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Purpose of the Fort Worden Guidelines for Rehabilitation

Fort Worden at the beginning of the 21st century looks remarkably like it did a century before. The overarching purpose of the Fort Worden Guidelines for Rehabilitation is to help ensure that the notable appearance remains intact as new uses are found for the buildings.

The history of the Fort Worden area begins well before the army arrived to build its fort. Prior to the arrival of Europeans, Point Wilson was within the sphere of the S’Kallam peoples and was visited by other Native Americans as well. The evidence of archaeological sites that have been located on the sand spit suggest the presence of a large encampment, and historic photographs show that settlers came to trade there in the 19th century. Later these lands were taken up by the federal government and private landowners, and portions of what would become Fort Worden were platted as part of the City of Port Townsend.

Fort Worden has experienced significant change over time. Those changes should have had a profound and lasting effect on the historic qualities of the military post, however, they have proven to be surprisingly impermanent. During World War I and World War II, building programs associated with the mobilization and training of soldiers for those conflicts transformed the Fort Worden landscape. Scores of wood frame buildings were wedged into every available building site, transforming the carefully ordered plan into a confusing warren of almost identical one- and two- story quarters, storehouses and mess halls. Yet those additions were cleared away, leaving the original buildings and plan little altered. Another sweep came in 1957 when the Washington State Department of Institutions remodeled many of the buildings in the conversion of the post to a treatment center for youth. That use significantly altered many interiors, but had little impact on the exteriors and grounds.

In short, Fort Worden has been lucky. Among its contemporaries (Forts Casey, Flagler and Ward on Puget Sound, Fort Lawton in Seattle and Fort George Wright in Spokane), it alone retains an appearance that easily recalls the period between 1904 and 1917 before World War I. It is one of the best preserved military posts in the Pacific Northwest, a quality recognized and reinforced by its designation as a National Historic Landmark, a designation reserved for the nation’s most significant properties.

We should not trust to luck as a guarantor of Fort Worden’s future appearance. Understanding and thoughtfully implementing the Guidelines for Rehabilitation will help protect critical character-defining features as the years pass by. If we do our job well, Fort Worden will always be a distinct and memorable representative of the past in our present.

By Commission policy, work on historic structures and landscapes at Fort Worden State Park must adhere to the US Department of Interior Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. While these standards provide guidance on the treatment of historic properties in general, they provide little specific direction on how to preserve the integrity of a particular historic property.

Site-specific guidelines for rehabilitation provide a critical intermediate step between the Secretary’s Standards and the construction of a particular feature in a particular historic site. Guidelines for Rehabilitation provide architects, builders, property managers, tenants, maintenance staff and others with parameters on how much change can be introduced in adapting an historic building or feature to a new use. Their overall purpose is to ensure that an historic property retains its authenticity and integrity while allowing flexibility to adapt the site and structures to address evolving needs of the park. In some cases however, additional investigation may be necessary to ensure that a particular site, building or feature is preserved. Additional preservation planning may be necessary.
Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission Direction

In January 2007, the State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) adopted a vision for Fort Worden as a center for life-long learning. As envisioned, the Fort will become a full-service, year round destination providing a diverse array of meaningful experiences for people of all ages, backgrounds, skills, and interests through its programs, events, services, and facilities. 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. With a variety of conference facilities and accommodations ranging from camping to residences and single guest rooms, plus high quality food service focused on locally grown ingredients, the new Fort Worden will allow visitors to design their stay around their needs and preferences.

As part of its adoption of the life-long learning center vision, the Commission recognized that it alone does not have the resources required to achieve the vision. Park management will need to work with its nonprofit and business partners not only to provide programs and services, but also to care and improve the Fort’s extensive collection of historic structures, landscapes, and small-scale features.

Asking partners to care for historic structures carries with it two principle necessities. First, prospective partners need to know what they can or can’t do with a structure and what preservation activities will be required in order to thoughtfully plan and commit financial resources to large-scale rehabilitation project. Second, the Commission must be assured that the partners’ efforts will not compromise the structures’ historical integrity.

