

I am surprised there is little public participation in this discussion as far as I can see. I guess the technical experts and public at large have complete faith. With so many contaminants left in the land area and underwater, it is impressive if agencies can clean it up. I applaud you if you can do it. I wish others with technical expertise had submitted comments, but will pipe up with my input. After toxics are removed to the best of your ability, it would be my preference to abundantly restore some native habitat since all humans as well as the fish, birds, invertebrates and mammals need natural habitat.

In the various waterfront sites, there is much bowing to "public access" in the way of seaside strolls by meandering citizens. There is much catering to agricultural, forest products, and other commerce which has led to the dredging of the Whatcom Creek estuary. All the while it seems that public access to fresh air, clean water, and riparian and shoreline protection are sorely undervalued. There is catering to politicians, institutions, shipping companies, commercial fishermen, and longshoremen who all use up natural resources, but not enough appreciation for such life forms as forage fish, sunstars, orcas, fir trees and eelgrass who give life to the ecosystem.

Many philosophical and physical headaches exist in developed parks. One example is that there is huge disrespect in displacing geese, gulls, pigeons and plovers in favor of putting down additional pavement place after place.

Another is that lawns, herbicides, rodenticides, etc. and the noise of machinery such as leaf blowers are all counterproductive to the health of public parks which are meant to provide opportunities for fresh air, aesthetics, restorative activity, and the like for people at large.

These days, parks are frequented by drug users and other criminals as well as common litterers. They are visited by annoying rabble rousers, transients, people who feed bread to birds, dads who teach kids to throw rocks in the Bay without regard to whom they might kill, and kids who lift marine animals out of the water and smash them or take them away. Debris left by park goers as well as debris that blows and flows down from the rest of the City create murderous hazards to creatures and are the antithesis of a cleanup effort.

Government is supposed to create spaces for the health and pleasure of the people in general. A lot of those people are in favor of protecting all species, experiencing more shade and less pavement, preserving cleanliness of estuaries and coastal waters, reducing noise and air pollution, preventing plastic and other litter in the environment, reducing carbon footprints, and welcoming salmon and orcas back to Bellingham Bay. Those people should not be discounted. With so much ecological harm having been done over so many years to the waterfront and Salish Sea, I encourage the partnering entities to consider designing an abundance of ecological features and installations that surpass what was there before R. G. Haley International and the other corporate polluters.

In my opinion, Lake Whatcom ought to be fenced like Seattle's water supply and other water districts are. In the same way, I believe these waterfront "ecological" activities ought to be really, genuinely, and primarily ecological. Even if I were among those families that insisted we must be able to take kids and grandkids to any and all coastlines, I question how going to sites that had so much contamination can be that wise.