

Fort Worden State park - Pier & Marine Learning Center  
Plans & Improvements for Recreational Opportunities Public Meeting  
April 18, 2019 – COMMENTS

---

- #1 - I wonder how important the boat ramp is – how many boats use it per year? #2 I think a dock is an important aspect to the Marine Science Center
- #1 - How intrusive/industrial will elevated boat launch be? #2 - This is the best of the 3
- PT Paddlesports keeps a zodiac rescue boat tied to the pier – We have used this to rescue children whose floatie took them too far from shore. Crab fishermen with problems, check on our paddlers and even locals paddling on their own. It takes the fire department 15-20 minutes to get to Fort Worden's beach
- This option needs a floating dock attached to the pier. Then it would be perfect
- Alternate 1 – not my preference. Too expensive. Pier & boat launch block sand drift. I prefer no boat ramp because of parking and boat and jet ski noise on beach, and in neighborhood. Alternate 2 seems the best, but no boat launch
- #1 - Great design. #2 - Appreciate the thought that has gone into designing the boat ramp.
- MSC needs small research boat access for many in-water studies. Can it be combined with Alternative 2? (a float with small equipment/gear storage).
- If, by moving the pier and boat launch, the sand movement will re-adjust “quickly,” then if a season of no pier and boat launch were given before building a new pier & boat launch, would that make a big cost reduction in that work?
- Have you considered funding from the Maritime Heritage Act? Meant for preservation and education projects.
- Suggest all MSC buildings combined under one roof. When thinking of enlarging on-shore MSC facilities.
- No boat launch please! It will attract jet skis, loud motors, people pulling boats up on the beach. The peace and quiet of a beach walk will be gone. Kayaks, rowboats, canoes, no motors would be best.
- Would it be possible to enlarge the MSC (into Alt 3)? In Alt 2 such that MSC would have everything in one place?
- Removal of the breakwater will make the launching and landing powerboats more dangerous. Also the waves generated by the large tankers & cruise ships.
- Alt #2 - Like the low impact on MSC. Allows for literal drift. A pedestrian pier, a unified MSC, moving boat launch closer to the ingress. Could eliminate the boat launch & still do the other parts.
- Kayakers would really benefit from a float dock. Protected from wind waves, tanker waves, cruise ships. Waves can get big.
- ALT 1 – This would disrupt MSC activities for years with only modest gain – 8 biennia?
- Opposed to #1 – for financial and marine/sea life impact reasons.
- ALT 1 is the worst of all 3 for environment and habitat and climate change. Move aquarium next to museum. Forget boat launching. The beach is so unique here – make it the focus for beach recreation.
- Where do kayaks and scuba divers put in?
- How long would MSC be closed? I support 2 story bldg. to display orca and whale skeletons

- #1 – I think it is excellent to separate the boat launch from the MSC pier, however, I prefer to see the 2 MSC buildings closer to each other (#2). I'm not attached to the historic pier unless there are environmental reasons to choose this option.
- Sea level rise #s are approximate. Please give a range not a number e.g. 1-3 ft or something like that.
- ALT 1 – this is the only way to go other than doing regular, incremented maintenance on existing dock (pilings and dock planking were replaced in early 1980s). Please continue the over water experience for MSC.
- ALT 3 – if you could start from scratch, why give so much footprint to parking and RV campsites? (shuttle people to a remote parking site or just give up a couple of RV sites!)
- ALT 1 – least preferred. Does not do anything to improve near shore habitat and general beach access experience. Beach & MSC should be the focus. Not efficient use of funds in this plan.
- Impacts kitchen shelter
- Need \$\$ estimates. This will ultimately make a lot of the decision!
- ALT 1 – rehabilitate - like the idea of keeping existing structure with new pilings for pedestrians. More MSC aquarium to land. Remove & don't replace boat launch. Maintain launch access for kayaks & paddleboards. Consider reducing footprint of pier & extending out beyond eel grass.
- #1 – concern for financial participation. Concern for impact to existing recreation and timing. Is this a replaced pier to avoid sea level rise?
- Why doesn't the MSC use the existing cablehouse building?
- ALT1 – please. The pier over the water is huge and so it ought to be rebuilt. Pipes to carry salt water to an aquarium on land seems to be an ongoing expense for repairs, not so great if pipes are shorter, over water.
- Where is the floating dock? Impact to MSC too great.
- For safety and engagement there should be viewing ports in floor of the pier so kids can see the water without danger of climbing on the sides.
- ALT 1 – seems very costly. Huge impact on the MSC. Doesn't unify the MSC.
- I would like to see a non-motorized boat launch only. Perhaps incorporate with pier.
- ALT – No Action – existing beach on south side of pier is great swimming beach for young families. That could be lost with changes.
- #3 – where will boaters who use trailers go? We keep closing boat ramps, yet more people live in Jefferson county who want to get on the water. We closed the ramp at North Beach and Boat Haven.
- #3 – consider the effects of the Cascadia fault earthquake. 1 – shaking produced by the earthquake and 2 – information from tsunami models and geologic studies of past tsunamis as to how tsunamis have affected the development area, and 3 – how the land level in the development area would change as a result of that earthquake.
- ALT 3 – could make an addition to the MSC like in ALT#2, keeping the pier and aquarium until the new part of the MSC is built.
- #3 – how long would MSC be closed?
- Strongly in favor of this one #3. Keep the focus on the sea, lighthouse, non-motorized boat use
- ALT 3 – is the best for the environment. My preference. Prefer no pier and no boat ramp. This seems favorable to the MSC.
- ALT 3 – Remove. Agree with removing boat launch for trailer boats. Maintain easy access for kayaks, stand up paddleboards. More campus for MSC to share. Don't like "no pier." Prefer to have pedestrian pier.