To address these needs, as well as ensuring overall preservation of the park’s historic properties, the Commission directed agency staff to prepare design guidelines. This document represents the fulfillment of the Commission’s direction and its on-going commitment to stewardship of Fort Worden.
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A History of Building at Fort Worden

This overview of the construction history of the garrison buildings supplements the information in the 1976 National Historic Landmark designation. The narrative addresses the development of the post over a 60 year period through World War II and the reuse of Fort Worden by the Department of Institutions.

Fort Worden is one of the best preserved historic military ports in the Pacific Northwest. Despite the impact of several different campaigns of construction, demolition and alteration, its appearance today is much as it was in the early years of the 20th century.

The announcement that the federal government would establish fortifications and a new military post at Point Wilson brought enormous relief to the citizens of Port Townsend. The city had never recovered from the financial depression of 1893, and the new building program meant jobs for local men and increased commerce for local businesses. Work on the concrete gun and mortar batteries began in 1898, but the construction of the associated garrison post -- the barracks, quarters, storehouses and other buildings that would house and support the troops -- would have to wait. A reservation of 640 acres had been set aside by Executive Order in 1866, but most of the property was already covered by private claims. The government owned lands sufficient only for the fortifications themselves; a good portion of the property needed to complete the reservation was held by owners who were reluctant to sell. It was not until 1902 that most of those lands were aggregated and the boundaries of the reservation took on much of their permanent form.

By that time, many of the fortifications were complete and the men who were to put them into service were already on their way. The question was where to put them when they arrived, and for the first time, the army officers in charge of Fort Worden faced a recurring problem: the post was chronically under-built, and there was a greater demand for building stock than had been planned for.

Looking north at what will become the east end of the parade ground, probably in 1902. Alexander’s Castle is visible as are the tents that provided temporary shelter for the soldiers.

The only place for the new arrivals was the collection of light wood-frame boarding houses and outbuildings that had been put up by the Corps of Engineers and its contractors. They had served the
men working on the fortifications and were now vacant. They were never intended to be more than temporary – as little more than shanties, they were not painted and the inside walls were not finished in anyway – however the army added to their number until all the features of a military post appeared on top of the hill. Barracks, mess hall, bakery, administration building, guardhouse and even a library clustered around the Ordnance Storehouse, which was the first permanent building of the new post. Even at that there was not enough accommodation for all of the soldiers, and some of them had to stay in tents until the permanent barracks were completed.

As presented in the pages of the *Port Townsend Leader*, there was immediate recognition that a new government installation would be a benefit to the city. There was certainly the advantage of a substantial payroll – that of the tradesmen putting up the buildings as well as that of the soldiers who would later occupy them – but there was also a good measure of civic pride in having as a neighbor what the paper promised to be one of the finest posts in the west.

The newsmen paid special attention to what was being built and steadily reported events ranging from the award of construction contracts to the final occupation of the buildings. What they saw impressed them both in terms of style and quality, making Fort Worden “perhaps the prettiest post in the country with an ideal location and everything favorable.” They could not have been surprised when an army official completing an inspection in 1904 “was lost in admiration when he saw the magnificent and complete buildings [that] included not only every convenience for the soldier but also a most liberal provision for his health and comfort.”

A reader of the time would likely be left with the impression that Fort Worden was something out of the ordinary and representative of a special commitment. That was not the case; the buildings going up at Fort Worden were fashioned from the standard plans of the army’s Quartermaster Department and were used on posts throughout the nation. The buildings represented a new commitment by the federal government to permanence and durability that had not characterized the facilities of earlier military reservations. That perspective was summed up in the army’s regulations of 1901. The direction of those regulations was that most military posts had been selected “for occupation as long as the Government shall exist” and that they were not only to be “made useful and healthful to the garrisons, but be made attractive homes for the Army by every means possible for the purpose.” Fort Worden and its sister installations regionally and nationally were expressions of that vision. The effect locally was transfiguring and by 1910, the post was on its way to having “more the appearance of a metropolitan city than a coast defense fortification.”

By the spring of 1904, 19 buildings had been completed, the product of a work force of some 150 carpenters, stone cutters and masons. The builders left a key in every lock in every door except the front; the front door keys were handed directly over to the post quartermaster. But nineteen buildings were not enough.

