

Chuckanut Village Marsh Public Comments Summary

	Name	Alternative Preferred	Comments	Response:
1	Comments provided during the April 7, 2009 public meeting		Don't want cars far from the shore more accessible to vandalism	Noted. Parking alternatives 1 & 2 are close to shore. Alternative 1 is probably least prone to vandalism.
2			Mary Frost property for sale, city should purchase property	The City is looking at sites to consider for acquisition to improve public access to the shoreline and will forward recommendations to City Council. The City Council directs staff activity related to land acquisitions and would have to revisit its current priorities for South Bellingham. The City will not discuss potential real estate purchases in public, except with the consent of the property owner. If parking were to be developed on any existing or future City land, wet areas and mature forest would be avoided. Clearing mature forest for parking is not desirable or practical. Existing critical areas will limit paving, filling and clearing.
3			Why can't the area just be left alone?	There are numerous studies that speak to the ecological importance of this project. To read the studies go to: http://www.cob.org/services/environment/restoration/chuckanut-village-marsh.aspx .
4			As development continues, more people will be in the area and there will be more use	Agreed.
5			Put in a gate to close the area at night-keep night users out	A gate or other traffic control measure would be essential once the beach area is closed to traffic. A gate would be less necessary at a properly designed, relocated parking area. Closing parking at night will encourage parking on Village streets.
6			Kayakers need parking-can't park ½ mile up the road –elderly kayakers need easy access	Noted. Parking alternatives 1 & 2 are close to shore.
7			Parks design-parking on street 2-3 vehicles and parking in right away 3-5 vehicles	Noted.
8			Stop Chuckanut development	Outside the scope of this project. Chuckanut Ridge development is in the Padden Cr watershed.
9			Use in the Chuckanut Bay area has effected habitat, less wildlife	Noted.
10			Install dog waste bags	With the increasing expense related to demand and use of dog dispenser bags, the Parks Department is promoting dog owner responsibility for providing their own bags and taking off site for disposal.
11			Kayak launching should be at Woodstock	Kayak storage and rentals are being considered at Woodstock but water depth constraints there are the same as at Chuckanut Village. Woodstock is not suited to car-top launching due to steep grades and a significant elevation change between the highway and beach. Preservation concepts being considered for Woodstock call for retaining the site's historic character and limiting parking and road building to the higher part of the site to protect the shoreline and its landscape. Boathouses, sheds, and lockable racks are for boats left at the shore and not regularly launched from vehicles. They are most feasible if the City has a partnership agreement with a supporting organization. A community boatshed for rentals or non-profit club type operation could be provided at Woodstock and at Chuckanut Village.
12			Invasive species removal	Invasive species will be removed from public land that is part of this project.
13			Have you looked at Railroad trestle and filling of Mud Bay?	City has grant funding to examine this issue. The Whatcom Marine Resources Committee has applied for a grant to study circulation and sedimentation issues related to the railroad trestle. The amount is approximately \$10,000, and could supplement the City's grants.
14			Concern about septic systems and their effect on Mud Bay	Whatcom County Public Works is providing funding to the County Health Department for increased landowner outreach and compliance with new OSS regulations, with the specific purpose of improving water quality in shellfish growing areas and Lake Whatcom. Health Department staff are currently working in the Drayton Harbor watershed, with Birch Bay and Lake Whatcom next on the list, and Chuckanut Bay to follow shortly thereafter.

15		Doesn't seem like a large benefit to the project-small area	The benefits of the proposed project to open up the lower tide channel and move parking off the beach will be real. The consultant stated that the benefits were not huge—when compared to much larger and much, much more expensive projects—but the benefits in this case do appear to outweigh the costs. The salt marsh and beach adjacent to this semi-enclosed bay are two habitat types areas of the highest concern in the nearshore science community. This is further compounded by the fact that the site is immediately adjacent to the mouth of Chuckanut Creek. This type of nearshore system is referred to as a pocket estuary. Researchers at federal, state, tribal, consultant, and university levels have caught juvenile salmon in relatively high numbers in pocket estuaries in Whatcom and Skagit counties. Puget Sound salmon (genus <i>Oncorhynchus</i>) spawn in freshwater and feed, grow, and mature in marine waters. During their transition from freshwater to saltwater, juvenile salmon occupy nearshore ecosystems in Puget Sound to varying degrees. The period of nearshore residence is critical to the viability, persistence, and abundance of Puget Sound salmon. Naturally produced juvenile Chinook salmon and juvenile chum salmon use the nearshore extensively and have the highest documented use in pocket estuaries like north Chuckanut Bay. Nearshore assessments in the north Puget Sound region have found that large estuaries and small “pocket” estuaries provide very high value nearshore habitat for salmon as well as other species. Published papers and reports on this include those by: Eric Beamer et al. of Skagit System Coop, Casey Rice of NOAA Fisheries, Melissa Brown of Lummi Nation, Scott Redman of Puget Sound Partnership, Dr. Kurt Fresh of WDFW, Dr. Leo Bodensteiner of WWU Dr. Guy Gelfenbaum and others of USGS and Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership/UW. Protection and restoration of pocket estuaries has been a priority Sound-wide. A series of easily accessible nearshore science documents is found at: http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/publications.htm , including a white paper on juvenile salmon.
16		Have you looked at replacing bridge on 18 th street, improving flood conditions, flushing and moving water out?	We are unaware of any problems at this location.
17		You should be looking at the larger picture	We did. This project ranked the highest in Whatcom County (CGS 2007).
18		There are 3 to 20 cars parking in the area	Noted
19		What is the current parking capacity?	Approximately 8- 10 depending on how closely cars are parked.
20		What is happening to the dock?	The dock is not part of the scope of this project. Having said that- the dock is in poor condition, does contain creosote treated wood beams, and is on public land but provides no benefit to the larger public.
21		Push the road on Mary Frost's property through, 75 feet, to improve access.	The SMP discourages creating new streets and parking on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts;
22		Have you evaluated what the effect of Chuckanut Ridge Development will be on the area?	The majority of land in the Fairhaven Highlands (AKA Chuckanut Ridge) development drains to the Padden Cr. Watershed and is not anticipated to negatively impact Chuckanut Bay water quality.
23		Look at the overall effect to the salt marsh	Noted
24		Improvement here strengthens improvement for habitat in general	Noted.
25		Wouldn't installing a box culvert be cheaper?	No- a pre-cast box culvert is the most expensive option.
26		Is removing culvert to stop access?	No- removing the culvert is to increase the hydrologic connectivity to the marsh area.
27		Have you talked to WDFW about salmon using the culvert?	Yes- WDFW supports the project.
28		Do you have money to do all alternatives? Is there concern about too much use? Are you limiting 100 parking spaces?	No- there is not enough funding for implementing all alternatives. The goal is to re-locate existing parking (about 8 -10 spaces).
29		Kayak parking needs to be closer, like 50 ft from shore.	Noted.
30	Phil Buly	Not 3 Some comments for you regarding the project after attending tonight's public meeting. I do wish that these be added to the matrix of public input. Please let me know if I should submit them in a different manner. Thanks for holding the meeting and taking comments. I'm concerned that you seemed to indicate at the meeting that there is no "maximum" number of parking spaces being considered; that if there was \$ that there might be 2 or 3 alternatives utilized. That seems to make the assumption that the area could and should be put to greater use than it is currently. This seems wrong in many ways, for one, not regarding the local community's desire to keep "the status quo". Secondly has there been (or will there be) an investigation to see if additional parking / use is warranted? I spend a lot of time walking the area, and while there are times when more than 8 cars are parked in the area, there are extensive times throughout the year when the area is empty of visitors. It's wasteful to just add parking because you have \$. Thirdly, while I understand that parking on the beach is the major concern, it is counter-intuitive to consider increasing nearby parking and accessibility to an environmentally sensitive area. To summarize, I recommend having more thought go into what is the maximum vehicle access desirable here. If it is the case that there is no environmental reason to limit visitors, then I believe that this "maximum usage" needs to be a top priority for planning and community input. Let's not have the end-use determined by happen-chance funding. Alternative 3 in particular (parking at the top of the hill) seems to not work for several reasons. The kayakers (which I am one) would not be willing or in some cases able to tote their kayak down and back up that hill. It would also be prohibitive to other users as well, for they would have a walk that half mile with no shoulder on what can be a busy and narrow street. In addition, the map you showed at the meeting had 6 spaces along 21st St, which is unlikely because there is a significant drop-off there down to a wetland (which you said you would investigate). I'm glad to see that you avoided tearing down the largest trees of that greenway for parking which are still stop-overs for herons and eagles.	The goal is to relocate existing parking (8- 10 spaces). Where that parking is located could be a combination of alternative 1 and 2 or 1 and 3 or 2 and 3 depending on public input. There isn't funding to implement more than 8-10 parking spaces. Alternative 3 was not well supported in the public comments we received and will not be pursued.

