

Fort Worden Long Range Plan

Preliminary Recommendations Stakeholder Comments

– Multiple Topics

Dear Ms. Burke:

I own a cottage in the Tree House Community which adjoins Ft Worden State Park. My home faces the Park and the National Military Cemetary, so I have both a personal interest as a nearby resident and as someone who has enjoyed and appreciated Ft. Worden State Park for nearly 17 years.

I want to first say how much I appreciate the work of the planning group for Ft. Worden and its focus on enhancing the park's role as a lifelong learning center. Having lived throughout the country as a university administrator and faculty member, I can appreciate the rich possibilities that this focus will offer the Park's future.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the *Preliminary Recommendations Report*. I offer a few insights and observations that (by page):

p. 3 Vision statement: I find the word "legendary" to be a bit awkward if left standing as it is. Would something like the following strengthen the vision statement: "Fort Worden is a legendary gathering place and premier retreat center where people are transformed through lifelong learning, renewal and discovery" ?

p. 3 Mission: Should there be a 5th item that expresses something like: "Improves quality of life in Port Townsend, Jefferson County, the Olympic Peninsula, and Washington State"?

p. 5 the phrase, "...ecological function of the main campus and surrounding areas should be restored and enhanced" seems to contradict the development of an upper campground loop that appears to extend well beyond the present campground to the north and west. This would essentially make a roaded, developed area out of the well-aged second growth embracing the 'Peace Trail" which begins just north of the cemetery at Admiralty Way. The camping loop doesn't appear in the Building Uses and Development Map on p. 58, and isn't called for in the text of the planning document (see: Upper Campground, p. 72). The proposed new camping loop doesn't appear in the Building Uses and Development Map on p. 58, and isn't called for in the text of the planning document (see: "Upper Campground" section on p. 72).

It appears that this new loop would add vehicles, electrical and restroom development, paved roadway, noise, pets, and some lighting to what is now a high-quality natural area, previously cleaned up after years of military use. I understand from a neighbor that a member of the consultant team, when asked about this proposed development in the Upper Campground, replied that WA State Parks wants ten new RV camping sites added. As a result, the consultants drew in an extra loop with that would satisfy this demand for more RV space and more. Like a neighbor, I'm not opposed to additional camping or RV sites, but there are at least two other Park sites that would require no intrusion into unroaded areas and no tree cutting. If additional RV sites are to be added, I would suggest either: 1) the overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just NE of the Mule Barn, or 2) the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground. The existing proposal, which for some inexplicable reason was not described in the recommendations, would destroy some of the Park's best wooded habitat and would violate the principle of restoring and enhancing the ecological function of the main campus and surrounding areas.

p. 29 The four categories of destination learning programs seem to capture the current categories of program offerings. Are there any that may be appropriate and could emerge as vital elements in a business plan? If I may, I would like to suggest "Personal and Professional Renewal" as a fifth category. Retreat centers like Aspen Institute in Aspen, CO and in Wye River, MD; Snowmass in CO; and the Chautauqua Institution in Western NY provide excellent examples of institutes and programs for professional and personal renewal. A review of their websites could inform and enrich the

recommendations for the Lifelong Learning Center at Ft. Worden. These types of activities also have the potential of providing a higher per-occupancy-night revenue than some other types of activities. A more thorough discussion of professional and personal renewal opportunities under either "Destination Learning Programs" or "Retreats and Conference Development" (pp.33-34) would strengthen these sections of the report.

Also, the recommendations under "Destination Learning Programs" appear overlook the possibility of introducing new on-site higher college degree or certificate programs through new education partners. My institution, for example, offers a 3-week intensive forensic anthropology field school at the U.N. World Heritage Site of Butrint, Albania. I could very well see a college or university introducing undergraduate or graduate degree or certificate programs in historic preservation, nonprofit management (with focus on arts, museums, theatre, etc.), or in number of possibilities in 4 (or 5, if "Personal and Professional Renewal" is added) categories.

pp. 44-46 I believe that the use of "historical source data for reservations at Ft Worden from other states" for the "Secondary Target Market" analysis understates the potential to tap the market for professional retreats and conferences. Use of data from organizations such as the Aspen Institute or Chautauqua Institution would provide a more robust analysis.

p. 52 Giving priority to the development of 100 additional single-guest rooms would enable the Lifelong Learning Center to attract higher paying personal and professional renewal retreats and conferences. I've mentioned examples such as the Aspen Institute and Chautauqua Institution. Another example would be Elderhostel. The experiences of colleges and universities during the past decade is that Elderhostel participants no longer desire to live in dormitory settings. Campus-based programs now house Elderhostellers in motels, retreat centers, and the like. .

pp. 57 I believe readers would like to see a rationale for relocating the main entrance to the west end of Admiralty Drive. Of course, since I live nearby, I'd rather not have the added traffic literally at my doorstep; however, I also recognize that rationale reasons for a move must prevail in the end. The route to the current entrance is a bit convoluted but it does avoid higher density residential areas. One important issue for consideration: By moving the entrance to the west-end Admiralty Drive, the assumption that can be drawn the the plan is to route traffic down San Juan Ave, from Sims Way and Discovery Rd. This would increase year-round traffic along the street on which Blue Heron Middle School is located. Is this a wise decision?

p. 71 Existing Power Distribution System: Has any analysis been given to the possibility of developing a gas and/or biofuel co-generation plan? Since gas is in the form of propane, this might not be feasible, and biofuel would require frequent delivery of biofuel materials. Still, some consideration may be warranted.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to comment and would be happy to provide additional insights if requested, or participate in other ways in the development of the Long Range Development Plan.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Monday, June 02, 2008 4:10 PM
To: Burke, Kate (PARKS)
Subject: Fort Worden Park

How about we leave the park as is and enjoy the esthetics?
Further development cannot possibly improve what is now a beautiful park!
Thanks for listening,
Name Deleted

-----Original Message-----

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2008 5:19 PM
To: Rick Sepler
Subject: Fort Worden Learning Cntr.

Hi Rick,

When the plan is actually implemented will there be mandatory street improvements such as sidewalks and bike lanes? Is there a traffic threshold that if exceeded will cause the state to require street widening? I am concerned about how that will be paid for. Will we be forced to pay for these out of our general funds?

What about water? This new plan is going to consume tons of water throughout its life starting from the ground breaking. We, as I understand it, have a limited supply. Are there any protections being crafted on our behalf? If we have water shortages in the future will we have priority on water usage over the Fort? I have this feeling that we are about to be led to the poor house. I think this is going to be very bright and noisy night and day. Neighbors of the Fort can only hope that all these new bldgs. don't have tons of mechanical on top of them.

Name Deleted

From: Rick Sepler [rsepler@cityofpt.us]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2008 12:51 PM
To: Name Deleted
Subject: Fort Worden Learning Cntr.

Washington State Parks is facilitating Environmental Review (SEPA) on the proposed Ft. Worden Master Plan. They are preparing a SEIS (Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement) which is a pretty rigorous level of review. As the proposed Master Plan is programmatic (i.e. it is an overall plan and not specific to a project or set of projects), new or expanded uses or structures in the future (that are not exempt) will have to do supplemental environmental review (which will give us another chance down the road to look at impacts more specifically).

We have asked Parks to run their programmatic alternatives through our Transportation Model. This will give the City an accurate picture of the effect of traffic from the proposal on our streets. This analysis will also identify both Washington State Parks \$ contribution to remedy any deficiencies they cause and the timing of such contributions.

We also plan on addressing existing deficient roads (no shoulders, sidewalks, etc.) serving the park. It is likely that Parks will also contribute their "Fair Share" portion of costs to remedy these. State law is very specific - we can ask Parks only to pay for their fair share of expenses associated with impacts - i.e. they can't be compelled to pay for pre-existing deficiencies.

In general, we get far more from Fort Worden than it cost us. For example, they are the largest contributor to LTAC funding, largest customer for water (they pay for it), significant economic contributor to the local economy, etc.

As far as water, I have been assured by the Public Works Director that we have an ample supply to serve our community - including the anticipated growth at Fort Worden - for the foreseeable future.

Please give me a call (379-5081) if you wish to discuss this further - or if you have question.

Rick

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2008 9:49 PM
To: Burke, Kate (PARKS)
Cc: Herzog, Peter (PARKS)
Subject: Public Meeting Notice

Kate,

Thank you for the meeting notice. I'd like very much to attend and cannot because of previous plans. I hope others from the surrounding neighborhood can make the meeting. Please let me share my conviction that six days' notice is insufficient for a public meeting of any sort, much less one about the future of Fort Worden. I respect the hard work you are doing on the fort's future and know how important it is to have local understanding and buy-in. For meaningful public participation (and to avoid the appearance of haste and exclusivity) it takes, in my opinion, at least several weeks' notice to give stakeholders a genuine chance to participate.

In addition, it would be great if you'd post on the Part II planning area of the fort's Web site an agenda for the meeting and substantive background materials so that participants could use the meeting to comment and ask questions thoughtfully rather than receiving information for the first time. If the Web site could bring people up to speed in simple, clear language (in place of current materials rendered in opaque bureaucratese), that would be a terrific step toward transparency and public trust.

Kate, from the couple contacts we've had, I very much respect and appreciate your expertise and sincerity. I'm really glad to know you're there. That's why it puzzles me when the fort's public outreach is lacking functional transparency and clarity. If it'd be useful, I'd be happy to amplify. In any case, I'll look forward to hearing what I missed.

Best,
Name Deleted

Cc: North Beach Neighborhood group

-----Original Message-----

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2008 4:54 PM
To: Herzog, Peter (PARKS)
Subject: Lifelong Learning and expense

A multitude of resident partners will create a shared economy that supports state of the art programming in the arts and culture, health and wellness, natural science, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation.

Sir, What is a residential partner? I'm guessing hotel/motel and restaurants/coffee shops. On another note, who pays for street improvements and maintenance over the years from increased traffic. Hopefully not the citizens of Port Townsend. Will there be state requirements concerning sidewalks to handle increased pedestrian traffic, what about bike lanes. There are none now in the area. How on earth will this get paid for.

Furthermore what about water, do you know that we only have a single source for this town? Who will have priority in times of shortages? Have these questions been addressed?

Thank you, Name Deleted

Dear Kate --

In response to this week's *Leader* article and a cursory review of the Fort's long range plan (Project Status Report – January 2008) and companion "Fort Worden Vision, Mission, Values, and Principles," obtained online, I'd like to offer a few thoughts. I do this with the idea that the film festival might one day make use of the services being discussed at the Fort, either through contracting for services or joining directly as a lifelong learning center partner. (As we approach our 10th anniversary — in 2009 — the board of directors has only begun to discuss the festival's future in its second decade. But, the potential of Fort Worden as an enhanced center for creative as well as recreational opportunity is such that we cannot let possibilities slide by.)

- I'm hoping the leading conclusion ("First and foremost, Fort Worden State Park continues as a park for public use, including day-use recreational activities, camping, meetings, reunions and vacations") can be stated to be a bit more inclusive of what the *Leader* listed as themes ("arts and cultural," "educational field studies," "health and wellness," and historic appreciation and preservation") To say "first and foremost" is to say "most important;" perhaps that's what's intended, but as a potential partner I found that it narrows the vision of "Fort Worden (as) a legendary gathering place where people are transformed through retreat, renewal and discovery".
- I concur about the need for "a cohesive marketing plan" that's "done right." The marketing of Port Townsend as supported by Lodging Tax Advisory Committee, the Chamber of Commerce, and, frankly, Main Street is an example of the caution the Fort consultants' stated concern. Their efforts are much too scattered.
- In the statement about the primary target market, it would be consistent if the list of "a diverse number of groups" of target markets was expanded to include "cultural" groups.
- Marketing to the age (35+) and income (more than \$56,000) groups will indeed require more "private accommodations" (more than "semi-private") if the effort is to reach its potential. While I hope the intention is to keep Fort Worden as a moderately priced alternative to the usual over-priced conference facility, the people in the demographics this plan wants to target require certain amenities. "Semi-private" rooms don't quite cut it. It's possible to have both, but the proportionality will be the sticky part.
- Some kind of group transportation (expanded electric golf carts, for instance) would be helpful to older visitors who have difficulty walking long distances or are no longer able to maneuver bicycles.
- You and I once discussed the possibility of the film festival making use of the Wheeler Theatre for our event programming. We still need to fill some seats in the venues we have, but the Wheeler, since it was originally designed as a movie theatre, might be a good addition when that time comes. Replacement of the seats at the Wheeler is critical to any decision on our part. Since we repeat screenings at various venues, festival-goers tend to fix on a specific venue to see most of the movies on their lists of "must-sees." That often means they'll stay at one theatre for three or four movies a day. That would be hard to do with the seats at the Wheeler. I can barely sit in one for two hours as it is. This, perhaps, is already part of the plan, but since I didn't see it in the materials, I thought I'd raise the concern.
- On a purely personal level, I agree with the expressed concern in this week's *Leader* about expanding campground sites to the area of the trail from the cemetery to Chinese Gardens. Given the terrain, there are few relatively level walking trails on the Fort grounds. To introduce campsites to this area would be to destroy it for nature walkers.

There is, I admit, a certain presumption in my framing comments about the Fort plan to the needs of the film festival. But because we have begun discussions with Thatcher about possible collaboration, I didn't want to pass an opportunity for input. Whatever our future relationship, I think the development of the Fort into a lifelong learning center is a terrific idea. The collaborative model as I understand it will allow for prime expansion of cultural and recreational opportunity without redundant (and expensive) organization. That's not a bad thing.

Best,

Name Deleted

Hi Kate - Just in case you don't remember me. I'm the newbie on the advisory committee.

Implementation of a long range plan along the lines of this report would create a wonderful park with tremendous benefits for both the State of Washington and the local community. The report can act as a roadmap or a set of guidelines for the future. However, it certainly will be a major undertaking with a lot of work required to set up an organization that can make it all happen over a number of years.

What is the primary objective of the effort? Early on, I got the impression that achieving a relatively modest increase in revenue in order to reduce the contribution from the state was the goal. This could be achieved by increasing overnight stays during the "shoulder" months by a couple of percent. This report provides a map for a "world class" state park. I certainly hope it is the latter.

Much is made of the need for comprehensive programs by combining the activities of more than one partner in order to make the park more of a destination. This will require that all the partners would need to think in terms of what is best for the park, not just their entity. Would it be advisable to make sure any new partners understand and agree to this?

Unless I missed something, the financial section does not discuss the capital requirements. I expect they will be very large and that the state will be expected to pick up a substantial part, if not all, of it. Do you think the return on investment will be attractive to the state?

The suggestions for the placement and construction techniques for parking are excellent. Certainly improved parking is required for major events. However, the report seems to call for substantial increases in parking. This doesn't fit with the concept of getting the required revenue increase by increasing the length of stay during the "shoulder" months. I guess this goes to the question of the objective.

A real positive for me is the report on plumbing, electrical, sewage, etc. I was concerned that the infrastructure would be in worse shape.

The latter part of the report uses the term "will" a great deal and refers to the hotel as "planned". The implication is that much of this has been agreed to. Is this correct?

The use of a non-profit entity as the governing organization is the only way to go. Centrum, as an organization, can provide experience and expertise to the new entity. This could even mean having some key Centrum personnel in its management structure. However, care must be exercised that Centrum not be compromised in any way. Too many business organizations have faltered and died by excessive growth or movement of key personnel to other assignments.

Kate, I foresee an enormous amount of work ahead to make this proposal a reality. Please call on me if I can be of any help in this endeavor. I really feel passionate about the opportunity and am ready to commit substantial time over a long period.

Name Deleted

RESPONSE TO FORT WORDEN LONG RANGE PLAN PUBLIC MEETING
May 27, 2008

Since most people in Port Townsend know me as Co-founder, with Name Deleted, of the Port Townsend Marine Science Center, I'd like to start by explaining my much larger connection to Fort Worden State Park (FWSP). Since moving to Port Townsend in 1980, I've been involved with the Park, both as a paying customer and as a volunteer, in the following ways:

- Participant and volunteer in Centrum Fiddle Tunes, Ethnic Dance Week, Blues Week and this year,

at the Writers' Workshop

- Developer and teacher in Centrum Water World spring residential program
- Teacher and volunteer at Bill Evans Modern Dance Workshop
- Renter/user of park family vacation housing
- Short-term resident and participant in Hostel activities
- Camper in park campgrounds
- Current participant in NIA classes in park gym
- Nature curriculum developer/instructor for students, teachers and families, with content based on FWSP natural features – beaches, woods, shoreline, geology, bluffs, forests, lagoon and pond. Many of these activities are now part of PTMSC's ongoing curriculum; others are used regularly with local home school students.

FWSP has been my second home – truly – for 28 years. It has my greatest affection and appreciation.

I recently attended the PROS /BCRA/WSP meeting at the Commons as an interested individual; I am neither on the staff nor the board of PTMSC currently. Since then, I've examined the maps displayed and read the report distributed at the end of the meeting. I appreciate the time and work that Park staff, partnering nonprofits and the consultant have put into this process; I learned a great deal from their report. I understand very well that the report presented only tentative proposals rather than conclusions written in stone. However there was an air of inevitability in the manner in which several proposals were presented. This letter will present a few of my concerns.

“STATUS QUO”

In speaking of the current situation at FWSP, it was said that maintaining the status quo is not an option. I challenge the use of the phrase "status quo" and the implications behind that choice of words. In the 28 years that I have been an active park user and participant, FWSP has never been static. Despite a persistent lack of adequate funding, significant improvements have taken place to the FWSP physical plant:

- Improvement of stage and lighting facilities in Wheeler Auditorium
- Reconstruction of blimp hangar as concert hall by Centrum in partnership with WSP
- Repair of PTMSC dock in partnership with Army Corps of Engineers
- Restoration and repair of Building 502, with PTMSC, for use as Natural History Exhibit
- Remodeling of Building 204
- Improvement of road to dock and campground
- Repair and improvement of rental housing
- Construction of a new conference/dining hall/coffee shop facility
- Remodeling and restoration of gym by Madrona Mind Body Institute, in partnership with WSP
- Remodeling of JFK
- Remodeling of part of concrete building by Port Townsend Woodworking School, in partnership with WSP
- Opening of boat/bicycle rental facility on the beach
- Introduction of accessible entrances to many buildings
- Remodeling of Canteen at the beach
- Many more that I'm sure I've missed

Does this seem like a “status quo?” Not to me. Does it reflect an inability to manage the Park? Not to me.