Two unanticipated circumstances altered the future appearance of Fort Worden. The first was the shift of the headquarters for the coast defenses of Puget Sound from Fort Flagler to Fort Worden. Fort Flagler seems to have been selected as the headquarters by military planners because of its central position in Admiralty Inlet and thus its valuable role in directing the course of a future defense of the waterway. That advantage aside, Fort Flagler was inconveniently located and difficult to get to, and the Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce began a concerted effort to persuade the army to change its mind, never an easy thing to do. In addition to noting the many advantages offered by shifting the headquarters to Fort Worden, the Chamber suggested that it had all been a mistake in the first place: the army officers in charge of laying out the defenses had used the wrong map. In the nation’s capital, Washington’s senators and members of Congress met with the Secretary of War and high-ranking officers, and whatever their arguments were, they were ultimately successful. By September, 1904, the headquarters were moved to Fort Worden.
That meant more officers, more men, more animals, and musicians – the headquarters came with a band. Work began on a band barracks, the quartermaster stable was remodeled to hold 20 animals instead 12, and 75 feet were added to the end of the quartermaster storehouse, completed only a scant three months earlier.

The second circumstance was a changing view of the value of fortifications at Point Wilson as well as a separate investment in making the defenses more effective. Army planners had decided early on that Fort Worden would be a two company post – not more than 250 officers and men. But more batteries were added to strengthen the defenses, there was a new and elaborate system of aiming the guns, there were new searchlights and the power plants that came with them, there were newly-formed coast artillery units of the state militia coming for training, all of which meant that the years between 1904 and 1910 were a period of superheated construction. By 1908, Fort Worden was a six-company post that several years later numbered 900 officers and men, working and living in about 40 stoutly constructed one- and two-story wood frame buildings that rested on foundations of stone, brick or concrete and featured roofs of black slate. It was not enough.
By the end of the first decade of the 20th century, investment in the garrison posts of the national coast defense system was slowing, and local commanders would have to look beyond the appropriations of the Quartermaster Department to meet many of their building requirements. Some types of buildings were specialized and came from other parts of the army. The hospital was an example, being designed and funded through the Office of the Surgeon General, and several other army departments also supported the construction of dedicated buildings Fort Worden. Improvisation was the rule for anything else.

One way to meet pressing needs was to modify what was already in use, with the result that a stables and wagon shed were converted to storehouses and a coal shed was modified to serve as an ordnance machine shop. Another solution was to adapt vacant buildings or use their lumber for new construction. The temporary buildings of 1902-03 sat unused on top of the hill, and by 1910 they had been converted to a number of storehouses, shops, sheds as well as an amusement hall. They would have been pressed into service earlier save for Col. George Grimes, Fort Worden’s commander in 1905, who denied the proposed relocation of one of the temporary buildings because it would have been out of harmony with the more handsome permanent structures.
An officer’s quarters mobilization building from World War I in a photograph dating to the 1920s or 30s. After the war, this building and ten others were retained as quarters for non-commissioned officers. All were removed in the 1950s except for the one shown here; it was relocated by the Department of Institutions to a site west of Alexander’s Castle and is now known as Bliss Vista. It is the only World War I mobilization building extant at Fort Worden.

The same army regulation that emphasized the attractiveness of army posts also gave direction about the appearance of the grounds. Shrubbery and trees were to be kept pruned, brush removed and vines, fruit and ornamental trees planted, and the grounds drained and ditched. Larger reservations were to be “stocked with game, and all native singing birds protected.” There does not seem to have been a formal landscape plan for Fort Worden although there were hints that the gist of the regulation had been heard: a fenced deer park was built in the vicinity of the future location of the balloon hangar, and trees and shrubs were planted around the newly seeded building sites. There was no need for any specific drainage improvements other than the cobblestone ditches that bordered one side of the roads. In retrospect, the cobblestone ditches seem an attractive feature but they were very unpopular with the troops at the time. In 1909, the post commander complained that they were kept constantly at work digging out grass from between the stones with a knife blade, a task that was "looked upon by the men as unnecessary, and produces discontent."

After 15 years of developing the garrison post, Fort Worden had achieved a distinctive character marked by carefully spaced clusters of buildings that looked very much like a comfortable combination of neighborhood and college campus. All that would change with the 1917 entry of the United States into World War I.