31	Larry Horowitz		<p>Thanks for your very informative presentation last night regarding the Chuckanut Village Marsh Restoration. I am interested in the studies you mentioned that highlight the need to preserve and protect the Chuckanut Bay estuary. I believe there are several; but I wrote down only two: the Whatcom County Nearshore Habitat Restoration (CGS 2007) and the NOAA study. Are any of these studies available online? If so, would you please direct me to them.</p> <p>My primary comment about the restoration project being considered is to first determine what impact the proposed Chuckanut Ridge / Fairhaven Highlands development will have on the Chuckanut Bay estuary and the Chuckanut Village saltwater marsh. It would be prudent to ensure that, before any investment is made to restore the marsh, it won't ultimately be lost due to a project that is already underway.</p> <p>My secondary comment relates to the cost benefit of this particular restoration. Most people would likely support this project if they understand the real value behind it. On the other hand, given the costs - both financial and the reduced access resulting from the changes - the community would likely oppose the project unless the benefits clearly outweigh the costs. Last night's presentation was not clear (at least to me) how much benefit this project provides.</p> <p>Thanks again for your time last night and for steering me in the right direction to obtain the studies you referenced. Good luck with the restoration project.</p>	<p>Studies are posted on the City's website at: http://www.cob.org/services/environment/restoration/chuckanut-village-marsh.aspx The majority of land in the Fairhaven Highlands (AKA Chuckanut Ridge) development drains to the Padden Cr. Watershed and is not anticipated to negatively impact Chuckanut Bay water quality. The benefits of the proposed project to open up the lower tide channel and move parking off the beach will be real. The consultant stated that the benefits were not huge—when compared to much larger and much, much more expensive projects—but the benefits in this case do appear to outweigh the costs. The salt marsh and beach adjacent to this semi-enclosed bay are two habitat types areas of the highest concern in the nearshore science community. This is further compounded by the fact that the site is immediately adjacent to the mouth of Chuckanut Creek. This type of nearshore system is referred to as a pocket estuary. Researchers at federal, state, tribal, consultant, and university levels have caught juvenile salmon in relatively high numbers in pocket estuaries in Whatcom and Skagit counties. Puget Sound salmon (genus <i>Oncorhynchus</i>) spawn in freshwater and feed, grow, and mature in marine waters. During their transition from freshwater to saltwater, juvenile salmon occupy nearshore ecosystems in Puget Sound to varying degrees. The period of nearshore residence is critical to the viability, persistence, and abundance of Puget Sound salmon. Naturally produced juvenile Chinook salmon and juvenile chum salmon use the nearshore extensively and have the highest documented use in pocket estuaries like north Chuckanut Bay. Nearshore assessments in the north Puget Sound region have found that large estuaries and small “pocket” estuaries provide very high value nearshore habitat for salmon as well as other species. Published papers and reports on this include those by: Eric Beamer et al. of Skagit System Coop, Casey Rice of NOAA Fisheries, Melissa Brown of Lummi Nation, Scott Redman of Puget Sound Partnership, Dr. Kurt Fresh of WDFW, Dr. Leo Bodensteiner of WWU Dr. Guy Gelfenbaum and others of USGS and Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership/UW. Protection and restoration of pocket estuaries has been a priority Sound-wide. A series of easily accessible nearshore science documents is found at: http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/publications.htm , including a white paper on juvenile salmon.</p> <p>One of the main underlying issues is that good shore access in Bellingham is hard to come by. Unfortunately so are tidal wetlands, which can be termed an "endangered shoretype" and supply more ecosystem function goods and services than most other shoretypes in the region. Finding one where feasibility (completed in the previous phase of work) showed that restoration is doable is also hard to come by. The underlying issue of good beach access is a county-wide problem and should be put at the top of the list of ways that the City, County and the MRC can positively serve the public good (in addition to current mandate of protecting resources).</p>
32	Julie Guy	1 or 2	<p>Rene, I did not get a chance to talk to you directly last night at the meeting, but I was very interested in the presentation.</p> <p>It seems that the restoration work is relatively simple and will be helpful. The big problem is where does the realigned parking go.?</p> <p>I have already sent in comments supporting parking close by, but after seeing the possibilities, I want to reiterate my support for Fairhaven and Chuckanut Street parking as well as the three spaces on the east side of the stream and footbridge.</p> <p>Since I moved to Bellingham in 2003 I have been impressed with the parks, trails and open spaces already in place, but I have also seen the neglect and lack of concern for all the folks who pay their taxes and greenway levies but get short shrift when it comes to opening up opportunities for them to enjoy our limited shoreline . Boulevard park is overloaded as is the little marine park the port put in. Zanich is also great..... but not enough.</p> <p>Here's where you have a chance to make the beachcombers, families, kayakers and senior walkers very happy with additional access to one of the most beautiful spots in the whole northwest.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing all the comments you are going to post on your website April 22 and to the next public meeting on April 23.</p>	<p>Noted. Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative.</p>

33	Janet Hosokawa		<p>I strongly disagree with Proposal #3.</p> <p>1) This greenway is an important "wildlife corridor" that links Chuckanut Mtn. to Chuckanut Bay. Since the city failed to acquire the "missing link" parcel (south of Chuckanut Bay Art Gallery) and this parcel was clear-cut and developed, my family and I have noticed a decrease in coyotes, barred and hoot owls in this greenway corridor (and an explosion in the rabbit population). Nonetheless, this segment of greenway proposed for parking/turnabout is still prime habitat for an incredible diversity of plants and animals, even in its "fragile" condition. It also acts as a noise buffer for the folks just south of it, in Chuckanut Village (CV).</p> <p>2) At my house on the corner of Arroyo Lane and 21st Street, as soon as the weather turns warm, daylight traffic on Chuckanut Drive is so loud and constant that you can't have a conversation in our backyard (which runs along 21st just off of Chuckanut Dr.) without shouting. Ironically, when the weather turns nice and my family wants to enjoy being outside, the traffic noise makes this very unpleasant. At present, the only relative "quiet" on our property is in the front yard. This "quiet" will be destroyed by the placement of a turnaround/parking lot in the greenway. The prospect of being surrounded by all this traffic noise and auto fumes makes me fume!</p> <p>3) I WOULD BE MORE CONFIDENT IN YOUR PROJECT IF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS WERE NOT LIMITED TO SHORELINE HEALTH BECAUSE, ULTIMATELY, THE ECOSYSTEMS ARE ALL INTERCONNECTED AND TAMPERING WITH ONE WILL ULTIMATELY IMPACT ANOTHER. "We all live downstream" and that 'stream' pours into Chuckanut Bay. As you and your team identified in the public presentation on 4/7/09, the natural environment in the Chuckanut Village area, is extremely valuable and rare. It is an extremely serious matter to reroute human patterns of use. Short of completely limiting access to the bay to foot traffic and banning parking, I believe any plan to accommodate traffic/parking/dropoffs/turnarounds, demands a comprehensive, thoughtful study about impact to the entire CV natural environment. I believe it is far better to let "deadlines" for planning funds (June?) expire and lose the funding, rather than hurriedly slap together a proposal because the funding is available. Potentially more harm could be done to nature.</p>	Noted. Alternative #3 was not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Based on comments received parking placing the primary parking in the North Chuckanut parking lot was not well supported and will not be pursued as part of this project.
34			<p>4) I favor the proposal that has the least impact on the TOTAL existing natural environment in our neighborhood. My family walks with our kayaks from Arroyo Lane down to the bay using wagon-like devices we created to ease the weight load. Kayakers can put in at the proposed Woodstock Farm waterpark or park in the existing North Chuckanut Lot and devise their own "kayak wheels" to stroll down to Chuckanut Bay. It is unnecessary to park right at water's edge for convenience. I believe it is reasonable to strongly limit beach access to the bay NOW, before added stress is placed on this entire natural area in CV, caused by the influx of people seeking beach access, especially if the Chuckanut Ridge Development goes through. Beside one or two handicapped parking stalls within reasonable distance from the proposed pedestrian footbridge (Plan 1), I think the city should strongly discourage traffic into CV by posting a no-turnaround sign off Chuckanut Drive and 21st St. I think the City right of way in Plan 1 (by the red fire hydrant in front of the last house before the marsh, on the west side of Fairhaven Ave, (that is currently for sale)), is a good place to put in the handicapped parking (only 1 or 2 spaces). It's already a cleared area planted with grass. I like the proposal for a footbridge in Plan 1. In conclusion, I desire a proposal that is far-sighted in defending not only the shoreline but also the unique ecosystems within CV. I support a bold plan to ban parking for bay access and to discourage auto traffic through CV. Those who want to enjoy the bay can park in the existing North Chuckanut Parking Lot and walk a few hundred yards more than I do to get to the bay. (Have you tried walking down Fairhaven Ave? Depending on the day of the week and time of day (weekdays at 5 pm., sunny weekends) it can be a very harrowing experience jumping into ditches to dodge all the auto traffic.) Thank you for your consideration of my ideas and concerns.</p>	
35	Donna Buehler	1	<p>Your proposal for removing vehicles from the beach area is very reasonable. I don't believe utility vehicles need to drive along the shoreline. There are several dead end streets in the Village and garbage and recycling are performed skillfully by the drivers backing down the street and driving forward out of the dead ends. Our recycling driver does this for 3514 Chuckanut Ave. UPS, garbage collectors, and most importantly fire trucks can use the same pattern. I don't believe it is necessary to drive around the block and onto the beach to complete those services. There is the issue of Burtrand Baxter and his friends reaching the dock that is on the shore in front of Baxter's rental property. Could the program you propose help build Baxter a gravel driveway from Fairhaven Avenue to his building which would provide him and his friends access to the building, their boats and the dock? This private driveway on his property would be perpendicular to Fairhaven Avenue. From this they in turn could create a lane perpendicular to the shore and the dock from Baxter's building. This would be entirely on private property instead of along the shore line. This seems fair since the dock is used by several people but is not a truly public facility. I think if Baxter, Ivan Bauter and their friends have easy access to their dock, their objections might be reduced. I think the notion of 'access' needs to be defined. Some take a broad view and contend access includes garbage trucks and UPS. The kayakers are a passionate group. I believe their needs would be easily satisfied by creating four diagonal parking places on each side (a total of eight) of Fairhaven Avenue on the city right of way where they were originally proposed. The issue for the kayakers is limited time parking. Realistically, can this be enforced? Why not remove the time limit for now. If it becomes an issue in the future, then rethink time limits. Eight parking spaces are currently adequate. It is quite sensible to keep vehicles off the beach. Protecting our exquisite estuary seems worth changing a few habits.</p>	Points are well taken. Thanks for the suggestions. Unfortunately there are wetlands that may limit placement of a new driveway.