In addition, WSP and the FWSP managers have strongly and successfully extended the Park's reach to a larger community. They have:

- Helped re-negotiate the parking fee originally imposed on all state parks
- Opened a centralized Visitors Center
- Significantly improved food services (after years of complaints)
- Started offering new naturalist programs such as the Saturday bird walks

- Locally they have enlarged use and participation in park activities by slowly and carefully encouraging and welcoming new public and private nonprofit partnerships on park grounds: Peninsula College, Goddard College, Madrona Mind Body Institute, Corvidae Press and the Port Townsend Woodworking School, in addition to others I have probably missed.

Does this seem like a “status quo?” Not to me. Does it reflect an inability to manage the Park? Not to me.

FWSP does have serious needs but I feel that it is important to recognize the above accomplishments before yielding control of a public body to an entity which does not currently exist, without a clearly stated mission, without a list of operating procedures and without a plan for oversight. The consultant might answer that these will be developed once the overall plan is agreed upon. But I cannot imagine giving my approval to any group without these omissions being corrected in advance.

It is rumored that Centrum would like to take on that role. Much as I respect and support Centrum, I cannot imagine approving even that body as the managing entity without the above-mentioned omissions being corrected in advance. Although there may seem to be an advantage in having an entity very familiar with the Park serve in that new role, I foresee potential conflicts of interest in having the managing entity also be one of the park nonprofit partners. A clearly stated Memorandum of Understanding delivered now, for public comment, might relieve that concern.

WHAT DOES FWSP NEED?

1. More money

Maintaining old buildings, modernizing them, considering new needed structures, improving technology throughout the park, etc. are all real needs. Would a private nonprofit management entity have more flexibility in funding – from private donors, grants and foundations? In today’s economy and political climate, that seems to be true. I personally would prefer to see generous public funding, since it would indicate that we had the type of healthy governmental attitude towards social policy so common in Europe. However, our country is presently far from such a policy – and decaying buildings can’t wait. I therefore support the establishment of a new non-profit organization for fundraising purposes only. This entity would not manage any other aspects of park management. Overall management would remain in the hands of WSP, the very capable local park manager and dedicated staff and volunteers of the non-profit partner organizations.

2. Better publicity/public information

I feel that WSP’s overall publicity, in particular with regard to the uniqueness of each park and especially of FWSP, is sorely lacking. Current WSP web design and information is old-fashioned, lacking in graphic appeal and fails to convey the excitement and beauty found at FWSP. These comments might apply equally to other parks and so a serious re-examination of all WSP publicity is necessary. A new managing entity for FWSP could address the local issues but only WSP could make the major changes needed to breathe new life into a wonderful park system. At the local level, I am confident that FWSP managers, working with nonprofit partners and support from WSP, could develop an improved publicity plan that would more accurately reflect the richness of FWSP. Such a plan does not require the existence of a new overall management entity. It can start right now.

3. A strong re-commitment to the social and environmental vision that gave rise to the public park movement in America

We – FWSP, WSP, the consultants and the public – have a wonderful opportunity to make a strong, passionate statement about the value and importance of public parks in the 21st century. And not merely about efficiency and the bottom line but about environmental protection, conservation and the importance of green spaces to society as human population grows. We need a strong clear message about the importance of parks to working families and to people with limited means as much as we need plans to increase revenue by catering to visitors able to pay \$125/night.

ADDITIONAL MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

PTMSC

Although I do not have any official position with the organization, I am still actively involved, especially in its work with young people. More than any other park partner, PTMSC primarily serves kids – in direct service, by working with their teachers and by finding scholarship money for them to attend programs free. I can't help looking at the FWSP plans and wondering where the inexpensive dorm housing is ...and what financial arrangements will be made for meals for low-income students. Will FWSP ever have subsidized meals for low-income kids, as schools provide? As FWSP increasingly tries to attract adults with money, the needs of youth – rural, urban, minority, low and middle income - should always have a high priority. I see only a vague reference to bunk dormitories in the report, but with no numbers. Numbers seem to be important only when measuring dollars.

Environmental Awareness

With each passing day, it becomes clearer that FWSP is an extraordinary site to be appreciated and also carefully protected. Every beach plant, each woodland path, each body of water within the park should be protected from both excessive human use and excessive signage. Each view of the San Juan Islands, of Mt. Baker, of Admiralty Inlet is a reminder of a complex ecosystem currently becoming strained by an increasing human population. To consider re-opening FWSP roads in an era when even the US Forest Service increasingly plans to close roads seems absurd to me. The roads are important for historical purposes only, showing how munitions and people reached the bunkers in the past; they should be available for public walking use only.

Although I understand some of the reasons for the desire for another entrance to FWSP, I have great concerns about using the entrance near the cemetery. In particular, I am concerned about the large wetland that borders the cemetery, is culverted under the current road and ends in what my students and I call Hidden Pond. It has been one of my primary teaching and study areas for more than five years. Although the pond was deliberately excavated sometime in the past, it and its adjacent wetlands now serve as rich natural environments, populated by frogs, salamanders, a variety of ducks, raccoons, river otters and numerous aquatic insects. The surrounding forest is a mix of deciduous and coniferous trees, many 80-100 years old (I believe) that results in high bird diversity (Black-headed Grosbeak, Western Tanager, Swainson's Thrush, Olive-sided Flycatcher and others). Furthermore, the roadside area earmarked as an RV holding area is unusually rich in mushroom diversity and also abuts the walk-in, primitive camping area.

Any construction or disturbance in this area is to be avoided. To consider one of the loveliest and most secluded natural areas of the park as an entry for RV's is, I believe, a mistake. Moreover, in an era of rising gas prices and concern about carbon footprints, it seems particularly foolish to plan for a future that caters to gas-consumptive RV's and their need for pavement, especially when such a plan requires the removal of large trees that sequester carbon dioxide.

Instead, I'd like to suggest as an example of true conservation, the efforts and successes of the PTMSC Botany Study Group Beach Restoration Project. Volunteers are not only working hard – and succeeding - in protecting the threatened community of plants along the beach but are also engaging in informal conversations with visitors curious about their work. The volunteers have found that when visitors understand the importance of the natural environment and are given an alternative that protects that environment, they are proud to “do the right thing.” Surely FWSP can follow that example and engage in protection and restoration projects in a publicly visible and educational manner - “doing the right thing” – rather than building additional parking lots.

The Consultant's Process

Since I had not been involved in any prior meetings between FWSP, its nonprofit partners and the consultants, my reactions are based only on the meeting of May 27, 2008. I understand that the meeting was designed for the public to merely hear the report rather than take significant input from the public. I think the report should have been placed on the web one week before the meeting, with ample notice encouraging the public to read it fully before the meeting. Sticky notes do not replace thoughtful public

discussion nor does letter-writing to state park officials. We needed time to examine the maps and diagrams and time to raise issues so that the consultant would have the benefit of hearing genuine public discussion, not merely abbreviated phrases that fit on a sticky-note. I suggest that future meetings have a more balanced allotment of time between presentations and public discussion.

Wording

1. I winced to see the phrase "Puget Sound Academy" in referring to possible PTMSC programs or to hear the minor correction, "Inland Sea Academy." I understand that the phrase is just that of the consultant, not of PTMSC but I do want to clarify the issue. The word "Academy" relates to formal schooling only, not to the experiential programs offered in alternative settings by PTMSC. Even the National Science Foundation has long recognized the distinction between "formal education" and "informal education." It funds both categories. Formal education consists of schools at all levels. The category of informal education includes the highly effective science museums nationwide, science television and radio programs, community organizations presenting science, community science participatory programs, youth groups and parks (local, state and national). PTMSC is a leader in the field of informal science education; it need not plan to offer an Academy, regardless of name.

2. Instead of "Educational Field Studies," I'd prefer "Environmental Field Studies." I have found that the overuse of the word "education" results in self-exclusion by people who were unsuccessful in formal school but who like to learn and are eager to take part in less formal programs.

3. The term "vanishing trades" was used in referring, I believe, to glassblowing and finish carpentry. The emphasis in that phrase, I believe, is wrong; instead it should reflect "revival" or "renaissance" of those skills.

Conclusion

I understand that FWSP will still be considered a public park under the changes being contemplated. The report makes it seem that this decision has already been made and that only the details need be filled in. As explained above, I support the maintenance of all management of FWSP within WSP, with the exception of the establishment of a fundraising nonprofit entity, to meet the financial challenges the park now faces.

I have been a strong lifetime supporter of public education, public libraries and public parks. I've traveled in European countries and seen the strong support given to those institutions there; indeed public support usually extends to the arts and medical insurance as well. It saddens me to see this country move even further from such policies than we have been in the past. I believe it is not an issue of wealth vs. poverty but rather of our misplaced societal priorities.

Thank you for considering these thoughts.

Name Deleted

PORT TOWNSEND PHOTOCLUB

The following are the comments of the Port Townsend Photoclub on the Long Range Development Plan for Fort Worden State Park:

The PT Photoclub (Club) strongly supports the Arts and Culture portion of the Plan, particularly the areas concerning the inclusion of photography related activities within the park.

Specifically the Club would recommend and support the following areas of interest:

1. The establishment of a permanent location within the park for photography related activities that could be enjoyed by visitors to the park, Club members and the general public. These could include meeting and classroom space, exhibit space and workspace for photographic projects.

2. The establishment of a photo trail or trails within the park where volunteers could lead walks to particular locations for specific photographic opportunities. This could include the creation of a pool of available leaders who could be on-call when activities involving their areas of interest occurred.
3. The development of photo contests of park images for visitors and the community with prize support from various commercial enterprises.
4. Creation of photo-related classes in techniques, technology and other aspects of modern photography for youth and adult audiences, either as part of other ongoing activities or a stand-alone annual conference.
5. Work through the park gift store and Friends of Fort Worden to develop photo sales opportunity that could benefit the artists as well as bring additional income to the Park.
6. Consider the creation of an "Artist in Residence" program in conjunction with other areas of art interest to help showcase art opportunities in the park and assist in the management and development of the various Art and Culture projects.

The Port Townsend Photoclub is a volunteer organization of over 65 active members in the Port Townsend area. It holds monthly meetings and sponsors numerous field trips, lectures and classes that are open to its members and the general public. It also conducts various contests for its members and provides volunteers for public events such as the Jefferson County Fair. It has a membership only web site and one open to the public.

For further information contact: Names Deleted

greetings-

i have been camping in the upper campground for many, many years. I keep coming back to ft. warden because it is quiet and one is able to escape the crowds and tourists of pt. townsend. i generally only camp during the week avoiding the many festivals which take over the fort.

my hope is that the new plans for fort warden dont destroy the quiet areas. over the years the city of port townsend has lost its more artsy , bohemian appeal - the very thing that made it a destination for many shoppers from the seattle area. i know many who used to make the trip up to p.t. for the ambience and the unique shops for holiday shopping ...that stopped when the town started getting a bit too mainstream.

someones misguided idea of what tourists need to see- the same shops one can find anywhere. it became 'safe' and almost contrived for the tourist... people used to come to port townsend for its uniqueness, not the facade of its former self i see it has become.

i would hate to see fort warden loose its soul. i know that revenue can be made without destroying the very thing that brings people to the fort

recently i spent a night camping there. it was so good to see kids obviously there for a camp, using the facility as a learning center. I also noted that that place could get very small if it was expanded and built up. increased vandalism in the batteries and more dollars required for maintenance and repair could be a price paid by over use.

the allure of that area is its history. its space. its simplicity.

Name Deleted

Hi Kate,

You recently received comments on the Fort's Preliminary Recommendations drafted by Name Deleted on behalf of the board of the Jefferson County Farmers Market. As secretary of that board for the past 4

years, I want to personally echo that points that Name Deleted made and urge you most strongly to ensure that the promotion of a local food economy is foremost on the long term educational agenda of the Fort. In reading the recommendations I felt like there was a complete disconnect between the approach of the consultants and the culture of Port Townsend as it has been articulated so frequently in town meetings (two of which have been held recently), by the city council (in, for example, our ordinance regarding formula retail stores), and by the constant effort by numerous organizations to maintain and enhance our uniquely local culture.

The consultants' focus on expanding accommodations begs the question, to what are the people who visit the Fort attracted? I would argue that it is, in fact, the strength of our local identity that is a primary, if sometimes unconscious draw to visitors and residents alike. When you all met with us at a board meeting recently I came away with the clear impression that the Fort wanted to become a more central focus of our community by providing more experiences that would serve residents.

Indeed, the prospect of having the Farmers Market located at the Fort to facilitate that shift was and is intriguing. I don't understand how expanding accommodations for visitors, including destroying one of the park's most beautiful trails for more RV sites, moves the Fort toward that goal? Perhaps that goal has been jettisoned in favor of what may seem to be a more economically "realistic" vision presented by the consultants. I will just say that there are plenty of places around that have chosen to be defined by "economic realism" at the expense of nurturing the unique soul of a place. Please don't let the Fort become another casualty of that trend,

Thank you for your consideration of these points. I know that the problem is a complex one and that you will do your best to balance all the different variables and ideas involved.

Name Deleted

Kate,

First of all, congratulations on the progress that you have achieved to date on the long term plan. I have read the May 2008 preliminary report and am including a few comments for your consideration. They are comments which, I'm sure will be better expressed by others.

PARK ENTRANCE: I really think that it would be a major mistake to move the main entrance to the West end of Admiralty Drive. To state it simply, the traffic flow approaching this entrance is lousy and potentially dangerous. Others have commented re: the additional parking and disruption of existing hiking trails.

BUSINESS PLAN: I really do not like to see a long term plan with only one optimal business projection. I suspect that the consultants income projections are on the high side of their considerations. What happens if you only achieve 50% occupancy instead of 65%? The obvious answer is that plans will be cut back but, will the plan be overspent at that point? Wouldn't be preferable to have a worst case scenario already laid out and approved in case of a shortfall. It would beat having to go back to square one again.

COMMON CADRE OF VOLUNTEERS: The chance of this being totally successful is doubtful. While the "New Park" will require a larger, active volunteer group, will the individuals share an equal passion for the various partners needs and visa versus. I personally, would find some, if not many, of the existing and potential partner activities to be of little interest. Perhaps this would prevent me from being recruited by a "common" volunteer coordinator.

GOVERNANCE: The implication in everything that I have heard or read in local publications is that the governance structure has been determined to be a Non-Profit organization. Centrum has been considered by many to be pre-ordained as the Non-Profit management. While I have the highest regard for and am a supporter of Centrum, I do not think that any partner should be allowed to function as the overall park management. First, it would be a conflict of purpose for

the organization and secondly a potential conflict of interest for any park partner to fulfill the governance role. While a non-profit may be seen as the vehicle for fundraising, it remains unproven as yet in the case of Fort Worden. Also, will the non-profit organization be responsible for funding capital facilities for a potential "for profit" partner who may be unwilling to invest capital without ownership?

LONG TERM LEASE: I question the need to supply a non-profit park management with a long term lease. This would seem to limit WSP's ability to hire and/or fire a "management" firm who is failing to meet WSP'S expectations. One only has to recall the lease arrangement at Point Hudson which did not provide for future planning. It seems to me that a formal but, more flexible management contract with stated goals and controls would better protect the taxpayer's investment in Fort Worden.

Kate, I know that a lot of hard work and \$\$ has gone into the planning. The end result has great potential. Let's take progress a step a time and experience positive results along the way.

Respectfully,
Name Deleted

From; Name Deleted

May 29, 2008

I have some serious concerns about leasing some or all of the functions of Fort Worden to a for-profit or non-profit organization. As I noted on my sticky note, The Port of Port Townsend had an extremely poor experience with the Point Hudson master lease and the only solution was time—40 years. We don't know what will happen next year much less 10, 25 and 50 years from now.

It occurred to me while reflecting on my concerns that the Port model of today might be a good example to consider for Fort Worden. The Port is essentially a property manager which provides opportunities for others to prosper.

The Boat Haven is the most notable Port property which consists of a multitude of activities ranging from boat repair and construction to restaurants, food shop, furniture repair, beer brewing, etc. The Port leases buildings (Gold Star Marine, Blue Moose Cafe, and PT Brewery for example) and leases ground to private building owners (Townsend Bay Marine, Shipwrights Coop, Haven Boat Works and others).

The variety of Port functions is particularly obvious at Point Hudson with three restaurants, a B&B, rigging and sail making, boat repair, plus a marina and RV park. The oyster hatchery in Quilcene and the airport add to the Port's diversity.

The Port has yet to flip a single burger at any of the seven restaurants on Port property or pound a nail in a wooden boat, or repair an aircraft engine.

The Port does do what it is very good at such as operating marinas, the RV park, and ship yards and travel lifts. These operations are generally big picture items where a central control is beneficial to all stakeholders. Also, Port operation provides needed revenues for operational and capital costs without diluting those revenues.

Non-profit groups have made overtures to the Port to run certain portions of Port activities in the past. I have been resistant to this because the officers and others in the non-profits are not non-profit and working totally in the public good. The American Red Cross and United Way are non-profits with executives earning millions of dollars a year. It is the corporations and not the individuals who are non-profit.

Fort Worden is already on track to adopt this model with the Commons food service and property leasing activities currently in place. A professional transit accommodations firm would be appropriate for the proposed hotel facilities and possibly the conference facilities and activities.

I would be delighted to talk to you about this idea at any time, and I am sure that Names Deleted would also be happy to talk about the port model. The Port of Bellingham is embarking on a huge public-private waterfront redevelopment project and the Port of Olympia has extensive property management projects which might be interesting to investigate.

We are residents of East Jefferson County and have attended several of the meetings, planning sessions and public forums that have resulted in the Fort Worden State Park, Long Range Development Plan, Preliminary Recommendations Report dated May 2008.

We are generally in favor of the Life Long Learning concept and the benefits it can bring to the people of Washington and others. The report contains some common sense recommendations on improvements that can be made to achieve the goals.

With that in mind, we would like to express some overall concerns after reviewing the report.

- The overall report and recommendations appear to be very revenue driven, rather than people driven. It appears that people come second. The State of Washington and the Parks and Recreation Commission have an obligation to provide services to all of the people rather than a select few. If the measurement of success is the amount of revenue brought in, then the state is missing the mark. There should be more than "heads in beds". The focus seems to be a conference center rather than a learning gathering place.
- The report has a focus on Fort Worden as a stand alone entity rather than something that is connected to Jefferson County, Port Townsend and the additional amenities that can be offered.
- It is stated that the target market is people within a 300 mile radius and a "disposable household income greater than \$56,000". This is an extremely limited market. I do not know of many people that fulfill this criteria (Bill Gates and Paul Allen come to mind) and those that do are probably interested in exotic destinations rather than a Life Long Learning Center. Again, this type of comment points to the revenue driven focus rather than people focus.
 - If this is a mistake and is meant to be total household income, then this emphasizes the lack of quality of the consultant's expertise and recommendations. Another example of the latter is pages 35-37 with pretty little pie charts for an extremely minor secondary market.