There was little reason to fear a naval attack on Puget Sound, and in common with American coastal fortifications elsewhere, Fort Worden was expanded as a training facility for heavy mobile artillery. Two main areas were cleared, graded and made ready for the new buildings, some 75 in number, that would house the sudden influx of recruits. The first site was an L-shaped parcel that lay on the sloping ground to the north and east of the hospital, and the second was immediately west of the non-commissioned officers’ quarters. Additional buildings were placed where space allowed. The structures put up during the mobilization were simple one- and two-story wood frame single-wall buildings with gable roofs of asphalt shingles; barracks, separate lavatories and mess halls featured a continuous ridge ventilator. The uniformity of design that had contributed so much to the appearance of Fort Worden was altered by a wholly new category of building that came not from the heritage of permanence but from the new requirements of a national emergency.
After the war, the future of the nation’s coast artillery posts seemed dim. The military lessons of the conflict provided little support for the need for big guns in concrete fortifications to protect important harbors and sea-coast cities. Many installations – Fort Casey and Fort Flagler among them – were stripped of their troop assignments as the army shrank during the peace-time years of the 1920s and 1930s. Buildings were left to rot and many were torn down.

The contraction had little effect on the building stock of Fort Worden. It became an important regional training center for both the National Guard and units of the Reserve Officers Training Corps, not only on the big coast defense guns but also mobile anti-aircraft weapons and the automotive equipment associated with them. Most of the inventory remained intact and continuing uses were found for the original permanent buildings as well as the additions of the war years. For example, the double row of small officers’ quarters that extended north from Alexander’s Castle became quarters for non-commissioned officers. Certainly not all of the World War I mobilization buildings were retained, but it appears that many were, at least until 1931 when some were converted to other functions. That was the same year that the Red Cross Service Club, perhaps the most important building of the World War I era because of its central role in recreation at the post, was destroyed by fire. Its loss led to a campaign for its replacement, realized in 1932 with the completion of the War Department Theater (Building 25).

Another important construction event of the 1930s was the addition of a camp for the Civilian Conservation Corps. The first assignment of a CCC company to Fort Worden was in 1933, however a permanent camp was not built until 1935. It was a cluster of single-story buildings west of the non-commissioned officers’ quarters on a site now occupied by a campground. The same area also had been the location of a group of World War I mobilization buildings; it appears that the CCC constructed a wholly new complex and did not adapt the older facilities.
On the eve of World War II, Fort Worden constituted a collection of about 100 buildings, most of which had been built after 1915 and differed distinctly in appearance from those buildings erected prior to that year. Areas in the landscape that had been open originally were now filled with buildings, and the visual character of the post had shifted. Another infusion of mobilization buildings was about to work an even greater transformation.

Beginning in 1941 and in common with the massive military construction program all across the nation, a new category of building soon appeared at Fort Worden. These were the 700- and 800-series buildings that came to typify the army posts of World War II. They were similar in design and materials to the World War I mobilization buildings but they were larger, with the result that they took up much more land. The two-story barracks block was the most common version and there were other designs for other purposes as well. The buildings were put up on most of the same sites that were used during World War I, many of the surviving buildings of 1917 being torn down to make room for the new replacements. They also occupied the ball field behind the permanent barracks, the hillside around Alexander’s Castle and the area on the beach north of the Ordnance Machine Shop.
The military use of Fort Worden continued into the 1950s. More buildings were added and others were modified so that by the time the federal government left the post, there were more than 200 wood-frame structures. Only the immediate area of the parade ground was left unaltered; in other locations it was difficult to recall the army regulation of 1901 and its instruction that military posts be made attractive homes for their occupants. The permanent buildings that had been built before 1917 comprised less than 25 percent of the building inventory of 1951. What the local paper had once called “the prettiest post in the country” was still there for those who knew where to look but it would have been difficult to see past the clutter of decades of construction that had placed need and efficiency ahead of graceful architecture.

After standing empty in the middle years of the 1950s, Fort Worden would unexpectedly recover much of its earlier appearance beginning in 1955.