36	Jan Hadley		<p>I'm writing to give my input on options for this project.</p> <p>1. I think that utilizing city right-of-way on the Dow property is a good idea. I think it would be an even better idea to have the gravel area continue through from Fairhaven to Rainier. People who want to passively enjoy the Bay from their vehicles (and this is a frequent use for the parking area- "lunch with a view") would benefit from the higher elevation gained by pushing the parking area through, plus it would allow more room for vehicles with trailers (both kayaks and power boats are trailered in) as well as just regular parking for those who want to walk on the beach. Additionally, once the vehicle access to "16th" Street is blocked on the Rainier end of the beach, there would still be a way for vehicles to get through on the lower end of Fairhaven Ave, so traffic flow would be better, in a big loop if you will. It is still important to have trailer access to the water, and this could be done at the south end of the culvert area, with signage stating load/unload only. Parking/turnaround in the Green Space on upper Fairhaven is a bad idea due to wetlands, wildlife, and possible blockage of the fire hydrant serving the neighborhood.</p> <p>2. IDEALLY, the property at 1517 Fairhaven could be purchased for an interpretive ed ctr and parking,(funded by the plethora of organizations concerned with salmon, saltwater, beach and watershed issues), Burlington Northern would remove the rip-rap restoring flushing action, but these things are probably not yet in the works. I think that we can still meet at Fairhaven Park if we take down the tables and get more chairs out.</p>	<p>The Shoreline Master Program discourages creating new streets on beaches due to the high ecological impacts. The City is looking at sites to consider for acquisition to improve public access to the shoreline and will forward recommendations to City Council. The City Council directs staff activity related to land acquisitions and would have to revisit its current priorities for South Bellingham. The City will not discuss potential real estate purchases in public, except with the consent of the property owner.</p> <p>If parking were to be developed on any existing or future City land, wet areas and mature forest would be avoided. Clearing mature forest for parking is not desirable or practical. Existing critical areas will limit paving, filling and clearing.</p>
37	Greg & Colleen Hoffenbecker	1	<p>My wife and I attended your public meeting Tues. night. Thanks for sharing the plan, its goals, and asking for citizen input.</p> <p>As environmental stewards, we support your goal of keeping motor vehicles off the fragile beach ecosystem. As nearby residents (we live 1.5 miles from Mud Bay) and long-time, frequent kayakers (we've enjoyed paddling there since 1994), we ask that you do whatever you can to maintain beach and water access to kayakers, birdwatchers and other nature lovers.</p> <p>As you know, Mud Bay and Chuckanut Bay are unique, not only for the incredible scenery and diversity of wildlife that all of us cherish and would like to protect, but also for the easy accessibility for kayakers. Mud Bay is one of only two places in Bellingham where kayakers can drop their boats off near a beach without competing for parking or with power boaters for launch space on concrete boat ramps.</p> <p>Requirements for Mud Bay to maintain kayak accessibility: two or more drop-off zones (10-minute parking max) as close to the beach as environmentally possible (100 feet max) clear level path from drop-off zone to beach where one could carry or roll a kayak nearby parking within easy walking distance to the beach (0.1 mile max)</p> <p>Thinking about the alternatives presented at the meeting, we preferred alternative 1 with the drop-off zone and parking on Fairhaven Ave.</p> <p>One final comment about something that others brought up at the meeting: Fairhaven Highlands. All of the good work you're doing here to help protect Mud Bay and Chuckanut Bay would seem like a complete waste of time and money if the Fairhaven Highlands project goes forward. It's hard to imagine developing 85 acres of land with 739 new housing units just upstream from Mud Bay, not having a major, negative impact on the Mud Bay ecosystem. Is there a way to get the goals of this project included in the EIS for Fairhaven Highlands?</p> <p>Thanks very much for considering our comments. We will continue to watch with interest as the project progresses. P.S. An idea for another project, another time: one way to improve water and shoreline quality would be to remove the public concrete boat ramps in Bellingham and put in eco-friendly kayak drop-off sites. We see oil slicks in the water almost every time we paddle (weekly, year-round). Bellingham is a world-class kayaking destination, it would be nice to encourage this eco-friendly use instead of the water, air and shoreline polluting power boats.</p>	<p>Noted. Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative.</p>
38	Dirk Fabian	1 or 2	<p>Thanks for hosting the public meeting on Tuesday. Here is my suggestion regarding the restoration plan. Background: I use the mud bay put-in for kayaking (and crabbing via kayak). I use the site 30-50 times / year. In the summer for crabbing, I usually launch at sunrise to set pots and return in the evening, so I rack up the visits. Typically 2-4 hours for a visit... some night paddles when it's calm out. I favor making beach/water access points at the end of both Fairhaven and Rainier Roads with 4-6 parking gravel spaces each about 100 yds. from the beach. The Fairhaven road side is better for boaters (deeper water access), while Rainier may be better for walkers (though there shouldn't be any restrictions, it's just an access reality). One could then totally remove the beach connector road between Fairhaven and Rainier roads, which floods at high tide anyway washing car waste into the water. That seems like it would provide the maximum environmental benefit. I would like to see a 2 car pull-out unloading area at the Fairhaven road access point. A wood bridge over the creek is enough -- don't make it so you could ever drive across otherwise you'll have a never-ending stream of repairs as the yahoos try to break through whatever barrier is there. Similarly, lockable gates have to be maintained, and I hate getting locked behind them! Finally, to the people who favor the large parking lot at the upper part of the road, they would do well to remember they will be woken up and disturbed more by making people park up closer to their houses... better to put parking down close to the beach. :) Good luck with the project.</p>	<p>Public comments show wide support for parking on Fairhaven Ave. Public comments do not show wide support for parking on Rainier Ave. Loading zone space(s) can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave.</p>