Names Deleted

Mr. Herzog:

My wife and I are volunteers at Fort Worden State Park with the Marine Science Center and Coat Artillery Museum. We would like to comment on the plan for Fort Worden produced by your consultants.

This is our most important observation:

There's a lot of fine words referring to the "Life-long Learning Center" and some words about the partners' role in the park. However, the emphasis is on using lodging to reduce the amount of funding the state is providing to the park. At one point, it is quite explicit: stating that the addition of 100 private rooms will increase revenue by \$650K per year and thereby reduce the state's contribution to the park from \$860K to \$438K per year. In order to do this, the consultants want park partners to focus on multi-day events that would encourage visitors to stay in the park. This seems to place income from lodging ahead of the "life-long learning center" vision of the park. If the Park service is serious about the "Learning" vision, the plan should reflect that as a priority, with the lodging a supporting aspect of that vision.

Some lesser observations follow:

The consultants present several possible management options, but then recommend a non-profit entity without showing any analysis/justification for that recommendation. We personally like non-profits, but that may not be the best choice over continued management by state parks or even a for-profit entity overseeing all park operations under state park supervision (much like national park service oversee concession operations or the way CA state parks runs Asilomar). Without that analysis one would think the consultants had a particular bias for non-profits.

The consultants assert that a "combined administration" would reduce costs by eliminating some redundancies, assuming responsibility for volunteer recruitment and training, and combining "retail" operations. There might be some modest reduction in admin staffing, but given the diversity in operations/functions of the park's partner organizations, it's difficult to see how combining volunteer programs for Marine biology, military history, performing arts, yoga, etc. is going to work. There are several "retail" operations in the park now, but the items they sell are quite diverse, ranging from books of poetry, to serious works on marine biology, to cannon pencil sharpeners. Those retail stores reflect the theme of the partner. A combined store would not do that so well.

Moving the main entrance to the currently closed west entrance on Admiralty Ave. might help park access for RV, trailers and large trucks, but would have an adverse impact on the residential neighborhood just outside which would be particularly aggravated if those vehicles used W St to access the entrance.

Names Deleted

Dear Mr Herzog:

Your name appears as the contact person on the webpage for the Fort Worden State Park planning exercise; hence this message to you.

Our organization has staged its biennial week-long festival ("Feis Shiatail") of Scottish-Gaelic language & culture at Fort Worden for four successive events, with the last concluding just a week ago. We thus have an interest in the future of Fort Worden.

Members of our Board of Directors & of our Feis Committee were quite surprised to learn, second or third hand, earlier this week that the State is considering major changes at the Park. We were also somewhat taken aback to be told, again, second or third hand, that the deadline for commenting on the proposed changes is TODAY. (The webpage does not seem to give any indication of a deadline for comments, I note.)

Our all-volunteer organization -- still recovering from the hard work of presenting our festival -- cannot officially comment on the recommendations of the consultants, found on your webpage, on this sort of notice. To convene a special meeting of our Board and our Feis Committee on very short notice, to consider rather lengthy documents, is not feasible. I volunteered to take a quick look at the recommendations & to offer my own comments -- not as official Slighe nan Giadheal comments, but as comments of one not unfamiliar with governmental planning exercises. Some of these comments also reflect discussion with our immediate past president (very knowledgeable about governmental planning).

- - -

It is not clear why the people in charge of this planning exercise chose not to communicate about it to groups such as ours that have a track record of use of the Park. Do we not have an interest in the outcome? Would it have been SO hard to send out at least an e-mail notice, or a postcard, to groups with histories of repeated use of the facility? It is obvious to anyone with much grasp of planning processes that this failure to consult with "outside" tenants was no accident.

Given the very short timeline, I have not been able to study the planning recommendations in depth, but there are some preliminary observations.

1. The thrust seems to be to favor the so-called resident partners over "outside" groups such as ours. The *inference* seems to be that "outside" groups will have access to the park for conferences, festivals, & the like, only if their programs fit within the general programs of the "resident partners" . What can one say? This is an affront to "outside" groups; it assumes that the programs of the "resident partners" are attuned to the State's over-all goals for the Park, while the programs of us "outsiders" are not; it assumes, in fact, that the existing mix of resident partners, with their various goals, is the best arrangement, now & forever more.
2. To avoid the obvious problems that such an exclusionary policy would create in a State facility, the consultants are pushing to take Fort Worden out of the State's park system by handing it over to a non-profit corporation (details not apparent). A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the State & the new operators would be in place -- but NOT, I note, a legal contract. (I assume, of course, that the consultants make this recommendation at the suggestion of the client, as is the usual practice.)
3. Experience, at least in Seattle, with this practice of turning over public facilities to the control of non-governmental bodies has been mixed at best, & quite controversial in day-to-day practice. These independent non-profit groups are subject to very little public input or control. That would be fine if they were operating with their own property -- but they are not.
4. The consultants & the park might reply that the public's interest will be protected by the MOU. But who can write a MOU that covers ALL possible future contingencies? I will certainly recommend to our Board that when they meet next, in August, they express a lack of confidence in this change of governance.
5. How the new non-profit corporation would relate to the "resident partners" is not clear (at least, so far in my perusal of the documents).
6. If the State actually intends to keep control over programs at the Park, then the proposal for a new group would seem to introduce a new layer of governance, with no apparent gain.

The "caution light" should be on. More consultation & more transparency should be required before any binding decisions are made -- assuming that they have not already been made.

* * *

A further word about the process. It would be utterly unreasonable for the State, or the consultants, to claim that there has been a public-involvement process here. Volunteer groups cannot be expected to respond to proposals that they only hear about second or third-hand, at the 11th hour. The basic document is 80 pp. in length, & all of us on the Slighe Board -- like those on many other boards -- are up to our eyebrows in all sorts of activities, & cannot just throw aside all other pursuits on this sort of notice in order to bone up on this sort of thing -- even assuming that we were fortunate enough to have a Board meeting scheduled, with spare time on its agenda, in the two or three days between receipt of the report of the notice & the artificial deadline for comments. To paraphrase a notice found in several County Clerks' offices around the State: "Your failure to include us in the process in a timely way does NOT constitute a crisis for us."

* * *

I don't claim great expertise in finding my way around websites, but I did not find any clear indication of the timeline for this exercise -- which would have been a good thing to find. Maybe the deadline doesn't really exist. Maybe there will be actual, properly-noticed, opportunities for meaningful participation.

Yours truly,
Name Deleted

Dear Name Deleted

I'm sorry you have not heard about planning work underway at Fort Worden. We have been working since 2005 over several phases, each of which included extensive public participation.

The comment deadline to which you refer (June 15) was for comments on a set of preliminary recommendations for a park business and operations plan, design guidelines, and site and facilities use and development plan (this is the document on the project webpage it appears you reviewed). This is absolutely not the final opportunity to comment on this project.

This work builds upon two previous phases of planning and has included several public workshops and postings to our webpage. Notices for public meetings were placed in local newspapers. A notice inviting our broader statewide/national stakeholders to review online documents was sent to our park mailing/e-mail list on May 20th. It appears your organization was not included on this list. We've now added you to our distribution list and I apologize that we missed you.

We have heard from other park stakeholders that they wish to have additional time to learn about the preliminary plans and provide comment. We are therefore planning to incorporate input we've received so far into an updated set of recommendations for additional public review.

Our intent is to publish an updated preliminary recommendations document towards the end of this month and hold a public workshop on July 8th, 2008 to hear additional comments in person. Of course, written comments are always welcome and will be accepted through August 1, 2008.

On August 7, 2008 we will bring a formal report on the updated preliminary recommendations to the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, our seven-member governing body. The Commission meeting will be held in Anacortes, WA and is open to the public to come and provide comment directly to the Commission. People on the park mailing list will be sent a post card with information about the Commission meeting and how to obtain the Commission agenda item (document that transmits the updated recommendations to the Commission for review).

The Commission will not take any action on August 7 on this project. This meeting simply provides a chance for Commission to review the preliminary recommendations and allows them and the public) to ask questions of staff. We hope to seek final approval of plan elements at the Commission's scheduled September 25, 2008 or November 13, 2008 meeting.

All that said, thank you for your comments and the time you've invested in preparing them. I want to assure you that we take them very seriously and will pass them along to our planning team and ultimately to the Commission.

We also want to assure you that we have no intention of excluding outside groups from Fort Worden. In fact, the opposite is true. We are attempting to incorporate our resident partners in providing expanded programs and services to add value to the Fort Worden experience. We are also asking resident partners to host conferences and events that, in addition to improving public service, will help generate the economic activity necessary to sustain operation and maintenance of the park. In our view, both "book-in" and resident-based conferences will be necessary to sustain the park and achieve the life-long learning center vision.

To us this is about building on what we have and re-organizing management to work together better and bring in additional resources, not to exclude anyone. I'm sorry you see our work as threatening, exclusive, or worse. We've worked hard to demonstrate the opposite, but sadly missing you on our distribution apparently led you to suspect the worst.

I invite you to call Fort Worden Area Parks Manager Kate Burke (360) 344-4401 or me (360) 902-8652 directly so we can discuss your concerns. Also, look for our updated document and please continue to give us your input.

Thanks,

Peter Herzog, Parks Planner

Dear Mr Herzog:

Thank you for your prompt reply, which I have read with interest & attention.

It is comforting to know that comments will still be received -- free speech is not yet dead. But will comments at this very late date in the process carry any weight? In my experience, the answer is "no". When a planning process has gotten this far along, with the staff, their consultants, & the insiders all on board (& presumably at least some members of the Commission, or why would scarce public money be spent on this), the outside members of the public have little-to-no influence.

Thank you also for the apology for having somehow failed to notice the Slighe nan Gaidheal has been an active user of the Park. It would be interesting to have an explanation of that failure. Here's a public-records request. Please furnish me (electronic format would be best) with the mailing list or lists for notification of this process.

Let me add that having notification in the "local" newspapers (Port Townsend?) is all very well, but Fort Worden is NOT a city park, nor a county park. It's a State park, & my bet is that it draws visitors and "outside" organizations from all over the State & even beyond. It's not just a local concern. If it were, you'd never be seeing this sort of e-mail from me, for example. Q.E.D.

You are to be congratulated on posting information on your website. The various agencies of the State are doing very good work in this regard, & it is much appreciated. How did you expect anyone to know to visit the website, though, if you didn't tell them in a direct way first that the process was underway? Frankly, it's bit much that you began this in 2005 with no word leaking out to us (we were there in 2006, & began negotiating for our 2008 use months & months ago, after all), & we hear about it only now, & not from the State.

* * *

As to the new governance structure, it still looks to me like a freeze-out of non-insider users. Disabuse me somehow, if you would, by pointing in the draft document to the language that protects us. I can't find it.

= = =

Time permitting, I hope to review the other documents on the website. I will be looking with particular interest for the problem statement. What is the problem that needs fixing? Once we have that firmly in our minds, then we can think constructively about what should be done to deal with the problem.

At present, we find In the draft document many different, disparate, & unrelated solutions to problems that are sometimes expressed, & sometimes not. New measures are proposed that range from having more sidewalks on site to a radical change in effective control of the park. For a start, those who are proposing the governance change might break the discussion of that issue out from all the other stuff, for separate, prudential discussion. To apply a simplistic slogan to the concern: You don't need to give away control of the Park to some new group just to build more sidewalks.

Again, my thanks for the swift response. The timing is still most unfortunate for our organization, & so what you hear from me is strictly unofficial.

To: Kate Burke

Re: Fort Warden Park Proposal

The present proposal for a Life Long Learning Center for Fort Worden is a vision to be considered. However, after listening to the presentation at the Commons and after continued research I have 5 major concerns that I think need to be answered before presenting this to the State Park Organization in the fall.

1. Non-Profit status

In my experience and perspective this change would begin the privatization” process. It takes the state park out of the hands of the people and for the people and places control and focus on other agendas...be they good or bad. The question I want to be sure is asked:

What is working and not working with other organizations that have done this direction ...and why? Why is this the option you have chosen? Is it for the right reasons for all parties involved...state, city, people of the state and people of the city or is this one person’s vision that you have bought into because of their dynamic presentation and grant availability.

2. Impact on local businesses i.e. B&B’s, restaurants, communities. How does an additional restaurant, upgraded rooms, and localization of suggested programs help what is already here? I see it taking away from those businesses.

3. Impact on children and the elderly: Why are you proposing redirecting traffic down Discovery to San Juan and Admiralty past a child day care, a middle school, an assisted living facility and a retirement home, not to mention the many homes, instead of the present route past a school that is being closed in 2010? Seems like you are just trading one set of problems for a different set...no net gain...net loss. The response offered was that large RV’s are winding around the downtown asking how to get to the Fort.

There is routing and signage now to the Fort. It is clear and specific. If people come wanting to go into Port Townsend they will come downtown regardless of a new direction. The human curiosity factor is greater than signs when people are on vacation.

4. Impact on the environment: When are natural resources are already being destroyed by private ventures, why would a city cut down old growth firs, a madrona, a hedge of wild rose, and an entire natural hill barrier for the Tree House community to widen Admiralty for RV entrance to the park?

The project has already destroyed enough trees that they promised would be protected.

5. Revenues: The presentation at he Commons showed this change would cut the operational financial losses in half. Why make a change when you are still @ \$400.000 loss? Bleeding is bleeding. I would expect this dramatic a change would not even be considered unless it was a break even venture. With gasoline prices and airlines prices on the rise, this change would create a bigger loss than presently exists if people do not come. Why is that reality not being viewed as reality? It is not a possibility any longer. This wonderful vision cannot ignore this single factor.

Dear Kate,

I read in the PDN this morning that the next FW Long Range Planning Workshop is tomorrow (Tuesday) night. While the PDN article didn’t mention the time of the workshop, I’m assuming that it will be in the evening, perhaps around 6:30? If so, I regret that I won’t be able to join you tomorrow night, but I did want to offer on a few comments.

Am I correct that the workshop tomorrow will be presenting the “Operations and Management Assessment Report” that was updated on 22 May and is posted on the Fort Worden website? If so, it’s a long, detailed document and shows a great deal of hard work from many people. At the risk of sounding like a broken record, I’d like to ask a question. In the “Programs and Services Inventory” section of the

summary only the in-house service providers are listed. For example, only CENTRUM is shown as providing writing/poetry/music workshops and performances, although other off-site non-profit groups provide such activities at Fort Worden as well. (Including, of course, the Puget Sound Folk Harp Society and Slighe nan Gaidhael.) On the other hand, in the "General Services" section the Fort Worden State Park Conference Center is shown as providing "rental venues for conferences and retreats", which presumably includes the rentals for both on- and off-site non-profit groups. Is the report perhaps 'mixing apples and oranges'? In order to get an accurate picture of what goes on at Fort Worden wouldn't it be better either to include both on- and off-site groups in the Programs and Services Inventory, or to break out how many of the rental-nights are due to CENTRUM programs and how many are due to off-site groups?

In general, I still find that the entire report (and therefore I fear the evolving management proposal) is overly dependent upon on-site groups. For example, the report often praises the diversity and number of the activities offered at Fort Worden but leaves the reader with the impression that all these activities throughout the year are provided by the various on-site partners alone. One of the report's key recommendations is to strive to increase the overnight visitors to Fort Worden by a small percentage in each of the shoulder season months but then proposes placing the entire burden of that increase upon on-site partners. From page 101:

1. Improved facility conditions and available services will enhance the marketability of existing facilities to increase usage.
2. Packaged programs that incorporate multiple providers on-site and are planned a minimum of six months in advance will assist the park and its partners in attracting additional overnight visitors.
3. A strategic, consistent, and collaborative marketing campaign supporting overnight services and opportunities at Fort Worden State Park are a necessity for increased visitation.

While I understand the desire to rely heavily on the on-site groups, or the "stakeholders" as the report calls them, I feel strongly that seeking out, fostering and supporting partnerships with OFF-SITE non-profit groups can go a long way to achieving the desired increased visitation targets. The report implies that if there is going to be a new program offered at Fort Worden, it is up to the on-site groups to invent and provide it. Why reinvent the wheel? If you want to 'package' programs to attract more visitors for longer stays, and you acknowledge that the customers you wish to attract are a diverse bunch looking for diverse programs (pg 92ff, pg 102ff), why not let some of the many diverse off-site non-profit groups provide some of the component programs for your package? I would recommend changing the second recommendation above thus: "2. Packaged programs that incorporate multiple providers on-site and/or additional off-site groups supporting the Fort Worden mission and are planned a minimum..."

Will there be a further update of the draft Report following the workshop tomorrow night? I understand the comment period extends through 15 June. Also, do you have an email address where I may submit written comments to the Washington State Parks Commission, or should I contact Mr. Olson who is representing the Commission on the Long Range Planning Task Force?

Thanks,
Name Deleted

From: Burke, Kate (PARKS) [mailto:Kate.Burke@PARKS.WA.GOV]
Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2008 3:51 PM
To: Name Deleted
Cc: Name Deleted
Subject: RE: Long Range Planning Workshop Tomorrow

Hi Name Deleted:

Sorry about the delayed response. I've been pretty busy with many things.

The presentation on May 27th was on the preliminary recommendations for the business and operations plan, the design guidelines, facilities and site development plan and the management structure.

It is posted at www.parks.wa.gov/plans/ftworden2

The plan focused on the partners at Fort Worden and the programs they provide. We are not discounting outside groups coming in by any stretch, but they are not committed to Fort Worden in the same fashion that our resident partners are. Off site groups chose to come here, one year they could be here, the next they could go somewhere else. Our revenue picture does include all rentals and we could break out what Centrum provides easily which is well beyond any one group that uses the Fort. Centrum generates well over a half million dollars in revenue to the park in one year!

The bottom line is we need to generate more programs during the months of November through May to provide more opportunities to the public as well as make FW more financial sound. And the plan is based on a "partner driven economy" - that's what has been the premise from the conclusion of what the public wanted from the first phase and the theme we've been building from in the second phase.

I know we want to maintain our current off site program relationships and create more lasting relationships. I think we are both thinking the same way, but we may not be communicating it very well.

All comments for the preliminary recommendations are to be submitted to me in writing by June 15th.

I can add this note as your comments or if you want to read the recommendations and write another one - it is up to you.

Thanks for being so involved Name Deleted
Kate

Dear Kate,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preliminary recommendations for the new Fort Worden business and operations plan, the design guidelines, facilities and site development plan and the management structure. I have three main concerns about the preliminary recommendations.