- #3 – will PTMSC really have a trouble free sea water system that runs underground? With barnacles and other fouling organisms growing in the pipes?
- Consider a different kind of boat launch and pedestrian pier – narrow upfront and wider waterward. Less motorized. Preserve social equity in access to water for crabbing & fishing. Something (preferred) between #2 and #3.
- #3 – How would budget be funded on all 3 projects? What are build out timelines?
- ALT 3 – like 1 MSC building on the uplands. Best for natural environment and long term sustainability. No OWS (overwater structure) is best for long term costs due to sea level rise, storm surge, earthquakes or tsunamis. Be safe; stay upland.
- #3 – probably healthiest for environment, but we would lose the boat launch and over water experience.
- Any change that favors marine habitat is highly desired. ALT 3 is most favorable for habitat.
- ALT 3 – concern about timing of work. Importance of the pier as a symbol of the park. Beside the lighthouse, the pier is the image of the park. Concern about funding and mitigation of cost to NSC, and major park attraction.
- #3 – why does the MSC have to be built on the beach? That’s ugly.
- #3 – could the MSC in ALT 3 be moved north and west as in ALT 2 which would be a least costly alternative?
- Like ALT 2 – safer. Reasonable compromise
- #3 – I look at the MSC distribution age. K thru 12. Would 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100. The MSC offers great opportunities to volunteer, get out and do something, do good!
- #3 – love #3 – best for environment. Best for future sea rise. New buildings for MSC which is desperately needed and will be much enjoyed by locals and visitors.
- #3 – does MSC lose any square footage with this alternative, compared to others?
- What factors make ALT 3 the best cost?
- #3 – lack of boat launch
- #3 – should the criteria be ranked in importance?
- #3 – isn’t the pier a historic structure, so removing it (in Alt 3) might not be possible?
- ALT 3 – problem: no access for MSC research in-water (small boats for beach seining , surveying both). Science and tourist related (e.g. 18 foot Boston Whaler trailerable but in water for days at a time) Need modest storage for equipment & gear on waterfront.
- #3 – have a smaller pier with the MSC on shore, but no boat launch.
- #3 – permit feasibility – isn’t this a no-go or go in criterion If permits are denied, construction can’t proceed.
- #3 – concerned about impact on MSC. No over-water access but that could be added like the enhancement of the marine environment. Is the proposed site of the MSC really sufficiently above the storm/king tide/sea level rise level?
- Like unifying MSC in one building. Need pedestrian pier. Like the rest of ALT3. Good flow – pedestrian walkability. Good environmental plan. Do not need boat launch available. Other places. Caveat is \*\*Cost MSC \$\$\$.
- #3 – shame to not have water access for boaters, fishers, etc. what about the mooring buoys? But a big plus for the eelgrass!
- #3 – if this is an option that the MSC prefers, I would support this for environmental reasons. However, for “getting folks out over the water” from an accessibility perspective, I currently prefer #2. I’m unclear how option 3 affects the MSC’s touch tanks.
- #3 – this is my least favorite because it has no pier at all. I agree there should be no boat ramp. But a pier provides perspective. I **prefer ALT 1**, a new pier with a new PTMSC marine exhibit.