39	Mary Matyas		<p>I am a sea kayaker that attended your presentation on April 7 regarding the Chuckanut Village Marsh Restoration Project. It is a favorite launch site for many of us. If things are going to change there, we will need easy access to the water with nearby secure parking so that we can easily carry our boats and gear to and from our vehicles. Parking up on Chuckanut is not acceptable. Carrying boats and gear approximately 50 yards is OK.</p> <p>Now that the site has been brought to everyone's attention, if you make changes, I wonder if more people will be going to the area. If so, more spots with easy access and nearby parking may be needed for those with small boats. Parking where we launch has never been a problem in that neighborhood. Some of our friends have had their vehicles broken into when parked at Wild Cat Cove.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>The Alternative #1 provides the best "secure" parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave. Chuckanut Ridge/ Fairhaven Highlands development drains into the Padden Cr watershed. It will not likely impact the water quality of Chuckanut Bay.</p>
40	Sue Madsen		<p>Hi all - so sorry I missed the meeting; I was out of town all last week. I'd like to thank everyone for showing up on behalf not just of WAKE but the kayaking community in general. One of the things that makes our city great is that citizens are informed and get involved in government decision making, and that is a good thing. I do, however, have some concerns about characterizing those efforts as trying to "save the Mud Bay put in" from the forces of evil. The reality is that this project is a perfect opportunity to work with the city to both improve access for kayakers as well as address some real environmental concerns in a pro active manner. Those of you who have let me drag you out on those monthly moonlight paddles know that it is one of my favorite put-in's, and not one I'm willing to lose.</p> <p>In the interest of full disclosure, I shared Renee's job at the city with her for several years, and helped write the grant to get funds for restoring Fairhaven Marsh. Given that, I'd like to set WAKE folks straight on a few things. I no longer work for the city, and thus these represent my own personal opinion/understanding of the project. The project did NOT come up in response to neighbors complaints about rowdy kids, but is part of a larger package of a number of activities intended to improve water quality in Chuckanut Bay. For those of you who don't know, the Bay is listed on Ecology's 303(d) list as having impaired water quality. In addition, the marsh has been recognized by both the city and the local Marine Resources Council as one of the largest and most valuable wetland areas within the city limits. Tim Wahl of the Parks Department has been involved from the get go, and thus it is not an attempt by the Department of Public Works to "take away" an access point, but rather a cooperative effort between the Parks Department and Public Works to protect and restore the environment while developing recreational opportunities at Woodstock Farm and elsewhere in the neighborhood.</p> <p>The city's Environmental Resources Department has been well aware of the need to maintain of access for kayakers and other recreationists, and has had those concerns in mind from the get go. I have kayaked the area with Renee (yep, she's one of us) and talked in detail with her and Tim about just that issue on numerous occasions over the last few years. The marsh restoration project and other water quality improvement projects to be implemented in the area are funded by a Centennial Clean Water Fund grant from the Washington Department of Ecology. Those grant funds cannot be used to pay for things like parking and trail development; however, I believe it has been the City's intent all along to make sure those issues are addressed using other funding sources. The best way to ensure that happens is for all of you to continue to participate in the planning process, by attending meetings and providing constructive suggestions and feedback. It sounds like the kayakers who attended the meeting last week did just that. That sort of participation benefits the entire community and is the best way to ensure a win-win situation. I'm proud to be associated with such a great group of civic minded individuals!</p>	<p>Noted. Excellent points.</p>
41	Susan Tommervik	1 and 2	<p>Thank you for an informative meeting last week about the Chuckanut Bay Marsh project.</p> <p>I support protecting the Bay. I am also a kayaker. I request that parking for kayakers be located in both proposed spots in Alt. 1 and 2 ---Next to the current house for sale, as well as at the end of Rainier Ave. Parking at the top of the hill would not be an acceptable option, in my opinion. If 12-15 spots were available, that would cover use for busier weekends. 8 spots would be the minimum--anything less would be a decrease in access for kayakers.</p> <p>I also request no time limit on these spots. We have to wait for tidal changes to get back to shore, so limits would be impractical for us. I want to add an additional comment about kayak parking. I request that the new parking areas be completed before the beach parking is closed.</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Parking on Rainier was not well supported in the public comments. The goal is to re locate existing parking which is 8- 10 spaces.</p>

42	Chad Yunge	1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed restoration and public access alternatives at Chuckanut Marsh. I attended the meeting last Tuesday but left early with the understanding that the information presented would be available on the City website. I am having trouble finding it but the following comments are based on what I remember from the meeting:</p> <p>Of the proposed alternatives, my preference would be to keep the public access and parking area as near to the existing access as possible. I believe this was Alternative One of your presentation that placed a turnaround and temporary loading area at the existing end of pavement and parking in the City ROW in front of the large house built in the wetland that is currently for sale. I believe this is the best area to relieve use conflicts between the general public and property owners in the area. The City-owned property further to the south feels too private....like you are recreating in someone's backyard. In addition, most beach walkers head north along the existing storm berm and over to the cliff areas at low tide. By accessing the area to the south (Alternative Two) will cause additional foot traffic over the very area you wish to restore. As a paddler, it would be my preference to keep the access as close as possible to the shoreline; however walking a couple hundred yards is fine for hand launching. Please do not consider alternative 3 for the obvious reason that it is not conducive to any existing public use of this shoreline and least consistent with the public access goals of the SMA.</p> <p>I am very interested in the actual restoration elements of the project which were not discussed in the meeting. Any information you can provide in future meetings or on the website would be greatly appreciated. Please include me as a party of record for notification of future meetings and correspondence associated with this project.</p>	<p>The Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave.</p>
43	Eugene Davis		<p>I was in attendance at the meeting last week at the Fairhaven Pavilion in which you presented options to the present situation at Mud Bay. I have lived in Bellingham for over 32 years and have kayaked for over 20 years. The Mud Bay area has always been one of my favorite launch sites. It provides a very safe and beautiful area to paddle in. I do hold a contrary view of the person at the meeting that stated that she has seen a huge decrease in bird and marine life in the area. I have noticed more Herons and migratory birds the last several years instead of less. I have always had a strong believe that we do need to protect and preserve areas for future generations. Over the past years I have volunteered photos plus time and effort to the Whatcom Land trust. As I said at the meeting I believe that the Kayak community wants to be able to continue to use this area and to have secure parking. Since the meeting I have talked with a number of the residents in the Mud Bay area and I believe that majority of the people welcome Kayakers. In my mind the best possible solution would be for Green Ways money to be used to purchase the property that the woman has for sale that has water access. I believe that with the land that the city already owns plus the additional land that is available that parking could be provided away from the beach and access to the water would also be available. This would allow for the area in question to be discontinued. I am concerned that there does not seem to be any input or coordination with the City's Park Department and I believe this is a real problem. The general consensus that I hear is that City Parks seems to want to provide opportunities for public use of land and that the Public Works wants to take it away. I sincerely hope that this situation can be resolved in way that benefits everyone.</p>	<p>The City is looking at sites to consider for acquisition to improve public access to the shoreline and will forward recommendations to City Council. The City Council directs staff activity related to land acquisitions and would have to revisit its current priorities for South Bellingham. The City will not discuss potential real estate purchases in public, except with the consent of the property owner. If parking were to be developed on any existing or future City land, wet areas and mature forest would be avoided. Clearing mature forest for parking is not desirable or practical. Existing critical areas will limit paving, filling and clearing. This project is a cooperative effort between the Parks and Public Works Departments to protect and restore the City's environmental assets while enhancing public access and recreational opportunities. Tim Wahl has been involved from the beginning.</p>
44	Dan Barrett	1,2,4	<p>I attended the meeting on April 7 to discuss the options for access to Mud Bay. This is a valuable launching spot for kayakers, particularly inexperienced ones for access to Chuckanut Bay. Of the 4 options (3 official and one from Tom Barrett) Options 1 (Fairhaven Ave parking), 2 (Rainier Ave parking), and 4 (parking along the access road) seem like they would work fine for kayakers. Option 3, parking at the top of the road would kill this area as a kayak launch site. I know there are other types of boats that launch here, option 1 seems like it might make life more difficult for those people.</p> <p>I haven't had a chance to drive down and look at options 2 and 4 myself yet, but will do so before the next meeting on this subject to see if one of them appeals more than the others.</p> <p>I look forward to finding the solution that provides the right balance of access and preservation of this area. please add to comment matrix.</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternatives 2 and 3 were not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Alternative 4 (proposed by Tom Barrett) is not an option under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The SMP discourages creating new parking on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts.</p>
45	Keith Kemplin	1, 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like option 1 – parking for 6-8 on Fairhaven Avenue with a footbridge to the beach and a turnaround at the end of Fairhaven or at the parking lot. 2. Additional parking on Rainier would also be good. 3. I'm not in favor of option 3- parking up by the Gallery because that would just be a lot more traffic and be impractical for kayaking. 4. I'm not in favor of any parking on or above the beach between Fairhaven and Rainier-it would detract from the plan. 5. I am in favor of cutting off car access as much as possible between Fairhaven and Rainier-at the very least a barrier on the Fairhaven avenue end. A clearly marked public footpath between Fairhaven and Rainier would be great- partly to make it clear that this is public land. 6. Please minimize the time during construction that the beach is not accessible for kayaking. 7. I would appreciate minimal signage and no interpretive signs. 8. A lot of kayakers slide their boats off the back end of their cars so it would be nice to have room to pull a boat off without blocking the street. 9. I will probably end up rolling my boat on a cart from car to mean high water so a surface that can support 70 pounds on two lawnmower wheels would be good. 10. hope the plan includes revegetation from the current parking area to Rainier Ave. <p>I've been using this as my main local kayak access for about 25 years. I applaud the goal of restoring the beach, estuary and tidelands.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative; 2 & 3) Alternatives # 2 and # 3 were not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued; 4 & 5) The SMP discourages creating new streets and parking on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts; 6) we will try; 7) there may be some signs needed; 8) Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave.; 9) noted; 10) the plan does include extensive revegetation.