1. The proposal potentially excludes off-site groups from being contributors to the Fort's business plan.

I understand your desire to give on-site partners primacy in their access to and their use of Fort Worden assets. In your view on-site partners have a greater commitment to the Fort, and they have often helped to upgrade the buildings they occupy. But I disagree with the perception that: "Off site groups chose to come here, one year they could be here, the next they could go somewhere else." There is no guarantee that on-site partners will continue to provide the same number of programs each year, and even the Seattle SuperSonics are on their way to Oklahoma! On the other hand, to give one small example, in January 2008 my group, the Puget Sound Folk Harp Society, had our *twenty-first* Fort Worden Folk Harp Festival and we have a deposit down for our twenty second festival in January 2009. This demonstrates a degree of commitment that is rare even among your on-site partners. We would gladly commit to a multi-year, continuing agreement with the Fort to ensure our ability to hold our Festival here. And I believe that other non-campus organizations would as well. While you, Thatcher and others have repeatedly said that off-site groups would still be able to come to Fort Worden ("for the foreseeable future"), none of these comforting words has made it into print. Nor has the potential of off-site groups' programming to generate revenue for the Fort been included in the business plan. I recommend you add statements such as:

"Off-site groups will be welcome to present programs at Fort Worden if they support the overall mission of the state park and conference center (arts, culture, history and the environment). Priority will be given to programs that support or complement programs offered by on-site partners."

When in 2007, “the State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) adopted a vision for Fort Worden as a center for life long learning...with a multitude of residential partners creating a shared economy” I don’t believe they did so with the understanding that other, non-resident potential partners would be excluded. I recommend that you change these statements in the Preliminary Governance Regulations thus (italics are added):

“A multitude of resident partners *augmented by a continuing stream of diverse off-site non-profit groups* will create a shared economy that supports state of the art programming in the arts and culture, health and wellness, natural science, outdoor recreation, and historic preservation.”

“While the Task Force recommends that a non-profit is best suited to manage, it is important to assure the public that Fort Worden will always remain a state park and operate according to the vision, mission, values, and principles the Commission has adopted for the Fort. *To this end, the lead non-profit agency will continue to welcome and reach out to off-site groups who can present programs supporting the mission of the Fort.*”

I’m also concerned by comments made at the 27 May meeting about “synchronizing” programming. On the positive side, such “synchronization” could help strengthen individual programs and encourage participants to stay at the Fort longer—for example, they might come to the Fort for a Marine Science Center course and stay an extra few days for a kayaking course. On the negative side, the speaker advocated ensuring that no outside programming be permitted to “siphon off” potential participants from those offered by the partners or to “saturate the market”. Am I to understand that if Centrum wishes to present a harp festival during the winter months, my organization will be considered unwelcome competition for them?

I realize that my small non-profit organization which generates some \$5,000 a year at Fort Worden is small potatoes compared to Centrum which generates over a half million. But please think of my comments as one voice on behalf of many small voices. I think the Fort is missing a bet by not including these small but perennial groups in its business plan. You’ve said that “The bottom line is we need to generate more programs during the months of November through May to provide more opportunities to the public as well as make FW more financially sound.” Instead of counting on one of the on-site partners to come up with new programming to fill that need, why not provide for the continued access to Fort Worden facilities by off-site groups. Provide in your business plan for “new program development”—reaching out to off-site groups that can develop and present new programs at the Fort and then solidifying these new partnerships with memorandums of agreement to commit to multi-year programming. For example, the recent Féis Shiàtail of the Slighe nan Gaidheal generated some \$20,000 revenue for Fort Worden. The addition of one such festival each month during your winter months would go far towards improving the Fort Worden bottom line, while ensuring the continuation of that diversity lauded in the consultants’ report.

In the earlier stages of the planning process I listened as the consulting team spoke about a “partner driven economy” and was inspired. I eagerly thought of members of my harp group collaborating with Centrum in presenting a workshop on bardic storytelling, or a shared concert series, or adding extra days to our annual festival to take advantage of new opportunities. As the process went on, however, I began to realize that my group wasn’t one of the partners you were talking about. I think that’s a pity, as we do wish to be involved in the future of this wonderful State Park that we all treasure and enjoy.

2. The expansion of the northern campground has not been justified on the basis of need, nor examined in light of its potential effect on habitat.

The Long Range Development Plan Preliminary Recommendations document consciously avoids discussing camping at the Fort. Yet the graphic posted as an attachment shows an expansion of the northern campground (on the west side of the Fort) of over double the current size. Moreover, the proposal adds a large “wagon wheel” of concrete pads for full sewer and utility hookups, along with the trenching required for the new sewer line. I believe this proposal needs specific public discussion and justification. First, is there such a whopping demand for non-beach front campsites? Second, will the

current fuel situation decrease what demand there is now, leaving this proposed campground expansion empty? Will the proposed campground occupy the entire currently forested area, so that those now looking across Chinese gardens from the North Beach area will see not a forested slope but a new RV park? If so, this will be a major change in the natural habitat of the area.

3. Opening the western entrance and creating a check-in station at that gate requires support from the City of Port Townsend.

This new entry gate and station for campers and RV's makes sense if—and only if—you work aggressively with the City of Port Townsend to ban RV's from taking any of the other current routes to the Fort. We're all well aware of the problems with the current routes. Only last month an RV sideswiped the Fort's main gate as it exited the Park. So it would be a great improvement to route RV's via the wide San Juan Avenue and with a straight entry into the Fort via Admiralty Way. But if RV's come to the new gate the other way—via W Street—they would have to negotiate the sharp bend by the cemetery and then a 90 degree turn on the blind corner to the gate. That would be far more dangerous than the present route.

Finally, as a military veteran who hopes to one day (in the far future) lie peacefully in the Fort Worden Cemetery, may I ask how you intend to shelter this area from your new noisy entrance hub?

I look forward to continuing participating in Fort Worden's long range planning process.

Cordially,
Name Deleted

COMMENTS OF JEFFERSON COUNTY FARMERS' MARKET, SLOW FOOD NORTH OLYMPIC PENINSULA CONVIVIUM, AND Name Deleted ON THE PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT
FORT WORDEN STATE PARK LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Dated: June 14, 2008

These comments are submitted in response to the request for public comment on the Preliminary Recommendations Report - Fort Worden State Park Long Range Development Plan prepared by PROS Consulting and BCRA Architects, dated May 2008:

I. IDENTITY OF PARTIES FILING THESE COMMENTS

My name is Name Deleted. I am a resident of Jefferson County, WA and a member of the Fort Worden Advisory Committee. I am also a member of the Board of Directors of the Jefferson County Farmers' Market and a founding member and President/Leader of the Slow Food North Olympic Peninsula convivium. I have been authorized by both of those organizations to file these comments on their behalf.

The Jefferson County Farmers' Market ("Market") operates the Port Townsend Farmers' Market pursuant to its mission statement:

To support the development of local sustainable farming by cultivating a vibrant farmers' market that serves as a community gathering place celebrating local farmers, food producers and artisans.

It conducts markets on Wednesdays and Saturdays in the Uptown district of Port Townsend during the growing season, roughly from May into November. In 2007, vendors at the market realized gross revenues of over \$600,000.

The Market currently features the products of 26 food growers, 11 food processors, 6 non-food processors (soap, lavender products, etc.), and 7 food vendors who prepare salmon, tacos, burgers, coffee, soup, and such to be eaten at the market. Unprocessed food sold at the market must be

produced in Washington by the farmer or grower who produced it. The Market very much emphasizes as its highest priority “the growing of healthy food.”

Slow Food North Olympic Peninsula convivium (“Slow Food” or “convivium”) is a newly-formed local chapter of Slow Food USA, a national non-profit whose mission statement provides:

Slow Food USA envisions a future food system that is based on the principles of high quality and taste, environmental sustainability, and social justice - in essence, a food system that is good, clean and fair. We seek to catalyze a broad cultural shift away from the destructive effects of

an industrial food system and fast life; toward the regenerative cultural, social, ecological and economic benefits of a sustainable food system, regional food traditions and the pleasures of the table, and a slower more harmonious rhythm of life.

The convivium currently has approximately 50 members. It shares the same goals as Slow Food USA.

II. THE COMMENTING PARTIES URGE THE PARKS COMMISSION TO ESTABLISH A CULINARY AND FOOD SUSTAINABILITY EDUCATION PROGRAM AS PART OF THE LONG RANGE PLAN FOR FORT WORDEN

As the mission statements of the Market and Slow Food make abundantly clear, both are committed to the creation of a sustainable food system and to community celebration of local food and the pleasures of the table. Accordingly, all three commenting parties resoundingly endorse the establishment of a culinary and food sustainability education program at Fort Worden.

The creation of such a center is particularly appropriate on the Olympic Peninsula. Because of our location, there are special challenges for food and other supplies to reach our area. If by land, supplies must travel across the Hood Canal Bridge, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge or around the Sound in vehicles that must absorb the increasing price of fuel to accomplish that task. If by water, supplies must come across the Sound in a ferry - a system that has been pushed to its very limits as a result of the current ferry crisis and well as the past and future closings of the Hood Canal Bridge. Even with all transportation systems in full gear, it still takes time and fuel to deliver needed products to us. That isolation makes our peninsula the perfect locale for a food sustainability center.

In addition, we have a great deal of local talent and knowledge here that could be used to advantage in creating a culinary/sustainability program at the Fort.¹

One of the leading organic food farmers in the country lives right here - Nash Huber. Attached is an article about Nash Huber’s recent recognition by the American Farmland Trust as its 2008 Steward of the Land. The article cites Huber, a founding member of the convivium, a vendor at the Market and a supplier to Bon Appetit, as “committed to providing local food for his community in order to reduce the impact that food production and distribution have on the environment.” In addition, our Peninsula boasts a cadre of young farmers, passionate about their role in our economy and in achieving sustainability. Many of them are vendors at the Farmers’ Market.

The Fort already has an excellent chef and historic supporter of local farmers, Jay Payne, working with Bon Appetit in the Commons. Among the convivium’s founding members are numerous local food luminaries, including Katherine Baril, WSU extension agent; Hope Borsato, formerly of Provisions and now with Bon Appetit; Micaela Colley of Organic Seed Alliance; Neil Conklin of Pasta Bella; Frank d’Amore of Pane d’Amore Bakery; Nash Huber and Patty McManus Huber; Laurette McRae, owner of

¹ In this regard, it is important to note that all four museums at the Fort - the Marine Science Center, the Commanding Officers’ Quarters, the Coast Artillery Museum, and the Guardhouse, as well as the rhododendron garden, owe their existence to local volunteers.

Sweet Laurette's Bistro; Will O'Donnell of Mt. Townsend Creamery; Rick Oltman of Cape Cleare Salmon; Jay Payne; Walter Santschi of Galatea Café; Gabriel & Jessica Schuenemann of Alderwood Bistro; and Arran Stark of Cultivated Palette Catering who together create an enormous talent pool on which such a food and sustainability center could draw.

We also have a populace with a growing concern for food sustainability as evidenced by the success of the Market. It is also interesting to note that last month 160 people from the Peninsula attended an all-day seminar in Blyn on sustainability entitled "Food for our Future" sponsored by the Olympic Community Action Program.

III. THE PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FAIL TO ADDRESS THE NEED AND DESIRABILITY FOR A CULINARY AND FOOD SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM AT THE FORT

Up until the release of these Preliminary Recommendations, it appeared that the Fort was well on its way to establishing a culinary instruction program. Specifically, as of this April, 2008, PROS Consulting advised that its research showed that the number one primary area for program growth at the Fort was "culinary instruction" and that such programs were very popular and would be the highest yielding for the Fort. It further advised that in order to establish such a program, a demonstration kitchen would be required. Inasmuch as these sorts of programs are intended to be a primary draw to bring more visitors - and particularly overnight visitors - to the Fort, it would seem to follow as the night the day that the Preliminary Recommendations would strongly endorse institution of such a program. However, to the contrary, nowhere in these Preliminary Recommendations is there even a word about establishing a culinary program as part of the long range plan for the Fort! It is not mentioned as a subject area for destination learning programs (pages 24-28), nor is there any mention of creating a demonstration kitchen in the site and facility use plan (pages 47-63).

IV. THE LONG RANGE PLAN NEEDS TO BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE ESTABLISHING A CULINARY/SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM AT THE FORT AND CREATING A DEMONSTRATION KITCHEN AND OTHER CULINARY FEATURES AT THE FORT

Not only has PROS Consulting determined that culinary instruction would be the Fort's best, highest yielding opportunity for attracting visitors to destination learning programs (with the concomitant increase in accommodation revenue), but combining this with food sustainability education will make it even more timely and appealing, as well as serve the Washington State Parks Commission's mission "to model the principles of sustainability in stewardship of its natural, cultural and recreational resources."²

Our state already has a reputation for leading the country in being "green." As a state, Washington is a trailblazer in sustainability, largely because that is an important value to our citizens. As such, establishing a culinary/sustainability program at the Fort would clearly serve the goal of our legislature in establishing the state park system "for the benefit and enjoyment of all the people of this state" (RCW 79A.05.135) and to "maintain and enhance ecological, aesthetic, and recreational purposes" (RCW 79A.05.305).

The Fort is a perfect venue for a food and sustainability center in our state. We have the need and the talent to create something very exciting. Among the ideas that have been discussed within the local community for culinary and sustainability resources at the Fort are the following:

- Planting a culinary garden.
- Establishing a community garden, possibly in the former Chinese Gardens site which once hosted farms that fed our community.
- Creating a demonstration kitchen for cooking classes.
- Creating a food processing center, which could include cooking and freezing produce, canning,

² Sustainability Plan for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission.

- curing, drying, smoking, etc.
- Establishing a culinary library.
- Hosting culinary reading and film groups.
- Hosting the Farmers' Market.
- Creating a program to promote sustainability by educating consumers on best practices, teaching sustainable agricultural methods, and promoting sustainable products - both food and non-food.
- Establishing outreach programs to educate K-12 students about food, nutrition and farming.
- Developing community programs for the off-season, such as community fireside dinners, afternoon teas, a holiday coffee klatsch, and intimate music and dramatic performances taking place in the warmth of the lobby fireplace area of the Commons.
- Providing a site for seminars on subjects as diverse as sustainability, native foods, farming, fishing, foraging, Northwest cuisine, Victorian cuisine in the Northwest, diet and health, food and global warming, food and literature, foods of other cultures and times - the options really are endless.
- Installing a fish cleaning table with a sink and running water near the cookhouse.
- Establishing a full-time retail outlet to sell local food products and earth friendly, sustainable non-food items.
- Hosting an annual seed swap for farmers in conjunction with a program to give them some guidance as to the anticipated needs of Bon Appetit, the Co-op, and other large buyers for the coming year.

A new facility would have to be created to accommodate a demonstration kitchen, which PROS Consulting has acknowledged would be essential to any culinary instruction program. The kitchen in the existing Commons is not properly designed to function as a demonstration kitchen, plus it is being fully used by Bon Appetit. Other possible sites for such a kitchen that have been mentioned in the course of the dialogue about the Long Range Plan are 1) to return the bakery building (Building T-304) to its historic culinary use by creating the culinary/sustainability center there and 2) to add on to the Commons (Building 201).

Finally, although there has been some mention in this process of prohibiting new partners whose operations might rival those of existing partners, such as Bon Appetit, the fact is that if Bon Appetit is unable or unwilling to take on the task of establishing a culinary/sustainability program at the Fort, then the Fort should seek other entities to assist it in implementing such a program. It is too timely, too important, and too

potentially rewarding to the Fort to delay implementation.

V. CONCLUSION

Fort Worden is here to serve the interests of the people of the State of Washington, including the Olympic Peninsula. The Market and Slow Food, two organizations firmly grounded in the food and sustainability culture of our area, resoundingly support creation of a food, culinary and sustainability education center at the Fort. In fact, up until issuance of the Preliminary Recommendations, it appeared that establishment of such a center was one of the highest priorities of the Long Range Plan. No good reason - or in fact no reason at all, having been given for abandonment of this priority, the three commenting parties respectfully urge the Parks Commission to include creation of such a program as a high priority in the Long Range Plan for Fort Worden.

Institution of such a program will not only serve the Fort's purpose in increasing revenue, it will also serve the interests of the people of the state of Washington and the Olympic Peninsula in furthering education and advancing sustainability objectives. And it would be a wonderful program to have in place for the Park system's 2013 centennial celebration!

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of June, 2008,
Name Deleted

Jefferson County Farmers' Market, and
Slow Food North Olympic Peninsula Convivium

Name Deleted
Director of Port Townsend Campus
Goddard College
205 Battery Way
Port Townsend, WA 98368

June 13, 2008

Hello Kate,

Following are my comments regarding the Preliminary Recommendations Report. I've provided a list of concerns but also know there are many aspects of the report and proposal I agree with including: green building, care and enhancement of the ecological function of grounds, technological upgrades, improvement of on-site (non-motorized or green) transportation, partner collaborations on staff, facilities and programming and the list goes on. We have a lot to be excited about and I appreciate all your work on this process.

Executive Summary:

- Under Site Use and Development Principles (pg 4): In my opinion, the current wording (First and foremost, ...should continue as a park for public use, including day use recreational activities...) is contradictory to the fact that the Fort has been designated to be a Life Long Learning Center. Shouldn't Life Long Learning Center be mentioned in that first passage? Current wording seems to undermine what we're working towards.

Existing Programs and Services Review:

- Table 4 (pg 11) Goddard's student numbers are inaccurate. My concern is that Goddard's contribution to the community is under-represented.
 - MFA Creative Writing is projected to be 69 this summer, a number that will remain relatively stable for FY 08/09
 - MFA Interdisciplinary Arts is projected to be 30 this summer and continue to grow over the next three residencies to a plateau of 70
- Goddard College, (description on pg 15): Goddard doesn't actually "provide" residence and meal service options, Goddard uses those services provided by the Fort and Bon Appetit. Again, the number of students listed is low.

Summary of Financial Analysis and Business Plan:

- Summary of Financial Analysis and Business Plan (p38): This was addressed in an earlier email. Goddard needs to be re-categorized as a Primary Program Partner along the same vein as Centrum. For a consolidation of information, I've resubmitted that information:

Following are numbers that I hope will provide a more concrete picture of Goddard's role and contribution to the Fort economy and community.

In general, our students are on campus for 8 days, faculty and staff 10 days. Goddard currently hosts four residencies a year. We are discussing an additional two academic programs and other continuing education opportunities that would run shorter residencies and not be bound by our academic calendar. (Winter programs!)