- #3 – even removing pier & boat launch allows for kayak & SUP launching.
- #3 – need to consider how to phase and not shut down MSC at all. Even temp closure would harm operation.
- Need a restroom if MSC stays on pier.
- #3 – if a new MSC, needs to fit into historic surroundings.
- #3 – besides considerations of recreation and history, I would like to see the character of our area considered too. The Salish Sea is losing many old piers and docks etc. that provide character. Ecological factors should also be paramount, but hopefully along with simple and quiet recreation, historic preservation, and sustaining character.
- #2 – The building on the pier is so important to the marine science center experience. Don't lose it! The boat ramp is unnecessary. It's a source of contaminants. Get ride of the boat launch!
- Probably prefer #3 – can you merge #2 and #3? No off ramp overhead launch. Nothing should encourage power boat traffic, which will only hurt environment. Encourage SUP & kayak.
- ALT 2 – relocate. No boat launch except for hand launched kayaks, small boats, stand up paddleboards. Consider pedestrian pier in existing pier location. MSC on land not on pier.
- Consider more than 1 lane for the boat launch. Will the lateral drift really not be disturbed by the launch ramp?
- Removal of the pier will remove the sand which makes for a safer sandbar for small children.
- Remove off-ramp boat launch vehicle circulation and provide a different alternative. Consider a boat launch that encourages kayaks, row boats, smaller boats. This ramp will be an eyesore and inhibit the experience of the majesty of the stunning natural beauty of the waterfront. Please show a physical pictorial example of the elevated boat launch.
- #2 – seems the option likely to please the greater number of stakeholders.
- ALT 2 – not as good as ALT3 but 2<sup>nd</sup> best. No need for boat launch. Other boat launches in the area. Not as good for environment and future high tides. This area cannot accommodate all recreational activities. Make it a beach haven and science experience and forget boat launching.
- Opposed to #2 for financial & marina impact reasons.
- ALT 2 – believe that sustainability could be increased easily to “high.”
- Why so much focus on preserving unremarkable military buildings and infrastructure? It's just glorifying war and focusing on fear. Let's focus on the natural environment.
- No Boat Launch! No Jet Skis! Have you considered that the boat launch will require fresh water washdown facility, that may cause runoff onto the beach and nearshore?
- ALT 2 – like the pedestrian pier. OK for MSC but prefer 1 building. Feel like boats and trailers not a good mix in this area. Area better suited for walking and beach activities.
- Input from Puget Sound Anglers – 2 lanes and boat launch. Dock on either side of ramp. More parking spaces. Many trucks/trailers = 50 ft in length. Restroom near ramp/parking? Docks on either side of ramp to be available year-round. Trailer boating in WA – growing. Make reasonable cost. Lower maintenance cost.
- Don't see need for boat launch. Other options exist in the area.
- How is encouraging more boating activity which brings oil spills, bottom paint, more overall people impact on the marine life better than having the current loss of eel grass!!
- #2 – if the MSC wants to retain the pier experience, I like this more narrow pier that extends further past the eel grass. I'd love to see us move away from the carbon experience (cars, fuel powered boats and the parking required for this access) and yet there are likely accessibility considerations and may be even marine study reasons I don't know about that drive us toward keeping a boat launch as part of the design. I'm not interested in pedestrian access, bicycle

parking, shore launching of human powered boats (kayaks, paddleboards), etc). More QUIET tanks at MSC.