46	Julianna Guy		<p>When Greenways levies were passed the public expected and voted for more access to parks, trails and open spaces.</p> <p>The proposal to fix the culvert and change the parking at the Salt Marsh seems to reduce the convenient access by the public to the bay and scenic shoreline. The proposed changes are understandable but the reduction of close parking is not.</p> <p>Bellingham's shoreline parks are fully utilized at the present time and it is clear that more shoreline access is in the best interests of the growing population.</p> <p>I urge you to pen up all parking available close to the shore on Chuck nut Street, just off Fairhaven.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Alternative #1 provides the closest allowable parking and was well supported in the public comments. This is the preferred alternative; The SMP discourages creating new streets and parking on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts;</p>
47	Sid Williams		<p>Consider paid parking with occasional reinforcement</p> <p>--handicap c permit - No Pay</p> <p>--to help defray costs</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
48	John Groves		<p>Consider parks plan proposed by Bellingham Parks.</p>	<p>Alternative 4 (proposed by Tom Barrett) is not an option under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The SMP discourages creating new parking and streets on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts.</p>
49	John Blethen		<p>Need replacement parking on Fairhaven. Acquire 2 parcels to the south. One is about to go on the market. Acquire marsh from property for sale on north side of Fairhaven. Break it off from property--assuming Green ways money.</p>	<p>The City is looking at sites to consider for acquisition to improve public access to the shoreline and will forward recommendations to City Council. The City Council directs staff activity related to land acquisitions and would have to revisit its current priorities for South Bellingham. The City will not discuss potential real estate purchases in public, except with the consent of the property owner. If parking were to be developed on any existing or future City land, wet areas and mature forest would be avoided. Clearing mature forest for parking is not desirable or practical. Existing critical areas will limit paving, filling and clearing.</p> <p>The privately-owned part of the Village Marsh north of Fairhaven Avenue already has a conservation easement which cannot be built on by a public or private party. Expenditure of city funds would be better spent acquiring other properties.</p>
50	John Calvin		<p>Kayaker 11 years. Opposed to removing public access in the name of estuary restoration.</p> <p>Multiple use of public lands must take into account the established public precedent. Legal rights to public access have long been part of Mud Bay.</p> <p>Please consider Tom Barrett's comments of Paul Leuthold of Parks and Recreation. Multiple Use and Public Access</p>	<p>This project does NOT remove public access. The goal is to protect the marsh by relocating parking and removing the culvert. Alternative 4 (proposed by Tom Barrett) is not an option under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The SMP discourages creating new parking and streets on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts.</p>
51	Kathleen Murphy		<p>I drive to use the put in for kayaks at Mud Bay and hope that whatever alternatives are chosen will include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) launch for human powered boars 2) parking close to the launch site (not walking all the way back to Chuckanut Drive) 3) balance between human use and habitat restoration 4) consideration of very long term impact of the project. 	<p>The Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave. Alternative #3 was not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Based on comments received parking placing the primary parking in the North Chuckanut parking lot was not well supported and will not be pursued as part of this project.</p>
52	Dan Moos	2	<p>Consider Parks plan for parking near beach. #2 alternative is preferred to parking a long distance away.</p>	<p>Alternative 4 (proposed by Tom Barrett) is not an option under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The SMP discourages creating new parking and streets on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts.</p>
53	Dave Church		<p>This is a water town and this is in my opinion our most beautiful water access. The natural "sculptures" eroded in the Chuckanut Tare are extraordinary and best enjoyed from a canoe or kayak.</p> <p>Thus easy vehicle beach access is of great importance. I'm 72--a long haul from my roof rack would eliminate the wonder bay access for me.</p> <p>I strongly support the concept of CV Marsh Restoration provided it includes easy and respectful access to the beach for both foot and human powered boats.</p> <p>I am a kayaker</p> <p>Alternative evaluation must include discussion of probable drainage basin changes that could negate the restoration value of this particular project.</p>	<p>The Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave. The majority of land in the Fairhaven Highlands (AKA Chuckanut Ridge) development drains to the Padden Cr. Watershed and is not anticipated to negatively impact Chuckanut Bay water quality.</p>
54	Christopher Grannis	1 or 2	<p>Thanks for your good work. I support the best environmental alternative. If parking on the right of ways of Fairhaven and Rainier is not to negative from an environmental point of view I would support that.I am reminded of the people from the city who encourage planting trees but say nothing about the imm?? destruction of trees at Chuckanut Ridge. I suggest you let the Parks Director know there is not much point of trying to save a beach that will be overwhelmed and degraded by the high density development of Chuckanut Ridge.</p>	<p>The most environmentally sensitive Alternative is #1. Alternative #1 also provides the closest allowable parking and was well supported in the public comments. This is the preferred alternative. The majority of land in the Fairhaven Highlands (AKA Chuckanut Ridge) development drains to the Padden Cr. Watershed and is not anticipated to negatively impact Chuckanut Bay water quality.</p>

55	Anonymous		Please keep easy access for families, children and seniors. Put in a box culvert, add a little gravel and save the rest of the \$.	The project will provide a sturdy foot bridge. It will be wide enough for strollers, kayaks, and wheelchairs. Installing a box culvert is the most expensive option with the least amount of ecological benefit.
56	Nadine Kaaland		Consider how important it is to plan for protecting access for small boats and people as well as long term protection of the habitat. Moving parking too far away increases vandals to destroy cars and gear. 3 parking at end of street and then several more up the street as proposed by City Park Director.	Alternative #1 provides the best "secure" parking. It also provides the closest allowable parking and was well supported in the public comments. This is the preferred alternative; The SMP discourages creating new streets and parking on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts; Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave.
57	Peter Frye	do nothing	Mud Bay, the beach and rocks around Mud Bay and the end of Fairhaven Ave. are one of the few areas in the city unchanged in time. It is a relaxed natural area where average people can enjoy nature. Me and my family bike to Mud Bay and explore or launch our canoe on a regular basis. The beach at the end of Fairhaven Ave. is an essential launch area for canoes, kayaks, and small boats on trailers. I am adamantly opposed to any change that would restrict public access in any way at any hour, or make it more difficult to launch a small boat including small boats on trailers. The current parking is fine as is and does not need to be changed. Parking off of Chuckanut Drive is unacceptable! Thank you!	The project does NOT take away public access. Alternative #3 was not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Based on comments received parking placing the primary parking in the North Chuckanut parking lot was not well supported and will not be pursued as part of this project. The current boat launch is meant to be a hand launch. If it was never legally permitted as a trailer boat launch then it is not required to protect that use under the SMP.
58	Eugene Davis		Kayakers have used this area for many years. We need parking. This is city property and not just for the locals that are fortunate that live there!	Noted.
59	Steve Robey	Do nothing	It would be best to do nothing. This project is not needed. Not enough parking provided and parking too far from beach. Use the money to fill the pot holes in the road.Thanks.	There are numerous studies that speak to the ecological importance of this project. To read the studies go to: http://www.cob.org/services/environment/restoration/chuckanut-village-marsh.aspx . The funds cannot be used to fill pot holes. Funding is dedicated to water quality and marine nearshore restoration.
60	Donna Buehler		1) All parks cannot meet all needs. You have to make a choice. Will they be habitat and nature preserve or human recreation area. It is really too small for both. 2) Woodstock is owned by city and has an old boat house on the inside of Mud Bay. The water here is deeper for launching any kayak. 3) The end of Rainier Street is too shallow for kayak launching. The cars might be closer but one would have to carry her kayak further.	Kayak storage and rentals are being considered at Woodstock but water depth constraints there are the same as at Chuckanut Village. Woodstock is not suited to car-top launching due to steep grades and a significant elevation change between the highway and beach. Preservation concepts being considered for Woodstock call for retaining the site's historic character and limiting parking and road building to the higher part of the site to protect the shoreline and its landscape. Boathouses, sheds, and lockable racks are for boats left at the shore and not regularly launched from vehicles. They are most feasible if the City has a partnership agreement with a supporting organization. A community boatshed for rentals or non-profit club type operation could be provided at Woodstock and at Chuckanut Village.
61	Kenni Merrit	1	I am writing to provide input about parking at Mud Bay. First and foremost, it is very important that, before the current beach parking is closed, there be adequate replacement parking ready and available for use in close proximity to the beach. The public needs convenient access to the beach, including access for families, seniors, kayakers/canoers, dog walkers etc. If City Council decides that it has to close the current beach parking, I support replacement parking on the City's ROW on both sides of Fairhaven Avenue about 100 feet uphill from the current parking, with three to four spaces on each side of Fairhaven Ave., together with an additional three or four parking spots at the end of Fairhaven Ave. where it dead ends at the beach.	The project will provide a sturdy foot bridge. It will be wide enough for strollers, kayaks, and wheelchairs. Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative
62	Wayne Gerner & Laura Mackenzie	1	We are long time residents of Chuckanut Village (55 years for Wayne, 15 years for me). Wayne is disabled and uses a wheelchair. He is use to coming to the beach with our dog via the current approach to the existing parking lot. I walk here 2-3 times a day with our dog and I also do litter patrol. If this parking lot must be closed, then please consider the following: 1. Provide an ADA/Handicapped parking space. 2. Provide ADA access to the beach over the culvert (wheelchairs, walkers, canes, strollers, etc.) 3. Provide parking for loading/unloading as close to the beach as possible for kayakers. 4. Provide parking on City right of way on north side of Fairhaven Avenue (less invasive, likely to be less expensive). If parking is sited in front of the house that's for sale there, then provide the owners with a natural buffer or privacy screen (tall hedge?) to block this parking lot in their front yard. 5. Avoid putting parking opposite here (Dow property side) as that would be more expensive, invasive and disruptive to the wetlands, trees and local wildlife. 6. Keep the existing garbage can by the beach and add another one at the new parking area. 7. Provide a dispenser of bags for picking up dog waste (a la North Shore Trail). 8. Avoid the idea of a parking area and turnaround at 21st and Fairhaven Ave. and parking on Rainer Ave. These ideas make us cringe because they are poorly conceived and will do more harm than good to our neighborhood. Questions: 1. If there is a permanent gate installed to block car access, how will someone in a WC (or using a walker, etc.) be able to get through to the beach? 2. These proposed changes do not take into consideration that local Chuckanut Village crabbers launch their boats from this beach during crabbing season. They do so a few nights a week, tides permitting. How can the parking be designed to accommodate them as well? 3. Where would a car with a trailer and boat turn around if they do come down all the way and find the parking spaces are full? 4. If boaters are not to be accommodated, then signage at the entrance to the Village will be paramount to discourage this and redirect them to where they can go. We look forward to the next meeting to see and hear your summary of everyone's comments and ideas. Thank you.	1) Handicap parking will be available at the end of Fairhaven Ave.; 2) Pedestrian beach access will be maintained via a sturdy wooden footbridge that will provide access for strollers, wheelchairs, boat carts, and double kayaks; 3 &4) Alternative #1 provides the closest allowable parking and was well supported in the public comments. This is the preferred alternative; 5) There isn't enough room to put all parking on the North side of Fairhaven Ave. To accommodate the 8 -10 spaces we will need to have parking on both sides of Fairhaven Ave. Any parking installed will be the minimum impact to the environment; 6) Parks maintains garbage cans wherever there is public parking at an improved shoreline site, on an as-needed basis and provided that the area can be regularly visited by operations staff; 7) With the increasing expense related to demand and use of dog dispenser bags, the Parks Department is promoting dog owner responsibility for providing their own bags and taking off site for disposal; 8) Alternative #3 was not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Based on comments received parking placing the primary parking in the North Chuckanut parking lot was not well supported and will not be pursued as part of this project.