In that year, the Washington State Department of Institutions acquired a significant portion of the former military reservation and one that included most of the buildings. The plan was to establish a treatment center for youth, and the facilities selected for the center were almost exclusively the distinctively styled structures that dated from before the two world wars. Between 1959 and 1967, many of the later buildings were sold or demolished. The original barracks of the coast artillery companies were remodeled to serve as housing for boys and girls, and the hospital became a school and library. The former officers’ quarters became residences for the staff. The treatment center closed in 1971 and was acquired by the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission.

At that time, Washington State Parks housed the newly-minted state historic preservation program (now the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation) and the agency director, who was also the State Historic Preservation Officer, emphasized the inclusion of those state parks that met the criteria for the State and National Registers of Historic Places. Fort Worden was listed in the National Register in 1974. The American Association of State and Local History, acting under a contract with the National Park Service, identified Fort Worden as a potential National Historic Landmark and prepared a nomination for the designation, which was made in 1976.

The World War II-era buildings were excluded from both the National Register and National Historic Landmark listing. They were of too recent a vintage, and would not reach the 50-year guideline for consideration until the 1990s. In 1991, the Department of Defense in conjunction with the National Park Service completed a nation-wide assessment of World War II mobilization buildings and concluded that they were significant for their design, construction and technological innovation. As a result of that finding, the mobilization buildings have been included in the scope of these guidelines for rehabilitation. Any future revision of the National Historic Landmark listing should include changing the period of significance from the existing 1898 to 1920 by extending it through the end of World War II in 1945.
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The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

The Department of the Interior and the National Park Service have provided leadership and guidance for the identification, evaluation and protection of historic properties for many years. To help determine the courses of action that could best ensure the retention of the distinctive character of many different kinds of historic properties, the Secretary of the Interior created the Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

The Standards address several different treatments, and the one that is most applicable to work at Fort Worden is the standard for rehabilitation. The Standards define rehabilitation as “the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values.”

The Standards pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior, related landscape features and the building’s site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

Although the Standards originate with the federal government and are employed most often in conjunction with federally-owned historic properties or federal programs, they are in use throughout the United States by cities, counties and states. The value and the flexibility of the Standards led to their adoption by the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission under its Cultural Resources Management Policy (2004).

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, from Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 68 (36CFR68), follow below, with comments illustrating how the standard has been applied at Fort Worden.

1. “A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.”

   A good example at Fort Worden is the use of the officers’ and non-commissioned officers’ quarters as vacation housing. Both types of buildings were intended to be occupied by families, the major difference now being in the length of stay. Most of the changes have been limited to kitchens and baths, rooms that often undergo revision in the life of a residence.

2. “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”

   A good example at Fort Worden is the rehabilitation of one of the barracks, Building 204. New uses such as the restrooms and an elevator were added carefully so that the major historic spaces of the building remained undisturbed.

3. “Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.”

4. “Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.”

   A good example at Fort Worden is the enclosed porches on the rear of the officers’ quarters. Constructed originally as open porches, they were framed in and sided before Word War I and they have become an element that contributes to the historic appearance of the homes.
5. “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.”

A good example at Fort Worden is the effort to retain early and distinctive sidewalks. When trenching for new utility systems intersected the sidewalk next to Building 223 (former Post Headquarters and now Centrum’s administrative office), the sidewalk was carefully lifted, placed aside, and then returned to its original position when the work was completed.

6. “Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”

A good example at Fort Worden is the replacement of the original roofing slate with new slate. No substitute material has the look of slate or its durable quality, and the slate roofs of Fort Worden are an important and distinctive feature of the historic district.

7. “Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.”

A good example at Fort Worden is what was not done during the rehabilitation of Alexander’s Castle. Cleaning brick buildings is a common part of their rehabilitation, often in an effort to make them look newer, but project managers decided that it was not necessary or appropriate at Alexander’s Castle. The harsh effects of water blasting are still visible on the Band Barracks (Building 205).

8. “Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.”

A good example at Fort Worden was the inadvertent discovery of an archaeological feature during the excavation for the foundation of the Commons. It appeared to be the remnant of a wicker panel of the type used to build trenches during World War I. It was documented and work to complete the foundations continued.

9. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”

A good example at Fort Worden is the addition of the Commons. A large and modern structure, its design and location were carefully considered to ensure compatibility with the historic property.

10. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

A good example at Fort Worden is the addition of a sheltered entry to Building 502 (former Ordnance Machine Shop and now a classroom for the Marine Science Center). The construction of the shelter did not alter the historic qualities of the building, and should the entry be removed, the building would look as it did before the shelter was added.
Introduction to the Guidelines

The Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings were initially developed in 1977 to help property owners, developers, and federal managers apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation during the project planning stage by providing general design and technical recommendations. Together with the Standards for Rehabilitation, they provide a model process for those with an interest in or responsibility for the continued use of important historic properties.

The Fort Worden Guidelines for Rehabilitation are intended to assist in applying the Standards to projects at Fort Worden and they may not be very helpful in other instances. The guidelines do not anticipate all possible circumstances and try to anticipate generally. Reflecting the Secretary’s Standard, the guidelines are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility. Additionally, the National Park Service Technical Preservation Services maintains a series of preservation briefs, technical notes, and technical reports to guide treatment of particular features (www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/). Examples of preservation briefs include: Repair and Thermal Upgrading of Historic Steel Windows, Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors, and Preparation and Use of Historic Structure Reports. The Association for Preservation Technology also maintains an on-line archive of “Practice Points”, a series of instructional articles on the latest advances in preservation technology (www.apti.org/publications/practice-points.cfm). These materials and others should be referenced to ensure that any preservation project uses the most up to date preservation practices.

Supplementing the guidelines is the Individual Resource Statement. The Individual Resource Statement outlines which character-defining features of a historic building are the most intact and should be preserved, and which features are the most altered and would probably be least impacted by a new use. Six properties were selected by the park manager to be covered by the statements: Buildings 7, 202, 225, 298, 304 and 305. They were chosen because they represented a variety of types and (with the exception of Building 7) were the subject of current discussions about reuse potential. Individual Resource Statements provide a format for collecting useful information in a single document and should be prepared for all historic properties at Fort Worden.

The Guidelines pertain to historic buildings of all sizes, materials, occupancy and construction types; and apply to interior and exterior work as well as new exterior additions. Those approaches, treatments, and techniques that are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation" appear under the "Recommended" section in each topic area; those approaches, treatments, and actions which could adversely affect character are listed in the "Not Recommended" section.

The "Recommended" courses of action in each section are listed in order of historic preservation concerns so that a rehabilitation project may be successfully planned and completed -- one that, first, assures the preservation of a building's important or character-defining architectural materials and features and, second, makes possible an efficient contemporary use. Rehabilitation guidance in each section begins with protection and maintenance, that work which should be maximized in every project to enhance overall preservation goals. Next, where some deterioration is present, repair of the building's historic materials and features is recommended. Finally, when deterioration is so extensive that repair is not possible, the most problematic area of work is considered: replacement of historic materials and features with new materials.

Character-defining is a term that refers to the visual cues in a property that help us recognize it as historic. It can be something as large as the size and shape of a building or as subtle as the contour of the picture molding. The shape of the windows, the arrangement of the interior rooms, the construction materials, even original door knobs and hinges are all character-defining features and altering or removing them reduces the integrity or wholeness of an historic property. If there are too many changes to the features, the property can lose its historic identity. Rehabilitation often results in alterations to character-defining features, and the Guidelines emphasize the importance of keeping the modifications to a minimum.
The Guidelines also refer to the **period of significance**. The period of significance is the length of time that the property was actively associated with the events, persons, or trends that enabled it to satisfy the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As stated in the building history narrative, the period of significance established for Fort Worden in the 1974 National Register nomination as well as the later National Historic Landmark designation is 1898 to 1920. Because many World War II buildings are now considered eligible for listing, the period of significance should be considered to extend through 1945. Many of the buildings constructed in the 1940s have been removed, and as a result the historic district today has an appearance that is similar to an earlier period that ended about 1917.

