

The second point that comes from that is in
reality

the proponent is really all of us in this room and all the
other

citizens of Bellingham and Whatcom County, because the plan and

the alternatives, as identified, have significant amounts of infrastructure components and utilities and the like that are being provided in some financial capacity by us.

I think that the statement earlier by Mr. Stoner where the EIS is not considering project cost is potentially a fatal flaw that needs to be revisited. Others have testified tonight as well that we should look at that, and specifically, I would suggest that the general public as well as our decision-makers need to be aware of who's paying for which component in each scenario, be it the ones identified tonight or other scenarios that come further.

Specifically, how much -- what is the cost for the infrastructure components that are paid by the Port which are then subsequently not recovered by either the sales of the underlying property or leases that come back to the Port? Secondly, how much is paid for by the City and that is not recovered by either sales of land or leases that come back, and how much is paid by the development community that's being identified in the scenarios?

My final point is that the Growth Management Act certainly provides that our comprehensive plans, in fact, link

the

land-use components, the infrastructure components, and that's
one

of the key items that we've had as we've developed our
comprehensive plan.

My comments on the financial analysis hold true
because the City performed this exact same type of analysis in

1995 when it did a supplemental EIS in adopting the urban fringe

plan for over 2,000 acres north of Bellingham city limits.

I think we could utilize the same process here as we

consider these 220 acres. We also have in our comprehensive plan

financial components for a parks plan, utilities plans, and many others.

I think we need to rethink the City's standing in this process to assure their valid cost data and that it is transparently presented to the public.

Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you.

Pat McKee.

PATRICK McKEE

Patrick McKee, 2801 Grant Street, Bellingham.

Zoning will determine the level of cleanup in the

New

Whatcom development area. I believe that how the zoning for
the

New Whatcom redevelopment proposal was arrived at was done in
an

illegitimate manner. I point to the original interlocal
agreement

that was signed between the Port of Bellingham and the City of
Bellingham. This interlocal agreement turned over for the next
20

years, after it was signed, the power to initiate new zoning
changes exclusively to the Port of Bellingham. This clause was
contained in a paragraph called "Status Quo Until Agreement."
That was part of the first interlocal agreement.

That was signed by the city council under
considerable pressure to do it quickly, and I believe it was a
grave mistake. This exclusive power to initiate zoning is in
contradiction to the City's own municipal code, which allows
the

planning commission of the City of Bellingham to initiate
zoning

proposals. It also allows the city council to initiate zoning

proposals. It now allows the planning director to initiate zoning

proposals. And it also permits the people of Bellingham to petition the planning commission and the city council to initiate

new zoning. So to deny all of those avenues to the people of Bellingham, to propose new zoning in the proposed New Whatcom development area, in my opinion was illegal.

I'm asking tonight that the state, in their consideration here, look at this interlocal agreement with the City -- between the Port and the City, have the attorney general of the state of Washington look into its legality because zoning and who can initiate zoning is so important in the environmental cleanup of this area.

Thanks.

MR. MARON: Next is Rodd Pemble, followed by Frances Badgett.

RODD PEMBLE

It's Rodd Pemble, P-E-M-B-L-E, 2915 Cedarwood.

Along the lines of the undesirable becoming the inevitable, I'm a bicyclist; I cycle to work every day year 'round. And apparently because we have a lot of grant money coming what I've heard is that we have a Laurel Street bridge design that's at 17 percent grade for several hundred feet, which

is basically a kind of a suicide run for cyclists, much less a semitruck that loses its brakes heading downhill on Laurel Street.

I just throw that out as just one example, which already seems to be on the fast track.

As far as the scoping, I have four areas that I'd like to mention: The first one is on page four. It echoes the concerns about the proposed planned action designation. I have no

question in my mind that all the areas of this waterfront area should be subject to the same scoping in the EIS that the shipping

terminal and the marina proposal should not be somehow automatically off limits just because those are pet projects of the Port of Bellingham.

The document itself admits that there's

significant

unknowns in the contamination that we may find, and so I don't see

how we can automatically say that those areas are off limits from

the scoping or the master plan review.

Second, I heard in the presentation tonight sort of a

veiled reference to areas that will be developed with public money

and others that will be marketed to developers. I would like the

scoping to evaluate the hazards of phased cleanup concurrent with

development on adjacent sites which have quote, unquote, "been cleaned up" versus a process where you clean up the entire area first.

I would like to see the scoping address the risk to

anybody on a supposedly cleaned up property that's being developed

for any purpose while phased cleanup is happening next door on an

adjacent parcel in this site.

Third, alternatives one through three, as numerous people have already mentioned, are sort of already halfway down the scale of what the public has put in in terms of this several

years of comment. I would liken it to going to the doctor and having him tell you, Well, Rod, you can be 50 percent healthy, or

you can be 30 percent healthy, or you can be 10 percent healthy.

Those are your three options. You can't be 100 percent

healthy;

you can't -- we can't even get you to 75.

I think I'd find a new doctor. And my guess is if

I

went through my neighborhood and that's what people are
starting

to say is we need a new doctor for getting prescriptions and
diagnoses that are only a shadow of what the public comment has
been.

Finally along that line, the alternatives
basically

set up a straw man for the community where, if we want to have

more parks we have to have skyscrapers; if we want to have more modest development, oh, then we got to scrap the parks that we all

said were so important. That's a false choice, and these alternatives have not been developed with public input near enough

as far as I can tell.