63	Tom Barrett	1	<p>I'm writing to provide input on the Chuckanut Village Marsh Restoration Project. I first question the cost/benefit aspects of this project. Your consultant stated during the April 7 meeting that closing the beach parking would have only minimal impact on the marsh. This project has caused quite an uproar in the community, so I question whether it is worth the considerable staff time, hard costs and community angst.</p> <p>Bellingham residents place very high value on shoreline access. This local taxpayer financed beach area is visited by residents from all parts of the City, not just the locals who are so fortunate to live there. With respect to parking, we must provide reasonable parking access for seniors, families, bird watchers, beach strollers, kayakers and others who have traditionally used this beach area. The proposed parking at the North Chuckanut Mountain Trailhead will not work nor will parking at the City-owned site near Chuckanut Drive. I would like to see parking on city owned rights of ways so that no additional funding would be required, other than minimal amounts to gravel and mark the parking spaces. People have traditionally parked on Fairhaven Avenue near the end of the paved portion. Parking should be available on both sides of Fairhaven Avenue. Some parking at the end of Fairhaven Avenue near the proposed foot bridge would be important too. There was discussion of parking on the City right of way in the north part Chuckanut Street, where there is an illegal structure and high ground. Parking could easily be done on the east part of Chuckanut Street also, in front of the house. Parking on Rainier Avenue should be a last resort. It is away from the beach and there would be concerns about vandalism. Before existing parking is blocked, replacement parking must be made available and usable.</p>	<p>The consultant did not intend to imply that benefit would be minimal; instead the intent was to convey that the benefit would not be huge on a regional level, but would be very beneficial to the local system (north Chuckanut/Mud Bay), which is an important area for salmon. In terms of benefit for cost, the proposed project is actually a very low cost one in terms of urban and semi-urban salmon habitat restoration/enhancement, which can often run into millions of dollars. Taking steps to protect this area now will cost under \$90K. Letting the area degrade and then trying to restore it after it has been degraded will cost hundreds of thousands. The project will provide a sturdy foot bridge. It will be wide enough for strollers, kayaks, and wheelchairs. Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave. Alternative #3 was not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Alternative 4 (proposed by you) is not an option under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The SMP discourages creating new parking and streets on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts.</p>
64	Sarah Collins	1	<p>I am in favor of alternative 1 of the Chuckanut Village Marsh restoration project. Even though this alternative is considered not an option because of the public access conflict, I really think it should be considered. With the removal of the parking lot, the amount of impervious surfaces and runoff will be lessened near the area adjacent to the beach. With the restoration of the beach, and the establishment of native vegetation, plant and animal diversity will increase. The removal of the culvert may improve fish access to the incoming streams. I think that the removal of the parking lot will not cause unintended traffic on the newly restored beach, as long as a new pedestrian bridge and path is built on the other side of the channel.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave.</p>
65	Bernie Walz		<p>Thank you for hosting the community meeting on this subject. I sincerely hope that the public comment will be taken seriously. I think \$100,000 is an excessive amount of money to spend on the shoreline restoration of Chuckanut Bay. I believe an excellent program, with much less funding would accomplish the same goal. It seems an adequate job of restoration could be accomplished with the following: 1) Blocking vehicle access as shown in red on the attachment.2) Providing vehicle parking as shown in orange on the attachment.3) Rebuilding a pedestrian bridge near end of Fairhaven Ave.4) Allow alternative driveway for house outlined in yellow on attachment (Address might 1602).5) Remove all non-natural debris from beach.6) Provide trash container at site & removal of trash as needed.7) Put up signs of do's & don'ts.8) Don't bother with wild black berries. The birds will just seed them again, unless someone is diligent about constant pulling unwanted plants.9) Let nature take its course. The salt water vegetation will fill in the bare spots in short order, if vehicle and foot traffic is controlled. I honestly believe, the above could accomplish restoration of said shoreline for a lot less than \$100,000. This is not free money. It is public funds. Please be a good steward of those funds.</p>	<p>Attachment not found.</p>

66	Steven and Sylvia Haffner		<p>My husband and I live in Chuckanut Village. Although we were not available to sign the petition to protect access to Chuckanut Bay, we are in agreement with it.</p> <p>That being said, if the money is burning a hole in your pocket, please take the following into consideration. This is a small, but long-standing, neighborhood. Many of the families living here have been here for generations. Steve grew up in this neighborhood, just a block from where we now live. We want to preserve our neighborhood, while sharing its bounty with others. Take into consideration not only the needs of the visitors, but the needs of the residents and try to minimize the overall impact.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned about safety and traffic flow. Any changes made should consider foot traffic, including children. Any parking area should have sufficient room and visibility for safe entry and exit.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and your consideration of our concerns.</p>	Noted. Any relocated parking will meet City of Bellingham parking standards
67	Laura Leigh Brakke	1	<p>I am writing in support of Alternative 1 for restoration of the Chuckanut Village Marsh. We need to protect and preserve and in this case restore, natural habitats. The importance of maintaining high quality marine environments are so essential to this area. Whatcom county is one of the few places in the world that once was home to all 5 Pacific salmon and we must work hard to keep what we have left. Please support Alternative 1.</p>	Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave.
68	Wendy Steffensen North Sound Baykeeper RE Sources for Sustainable Communities	1	<p>Please accept these comments on the Chuckanut Marsh Restoration project from the North Sound Baykeeper program at RE Sources for Sustainable Communities. RE Sources is a nonprofit community sustainability organization, based in Bellingham and founded in 1982. Our mission is to promote sustainable communities through recycling, education, advocacy, and conservation of natural resources. We implement a variety of programs, including The North Sound Baykeeper. The goals of the Baykeeper are to protect and restore marine waters and nearshore habitats and reduce the amount and toxicity of pollution entering our waterways. The Baykeeper represents over 500 individuals in the community. RE Sources and the North Sound Baykeeper are very supportive of Alternative 1 for the Chuckanut Village Marsh Restoration project. We find that Alternative 1 speaks directly to the goals of the Baykeeper program:- Restoration of marsh and fish habitat [through culvert removal]- Prevention of pollution from contaminated runoff [through revegetation and relocation of parking]. It is important that we act to protect and restore habitat at Chuckanut Marsh as it is one of the few areas where the ecosystem is relatively intact and healthy and simple actions can provide great benefit. Chuckanut Marsh contains our best pocket estuary, providing valuable rearing habitat to salmonids and a high functioning Class 1 wetland. The only concern I have regarding the project is one of process. I am unsure that the larger public had sufficient notice to provide comment. I learned of the comment period deadline only because I sit on the Marine Resources Committee and was alerted via e-mail on April 16! While the Bellingham Herald posted notice of the April 7 meeting they did not post that there was a comment period and deadline. As shown in the Whatcom County Marine Resources Committee prioritization study, restoration of the Chuckanut Bay backshore wetland was the highest prioritized habitat action in a study of potential actions to restore habitat in Chuckanut Bay, Birch Bay and Point Roberts. As such, I believe that the actions at Chuckanut Bay would be of interest to those in the wider Whatcom County community and would have far-ranging support from those who wish to see healthy salmon populations and restored habitat. Thank you for your efforts to protect and improve this valuable habitat.</p>	Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave.