To further guide the owner and developer in planning a successful rehabilitation project, those complex design issues dealing with new use requirements such as alterations and additions are included at the end of each section to underscore the need for particular sensitivity in these areas.
How to Use the Guidelines

IDENTIFY, RETAIN, AND PRESERVE

The guidance that is basic to the treatment of all historic buildings -- identifying, retaining, and preserving the form and detailing of those architectural materials and features that are important in defining the historic character -- is always listed first in the "Recommended" area. The parallel "Not Recommended" area lists the types of actions that are most apt to cause the diminution or even loss of the building's historic character. Remember, however, that loss of character is just as often caused by the cumulative effect of a series of actions that individually may seem to be minor interventions. Thus, the guidance in all of the "Not Recommended" areas must be viewed in that larger context, e.g., for the total impact on a historic building.

PROTECT AND MAINTAIN

After identifying those materials and features that are important and must be retained in the process of rehabilitation work, then protecting and maintaining them are addressed. Protection generally involves the least degree of intervention and is preparatory to other work. For example, protection includes the maintenance of historic material through treatments such as rust removal, caulking, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating; the cyclical cleaning of roof gutter systems; or installation of fencing, protective plywood, alarm systems and other temporary protective measures. Although a historic building will usually require more extensive work, an overall evaluation of its physical condition should always begin at this level.

REPAIR

Next, when the physical condition of character-defining materials and features warrants additional work repairing is recommended. Guidance for the repair of historic materials such as masonry, wood, and architectural metals again begins with the least degree of intervention possible such as patching, piecing-in, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing or upgrading them according to recognized preservation methods. Repairing also includes the limited replacement in kind -- or with compatible substitute material -- of extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes (for example, brackets, dentils, steps, plaster, or portions of slate roofing). Although using the same kind of material is always the preferred option, substitute material is acceptable if the form and design as well as the substitute material itself convey the visual appearance of the remaining parts of the feature and finish.

REPLACE

Following repair in the hierarchy, guidance is provided for replacing an entire character-defining feature with new material because the level of deterioration or damage of materials precludes repair (for example, an exterior cornice; an interior staircase; or a complete porch). If the essential form and detailing are still evident so that the physical evidence can be used to re-establish the feature as an integral part of the rehabilitation project, then its replacement is appropriate. Like the guidance for repair, the preferred option is always replacement of the entire feature in kind, that is, with the same material. Because this approach may not always be technically or economically feasible, provisions are made to consider the use of a compatible substitute material.

It should be noted that, while the National Park Service guidelines recommend the replacement of an entire character-defining feature under certain well-defined circumstances, they never recommend removal and replacement with new material of a feature that, although damaged or deteriorated, could reasonably be repaired and thus preserved.
DESIGN FOR MISSING HISTORIC FEATURES

When an entire interior or exterior feature is missing (for example, an entrance or a principal staircase), it no longer plays a role in physically defining the historic character of the building unless it can be accurately recovered in form and detailing through the process of carefully documenting the historical appearance. Where an important architectural feature is missing, its recovery is always recommended in the guidelines as the first or preferred, course of action. Thus, if adequate historical, pictorial, and physical documentation exists so that the feature may be accurately and reasonably reproduced, and if it is desirable to re-establish the feature as part of the building's historical appearance, then designing and constructing a new feature based on such information is appropriate. However, a second acceptable option for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building. The new design should always take into account the size, scale, and material of the historic building itself and, most importantly, should be clearly differentiated so that a false historical appearance is not created.

ALTERATIONS/ADDITIONS TO HISTORIC BUILDINGS/NEW STRUCTURES

Some exterior and interior alterations to an historic building are generally needed to assure its continued use, but it is most important that such alterations do not radically change, obscure, or destroy character-defining spaces, materials, features, or finishes.

Alterations may include providing additional parking space on an existing historic building site; cutting new entrances or windows on secondary elevations; inserting an additional floor; or installing an entirely new mechanical system. Alteration may also include the selective removal of buildings or other features of the environment or building site that are intrusive and therefore detract from the overall historic character.