Month	Program	students/faculty/ staff on campus	housing/ meeting space expenditures	meal / catering expenditures	totals per residency (paid to Fort Worden & food service)
Jul-07	MFAW (Creative Writing)	74	\$ 33,239.00	\$ 21,302.00	\$ 54,541.00
Aug-07	MFAIA (Interdisciplinary Arts)	21	\$ 17,965.00	\$ 6,202.00	\$ 24,167.00
Feb-08	MFAW (Creative Writing)	80	\$ 45,843.00	\$ 23,510.00	\$ 69,353.00
Mar-08	MFAIA (Interdisciplinary Arts)	36	\$ 17,957.00	\$ 9,492.00	\$ 27,449.00
					Total for FY 07-08
		211	\$ 115,004.00	\$ 60,506.00	\$ 175,510.00

We anticipate that the Creative Writing program numbers will remain stable through Spring 09. Interdisciplinary Arts will grow at a rate similar to that of Creative Writing (last summer was the first Interdisciplinary Arts residency).

These expenditures are limited to housing, meeting space and meals. Goddard also utilizes the services of other Fort Partners including Centrum and Copper Canyon Press.

Summary of Site and Facility Use Plan:

- (Pg 53)I'm opposed to the addition of RV and or camping sites in the wooded area between the west and northwest of the current camping and campus area. This sort of addition would greatly harm the natural environment (including plant and wildlife habitat) of the Fort. It also contradicts the proposed expansion of self-guided nature tours and other programming related to the natural environment.
- I have serious concerns regarding the re-routing of RV traffic into the Fort via the western entrance. As a pedestrian who walks that section of the Fort daily, I observed it to be very dangerous. There is a blind corner and hair-pin turn. I imagine accidents would be inevitable given the size of RVs and that most visitors would be unprepared (from lack of experience) to safely navigate the intersection.

Fort Worden State Park
Long Range Development Preliminary Report

Input from Names Deleted - June 12, 2008

1. Generally we view the whole plan as very positive and necessary for the long term survivability and success of the park complex.
2. Page 5, para 8 refers to "Appendix 1". The summary report does not have any appendix. For clarity, the summary report should notate that the appendix is available on the full report only (if such is the case).

3. Page 6, para 10 we believe that the Visitors Reception/Information desk should be staffed and open 0700 hours to 2100 hours daily, seven days a week, without closure for lunch breaks.
4. Page 8, Kudos to the development of a Marketing/Sales organization and plan. This is long overdue and a MUST for success going forward.
5. Page 9, Customer Fulfillment...an ABSOLUTELY fantastic opportunity to inform clients/guests in "advance" of their arrival of the many value added benefits that Fort Worden State Park has to offer, not only those that are specific to their reservation, but also the full complement of opportunities provided by the park and it's partners.
6. Page 9, Customer Fulfillment...An essential element to manage customer/guest expectations and continue positive relationships to solidify loyalty their return time and time again.
7. Page 9, Key Best Practices:
 - a. "Consistency": Absolutely agree and support a set of standards for consistency!
 - b. "Co-ordination": Great recommendation! In addition to being courteous to partners, etc. this provides improved quality of service to guests.
 - c. Fully support co-ordination of partners through monthly meetings at a minimum.
 - d. "Communication": full time professional staff a MUST. This would likely be the Marketing organization which needs to be a minimum of three people. One strong marketing "leader", supported by one "analyst" and "clerical support person".
8. Page 13, "Responsive Maintenance Program"
 - a. Grounds/Landscaping requires a regular schedule for upkeep as to opposed to being driven by special events and/or the random whim of whoever feels like doing what on any given day.
 - b. Maintenance of camp sites particularly needs to be on a schedule to ensure pads, picnic tables, and fire rings are well trimmed on a regular basis as well as control of overgrowth of shrubbery and bushes and complete eradication of poison Hemlock a must.
 - c. Improved signage throughout, but particularly identifying where the campgrounds are with enlarged up-to-date "You are here" type of maps to assist visitors,.
9. Page 13-14, Coast Artillery Museum and Commanding Officers Quarters Museums are not only of value from an historical point of view but are the very essence of the original purpose of Fort Worden and therefore need to not only be preserved but supported financially. Even though there are no fees levied to either struggling non-profit organization, because of their importance it is our believe that the overall Fort Worden State Park budgeting process should plan for sufficient funding to not only support the capital infrastructure of these two organizations, but also provide some operating funding to enhance and improve their appearance, particularly the Coast Artillery Museum and Artillery Hill.
10. Page 15, Goddard College infrastructure and cost to maintain seem out of proportion to the approximately 3 dozen students served annually, unless what is not stated is that these 35 students contribute sufficient fees to "pay the way" for Goddard's operating costs and maintenance and upkeep of the physical building. A general observation about the lease agreements with partners...there does not seem to be any basis of standardized rates, ie. some amount of dollars per square foot, etc. To be consistent with normal market practices, it would seem appropriate to initiate a standard lease agreement approach for all partners.
11. Page 18, Accommodations Review. Not sure why Camping usage was not considered in this review. In fact for the most part when reading about accommodations, camping is totally ignored, while it would seem a reasonable alternative especially when you consider some of the "packaging" referred to later in the report. Realizing that camping is only a small part of the overall experience at Fort Worden State Park, it is a market that is unique and which has potential for growth and improvement, particularly in the off peak season.
12. Page 27, Historic Appreciation and Presentation: Consideration of a one time investment in enhancements for the Coast Artillery Museum to boost its attractiveness and value to future visitors to Fort Worden State Park. Such enhancements could include but are not limited to:
 - a. additional displays (many artifacts exist that are not available to the public at the present time),
 - b. added video screens (hundreds of photos of the history of Fort Worden, particularly the Gun Batteries, etc. that can be displayed through continuous loop "slideshows" on various flat screens through out the museum),

- c. added audio in the various display areas, including oral history recordings which could also be played or selected to be played through a hands on menu driven system for guests in a well appointed appropriate sitting area,
 - d. enlarged and upgraded souvenir and gift shop area,
 - e. additional signage for Artillery Hill with the possibility of audio assisted walking tours...the needs are great the possibilities are endless. The Coast Artillery Museum, as with all the partners should in fact have a detailed business plan in a standard format consistent with the overall strategic plan for the entire fort. This business plan would present the requirements for improved visitor experiences and overall growth over a two to five year planning period.
13. Page 29, Para 2 opening sentence seems very awkward. Suggest wording change to something like, "...attractive events need to be planned to bring guests for multiple days..."
 14. Page 31, Packaging a great idea! Possibly partner with statewide or national travel agency or agencies and/or Tour Bus companies?
 15. Page 32, Fully support the recommendations re: "Program Planning & Promotions".
 16. Page 32, ESRI data appears limited to "consumer" markets only. What about the huge potential in "corporate" markets for "Business Retreats", "Leadership Conferences", etc.?
 17. Pages 33-37, First priority should be Primary Market for sure. Secondary markets may hold high potential for growth compared to the recent past, but given other factors such as dramatic increase in travel costs, etc. it would seem that markets outside the 300 mile radius should be a much lower priority and may not provide the expected return on investment at this time.
 18. Page 38, Again there seems to be lack of consideration of the Camping opportunities throughout this analysis.
 19. Page 40, Marketing/Communications organization needs to be a minimum of three people, the ambitious intent of this plan cannot be accomplished and sustained with an organization of only one person.
 20. Page 41-45, Should include budgetary plans for growing camping accommodations, ie. occupancy, length of stay, etc.
 21. Page 44, Misnomer, this is NOT a "Balance Sheet" but rather an "Income Statement (or Statement of Profit and Loss)"
 22. Page 45, Sentence one replace the words "Balance Sheet" with "Income Statement".
 23. Page 48-52, Lacking in terms of reference to camping facilities (existing and future). Many campsites require improvements (flooded low spots when it rains), brush and trees overgrowing many sites, fire rings and tables need repair/replacement, signage needs to be added (non existent at the present time), campground rules need to be prominently posted including clarification on 24 hour access (one of the most frequently asked questions asked is related to the park gate closure at dusk).
 24. Page 56, First mention of "new dining center". Not clear where or what this is?
 25. Page 57, Internal Shuttle is a great idea. This could, especially in high season run regular routes between campgrounds and center of park and up to Artillery Hill.
 26. Page 58-61, Natural Features and Formal Landscape Rehabilitation plan for Battery areas to ensure preservation of these historical sites (removing ever encroaching grass, shrubs, etc. from the batteries themselves, plus create "clear view" areas which would have existed in the past 50-100 years.
 27. Page 60, Assessment and Recommendations of the Existing Telecommunications System. Expansion of WiFi hotspots throughout is essential, especially in the campground areas.
 28. Page 60, Area-Specific Existing Conditions, Key Considerations, and Recommendations. Signage, signage, signage...HOORAH!!!
 29. Page 66, Fort Worden Task Force Preliminary Governance Recommendations. Fully support this approach to a centralized management model for all partners. Must ensure the Marketing/Communications team is fully engaged to support any fund raising initiatives...once you arrive at this stage it may be necessary to add another staff person to the Marketing/Communications organization that can assist with target market databases, direct mailing, web site support, etc.
 30. Page 67, Remove the word "in" from the end of the first sentence, ie. "-management will not change overnight."

Prepared and respectfully submitted
Name Deleted

June 12, 2008

To: Kate Burke, Fort Worden Area Parks Manager
From: Name Deleted Non-Motorized Transportation Advisory Board, City of Port Townsend (360-379-2987)
Subject: Long Range Development Plan and Recent Installation of Faulty Bicycle Racks.

The Non-Motorized Board does not meet until July 3 so I will need to write these comments and recommendations as my individual suggestions, not as suggestions formally coming from the Non-Motorized Board.

Two separate topics are covered:

1. Concern about pedestrian and bicycle access to the West end of Ft. Worden
2. Recent bicycle rack installations have been of a faulty, non-functional type of rack that most bicyclists avoid using.

1. Non-Motorized Access to Ft. Worden. The two entrances used by non-motorized traffic to the developed parts of Ft. Worden are the gate at the corner of Walnut and W Sts. for traffic from the Southeast and the gate at the corner of Admiralty and Spruce Sts. for traffic coming from the West and Southwest. My concern is that the plan indicates that the entrance at Admiralty and Spruce will become an RV entrance, which may make it become hazardous for pedestrians and bicycles, particularly for children. Currently, this entrance is heavily used by pedestrians and bicycles before and after special events when the main entrance is clogged with motorized traffic. If this entrance becomes open to motorized traffic, particularly large diesel-powered vehicles, special consideration needs to be made for providing safe and pollution-free non-motorized access. The Admiralty and Spruce entrance has been the primary non-motorized entrance to Ft. Worden since it opens to a relatively level and easily accessible portion of Port Townsend.

The Long Range Development Plan for Ft. Worden includes many nice paragraphs about the need to encourage more pedestrian and bicycle traffic but the specifics in the Plan are focused on improving access to motorized vehicles. This is a fundamental inconsistency in the Plan, especially at a time when fuel prices and climate change can be expected to produce a large increase in non-motorized transportation.

2. Recent Installations of Non-Functional Bicycle Racks. I would like to commend Ft. Worden for its earlier installations of good, functional bicycle racks, particularly the "Wave-type" racks at the McCurdy Pavilion, the Marine Sciences Center and some other locations. However, recent installations of non-functional "Fence" or "Dishrack" type racks, like those at the Commons and the new one at the Gym are not suitable for parking modern bicycles. Good bicycle racks need to support the frame of the bicycle, not the wheels, as well as provide a place to lock the frame of the bicycle. Most modern bicycles have alloy wheels that are susceptible to damage when placed in a "Wheel-supporting" rack. Most people park their bicycles only on the ends of these racks so the frame can be supported and locked. The new rack at the Gym is designed for child-sized bicycles only; the hole spacings are too small for adult-sized bicycles, if someone were foolish enough to attempt parking of a good bicycle. Yet the Gym mainly caters to adults not children. These "wheel-supporting" type bicycle racks should be removed and replaced with "Wave-type" or "Rail-type" racks like the new ones that can be seen in Downtown Port Townsend.

In preparing a supplement to the City's 1998 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the Non-Motorized Transportation Advisory Board surveyed bicycle parking throughout the City and formulated specific recommendations for the types of bicycle racks needed throughout the City. This Plan is currently in

preliminary form and is not yet ready to distribute to the public, but I can attempt to get you an advance copy of the specific recommendations for Ft. Worden if that would be helpful for you at this time.

The proposed new entrance for Ft Worden strikes us as introducing a number of dangerous circumstances. Here are a few:

- Admiralty Ave, between the park and San Juan, is too narrow to safely accommodate the likely volume of RVs with all the cars, walkers and bikers, not to mention the deer and raccoons, currently using the street. Cutting trees and widening the road, if proposed to achieve mitigation, seems akin to "paving paradise to put up a parking lot."
- Turning south from Admiralty onto San Juan, occasionally tough now, is likely to become hazardous when numbers of lumbering RVs attempt to negotiate the San Juan traffic zooming over the rise from the south and around the bend from 49th. Add a pedestrian or biker to the intersection, or a car approaching from 47th St, and drivers may be unsure how to proceed (as some are now).
- What a bad idea to introduce a parade of RVs past Blue Heron School during the summer when children cross San Juan to use the school grounds and there are no crossing guards on duty.

Names Deleted

COMMENTS ON FORT WORDEN PARK LONG-RANGE PLAN JUNE 2008 CONSULTANT REPORT

Areas of Port Townsend Marine Science Center Strong Support for Fort Worden Park Plan

Port Townsend Marine Science Center and Fort Worden Park Mission & Values Alignment—Life-Long Learning

- History, current programs, and strategic direction of the Port Townsend Marine Science Center (PTMSC) are dedicated to learning about, and stewardship of, our coastal and marine environment.
- PTMSC supports Fort Worden Park (hereafter referred to as the Park) that is committed to being a "focal point for understanding our place in the world." (December 2006)
- PTMSC fully supports the Park's values of stewardship, learning, play, a culture of hospitality, and collaboration

Public Access Commitment—Open to "all ages, abilities, and backgrounds."

- PTMSC celebrates the Park as a public resource. We are in essence an educational organization dedicated to the interests of the general public
- PTMSC supports the need for a broad constituency through school and public programs, teacher development, citizen-science activities, and active affiliation with numerous entities dedicated to the protection and preservation of our natural environment
- Through "excellent hands-on, experienced-based education, PTMSC will help create a responsible public stewardship for our environment."

State Priorities—Government Task Force Recommendations (June 08-p. 64)

- PTMSC current programs, and strategic plan, confirm our continued commitment to improved student achievement in accordance with Washington (WA) state's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALR) for science
- PTMSC's mission, values, and programs support the state's goal to improve the "quality of WA's natural resources" with special focus on Puget Sound.

Categories of Program Emphasis

- The Park's four areas of program focus (Arts & Culture; Education Field Studies; Health & Wellness; Historic Appreciation and Preservation) have great potential for supporting individual learning and a holistically healthy population and natural environment

Design Standards

- PTMSC supports the design standards that are dedicated to preserve the integrity of the Park, provide accessibility to all, while allowing improvements in keeping with the scale and culture of the existing site.

Areas of PTMSC Support----with Qualification

“Shared Economy” Improved Financial Vitality of the Park through Collaboration

- PTMSC supports the intent to increase revenues--therefore enabling the Park to remain a treasured resource for generations to come.
- PTMSC supports the principle of collaboration and improved partner communication as a vehicle to support both the long-term vitality of the Park and strength of its partners.

PTMSC affirms its support of the “shared economy” with the following *qualifying statements in italics*:

Park Support & Maintenance Services—PTMSC will:

- Participate actively with Park partners to promote clarity of mutual expectations regarding access to, and availability of, park maintenance and support services.
- Ensure that Park support resources receive timely notice required for support of PTMSC programs and services.

Branding/Marketing/Promotion—PTMSC will:

- Participate in creating and supporting an over-arching brand for the Park.
- Participate in collaborative promotion and communication of Park programs, including supporting time requirements needed for optimum, consolidated program communication.

Resource Sharing/Consolidation of Resources—PTMSC will:

- *Work with partners to determine and implement the appropriate level of resource consolidation that promotes operational efficiency and effectiveness BOTH for the Park--and its partners.*
- *Reserve the right to retain direct autonomy over program and operational functions that we deem critical to our core mission and strategy.*

Year-round & Multi-day Program Development

- As stated in our “Adult and Family Learning Goal” in our newly adopted Strategic Plan, “... PTMSC will provide adult & family experiential learning opportunities that enhance knowledge and respect for our natural environment... These programs also support Fort Worden’s long-range plan and contribute to the stewardship and vitality and appeal of the Park.”

Qualitative Program Improvement—PTMSC will:

- Participate in development of Park-wide standards of program and service quality.
- Support agreed-upon standards in our programming and services.

Program Development and Integration

- *PTMSC will participate in collaborative, packaged-program development that both supports its mission and goals and contributes to the Park vitality so long as integration activities do not compromise our ability to fulfill our own mission and operation.*
- *PTMSC does not agree that the “predominant focus (p. 24) of the partners should be increasing traffic and average length of stay...”*
 - *“Predominant focus” on length of stay undermines the considerable public and stakeholder feedback regarding the Park direction expressed in the December 2006 report.*
 - *PTMSC believes the predominant focus should be developing quality programs that will result in increased traffic and average length of stay.*
- *PTMSC supports the three categories listed under Education Field Studies (p. 26) with some minor changes that are listed on page 5 of these comments.*
- *PTMSC supports program packaging descriptions (p. 31) with minor changes that are listed on page 5 of these comments.*

Aspects of June 2008 Document Which Cause Grave Concern

The June 2008 Consultant Report Signals a Departure from Original Intent (December 2006)

The June 2008 report was expected to develop specificity regarding the implementation of a financially more sustainable Park based on the concept of Life-Long Learning. The December 2006 plan selected a learning option over a conference center focus in order to maintain the cultural integrity of the park, to support access for all, and to ensure that a “learning-oriented atmosphere” didn’t turn into a “market-oriented atmosphere.” The June 2008 plan represents a major shift toward a commercial enterprise which may compromise the Park as a public resource. The document:

- Demonstrates an intense preoccupation with marketing analysis that by its nature promotes exclusivity based on select demographics. The document is replete with emphasis on “primary and secondary target markets”, “disposable income” and other demographic analyses aimed at slicing and dicing the general public into desirable and undesirable purchasing segments.
- Identifies the “primary target for the Fort Worden Lifelong Center” as those with a “disposable household income of \$56,000”—an exclusionary demographic that undermines the Park’s primary role as a public institution.
- Places little emphasis on how the Park will contribute to, and integrate with, the vitality of the broader community of Port Townsend as featured in the December 2006 Park plan.
- Proposes a hotel with 40 new employees—focused on serving the “target market.”
- Places significant emphasis on conference services by
 - setting expectations for partners to develop conferences, and
 - identifying event, business meeting, and conference planners as primary target markets.
- Disregards the diversity of partners needed to support a Park that is BOTH financially viable, and true to its public mission. Learning has little emphasis.
- Places no emphasis on improving gathering/housing facilities for “price conscious visitors eg., school groups.” Some current barracks space will be retained, but it appears that no improvements are intended for those who fall out of target market circles.