- I support 2 story building for MSC. This would allow display of area & whale skeletons, which would be good draw for visitors. How long would MSC be closed?
- ALT 2- Good option but I don't know? No boat launch. Like the smaller pier. More intimate to water. New, bigger buildings MSC is great. Like to aquarium on uplands. Boat launch should be kept small to minimal; anchor ins. New boaters will scour eelgrass and add more impacts to kelp beds to north (no jet skis) – pollution due to fuel & wash station which is too close!
- Keep MSC and overwater facility. No power boat launch. No water taxi. Keep facility for lo-tech water equipment i.e. kayaks, etc.
- For any of these options, the use of the Cablehouse should transfer to the MSC. The PDA doesn't need a valuable building to sell fries and ice cream for 3 months. Use a food truck!
- \$15-18m exorbitant cost. Not a lot of valuable change. Impacts to MSC too high. Concern about an additional structure & retrofitting.
- Recreational experience extremely important. Keep MSC an over-water facility. No water taxi. No power boat launch. Keep pedestrian and lo-tech facility.
- The most important decision criteria is the appeal of the post project facility to visitors. An over-water facility has a strong allure, especially to visitors from non-coastal locations. Children and adults alike are drawn to a pier, first to look down into the sea, and then into the science center. Building with its aquariums and educational exhibits. The end result matters most.
- Build new pier before dismantling existing pier
- It seems the easiest and least costly option is to rehabilitate ... eel grass is striving all around Ft Worden. Pier or no pier. This existing one was replied in the 80s and is still up and functional. Let's repile and remove launch. We have a MSC on a pier – let's not lose that!
- What will happen to PT Paddlesports during and after construction?
- How does the ramp effect the visual connection to the light house?
- Need 2 boat ramps with piers on both sides for access. Need \$\$ estimates in each Alternative (1) to rebuild the pier and that building – how much?
- Boat launch – I am worried about car traffic and boat traffic off the coast of this area. More boats will add pollution, noise and limit enjoyment of the beach. A launch for kayaking, SUP, etc no motorized would be better.
- What does the MSC want? What is its goal? Will a bigger and modernized MSC actually improve the wonderful service it currently offers our community?
- Expanded MSC means more people. Where do they park? Where are the restrooms? What about the new streets design needed?
- Consider removing the MSC from pier, ending vehicle access, make it walk on only. Get some more years out of it. Create consolidated upgraded MSC on land. Improve ecology. Less vehicles. Sustain character.
- Like the design, however the trailers/truck approach looks ok, but may be difficult for some drivers.
- It would be nice if the marine science center could expand on land AND still be out on the pier as well.

Fort Worden State Park – Pier, Boat Launch & Marine Science Center  
The Commons Building, Room A - June 10, 2019  
Public Meeting Comments

- Do not feel a motorboat launch is necessary. The large elevated launch with trestle would take away from the beauty of the beach – also add noise. I would not want to walk under motorized car/boat trestle – it takes away from the experience of the beach. It would be attractive to visitors to have a place with no motorized boat launch – a place that encourages other types of non-motorboats, a place that encourages walking, biking, surfing, swimming, tide pooling, sitting, picnicking – all without much motor noise. Fishing from the beach or pier is also possible and quiet. Keep this area of beach special – enjoy nature at its best. The rest of the preferred alternative I support – keeping PTMSC impacts somewhat minimal is appreciated.
- Comments
  1. continue to prefer Alternative 3 but would be ok with pedestrian pier.
  2. I disagree that no boat launch will result in low recreational rating. The main use of this area is:
    - a. Beach
    - b. MSC
    - c. camping. There is very little boat use. The boat launch is very expensive, an eye sore and low usage.
  3. There are very few fabulous beaches like this one in WA. Make the beach the focal point and make it as much of a pedestrian zone as possible limiting trucks, truck noise, truck exhaust etc. and more people will recreate. Can expand kayak, rowing, etc. By trying to make this area a little of everything you make it average/mediocre instead of making it something unique and grand.
- Aesthetics – materials for pier, buildings, cost impact? (I support more \$\$ for better materials) – Pedestrian Safety – decrease car interaction. Allow for long non-beach walkways from gate to point.
- What happens during fishing season? Better access = more people.
  1. Why not wrap existing pilings and extend life?
  2. Passenger ferry to cut auto traffic.
  3. Can you save existing trees?
  4. How do multiple boats put in and take out?
  5. Not enough parking for boat trailers.
- Relocate & preferred Alternatives
  1. It appears that the boat launch impacts in cost (Launch & breakwater) and view shed are not worth the benefits for the number of users (only 6 parking spaces).
  2. Would permits and breakwater be needed for a less obtrusive non-motorized boat launch?
  3. Would the eel grass gap in the diagrams be allowed to fill in with the new boat launch?
  4. Include passive barrier along multi-use path to protect beach vegetation.
- Passenger terminal use and widen launch ramp.
- 6 trailer stalls for the boat ramp is not nearly enough! This will become the go-to launching facility when it is done. It was that in the past when it was able to be maintained. Mid channel bank is why everyone comes here to fish. It is rowing (not legible) from here.

- My choice in order of preference is
  1. Preliminary alternative (preferred)
  2. Relocate
  3. Remove
  
- Choices
  1. Rather than adoption of a traditional piling in the most active drift area, would it be feasible to consider a span for the most landward portion? Metal structures with suspension system from land bulkhead to seaward pier system.
  2. Will PTMSC maintain a permit to pipe seawater to new structure on land? Primary objective of touch tanks – tidal tanks and associated educational programming.
  