69	John Rybczyk	1 or 2	<p>I attended the April 7th public meeting regarding the proposed marsh and shoreline restoration project in Mud Bay and I thank you for the opportunity to both review and comment on the restoration proposals. By profession I am an estuarine ecologist. I am also a kayaker, open-water rower, and recreational crabber. I frequently park and launch from the Mud Bay parking lot. Personally, and selfishly, I will be sorry to see the beach parking go. It provides convenient and easy access to a special and unique ecosystem in Whatcom County. However, I also realize that as the city's population grows, more people, not less, will be visiting Mud Bay, and an as-of-now marginal parking situation will only get worse. Furthermore, I am familiar with Jim Johannessen's shoreline restoration work. He is rightly recognized as an expert in this regard and I have every confidence that we would all be pleased with the results (i.e. benefits to the ecosystem) if he and his firm were to direct the restoration efforts. That being said, it is also true that safe and public launching sites for human powered watercraft are at a premium in Whatcom County. The protected waters and shores of Mud Bay provide the safest and closest access to world-class sea kayaking in Chuckanut Bay. It is also a favored launching site during the crabbing season for those crabbing from kayaks, canoes and other light craft. It is a peaceful, quiet, and wonderful place for low-impact, local boaters to enjoy the water and escape the mayhem of the motorboat launches in the vicinity. Therefore, I believe that any restoration alternative should include close parking and easy access for boaters and beach-goers in general. A few in attendance at the April 7th meeting suggested that a reasonable alternative would be to use the North Chuckanut Trailhead parking lot for beach access. First, you would be hard pressed to find any boaters who would feel comfortable leaving their boats, paddles, lifejackets, crab traps, and other expensive gear, unattended on the beach while they hiked a mile up the hill to retrieve their car. Neither would any mother in her right mind even think about dropping her toddlers off at the beach while she drove back up to Chuckanut Drive to park the car. Second, this alternative violates the spirit, if not the intent, of the Shoreline Management Act, which is to "protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline; increase public access to publicly owned shoreline areas; and increase recreational opportunities for the public in the shoreline area." Third, I suspect that those who favor this alternative are more interested in restricting access, for whatever reason, than they are in providing real and reasonable solutions. Therefore, the North Chuckanut Trailhead Parking "solution", or any plan that includes parking spots located hundreds of yards from the launch site, is an untenable and unreasonable alternative that, I hope, receives the attention and consideration that it deserves, which is none.</p>	
70	John Rybczyk		<p>Others at the meeting argued that there were much greater threats to the Mud Bay ecosystem, such as the Chuckanut Ridge development, thus all money and efforts should go towards preventing those impacts. While it is certainly true that there are, and will be, other and potentially greater threats, we must not forgo the present opportunity to restore and enhance the Mud Bay wetlands and shorelines merely because greater threats loom. To do so would be akin to refusing a flu shot because one believes that all medical efforts and funds should go toward cancer research. Much like a healthy human body can overcome the annual onslaught of the flu virus, so a healthy ecosystem is resilient to environmental impacts. For example, we can promote ecosystem resiliency by enhancing the marsh's connectivity with the bay (by removing the restrictive culvert now in place). Increased tidal energy subsidizes the marsh by bringing in nutrient-rich, oxygenated water and flushing out natural toxins (sulfides) that accumulate in the sediments. In other words, restoration gives these systems, and the organisms that thrive in them, a fighting chance in the face of other impacts. We do what we can, when we can.</p> <p>So, in my perfect world, only me and a few of my closest friends would know about the Mud Bay access site, we'd have minimal impact, bother no one, park on the beach, our cars would leak no oils or other fluid, and the residents of Chuckanut Village would bring me a cold beer after a long row. Since that is an unlikely scenario, I favor an alternative that includes restoration and enhancement, easy access, and close parking; alternative 1 or 2 perhaps. The parking is too far away for alternative 3 to be viable. Alternative 1 appears to have the least impact on existing dwellings. I caution that any bridge built over where the culvert is now be wide and sturdy enough for two people carrying a double kayak or for a person using a boat cart. This is an important point regarding access; if we can't park on the beach, many of us will have to use a cart to roll our boat to the shoreline. Any bridge will have to be big enough to allow for the passage of such a cart. I also ask that you consider providing some access, somewhere on the Bay, while the restoration work is in progress. Don't just fence off the entire area for the project duration. Thank you again for this opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternative #1 provides the parking closest to existing parking. Loading Zone parking spaces can be provided at the end of Fairhaven Ave. Alternative #3 was not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Based on comments received parking placing the primary parking in the North Chuckanut parking lot was not well supported and will not be pursued as part of this project. The majority of land in the Fairhaven Highlands (AKA Chuckanut Ridge) development drains to the Padden Cr. Watershed and is not anticipated to negatively impact Chuckanut Bay water quality. The project will provide a sturdy foot bridge. It will be wide enough for strollers, double kayaks, boat carts and wheelchairs.</p>

71	Judy and Philip Shantz	<p>After attending the initial meeting on this project April 7, and since talking with other residents, we feel that there does not seem to have been any serious analysis done of what the actual problems are at the beach parking strip in Chuckanut Village. The kayakers who don't live in the village do come down, park their cars and unload their kayaks – but almost exclusively on warm, sunny weekends with very few users during the week. As village residents for almost 30 years, we have never seen any of them “trash” the beach.</p> <p>There are also other incidental users – a few small boaters taking crab pots out – but that seems to be minimal. Some people come down, park and walk the beach. There is little degradation being caused by these users.</p> <p>The real abusers are those who come to party, hide out, drink, start fires and leave their trash. They back their vehicles into the shrubbery on the edge of the marsh attempting to avoid detection, use the marsh as their toilet, and have been known to stay for days. The mess they leave is usually cleaned up by residents.</p> <p>Within the past week we have heard the rumor that the folks from WAKE and other kayakers believe that the village residents “hate” them. We don't know where that is coming from. We have lived in the village for 29 years and have never heard anyone speak negatively towards them. It may only be the opinion of a few villagers or residents of Briza above – though some village residents directly adjacent to the bay might “hate” the few abusers who park on their lawns or block their driveways.</p> <p>We ourselves kayak in the bay and the fellow paddlers we meet are all looking for non-polluting and serene recreation opportunities and are definitely not inclined to damage the environment they want to paddle in.</p> <p>The issue doesn't need to be an us versus them, a villagers versus boaters issue. There needs to be a reasoned compromise – but that dialogue might be better started between the residents and the non-resident users – rather than having the City come up with their own plans that don't fill any of the needs.</p> <p>One suggestion we could work with would be to gate the roadway from dusk to dawn. There are enough people in Chuckanut Village with a commitment to the environment that we could form a committee and share the responsibility of locking and unlocking the gate each day. (We have thought this for years and would volunteer to be first).</p> <p>That being said, there should definitely not be any expectation that the City provide ample parking for every person who wants to come down and kayak. Just as there is a boat launch at Lake Padden Park and boaters must first launch their boats and then remove their vehicles up the hill to a lot near the road, the expectation should be no different for this tiny, fragile beach.</p>	<p>A gate or other traffic control measure would be essential once the beach area is closed to traffic. A gate would be less necessary at a properly designed, relocated parking area. Closing parking at night will encourage parking on Village streets. The City is looking at sites to consider for acquisition to improve public access to the shoreline and will forward recommendations to City Council. The City Council directs staff activity related to land acquisitions and would have to revisit its current priorities for South Bellingham. The City will not discuss potential real estate purchases in public, except with the consent of the property owner. If parking were to be developed on any existing or future City land, wet areas and mature forest would be avoided. Clearing mature forest for parking is not desirable or practical. Existing critical areas will limit paving, filling and clearing. With the increasing expense related to demand and use of dog dispenser bags, the Parks Department is promoting dog owner responsibility for providing their own bags and taking off site for disposal. Parks maintains garbage cans wherever there is public parking at an improved shoreline site, on an as-needed basis and provided that the area can be regularly visited by operations staff. These amenities could potentially provide for increased public access. With the kayak cart racks there should be a workable operating agreement with a partner, club or a community group for instance.</p>
72	Judy and Philip Shantz	<p>Likewise, although it is true that the City does own a great deal of right-of-way in Chuckanut Village that has been grassed over by residents – it is antithetical to the whole idea of “restoration” that those areas should be converted to parking spaces for the convenience of recreationists who don't want to walk down the hill after parking their cars. All of us who use the beaches and trails throughout Bellingham and park our cars in the lots provided run some risk of damage or vandalism. Those are calculated risks we accept in order to enjoy the many recreational opportunities available in our area. In addition, the idea that the City should spend Greenways money to buy up the large timbered lot adjacent to the beach at the bottom of Fairhaven Avenue (where our local geese breed each year) and turn it into parking is nothing short of destruction of the marshland, not restoration. A piece of property does come to mind that might serve; the small lot at 1910 Fairhaven Avenue. It has a tiny house that cannot be expanded and is virtually unsaleable as is. If the City has funds to buy property, that could become a small shelter – perhaps even an interpretive center with a screened off portable toilet and three or four diagonal parking spaces across the front. But in the final analysis, there needs to be some sense of scale. The village and the beach can only support a little traffic and parking before large-scale degradation begins to happen. Our preferences would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave the culvert as it is to drain the marsh and so the normal ebb and flow of tidal water can continue into the salt marsh across the current road. • Gate the road approximately where the pavement currently ends, closed from dusk to dawn • Provide, on the beach itself, two or three parking spaces at most with one handicap space and enough room to turn around and launch a boat • Provide a rack for people to lock up bicycles and kayak carts • Provide a couple of trash receptacles • Provide informational signage about the marshland and the bay itself • Provide berms or barriers to keep vehicles from driving into the marsh vegetation <p>Above all, we feel that plans should not be rushed through for permanent solutions until all the parties have had a chance to meet and discuss the many ideas and options in a reasoned discourse.</p>	