Partner Focus—Partner Strength First--Park Economy Second.

The plan affirms that “Increasing traffic and average length-of-stay in improved overnight accommodations should be the predominant focus of programs and services on site.” (p. 24) The idea that the “predominant focus” of the partner organizations is to use the hospitality services of the Park ignores the diversity and complexity of the existing and future partners.

- It appears that what was a “means” (overnight stays and multi-day programs to support Park viability) has become an “end” in itself--with life-long-learning becoming an afterthought.
- The report repeatedly emphasizes the “extensive and incredible diversity of programs and services at the park.” (p. 5). Yet the assumption that these complex and diverse organizations exist primarily to develop multi-day programs to enhance the revenues of the Park ignores basic principles about managing significant diversity.
- Perhaps the managing entity of the Park would do best to see itself as a “holding company” and work to develop a mission-focused portfolio of strong partners who can manage their organizations and also contribute to the success of the broader enterprise

Partner Classification Needs Reconsideration to Support Park Long-Term Viability

The current classification system limited to “Business Partners” and “Support Partners” is inadequately attentive both to the Park’s broader role as a center of learning and to the complexity of the partner organizations

- Inclusion of “Educational Institutions” in the Support Partners makes no sense. The “Support Partners” represent those hospitality and administrative functions that are shared, and provide service to all partners and programs.
- By developing a more sophisticated partner classification system the Fort can ensure that it maintains a balance between its commitment to the general public and attention to activities specifically targeted at revenue enhancement.
- More refined partner categories would enable the Park to develop a powerful portfolio of partners in both the business and public sectors, as well as enable Park management to build contracts, partner expectations, and financial parameters based on a more differentiated view of contributing organizations.

- An alternative classification that better reflects the broader mission of the Park is:
 - Business Partners
 - Public Partners
 - Historic Preservation/Appreciation
 - Educational Organizations
 - Community College
 - PTMSC
 - Service Partners (as indicated without Education)

Non-Profit Management Model Is Not Clearly Explained

The decision to implement a non-profit management model and eliminate the Park's role in managing the operation of Fort Worden State Park was not fully explained. How can people support a decision as significant as this without knowing how the decision came about and allowing time for public discussion? If Centrum is selected as the non-profit manager, there must be adequate explanation as to why they are best suited and we need a mechanism for public discussion. The appearance of a conflict of interest is too strong otherwise.

Accessibility a Core Issue – A State Park Needs to be Accessible for All

The December 2006 Park document indicates that “Fort Worden State Park is first and foremost a public place” with the “majority of the park's lands and facilities...freely accessible to the public.” How can the vision and mission which require keeping the “current level and diverse nature of public access,” be supported when so much emphasis is focused on building and maintaining facilities, services, and programs that serve a limited group? Access is not measured by acreage and pronouncements of openness. Access is a direct function of the preoccupation of the leadership of the Park, and given the June document, it seems clear that public access and public learning are in danger of becoming secondary priorities for Park management.

Suggested Language Amendments

P. 17, second paragraph - It currently reads...”The Marine Science Center raised \$500,000 through corporate and individual donations, and foundational funds to rehab the Thistle Building into the Natural History Center...”

That was a 1.3 million campaign. Why not say...”The Port Townsend Marine Science Center raised over \$1,000,000 through corporate and individual donations, and foundational funds to rehabilitate the Thistle Building into the Natural History Center and improve the PTMSC exhibits...”

P. 25, Educational Field Studies - PTMSC prefers Environmental Field Studies.

P. 25, under Educational Field Studies, in the first paragraph - PTMSC is not an advocacy organization. The word is not in our mission statement nor is it in our current Strategic Plan. We suggest replacing advocacy in that context with: “...to strengthen individual environmental awareness and stewardship.

P. 26, under Marine Science Program, item 3, “Floating Laboratory Tours.” PTMSC likes this idea, but currently does not have a research vessel with which to partner. We've recently partnered with a research vessel but it went out of business. PTMSC will look for future opportunities. PTMSC does not want to be obligated to something that is not financially feasible. For your information, the *Glacier Spirit* and *Olympas*, vessels that we currently use for our birding and wildlife cruises, are tour boats and are not set up to serve as a floating laboratory. PTMSC, however, has spoken with the owners about this possibility. To be realistic, this item could be labeled “On-the –Water Science and Discovery Program” or something similar. PTMSC will give this some thought.

P. 26, Puget Sound Academy. We prefer “Inland Sea” to Puget Sound and the term “Academy” implies something exclusive, like a private school. Was this the consultant's intention to offer a more exclusive

high end program? This whole section under Puget Sound Academy is confusing. Is this a recommendation for something new? PTMSC provides single- and multi-day programming for schools and would not limit these programs to 5-12 or 7-12th graders. We frequently host residential programs for schools bringing younger students, such as Pioneer School from Spokane, WA. This group was here May 21-23. PTMSC needs clarification as to the consultant's intentions in this section.

P. 26, under Citizen Science, item 3 – eliminate “advocacy” and consider saying, “Network of citizen-monitoring and stewardship programs”.

P. 31, Program Packaging, Puget Sounder II – good collaborative ideas, but the per person cost would have to be increased due to fuel prices.

Fort Worden Long Range Plan Preliminary Recommendations Stakeholder Comments – West Gate Entrance Relocation

Dear Kate,

If, indeed, there is planning in the works to make radical changes in the camping areas at Fort Worden, please register my opposition to cutting trees and encroaching upon the wooded habitat for any purpose. I don't know if my words have any impact on a decision made to cut trees in Fort Worden Park.

Other choices can and need to be considered for parking large recreational vehicles. Fort Worden is an entrusted site of natural beauty that serves many purposes. The deer and other wild creatures wander the streets of Port Townsend in search of habitat. I cry out at the thought of new ground being eroded and newly dedicated to the dollar and tourism.

What is happening here?

Name Deleted

Dear Ms. Burke,

I've read about the plan to add new motorhome camping sites to Fort Worden. Please do not approve any plan that requires building more roads and/or cutting trees or otherwise disturbing natural areas.

It makes no sense to try to make the park accessible to more people by arranging for there to be *less park* to enjoy. There is a seemingly infinite amount of already-degraded areas in the country that people can spend time in. Please don't degrade one of the scraps of still-existing natural parkland alongside a populous area. We need this natural area, and we need all of it to remain natural.

Moreover, to specifically degrade a natural area for the sake of motorhome camping seems to overlook the current trend in this country toward "greener" decisions. Global warming has made a large percentage of the American people recognize the damage done by the automobile. These people are attempting to limit further damage. While this movement is afoot, it makes no sense to cater to the smaller percentage of people who ignore the implications of global warming and persist in traveling via motorhome.

Please don't further encourage motorhome camping by building further accommodations for motorhomes in Fort Worden. And especially, don't degrade *any* natural area in the park to accommodate campers. It just doesn't make sense to make "less park."

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

Hi. I live in Port Townsend and have heard about some proposed changes at the Fort which I'd like to give some input on. I heard that the trail at the west end of the park is being considered as an area for campground expansion. I hike there about 3 times a week. I notice that most people who hike around that part of the park (who enter through the park, not north beach), enter through that trail. It is extremely popular. And, for good reason. I think of it as the "avenue of the trees." Seems to me like that is one of the only places in town a person can hike through really tall trees. The amount of oxygen being generated there is wonderful, you can feel it as soon as you enter the canopy. It is important for all of our health that there be places like that away from machine noises. I treasure that walk and beg you to preserve it.

Thank you for your consideration
Name Deleted

Dear Kate Burke,

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the leadership you have provided in recent years in respect to honoring the "thinking local " i.e. the food at the commons and your sensitivity to the folks here in town who highly value the wildness, habitat and recovery state that Fort Worden is in today.

I have heard whisper of the possibility of extending the campground into the forest of bigger trees and was aghast and dismayed. I missed the opportunity to comment on the RV sites that have popped up like warts above the JFK building. That area too is (was historic to me) until the sites and the RV's arrived. I try not to look at them when I walk by.

Please look to the rear of the Mule barn or behind the rental houses, where yet another host RV has sprouted. NOT into the forest that is still in recovery from the cables the military left.

Thanks for listening.

Regards.

Name Deleted

The newly published Preliminary Recommendations for Part II of the Fort Worden long range plan contain a peculiar undocumented extension of the upper campground drawn in the Master Plan Map (p. 64). It shows 10 new RV camping sites in an area that is currently wooded, alongside a favorite walking trail.

I certainly hope this ill-considered extension is in the plan by error. Perhaps so, since there is no text in the document to explain it. If this campground extension is an intentional part of the proposal, please dismiss this most unfortunate suggestion. It would be so much better to add sites to the lower campground where

the ground is already much disturbed, even partially paved, or to choose several other less wooded locations for additional campsites.

Please preserve the existing woods and native plant understory in the park; they are such a big part of the park's appeal. The woods provide the habitat for the wildlife that makes this such a special "city park".

Thank you,

Name Deleted

Hi Ms. Burke,

It has come to my attention that there is a proposed expansion of the upper campground in the Long Range Development Plan. I do not think it would be a good idea to locate this in a presently treed area. I know that area and it is one of the nicer areas of forest in the park. I think if the additional sites are needed (and I think they won't be – I expect less RV travel in the coming years as gas prices increase further) they should be located in either the overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just NE of the Mule Barn; and/or the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground.

I would suggest waiting on building more campsites in any location until you see if more sites are used in the next couple years, or less.

Thanks for your attention and good stewardship of the Park. It has greatly improved under your care.

Sincerely,

Name Deleted

Dear Kate,

I am writing to add my voice to the many who have expressed extreme concern about the proposal to cut down trees and change the area just north of the cemetery, in order to create new campsite loops.

There are other areas in the park that are much better alternatives, both environmentally and financially!

I am outraged at the idea of this proposal and ask you to please do everything you can to secure alternative sites for increased camping. We need that wooded area. It adds so much to the park and offers people the quiet, solitude and connection with nature that many so appreciate and need. I am among them, and my son and I derive much benefit from that very area of the Fort. Please preserve it!

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

Dear Kate,

I'm writing with great alarm and concern about information I have been heard in relation to a proposed expansion of campgrounds in Fort Worden as shown on the map for the master plan on page 64 which would be destructive to a lovely natural area in the park. I frequently walk along the Peace trail and the area proposed for the motor home campsites and would consider it a tragedy if that area were to be paved over to provide Rv campsites. I'm sure that there are far more suitable areas available in the park for more campsites which wouldn't involve ruining the park's still existing natural areas. I hope you can protect our park and keep the preservation of the park's natural beauty a priority. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

Dear Ms. Burke,

This is in reference to the Master Plan Map, p. 64, to which has been added an Upper Campground Loop extending well beyond the present campground to the north and west. The existing proposal would radically affect trail use and is environmentally destructive to some of the Park's best wooded habitat. It would make a roaded, developed area of the well-aged second growth embracing the 'Peace Trail' which begins just north of the cemetery at Admiralty Way, adding vehicles, electrical and restroom development, paved roadway, noise, pets, and some lighting to what is now a high-quality natural area, previously cleaned up after years of military use.

The camping loop doesn't appear in the Building Uses and Development Map on p. 58, and isn't called for in the text of the planning document (see: Upper Campground, p. 72).

I'm not opposed to additional camping sites, but there are at least two other Park sites that would require no trespass into unroaded areas, no tree cutting, and at most brushing some noxious weeds. I would suggest either: the overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just northeast of the Mule Barn and/or the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground.

Respectfully,
Name Deleted

Dear Kate,

You may know me a little bit. As the Port Townsend Garden Club Arbor Day chairperson who with our club and Name Deleted planted a Big Leaf Maple on the green near the Maintenance Building, I am writing

you about the planned development of an upper campground loop at the Fort. Please reconsider this change. The added sites would be useful, but down where there are already roads and utilities would surely cost less. Also, my experience is that campers in a water / beach area prefer to be closer to the water and beaches. And with the woods and foot trails preserved, these campers could enjoy more of the pristine natural woods we all love. As we learn that many decisions we make impact our environment, and that we +can+ do something to help, it is surely incumbent upon a state park to make conscious and responsible choices when possible. Let's put the new campground (s) where we now have noxious invasive (non-native) weeds -- broom, Himalayan blackberries, and poison hemlock, which if removed would benefit the biodiversity of our peninsula.

As a Master Gardner with WSU, an avid grower of organic vegetables, and as a bird watcher, in addition to being a camper to whom it just can't get any better than a campfire, smores, and a hootenanny, I humbly request reconsideration of the planned Upper Campground Loop at Fort Worden.

With gratitude, and Respectfully,
Name Deleted

Dear Ms. Burke

Please, accept my comments regarding the new Fort Worden State Park Long Range Development Plan, "Preliminary Recommendations Report."

- Eliminate the "Upper Campground Loop" as described on p. 64 on the Master Plan Map.
- For additional camping slots, if needed, use sites that would not require trespassing into unroaded areas with minimal tree cutting.

The proposed plan calls for adding an Upper Campground Loop extending well beyond the present campground to the north and west. It appears that this addition would add roads and develop area of the well-aged second growth that embraces the "Peace Trail" and begins just north of the cemetery at Admiralty Way.

The camping loop doesn't appear in the Building Uses and Development Map on p. 58, and isn't called for in the text of the planning document (see: Upper Campground, p. 72). This new loop would add vehicles, electrical and restroom development, paved roadway, noise, pets, and some lighting to what is now a high-quality natural area, previously cleaned up after years of military use.

If more camp-sites are required, please, use sites that would not require trespassing into unroaded areas, no tree cutting, and at most brushing some noxious weeds. I would suggest using either:

- the overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just NE of the Mule Barn; and/or
- the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground.

I am also concerned about the short notice for public comment on the Fort Worden State Park Long Range Development Plan. Early in the process, I had made comments and assumed I'd be notified as to an opportunity to make further comments on the preliminary plan. My only notification has occurred by happenstance due to a friend's third or fourth email.

Please add my name/email to any future notifications regarding the planning for the park.

Name Deleted

Hi Kate,

In talking with many people about the issues related to the recommended West Entrance issue, I heard that some people are concerned because RV's are ending up on streets off the current designated route. I design signage and know that many people don't bother to read signs - so that's probably part of the issue, however, I also know that for a directional system to work, it must consistently direct at every decision point along the way. There is a major decision point at the corner of F and Cherry St. that does not have a sign. I'm sure that's because someone thought it would be obvious to go straight, but what I've learned is that you can't assume people will be logical. Anyway, it might be helpful to add one additional directional sign at this intersection.

Also Kate, I realize you have been getting a lot of response to the west Entrance question. The unfortunate thing is that we (I) seem to write only to "vent" over a concern, and never get around to writing about something we really appreciate. So I'd like to say how much we do appreciate the great work you have been doing at the Fort. We're thrilled with the direction the Fort has taken under your watch. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

Dear

Kate:

I've just learned that the Parks Department is considering adding new campsites at Fort Worden State Park in an area of beautiful woodland that is used for walking and hiking by many in our community, not to mention all the wildlife that lives there.

It is very disappointing that this plan is being considered without easy access to the public for comments.

There are several other sites in the park that would be suitable for extra campsites without destroying the woods, and I'm asking you to consider those.

Respectfully,
Name

Deleted

Honorable

People

with

Power,

I recently learned that you are thinking of turning the small, narrow Admiralty Street into the main entrance into Fort Worden for large RV's and Campers. I live on Z Street on a bluff just above Admiralty. I cannot imagine what the air will be like when RV traffic is baked up and all those vehicles are idling. Do you know that there is a wonderful pond just into the Fort above Admiralty that is often filled with migratory birds? Did you know that one of the foot trails comes right through Treehouse and down the bank to Admiralty? I hate the thought of RV traffic destroying the peace that surrounds the cemetery. It seems that in this time of increased environmental consciousness that it might be time to rethink the kind of camping in the Fort. If you had simple tent camping, maybe people would wish to have meals at the new commons or go into the town and avail themselves of Port Townsend's many wonderful restaurants and eateries. I hope that you will reconsider your plans, and think about what might be best for everyone, and the future of the Fort.

Thank

you,

Name

Deleted

To: Persons of Interest

Re: Proposed West Entrance to Fort Worden and tree removal for parking

This letter is in response to the newspaper article re: Changes proposed for Fort Worden . As a member of Port Townsend Community and of the Tree house located on the corner of W and Admiralty Way, I have concern about a plan that would change the road configuration and main entrance for RV's to the park and about cutting down any trees to make more room for parking.

My main concerns are listed:

General:

- There is a lack of knowledge of the plan. No one (that we know) were even aware of these access issues until this past week. People need more facts, and an opportunity to react to them. For instance, what are the estimated use figures for the new Fort Worden? How many more cars/RVs per day would be using San Juan en route to a new entrance? What other adjustments would need to be made? Street widening? Stop lights? Signs? Trees taken out? What are the specific standards for streets and sidewalks?
- Using the West Entrance substitutes one set of neighbors' issues for a whole new and more problematic set using the other entrance. This new plan will seriously affect anyone who lives on and beyond San Juan, including North Beach, Tree House and Bell St. We don't want to see this issue pitting one group of PT residents against another, because it really needs to be resolved in a much broader way than whose street is getting the most impact.
- Will there be Public meetings on this issue? There needs to be more opportunity for residents to comment.

Environmental Issues:

- Why are we encouraging RVs at a time when we should be driving much smaller vehicles?
- Why are we considering taking out 80 - 100 year old trees to accommodate this new traffic and parking pattern and vehicles that are becoming cost prohibitive to operate?
- The proposed entrance is flanked on both sides by wetlands, on the lower side by a stream, flowing to a pond which is a sanctuary for waterfowl, resident passerines and seasonal migrants;
- A secondary eagle nest is located very close to the this proposed entrance
- There will be increased noise for the Treehouse and San Juan Avenue neighborhood.
- The west entrance and trailhead are currently a quiet entry to the most secluded mature forest in the park. The area's highest and best use is for walkers, runners, baby carriages and bicyclists.
- The proposed parking inside entrance would impact stands of large trees.
- Issue of the Treehouse Community itself....A deeply cut bank flanks the north side. The city was adamant about protecting as many trees as possible in this area, partially because of the eagle's nest. Why are we now considering compromising the health and stability of those same trees?

Safety/Traffic Issues:

- Has there been an analysis of traffic patterns and issues connected with this site?
- Both corners (Admiralty and Spruce and Spruce and W) are extremely dangerous
- An entrance booth at this corner would cause a huge bottleneck at that corner
- Several thousand more cars will stream past Blue Heron Middle School. Increased traffic on San Juan Ave. will impact all residents beyond this area including North Beach, Tree House and Bell St. That area is already a bottleneck and there is an obvious issue with 6th through 8th graders in their ingress and egress from school.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration of this most important issue. Please inform me of any upcoming meetings about this matter.