The construction of a new structure or an exterior addition to an historic building may seem essential for a new use, but the guidelines emphasize that such new structures or additions should be avoided, if possible, and considered only after it is determined that needs cannot be met by adapting an existing structure or by altering secondary, non character-defining interior spaces, within an existing structure. If, after a thorough evaluation of interior solutions, an exterior addition or a new structure is still judged to be the only viable alternative, it should be designed and constructed to be clearly differentiated from historic buildings and so that the character-defining features are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

SUSTAINABILITY/ACCESSIBILITY/SAFETY AND HEALTH CONSIDERATIONS

These sections of the Guidelines for Rehabilitation address work done to meet accessibility requirements and health and safety code requirements; or retrofitting measures to conserve energy. Although this work is quite often an important aspect of rehabilitation projects, it is usually not a part of the overall process of protecting or repairing character-defining features; rather, such work is assessed for its potential negative impact on the building’s historic character. For this reason, particular care must be taken not to radically change, obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining materials or features in the process of rehabilitation work to meet code and energy requirements.

The approach recommended in these guidelines is that all three considerations – historic preservation, accessibility, and sustainability are important. Historic preservation is the process through which the hard work is done to find solutions that don’t compromise any of these goals. In those rare circumstances where no solution that satisfies all three needs is feasible, the State Parks Historic Preservation Officer or other designated preservation official will work with the facility manager to develop an appropriate compromise.
INTERPRETATION OF GUIDELINES AND PLAN REVIEW

The State Parks Historic Preservation Officer (SPHPO) should provide on-going interpretation and plan review for proposed projects until such time as a Commission-approved non-profit management entity appoints a qualified on-site preservation official to fulfill this function. Alternatively, the Commission may appoint a qualified on-site preservation official prior to approval of a non-profit management entity. The qualifications for the on-site historic preservation official should be agreed upon in a Memorandum of Understanding or other formal agreement between the Commission and the non-profit management entity.

Appointment of an individual, as opposed to a committee, is preferred to promote responsive, timely and predictable decision-making. A review committee may be formed at the discretion of the SPHPO or appointed on-site preservation official, but should only serve in an advisory capacity.

State Parks should develop a formal process for review and approval of proposed new construction and rehabilitation projects at Fort Worden. Agency staff should prepare this process for approval by the Director within about six months of Commission adoption of the Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The approved process should include a “pre-application meeting” where the SPHPO or on-site historic preservation official can meet with a project proponent and identify any technical investigation necessary to proceed (e.g., Historic Structure Report, see National Park Service Preservation Brief #43) and establish review requirements, schedule, and other considerations related to the proposed project.

The approved review process should also set a series of review thresholds based on a project’s magnitude and the extent of change to historic structures, landscapes, or small-scale features expected to result. This should include a minimum threshold under which no formal review is necessary for work completed by someone with basic training in historic preservation (e.g., routine maintenance and minor improvements). Intermediate and higher thresholds requiring review by the on-site historic preservation official, SPHPO, the Commission, or others should also be established where helpful in fostering predictability, efficiency, or timeliness of review while ensuring the park’s historical integrity is preserved.

REVISIONS/ADDITIONS TO THE GUIDELINES

Historic preservation is not a static endeavor. The Guidelines for Rehabilitation will likely require revision to reflect significant changes in the Commission’s historic preservation policies, accepted preservation practices, accessibility requirements, and other mandates, or to correct any errors or omissions. Putting the guidelines into actual practice may also reveal situations where additional or more refined guidance on appropriate rehabilitation is necessary or where guidelines lead to an erroneous result.

To ensure they retain their usefulness and remain state of the art, the guidelines should be reviewed on a two-year cycle. As part of regular review, the Fort Worden State Park Manager or non-profit management entity should solicit input from stakeholders (e.g., Advisory Committee, Partners, and City departments/boards) and transmit proposed amendments through the historic preservation officer (either the SPHPO or on-site preservation official) to the State Parks Director and ultimately to the Commission for approval. Commission approval will require an opportunity for public comment as well as environmental review in compliance with SEPA.

Any amendment of the guidelines will require close coordination with the City of Port Townsend, particularly once the City adopts the guidelines into its zoning code as envisioned. Proposed amendments may require separate approval by the City. Amendment of the guidelines will also include consultation with the National Park Service National Historic Landmark Program to ensure consistency with and retention of Fort Worden’s National Historic Landmark designation.

In extraordinary circumstances, changes to the guidelines necessary to respond to an emergent issue/need may be proposed for Commission approval outside of the regular review cycle.