Lastly, on a couple of specific points, the scoping

does not mention garbage and recycling services and how those will

be provided in this significantly large new area. We're talking

about hundreds of businesses, thousands and thousands of new residences. I manage recycling drivers so it's something close to

my heart. But those materials have to be gotten out efficiently.

And also, then, along the same lines, I haven't seen

anything in the scoping which mentions service vendors: FedEx, UPS, food deliveries, retail store deliveries. Maybe there's something somewhere in there that I missed, but I think that's a

pretty critical component as we develop a very -- what's likely to

be a very dense new urban neighborhood. We're having problems
in
downtown Bellingham and Fairhaven right now with those
conflicts.

Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you, Mr. Pemble.

Frances Badgett and then Jack Weiss.

FRANCES BADGETT

Good evening. Frances Badgett, 2514 West Street.
I speak tonight on behalf of the Bellingham Bay Foundation, and
our philosophy is that cleanup comes first, and I have marked
on
this map what exactly we mean by that.

These two areas, the chem-fix and the caustic
groundwater plume should be removed from the maps as
developable
areas and they have not been. And they're pretty significantly
large areas. Not only should they --

MR. MARON: What's your -- I'm sorry? I
can't see.

MS. BADGETT: I can bring it to you if
you
want to take a look.

MR. MARON: Are you talking about the
blue
-- the blue --

MS. BADGETT: Yes. The caustic
groundwater
plume area is the blue area. And the chem-fix is the yellow.

MR. MARON: Got you.

MS. BADGETT: We believe the material
from

those sites in the marked area should be removed before development begins, that the entire site should be remediated before buildings are built. We feel this is kind of logical. This does not stand with the Port's belief that they will cap those areas and build on top of them.

I would like to speak on the levels in those two areas. The levels of mercury in those two areas, up to 5,800 milligrams per kilogram of mercury. And mind you that the residential standard for mercury is, I believe, 22 or 23 parts per million and upwards. And the mercury vapor from those areas is 117 micrograms per milligram cubed to a high of 779 micrograms per milligram cubed. Mercury vapor is actually in some ways more dangerous than actual elemental mercury or industrial mercury.

And the caustic groundwater plume, we're talking about a high of 12,000 milligrams per kilogram.

The reason I bring this up is because we're actually at an intersection right now where we can choose what direction we take for our community. And our community has spoken by signing the Healthy Bay Initiative, 7400 signatures, in favor of the removal of mercury from our waterfront. And I realize that this means that the mercury goes to another community and causes a problem there, but at least would not be under where residents are or near where residents will be, and it will not be where children

will be playing or on top of, you know, parks. We've been told parks and parking lots would cap the mercury. At least if we remove the mercury we would not be having that problem.

We also believe that the mercury if removed then we could have a complete flexibility in what happens to our waterfront; it could be industrial. Capping would bring it to an industrial level, which is what the Port has committed to.

Removing the mercury would also bring to an indus -- to a residential level. There is no mixed-use level; there is no mixed-use standard for cleanup, and we want to make that very clear that there is a residential standard under MTCA regulated to

which we believe this should be cleaned up.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you very much.

Jack Weiss.

JACK WEISS

Jack Weiss, 2805 Cedarwood Avenue, Bellingham.

I have other comments I'll submit in writing on many

other topics, but tonight I'd like to speak about parks. And I

--

when I'm looking at this, I want to go back to what our comp plan,

what the city comp plan that was adopted about ten months ago, what it says in its designation about the waterfront.

It calls for 1225 units of housing with approximately

2200 people. It also has -- we also have in the city a level of

service for parks based on per 1,000 people, and at 47.49 acres of

parks per 1,000 people that would come out to be about 103 acres

at the -- our current level of service; the comp plan conservatively listed at 41 acres.

Now fast forward to what we're doing tonight with this scoping here, we have a low density proposal. It calls for

at -- I'm doing a couple math things here. Mike, you've listed it

at 1,000 square foot per unit; the City has been using -- and
you

have been using in the past -- 1200 square feet per unit, so
I'm

not quite sure which one's right. But it's either 1325 units
or

1600 units of housing under the low density proposal. And
we're

having 11 acres worth of parks in the narrative, but in the --
Already? Wow. But in the actual illustration it said 14.9
acres,

so I'm not sure which is what.

When I'm looking at the high-density, though, it

calls for 33 acres of parks, and when you look at -- if you extrapolate it to the comp plan it should be over 100 acres.

And

I realize that there's some issues going on with how the level of

service is, but what I'd like to go and do is recommend to you three possibilities here: Either provide the park acreage in compliance with the City's comp plan ratio, which would dramatically increase the acreage for all of the alternatives;

or

maintain at least 33 acres in the -- in all of the alternatives that are the no action alternatives, or, you know, the ones

that

are not no action; or provide another alternative, which I would prefer with the park acreage that is respecting the desires of the

community when it comes to having open space trails and parks.

Thank you.

MR. MARON: Thank you, Mr. Weiss.

Do we have any more sign-ups? We don't. Okay.

So does anybody like to -- is anybody inspired to come up here and would like to address the crowd tonight?

Going

once; going twice. Okay. So we'll close the hearing tonight.

[Public hearing concluded at 7:54

p.m.]