Respectfully, Name Deleted

Hi Kate, I just received the email about the plan to build a new campground N of admiralty road on the peace trail. I live right by the fort and walk the trail north of the cemetery everyday. I am a naturalist so know that there are many animals that make that area their home. It makes me soo sad that they are even considering it. I am also aware that there is a plan to open up the service gate adjacent to the cemetery for camping traffic. I am worried that this will also effect the sensitivity of this area.

What can i do?????
Name Deleted

As someone who has walked the trails of Fort Warden regularly for the last 30 years, I would hope that any new camping sites not detract from the natural beauty and serenity that the wooded areas of the Fort provide. The present proposal for the Upper Campground Loop site would seem to be a poor one. Please consider less disruptive alternatives.

sincerely,
Name Deleted

Hi Kate,

I was out of town so missed the meetings last week. I have read the material and will get written comments to you later this week. I do want to comment on two issues that have generated considerable discussion in the community. Because they have raised some hackles I suggest that you hold off on firm decisions until there is a bit more discussion.

First is the COQ dilemma which I see as an ongoing difficult relationship that seems to be falling apart. That building is a terrific asset to the Fort and a museum is probably not its best use, even if some group steps forward. I'm not convinced, however, that high end rental accommodation is what it should be. Did the consultants do a financial analysis, comparing revenue as accommodation with revenue from special events like receptions, weddings, reunions, etc - activities that would not require significant upgrading? I'm not opposed to conversion to accommodation but want to make sure we do not miss other opportunities to capitalize on its unique location and historic qualities.

The other issue is the 10 additional campsites which seem to be slipped into the plan without much analysis. The reasons for adding them in that location need to be spelled out so that the local grumble/rumor mill won't get more cranked up about it. I know that campsites bring in lots of revenue and that we have high seasonal demand - and also that some locals want to keep that park pristine as it was when they came to town. We can minimize local fuss with a bit more explanation so those folks who are firing off e-mails don't think that Parks is trying to pull a fast one.

All for now,
Name Deleted

I attended the public meeting on May 27 and have since spoken at length to both Kate Burke and Peter Herzog. I would like to have these comments included as part of the public input:

1- I object to the expansion of the upper campground, as it would involve tree-cutting and ruining the Peace Mile trail, my favorite walk for 35 years. I understand that this expansion has been cancelled.

2-Having the West Gate be the main entrance disturbs me a great deal. It's on a blind corner, already a hazard for bicyclists and drivers. The probable road widening and other traffic-mitigating changes and the definite very great increase in traffic would take from the people in the Treehouse neighborhood the very qualities that have so recently led them to purchase their homes.

Inside the gate, the increase in traffic will cause a constant noise level that will dramatically impact the Peace Mile Trail experience and that of campers in the walk-in campground just yards away. I understand that the roadway would be widened as well, taking much from that currently peaceful corner of Fort Worden. Main gate traffic next to nature trail and campsites is not sensible planning!

The entire main West Gate project concerns me also because there is a wetland adjacent to it (yards away) and on the west side of the little pond there, there is an eagles' nest. The nest is not currently in use, but the eagles move their nests every few years from one to the other of the three nests inside Fort Worden.

Thank-you for considering these important issues.

Name Deleted

Hello

Kate,

Please consider my suggestion that any additional campground development should occur in areas of the park that do not require the incursion of roads or destruction of restored habitat. I am a proponent of camping at Fort Worden, but a stronger proponent of the natural restoration of sensitive habitat.

Thank you,
Name

Deleted

Kate -

It was with shock that I learned of the plan to eliminate natural space for more camp sites at Fort Worden. Please extend my strong disapproval for this plan.

I am very pleased with general access to the park, and appreciate and regularly enjoy the the natural space that is being planned for more RVs. It certainly seems that the option for adding additional RV spaces (not a very lofty goal in itself) could be done with less intrusion on the park.

I would readily agree to write a letter, attend a meeting, or do whatever you suggest to have my voice heard about this plan. Please just let me know how I can help.

Name Deleted

Hello Kate,

I was pleased to see in the Leader that plans for expanding the upper campground are getting another look. I think it is wise to utilize areas that are already open so the park trees are preserved. Since the idea is to expand motor home camping spaces the idea of using the open paved areas in the lower campground are the best idea.

Motor homes don't need the tree protection that tent campers need so if camping is to expand in areas with trees I think it should be for tent campers and that expanding the bicycle camping sites would augment Port Townsend's aim to be a bicycle friendly city.

I was disturbed by the plan for Fort Worden focusing on a target market of people with a disposable income of \$56,000. When I was growing up my parents went through economic hard times when they were

students and later when they were divorced but two things contributed to the fact that even though we didn't have money I never thought of us as being poverty stricken. Those factors were education and

getting out into nature. We visited parks as one of our families primary sources of recreation. I understand the need for parks to make more money in these exceedingly difficult times however I would like to see the efforts to include low income people in the park's long term plan as a part of the strategy that is written down and not just a spinoff of the Lifetime Learning programs. I would like to see this inclusiveness in the language of the mission statement or in the park's long term plan.

I enjoyed the discussion last week and look forward to it's continuation.

Name Deleted

Dear Kate Burks:

I am writing in response to one proposal in the preliminary recommendations for Fort Worden. Adding camping sites for recreational vehicles will add to heavy motor vehicle traffic through Port Townsend, increase noise in the park, add impervious surface and reduce wooded habitat. At present the city and county are working on ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To help in reaching that goal, I suggest adding only tent camping sites at Fort Worden.

I hope that all plans for Fort Worden will serve our climate protection goals. Thank you for your attention,
Name Deleted

The green space at Fort Worden is a treasure not to be traded for vehicle traffic and camping development. Please do not use any more space for motor homes or other reductions of natural areas.

Name Deleted
Fort Worden user
twenty year PT resident

Dear

Planners,

It was with dismay when we learned, just last week, about the proposed west entrance change at Fort Worden. A year ago we bought a property in the Tree Houses Community.

We respectfully submit these comments regarding the proposed changes to the West entrance of Ft Worden:

- Trees! That was one of the reasons we chose to be to buy at Tree Houses. We were very impressed with the community's endeavors to maintain and protect the large trees that are on the property.
- Fort Worden was the second plus for us. A short walk past the cemetery and through the west entrance, took us into a beautiful, quiet, old growth forest where we hike with our children and grandchildren, who reside in Port Townsend.
- We, and our neighbors, are able to walk to Centrum along a quiet, safe, wooded lane through the West entrance.
- We ride our bikes from Tree Houses to our daughter's home on Jackman in North Beach, taking a great deal of care watching for traffic coming over the hill on San Juan toward Admiralty Avenue. We remind our grandsons about the potential danger, when they come to visit us, riding their bikes. With RV traffic, we fear it will be even more dangerous.

We hope you will take the above into consideration. It would also be helpful to us and our neighbors if you would extend the deadline date for comments, for a few more weeks.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

Living across from the Ft, and taking advantage of the trails often, I find the proposal to add more camping spaces for huge RV's and encroach upon beautiful, wooded and quiet areas, is, indeed outrageous. If more camping is needed, please find another location that would not threaten the limited spaces we enjoy, would not involve cutting down trees and creating new roads. Thank you.

Name Deleted

Kate Burke:

I was sorry to hear about the addition of those campground sites. But I have to say that I am not so alarmed at them as many others that I have talked with. Why Fort Worden would need to destroy such a great trail in order to add them is just too bad. There is plenty of room down there with all those along the beach. They would hardly make a statement, at least not the negative statement that this proposal does. I trust that greater sense will prevail.

Best regards,
Name Deleted

Dear Kate Burke,

I am a resident of Port Townsend and a frequent user of Fort Worden State Park.

I am Opposed to the proposal to add a loop to the upper campground, to the north and west of the present campground, for Motor Homes. Please reference the Master Plan Map on p. 64. This area is currently a pristine and rare natural place. Please DO NOT allow this aspect of the plan to be approved. This area is very near the place where Bald Eagles nest and rare Calyspo Orchids can be found. It is an area that is unique in the park and is appreciated for its serenity and beauty.

It's understandable that the Park needs more RV and camping space, but not at the cost of its best assets. Locating additional RV sites at the lower campground or north and east of the Mule Barn are far better choices.

Regards,
Name Deleted

Dear Ms. Burke,

I came up here tonight to write to you with my comments --- and no need! thank you so much for reconsidering this option of endangering intact forest. I look forward to the next opportunity to comment. thank you for your responsiveness.

sincerely,
Name Deleted

Dear Kate,

I am writing to express my concern and opposition to expanding camping into currently forested areas of the Fort. As Port Townsend continues to grow and develop we are continually losing valuable natural habitat. The woods at the Fort have been a sanctuary and one of our most valuable assets, both for wildlife and people. I understand the need for additional campsites, but surely there are other, already cleared areas that could be used.

Thank you,
Name Deleted

Hello Kate,
Thanks for revising the campground plan to include no new forest cutting. I was advised of the change just as I was getting ready to submit a comment. Please preserve the forests of Fort Worden to the strongest extent possible.

Name Deleted

Re: Proposed new park entrance
Dear Ms. Burke:

The preliminary Long Range Development Plan for Fort Worden is environmentally insensitive in its proposed new access plan for the park. While there are a number of engineering problems associated with the proposed new entrance, anyone of which should be sufficient to cancel this proposal, I'll focus on the associated environmental degradation.

1. The proposed new entrance is located at the trailhead of the most ecologically important forest in the park. A dirt path leads from the small parking area through a magnificent 80 - 100 year old, naturally-regenerated Douglas/grand fir forest. Essentially it is the same age cohort that is protected in Old Fort Townsend State Park's Natural Forest -- one of the most protective designations in State Parks' classification system. If this forest is worthy of protection at Old Fort Townsend, it should also be protected at Ft. Worden.

2. The new entrance, in itself, would not only irreparably alter the secluded, natural character of this portion of the park, the plan additionally calls for tree removal to accommodate an RV "parking" area adjacent to the entrance station. Clearly there would be significant tree removal in this area.

3. The approach to the entrance would also require tree clearance along the existing right-of-way adjacent to Spruce Street and Admiralty Avenue, again changing the low-key, natural character of this portion of the park.

4. The entrance would require an expansion or upgrading of the park road connecting with Spruce and Admiralty. There are wetlands on both sides of this road. Parks' commitment to stewardship should negate any wetland degradation/alteration.

5. An alternate bald eagle nest is located close to Admiralty Avenue. It is unclear whether this nest is still within a protected eagle habitat area, but alternate nest sites are often reactivated. The proposed new entrance, with major new traffic ingress, would militate against the nest's use in the future.

I have worked with State Parks on forest and natural areas issues both professionally and as a volunteer for the past thirty years. The current proposal needs to be revisited.

I would be pleased to meet with you to discuss these issues further.

Name Deleted

Hello;
I'm one of the many local residents who feel Fort Worden is a treasure for the area. I appreciate the effort you are putting into giving it long term life.

I am concerned about the new RV sites, however. The Park needs to earn money and as I understand it, the sites are often full. More sites could be located where they wouldn't impact the wooded areas, couldn't they? Those sites might not be as desirable but will be filled anyway, by people who want to be in the park.

Saving the wooded areas for all of us to enjoy seems something that is important.

Sincerely,

Name Deleted

I'm not opposed to add'l camping sites, but there are at least two other Park sites that would require no trespass into unroaded areas, no tree cutting, at most brushing some noxious weeds.

I would suggest either: the overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just NE of the Mule Barn; and/or the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground. The existing proposal is completely outrageous and potentially destructive to some of the Park's best wooded habitat. Please do not disturb the natural beauty of the trees that would have to be removed to house ten new RV sites....Do not get the point?????? Why make space for dinosaurs(gas eating).....Thanks for listening...I have been coming to Fort Warden daily for nearly 30 yrs....Enjoy your day..Name Deleted

I'm not opposed to add'l camping sites, but please choose another area than what is being proposed. There are at least two other Park sites that would require no trespass into unroaded areas and without needing to cut large growth trees!

There is an overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just NE of the Mule Barn; and/or the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground. The existing proposal is completely outrageous and potentially destructive to some of the Park's best wooded habitat.

Name Deleted

I'm writing to express my concern over the plan to develop more campsites in the wooded area near the mule barn. I've lived in Port Townsend since 1972 and my father was a park ranger at Fort Worden when it was first developed into a State Park. I have many fond memories of playing in the woods between Chinese Gardens and the Mule Barn. Now I have the pleasure of sharing this beautiful stand of trees with my son who is three and a half. Its one of our favorite places to visit and also one of the few undeveloped wooded areas in Port Townsend that is open to the public and can be easily accessed. It would be sad to see this area developed.

Thanks for taking the time to read my comments.

Sincerely,

Name Deleted

Dear Ms. Burke,

I don't think more RV sites in the park are a good idea. Our town already sees a fair amount of RV traffic for the current sites. With the global warming crisis so strongly in effect, the idea of eliminating more trees to encourage more RV use seems very short-sited. RVs are very inefficient in their use of gasoline, and produce enormous amounts of green house gases. Trees absorb carbon. Please reconsider this plan. Thank you, Name Deleted

Dear Ms Burke,

We would like to echo the sentiments of Names Deleted and others with regard to plans for developing new campground sites. While we recognize the need for more campground sites we would strongly object to their placement near and around the Peace Trail that runs through beautiful second growth forest near the cemetery. That trail I one of the loveliest pathways in the park, enjoyed by many. The overgrown brushy area near the mule barn and the vacant paved parking at the lower campground would seem to be much more appropriate sites. Both these sites would eliminate the need for tree cutting and minimize disturbance of natural areas.

We applaud the development of existing buildings for the Madrona Mind Body Institute and the Woodworking School. Fort Worden is truly becoming an asset to the community.

We only heard of this plan through friends' emails and would appreciate being added to the list for further plans for the park.

With Respect,
Names Deleted

Re;	Additional	Campsites/RV	sites
-----	------------	--------------	-------

I'm not opposed to additional camping sites, but there are at least two other Park sites that would require no trespass into unroaded areas, no tree cutting, at most brushing some noxious weeds. I would suggest either: the overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just NE of the Mule Barn; and/or the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground. The existing proposal is potentially destructive to some of the Park's best wooded habitat.

Thank you for your consideration.
Name Deleted

Name Deleted

I'd like to register my disapproval of the proposed development for the west entrance of the park. Specific objections—

1. The entrance would be on a blind corner, and involve routing traffic either past the Blue Heron school, or circuitously around the cemetery. It doesn't save any travel time, and it ruins what is now a nice foot- and bike- entrance.
2. The proposed entrance is a semi-wetland and will involve extensive fill to make it solid
3. The RV holding area will require taking out big trees. See the attached photos, the proposed artist's rendition and the area as it is now; the current camping registration is much more centrally located relative to the campsites. Will people have to drive all over the fort looking for their site then come clear back to the entrance? You can bet that nobody is going to walk, they'll drive and make fumes.
4. The RV camping loops totally change the character of the wonderful walking and biking trails. Actually, they obliterate them is a better way to describe it.
5. These are wonderful old trees, conifer/ deciduous mix, and good birding habitat
6. There's an eagle's nest which has been used in the past fairly close to the proposed RV loop. This doesn't seem appropriate development for a State Park.
7. Now doesn't seem like a good time to be providing more RV camping; fuel prices are up, fewer RV's will be on the road, and encouraging them to come to PT is encouraging fuel use. Better to encourage tent camping, not paved-ground campsites.

At the next meeting, I would like for there to be good opportunity for public comment on this. I do not think very many local people will support changing the nature of the park this drasatically.

Thanks,

Dear Ms. Burke:

I was very disturbed to hear about the plan to put a new loop through a high-quality wooded area for the purpose of building new motor home sites.

There are other sites for this new campground at Ft. Worden that wouldn't disturb one of the best wooded habitat in the park.

Please remember that things have changed and that motor homes will be falling into disuse now that the price of fuel is so high and take that into consideration also. It would be outrageous to destroy a prime natural area to create campsites that probably won't be used much anyway.

Please consider very carefully where you put this new campground. If there must be a new campground for motor homes, please put it in another area--such as just NE of the Mule Barn, or at the paved area at the Lower Campground.

There are going to be an awful lot of terribly upset people if you pursue the current plan to destroy those woods.

Thanks.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

Dear Kate

Both my wife, Name Deleted and I use the Fort Worden walking trails extensively. In my case for 33 years. We absolutely love the Fort. It's one of the greatest pure places left in the region, filled with a deep sense of historic mystery and natural beauty. It also has, from it's earliest days as a State Park, been an exemplary model of partnerships between civic, municipal and private entities. A succession of gifted managers have overseen its development, none more conscientious or creative than yourself. The Park is stronger and more vibrant than I can ever remember. As a private citizen I thank you.

So in your search for feedback from users of this wonderful local resources I know you will consider local voices as you move forward with planning for future development. I have read Name Deleted letter, below, and it states succinctly my own position regarding the "Preliminary Recommendations Report." So well that I will simply forward my agreement with it rather than try to improve or equal it. Please listen to what she says. She has expressed very clearly the feelings of many, many local users of the Fort.

I also would appreciate being included on any future emails regarding this issue.

Thank you Kate. I hope all is well with you and once again, you have my gratitude for the job you're doing.

Name Deleted

Gentlepersons:

I have just learned that a significant change that would effect my neighborhood is in the works. I understand that serious consideration is being given to changing the main entrance to Fort Worden. To my knowledge, there have been no public meetings seeking comments. I trust that you folks will assure due process in this important matter.

Thanks you for your attention.
Name Deleted

June 2nd, 2008

Dear Kate Burke,

I heard about the new plans to add camping sites at FW. Hurray!
What sounds less than exciting to me though is building them as proposed in the long-range planning that I just read about in an email I received.

I object to what looks like new construction in pristine FW for RV camping. That area is better left alone in my opinion and I hope you find an alternative site.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

To whom it may concern,

I was unable to attend the neighborhood meeting held Saturday, June 7. I absolutely concur with ALL the concerns listed below. I am a resident of Tree House and am very disturbed about the proposed new major access to Fort Worden State Park. Currently I walk through the park to access North Beach and the beach around the lighthouse. I am concerned that this development will severely impact the serene forest and trails in this portion of the park.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

General:

- There is a lack of knowledge of the plan. No one was even aware of these access issues until this past week. People need more facts, and an opportunity to react to them. For instance, what are the estimated use figures for the new access to Fort Worden? How many more cars/RVs per day would be using San Juan en route to this proposed new entrance? What other adjustments would need to be made? Street widening? Stop lights? Signs? Trees taken out? What are the specific standards for streets and sidewalks?
- Using the West Entrance substitutes one neighborhoods' issues for another new and more problematic set. This new plan will seriously impact anyone who lives on and beyond San Juan, including North Beach, Tree House and Bell St. We don't want to see this issue pitting one group of PT residents against another, because it really needs to be resolved in a much broader way than whose street is getting the most impact.
- Will there be Public meetings on this issue? There needs to be additional opportunities for residents to comment.