73	Jody Chapman		<p>Being as avid Kayaker, I would like to see some way to enlarge the window of kayaking for handicap people. Because of the mud flats/shallow water, I can launch only near high tide, and must return before the water recedes again. Could a narrow channel be dredged for hand powered boats? Could a launch site be established at the wood stock farm with easy access?</p>	<p>It would be very difficult (if not impossible) to get a permit to dredge a channel here. Kayak storage and rentals are being considered at Woodstock but water depth constraints there are the same as at Chuckanut Village. Woodstock is not suited to car-top launching due to steep grades and a significant elevation change between the highway and beach. Preservation concepts being considered for Woodstock call for retaining the site's historic character and limiting parking and road building to the higher part of the site to protect the shoreline and its landscape. Boathouses, sheds, and lockable racks are for boats left at the shore and not regularly launched from vehicles. They are most feasible if the City has a partnership agreement with a supporting organization. A community boatshed for rentals or non-profit club type operation could be provided at Woodstock and at Chuckanut Village.</p>
74	Ross Marquardt	1	<p>Keep all parking on Fairhaven Ave. No parking on Rainier Ave. Discourage driving onto beach off Rainier Ave.</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternatives 2 and3 were not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Driving on the beach is not an option under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The SMP discourages creating new streets and parking on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts.</p>
75	Lee First	1	<p>Please accept the following comments into the record for the Chuckanut Marsh Restoration Project:</p> <p>I support Alternative 1 for the Chuckanut Village Marsh Restoration project because it will be the alternative that has the highest degree of marsh restoration and is most protective of fish habitat. I believe alternative 1 will also provide the most amount of pollution prevention (via re-vegetation and relocation of parking).</p> <p>It is important that we act to protect and restore habitat at Chuckanut Marsh as it is one of the few areas where the ecosystem is relatively intact and healthy and simple actions can provide great benefit. Chuckanut Marsh contains our best pocket estuary, providing valuable rearing habitat to salmonids and a high functioning wetland.</p> <p>Thanks very much for considering my comments.</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative.</p>
76	Jennifer Purcell	1	<p>Vehicles should be blocked from waterfront-person gate on Fairhaven Ave. No parking on Chuckanut Ave- no vehicle access (private driveway). Parking on sides of Fairhaven Ave. No parking or vehicle access from Rainier Ave. (person gate on Rainier).</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative. Alternatives 2 and3 were not well supported in the public comments and will not be pursued. Driving on the beach is not an option under the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The SMP discourages creating new streets and parking on beaches if other options are available due to the high ecological impacts.</p>
77	John Goodman		<p>Thank you for the meeting the other night. I think it is great that there is an incentive to improve the sensitive environment at Mud Bay in Chuckanut Village. There are a lot of things to consider of course. I know it was a tough crowd, but hopefully you gained a sense of how important this place is to so many folks and that a careful decision is in order. I have been pondering the various proposals presented and concerns re keeping cars away from the beach and where to put them. I have been wracking my brain to try to come up with a plan that makes the most sense for the environment as well as the residents and public, but is not easy to come up with something that won't have negative effects on the residents of the village, including myself, when parking is removed from the beach. These impacts could be huge. Limiting or changing access concerns a great many folks as you could tell at the meeting. I think the time for public input/comments and discussion REALLY needs to be EXTENDED to be fair. There is a petition circulating right now in the village that requests this, among other things. There is at least one full scale neighborhood meeting planned to discuss concerns villagers have about the proposals presented. I just hope you will allow a bit more time for our collective concerns to be consolidated and presented to you. Since today is supposedly the last day for comments, for the record, here are my "current" personal thoughts on the subject: I can agree to having parking moved off the beach for the sake of an improved beach environment, however if you are going to be taking something away from people who live in the village, you need to give something back I strongly feel. Since villagers are being asked (told?) to absorb parking within neighborhood it appears, I think that there needs to be some kind of private boat launching and dock access retained, at the very least, for the people who own property in Chuckanut Village. Some of the residents who live here are at least 3rd generation "villagers." You can't just shove this no vehicle access/boat launching except to kayakers on the long time villagers without creating a stir. I am ok with parking as shown on several plans, with 4-5 cars close to the drainage culvert to be removed. Period. But NO other parking in the lower village. No parking on the street or cars will be towed. Then have a small 4-5 car lot on the greenway above on the Fairhaven Ave. lot near the gallery, but certainly no more. Put the parking on the flat dry spot. Note: this greenways property should NOT be trashed and turned into a big parking lot as that will affect neighbors up there. My idea here is that when someone headed to the beach looks down at the top of the hill by the Church, they can see if there is room in the parking lot or if it is full. At that point they can alleviate the ongoing problem of people driving all the way down to the bottom to find that there is no parking and then having to drive back out. If the lot is full, then they will have to go to the upper lot. If that lot is full, then perhaps even to the gravel pit/trailhead lot or Woodstock Farm. By the way, the Woodstock Farm should be considered and kept open as an alternative site for parking and beach/kayak access by the way. I DON'T want to see parking relocated in front of personal residences. Parking along the undeveloped Dow/Frost property could be an option, but not one I am that keen on either, unless that property becomes a city greenway someday. Then some parking could be located on the land itself perhaps, if parking pressures build over time. As for property owners of the village, I think it is imperative that some kind of boat access and launching be retained (boats larger than kayaks). I think the best location would be on Rainier, which is off the beaten path for the public, and next to the retaining wall by Buellers. It could simply be a 15 feet wide unimproved section for dropping a skiff off, period. There could even be a locked gate, with villagers having the only access to this private boat launching spot. The rest of the beach zone that is damaged could be restored with cars banished from driving along any of the rest of the beach to the north. 15 feet is not too much to ask for the residents of the village I feel. The remainder of the area can be for the public's use.</p>	<p>Your thoughts are appreciated. There is a lot to consider here. There is an 80ft right-of-way (ROW) along Fairhaven Ave. Street parking is an allowed use in street ROW even in front of private homes. The City is looking for any permits related to the existing dock. The dock is located on public land with little benefit to the public. Creating a "private boat launching and dock access for people who own property in the village" on public land is not an option.</p>

78			<p>I also feel the dock must stay. It doesn't have to be that dock forever, but perhaps replace the dock with one that won't be polluting the bay with creosote. There has been a dock there for almost a hundred years and I believe that dock location and use should be grandfathered in. It is the community dock essentially. The original dock rotted away years ago, but the locals keep replacing it with new floats. There has been a dock there since I arrived in '81. It won't go away without a big fight is my feeling.</p> <p>These are my thoughts at this time, but I hope you will consider extending the time frame for commentary. As stated, there is a lot to consider here.</p>	
79	Morgan Libby		<p>I think any plans for this should examine the impact that the railroad overcrossing has on water flow and fish population. Perhaps there are flaws in the design of the overpass that are contributing to the decline in fish and other hydrologic problems.</p>	<p>City has grant funding to examine this issue. The Whatcom Marine Resources Committee has applied for a grant to study circulation and sedimentation issues related to the railroad trestle. The amount is approximately \$10,000, and could supplement the City's grants.</p>
80	Mark J. Herrenkohl,	1	<p>I was out late last week and missed the "final" call for public comment on Chuckanut Marsh. If you are still willing to take comments on the project, I am very supportive of the plan and prefer Alternative 1. Alternative 1 meets the project goals outlined during the public meeting but also provides easy access and parking for the Kayakers and other beach goers. I especially like the turnaround so folks can drop off their gear close to the beach access. Thanks again for all the time and energy you and CGS have put into this plan. I think it will be truly beneficial to the marsh and shoreline ecosystems!</p>	<p>Alternative #1 was well supported in the public comments and is the preferred alternative.</p>