Environmental Issues:

- Why are we encouraging RVs at a time when we should be driving much smaller vehicles?
- Why are we considering taking out 80 - 100 year old trees to accommodate this new traffic and parking pattern and vehicles that are becoming cost prohibitive to operate?
- The proposed entrance is flanked on both sides by wetlands, on the lower side by a stream, flowing to a pond which is a sanctuary for waterfowl, resident passerines and seasonal migrants;

- A secondary eagle nest is located very close to the this proposed entrance
- There will be increased noise for the Treehouse and San Juan Avenue neighborhood.
- The west entrance and trailhead are currently a quiet entry to the most secluded mature forest in the park. The area's highest and best use is for walkers, runners, baby carriages and bicyclists.
- The proposed parking inside entrance would impact stands of large trees.
- Issue of the Treehouse Community itself....A deeply cut bank flanks the north side. The city was adamant about protecting as many trees as possible in this area, partially because of the eagle's nest. Why are we now considering compromising the health and stability of those same trees?

Safety/Traffic Issues:

- Has there been an analysis of traffic patterns and issues connected with this site?
- Both corners (Admiralty and Spruce and Spruce and W) are extremely dangerous
- An entrance booth at this corner would cause a huge bottleneck at that corner
- Several thousand more cars will stream past Blue Heron Middle School. Increased traffic on San Juan Ave. will impact all residents beyond this area including North Beach, Tree House and Bell St. That area is already a bottleneck and there is an obvious issue with 6th through 8th graders in their ingress and egress from school.

We understand that there is a traffic analysis in progress which will determine whether switching the main Fort Worden entrance to the West Entrance is a good idea. Whether the consulting firm comes up with results that will favor this option or not, we who live in this area, and use the three intersections closest to the entrance with regularity, know that there are issues that are not going to be solved by stop signs or traffic counts, and that there are important environmental considerations that are not measurable by standards or surveys.

To say that the current entrance is not a good option because it doesn't have sidewalks/pedestrian access is not the answer. There need to be sidewalks on Redwood and Cherry. It is understandable that the people who live on the south side of the park have issues, but it is not fair to exchange one set of problems for another and foist the responsibility of accommodating RV and other traffic on another set of park neighbors, compromising some very important environmental assets in so doing.

Walker, Cherry and Redwood are wide streets that lead to a beautiful boulevard in the Park that shows off the spaciousness of the old military fort. The West entrance is a narrow one lane road in a secluded portion of the park that is well used by people walking their dogs, bicyclists, pedestrians, strollers, etc. This entrance is not just NEAR a wetland. It is ON TOP OF a wetland with standing water most of the year and is very close to (upstream from) a sanctuary where rare birds find shelter and students quietly study and write in their journals. (Note the beautiful photo on the cover of the brand new Fort Worden brochure.) This pond doesn't even appear on most maps, but it is an incredibly important wildlife and science education area. The entrance is also quite near a secondary eagle nest. It has some of the most beautiful trees in the park, including ones that are in the middle of the proposed RV parking at the entrance. These are only 80 -100 years old, but the growing conditions at the edge of the forest have allowed them to become huge and healthy.

Any widening of Admiralty, any development of that entrance, will severely impact the wetland and will necessitate cutting down trees, and wipe out the walk-in campground... in favor of what? RVs which use way too much gas, and don't even add to the Park's bottom line because of their self-containment? There are so many people who use that little corner of the park, who appreciate that quiet access to the trail system. By putting an entrance station there and parking for RVs, you will change the character of that place completely, not to mention the bottleneck that it will create. The place for check in of RVs and other vehicles is the Gatehouse with its large paved parking lot adjacent. From there, RVs can enter the upper campground from above or go to the beach. There is no need to make a parking lot that takes out any of these trees.

There is no good way to widen Admiralty. It will either cut into the Treehouse Community side of the right of

way or the forest on the other side. At the Treehouse, the concept from the beginning (and with the insistence of the City) was to save as many trees as possible. Any further cutting of the trees in the right of way on the south side will compromise those that are left. The bank is steep and would require a huge retaining wall to stabilize people's backyards. On the Park side there are beautiful old trees which have grown large because, as mentioned in the paragraph above, of the vigor of growing at the forest edge.

We who use Admiralty on a regular basis know well the blindness of all three corners nearest the proposed West Entrance: 1) Admiralty and San Juan (esp. coming from the Park and turning left...even with a stop sign, it is taking your life in your hands with a bicycle or small car). 2) The corner of Admiralty and Spruce has people cutting into the other lane of traffic (both directions) and a hill coming down into the park which is blind both ways until it is crested. 3) The corner of Spruce and W, which will be used because some cars and RVs will inevitably get lost, is incredibly dangerous. Often I just come to a complete stop, while I wait for the other totally oblivious driver coming from the other direction to make a decision about rounding the corner (or to see me, which does not happen until they are a few feet from my car).

While I understand that these proposed changes have been in the planning stage for some time, it should be quite obvious that people didn't know or understand the impact on their lives or the environment that this proposal would make. I urge you to allow plenty of time and create a forum for public participation and to consider deeply the environmental, quality of life, aesthetic and safety implications of what you are proposing. This proposal impacts everyone who lives on and beyond San Juan Avenue, anyone who appreciates the natural values of Fort Worden, and anyone who uses the Park by foot or bicycle.

Respectfully,
Name Deleted

June 13, 2008

City of Port Townsend

This letter is our official protest to the portion of the new Fort Worden development plan that proposes making the West entrance to the park the main entrance for all vehicles coming and going.

It is our understanding that this new access to Fort Worden is to accommodate more campers and their RVs. As of this week we see that the section of San Juan Avenue leading up to Admiralty Way is now being widened and we wonder if this is in preparation for the plans at Fort Worden. If so, this means that the road near San Juan on Admiralty will soon be widened too and of course this would have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding neighborhood with noise pollution, wildlife habitat being destroyed and trees that look to be 100 to 200 years old cut down. Once the State begins working on the West entrance, what has been a peaceful retreat will no longer be a place for people to come and enjoy the natural surroundings, but will become a main thoroughfare to the park. We're not sure what the costs are, but we can surmise in the millions for the taxpayer, all to accommodate a few hundred or thousand more campers per year, driving polluting RV's? Also, the revenues earned from fees collected from campers wouldn't begin to compensate for the money spent to make these changes.

It's not clear to anyone we know in this community, what the specifics are of the plans and hence to what extent the plans will impact this quiet and secluded area in and around the park. We propose that someone with the City of Port Townsend hold a community meeting to lay out the plan for the West entrance and answer questions and concerns many of us have.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

Dear City Planners,

One week ago I learned that there were plans in the offing to make the back entrance to Fort Worden the primary entrance, necessitating road-widening along Admiralty and at the gate, and removing old trees for the purpose of parking cars.

I am writing to strongly oppose such a plan.

There are wetlands right at the gate which the current egress already crosses over. Any expansion at that site would disrupt and endanger the species settled there. There is a secondary Eagle's nest in the location proposed for cutting back. I am sure the Port Townsend locals have not been adequately informed and given time to make comment. This news has obviously not been widely circulated in town, and yet comments due date is 6/15! At the very least, a time extension for the evaluating of the plans and hearing feedback from the population would be in order.

It is hard for me to believe that such a retrograde plan in this day & age of "green" would prioritize space for our metal hulks of tonnage -- apparently trading tourist dollars for the very items the tourists are attracted to? The trees, the pristine few bits of forest trails unhampered by the sounds and smells of the impact of humanity and its cars (of all things). Forest for cars seems like the last thing we should want a Port Townsend Park to represent.

Parking should not impact the forest itself, and the inviting paths. A huge number of park visitors already use primarily bicycles and foot. Perhaps shuttle systems to outlying parking lots for the vehicles are in order. No matter which route taken into the park by vehicle traffic means a bottle-neck, but surely the Admiralty route would be the worst, as well as the most devastating impact on pristine forest.

I eagerly await hearing that this idea will be scrapped, and see some community participation before such drastic, impacting plans are implemented!

Thank you for your attention.
Name Deleted

Hi Kate

I do not want to cut trees at the fort to build roads and add camping sites.

I'm not opposed to adding camping sites. Three other Park sites that would require no trespass into roadless areas, no tree cutting, at most brushing some noxious weeds are

1 the overgrown brushy area (broom and blackberry) just NE of the Mule Barn

2. the vacant paved parking at the Lower Campground.

3 the lawn next to the upper campground and the rows of houses

The existing proposal is potentially destructive to some of the Park's best wooded habitat.

Thanks and Blessings

Name Deleted

Dear Mr. Herzog:

I live near Fort Worden and a favorite trail of mine, the Peace Mile (and I think I speak for many of its beauty and peacefulness) is probably very close to where trees might be removed to create more RV space. And I am hearing that trails might be changed.

I know Ft. Worden is considered the jewel of the state parks system as it is one of the few which generates income for the state. I wonder if being a jewel must always equate to money?

Is the value of money more important than that of healthful walks, happy people and dogs, deep breaths full of oxygen from the trees and the sheer pleasure of simply being in nature? Do we really need the extra rent generated by these RVs, who will also add to the carbon dioxide being brought to our peaceful place?

I trust we will need all of our trees to try to offset the extra carbon dioxide produced from so many additional low mile per gallon RVs.

Please reconsider...
Name Deleted

Fort Worden Long Range Plan Preliminary Recommendations Stakeholder Comments – Commanding Officer’s Quarters

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Monday, May 26, 2008 4:30 PM
To: Burke, Kate (PARKS)
Subject: COQ

May 26, 2008

Kate Burke
Fort Worden State Park
200 Battery Way
Port Townsend, WA 98368

Dear Ms. Burke,

I was shocked and disappointed to learn of your seemingly unilateral decision to close the COQ. Moreover to do this without any previous discussion with Bill Conklin and the Board members of the Heritage Group was more than a little rude.

The Heritage Group (past and present) have given strong support and much of their valuable time to bring the museum into being and to staff its operations. These have been volunteers -- ALL -- not paid bureaucrats.

Surely we should explore ways to sustain this operation. After all, Port Townsend bills itself as being a Victorian town and sells this concept successfully to tourists who are the life blood of local merchants.

And now, with a seemingly disdainful flick of a pen, you seek to dismantle one of the real gems of our Victorian heritage. So much for the state supporting the local community.

If you persist in seeing this decision through, I am sure the ghosts of:

- ◆ Lucy Vane
- ◆ Tess Gibson
- ◆ Gussie Lester

will haunt you in your dreams.....and justly so.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted

◆ Co-Founders of the Commanding Officers Quarters

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2008 8:06 PM
To: Burke, Kate (PARKS)
Subject: COQ

March 30, 2008

Dear Kate Burke

Our group was dismayed to hear that you are planning to close the Commanding Officer's Quarters Museum in Fort Worden. We strongly urge you to keep it intact and open. Many of us belong to the Heritage group that has been instrumental in setting up, soliciting appropriate items for the home and volunteering as docents. We feel that the COQ fulfills part of your mission to provide lifelong learning. This house has been in operation for 26 years and many visitors, families and school children have enjoyed it and learned about household life at the turn of the century. Once this home is dismantled and the articles stored away it will be very difficult and costly to restore this home as it is now.

We hope that you can find other ways to manage the COQ. Perhaps some arrangement can be made with the Jefferson County Historical Society to oversee the COQ just as they do with the Rothchild House. The COQ is a unique museum showing living conditions and life at the turn of the century for military families. Please keep it open and available for future generations to explore and enlighten.

Sincerely
Name Deleted

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2008 7:21 PM
To: Burke, Kate (PARKS)
Subject: The Commanding Officer's Quarters Museum

March 30, 2008

Dear Kate Burke

I find it appalling that the Commanding Officer's Quarters Museum (COQ) in Fort Worden is being considered for conversion to rental housing. Over the past quarter century the residents of Jefferson County have worked hard to make the COQ one of the finest "Military House Museums" in the country. It's focus on the early 20th century is AUTHENTIC, unique, and a great learning experience for every age, not to forget an honored remembrance to our WWI soldiers.

As a resident of Port Townsend, I recall the brochure/letter I received urging my input and support for the "life long learning center" which the State of Washington plans to create at Fort Worden. No where in that brochure/letter was there a mention of the elimination of the COQ.

The COQ was lovingly created by Jefferson County residents. It houses many personal family heirlooms graciously donated to present a true image of the Fort Worden time period. As it now stands, the Commanding Officer's Quarters Museum IS A LIFE LONG LEARNING CENTER and should be a focal point in fort's long range plan.

Sincerely
Name Deleted

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 3:59 PM
To: Burke, Kate (PARKS)
Subject: Commanding Officer's Quarters

Hello Kate:

I've attached a memo and photo with my opinion on the best role for the Commanding Officer's Quarters.

Name Deleted

May 27, 2008

TO: Kate Burke, Park Manager, Fort Worden State Park
FROM: Name Deleted
RE: Commanding Officer's Quarters Heritage Museum

This is to encourage you to pursue options to keep Fort Worden's Commanding Officer's Quarters in operation as a museum. The ties between the residents of Port Townsend and those stationed at Fort Worden run deep. This excellent historic house museum provides the perfect setting to tell that story to both visitors and members of the surrounding communities. A museum can provide the greatest number of people with the opportunity to explore and learn in one of the fort's most impressive historic buildings.

In a Landmark National Historic District you must take up the responsibility to preserve and interpret this site's significance to the nation. Continuing the fine work of those who have shared this resource for 30 years would allow it to remain truer to its original configuration than would adaptation to transient housing.



Fort Worden's 6th band, Coast Artillery Corps, parading past the Port Townsend city library in May 1919.

From: Herzog, Peter (PARKS)
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 9:44 AM
To: Burke, Kate (PARKS)
Subject: FW: Fort Worden May 27th 2008 Workshop ltr for inclusion in the record

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

-----Original Message-----

From: Name Deleted
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2008 5:42 PM
To: Herzog, Peter (PARKS)
Subject: Fort Worden May 27th 2008 Workshop ltr for inclusion in the record

Mr. Herzog - please enter our letter to Ms. Burke in the record at the public hearing regarding Fort Worden's future uses.

I believe the letter speaks for its self but I trust that the Park Commission and the management for for Fort Worden will not abandon a significant tie to the past by seeking short term cash gains in ending the Commanding Officer's House Museum.

May 22, 2008

Ms. Kate Burke
Fort Worden State Park
200 Battery Way

Port Townsend, WA 98368

Dear Ms. Burke

This letter contains comments about the Commanding Officer's House Museum at Fort Worden, Port Townsend, WA. I understand that the management of the park proposes to end the use of the house as a museum and turn it into a rental. I believe this will be discussed at meeting to be held on

The following reasons for retention of the COHM are:

1. This museum is a strong link to the "Victorian Heritage" of Port Townsend and enhances the great effort being made by the community to maintain and enriches this unique history.
2. The museum provides a unique glimpse into a past that is not available in any other place in Fort Worden Park; and, is a valuable adjunct to the other historic homes in Port Townsend.
3. Adults and children have a unique educational opportunity to see, sense and understand the monumental changes in our culture that were occurring at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century and that can be referred to in relation to the way we live today.
4. Our strength as a country can only be maintained by preserving and protecting our past – preservation of this historic structure and the manner in which it was used is part of our heritage. Great communities, cities and countries are strengthened by a sense of their place in history, how they were a part of history and what they contributed.
5. Once converted to a rental there will be no "going back" – as costs to restore a historic home will be prohibitive.

The following are not good reasons to convert the house to a commercial use:

Seeking to increase immediate cash flow – in the amount that could be generated by this structure - will not solve Fort Worden's financial problems. In fact the draw of the park, its environment and its historic setting will be forever lessened. The museum is part of the park history and you are detracting from its depth and the experience that one has when visiting.

In my opinion the protection and integration of our country's history into the lives of our citizens is an on going responsibility at all levels of government. The elimination of the Commanding Officer's House is a short sighted decision. Instead, view the house as an asset; strengthen its role as a part of Fort Worden's place in American history. People visit places for a variety of reasons and certainly the history of the fort is one reason to go to Fort Worden; and, without this museum you are debasing the quality of everyone's experience. In the long term its elimination may actually decrease revenues.

Names Deleted

Dear Mr. Herzog,

As a resident of historic Port Townsend, WA I was stunned to hear that a potential plan for the future of Fort Worden is to convert the beautifully restored Commanding Officer's Quarters into rental housing.

As a resident who came to this historic community because of its pride of heritage in the landmark historic downtown, uptown and Fort Worden, I was shocked to think that the State would even remotely consider turning the COQ into rental housing.

I can't imagine that any kind of cost justification has been carefully worked out prior to putting this notion forward.

The COQ is a priceless time capsule that I proudly show to every visitor who comes to see us. Even visitors on the street that I meet who ask about things to do are directed toward that house.

The advantages it brings to the community and visitors at large in terms of educational benefits must far outweigh the dollars and cents of conversion to another rental unit when so many already exist.

One of the main reasons people visit Port Townsend is because they want to see Victorian Homes and Buildings and enjoy the feeling of stepping into the past, even if just for a few short hours. Those visitors are a mainstay of our entire town's economy. Even though PT boasts an enormous number of old homes compared with other towns of its size in the state, most are private homes not open to the general public. The only exceptions are the COQ and the Rothschild House, also a state park.

Commanding Officer's Quarters offers the only other opportunity for the public, and particularly, children, to see the inside of a vintage home of substance. The restoration done to bring it to its current status as an exemplary example must have been considerable. With today's rising construction costs, the cost to reverse the process would have to be prohibitive to make the building useable for a rental property.

ADA access, updating the plumbing, wiring, fire systems, etc., to today's building codes will be extremely costly, to say nothing of creating a usable kitchen. Would the state really spend multiple thousands to do that? I would like to see the final estimates for such a conversion along with a return on investment (ROI) plan. How many years before those thousands are recouped?

It's difficult to imagine that the State of Washington would so carelessly spend tax payer dollars on a project that would require years to justify financially, to say nothing of the loss to the public of one of the few truly magnificent house museums in the state.

Please add these comments to your report for the June 15, 2008 meeting.

Sincerely,
Name Deleted