- Alternative #3 works best for a wildlife habitat (salmon, eelgrass, etc.) . Under design criteria the
  1. Concern is (to) improve habitat
  2. Concern is sea level rise
  3. Alternative #3 is obvious choice

There will be lots of recreation left under Alternative #3 and natural environment will greatly be improved.

- A quick reference was made to “FEMA Requirements.” I am wondering if Tsunami survivability was considered? I work with the Jefferson County Dept of Emergency Management. In post Cascadia Recovery we will need boat landing locations to bring in supplies due to the surface road disruption. Please consider this factor.
  
- People who launch boats are not campers. They drive trailers down the hill. Where will they park trailers? How do you get seawater to new marine science center on land?? (now have easy pump of seawater.)
  
- The preliminary preferred alternative is a good compromise of a large number of competing considerations.
  
- Choices/Consideration
  1. Would like to see more consideration for landscape context. The constructed marine facilities direct energy flows perpendicular to shore, whereas human access and ecological movement is parallel to shore.
  2. All pavement is foreign and unwelcome in beach environment.
  3. Humans need beach access. This location needs to celebrate beach.
  4. The path for humans around street and parking is too far from beach and water.
  5. The 5’ fill for boat launch and pedestrian gangway displace beach habitat and obstruct flows of ecological process parallel t shore (water circulation, animal movement, aesthetics.) Need tons of riprap.
  6. Why do all structures need to be straight lines and right angles? Arcing piers & vehicle circulation.
  7. Boat launch is hard to back trailer – can’t see water or people. No line of sight.
  
- Are you budgeting/planning for fresh water (shower, drinking fountain, etc.) in concession area (on beach side of the road?)
  
- Boat ramp is 20 feet wide. Boats being launched and boats being taken out must take turns. This may become a bit snarled.

- Like it. As there will be increase traffic and people, how are you designing the access/staging/turn around for fire & emergency medical.
- We need a good boat ramp with adequate parking for trailers (need more than 6 stalls). I like the elevated boat ramp design.
- Floating breakwater – How attenuate waves?
- Do you really require additional expense for launching at super low tides? Although these occur in peak months, the expense isn't worth it.
- Why do you want boat launch that you are trying to obscure? Let's forget the boat launch.
- \*Good Job\* I am convinced preferred alternative is best but would like the boat ramp to be non-motorized access only for public safety concerns. And, because motorboats can launch in 2 other areas of our town!
- MSC has an investment in its building on the pier. How is Parks planning to pay for the condemnation of its assets? How much will the alternatives cost MSC to rebuild?
- Replace concrete launch ramp with a grid so light can go through for eelgrass. It is difficult to back a trailer on the ground much less down/up a ramp for a ways. \*Why only one lane? What entity provides permits? Why not more launch area?
- Has any thought been given to overall traffic flow within Fort Worden?
- Have you been collecting data on boat launch use? If so, what do you know about who and when it's used? (& how many people/year).
- If the preferred plan is executed, how long would the aquarium function as it does now? Would the new museums be 2 levels and when would it be built?
- How long would the aquarium be closed to the public?
- The presentation implied the boat launch concept would be for smaller craft. If that is so, how is this policed for boat size? Why is the boat haven boat launch not adequate for the boat launch needs?
- Are trailers backing up 200' at low tide? Restrooms are across from launch. Little kids will be running across launch area to beach. All launches are Dungeness Pt Angeles, Pt Townsend Boat Haven have breakwater or surrounded by spits.
- Will floating dock be removed September-May? Your design seems to have breakwater on wrong side of boat launch. Will there be pump out and rinse off station or will they use campsite facilities? Floating dock is hard to walk on in high winds and waves. Is 12" concrete curb entire length of boat launch or only elevated portion?

- Satellite view of Manchester elevated launch looks like it stops literal shift. Oil, gas, pollution on eel grass, fish eggs. Traffic through park increases. Who will monitor boats dumping sanitation devices illegally before coming to launch?
- Is the demand from the small boat community, for a new improved launch facility strong enough to justify the cost? Are the launch facilities in town inadequate to meet the launching needs?
- Concerns/Questions
  1. Concerned that with only 6 truck-boat trailer spots, there may be parking conflicts in other areas.
  2. What is current boat launch usage?
  3. Is an extra-long boat launch necessary? How often does an extreme low tide affect boaters?
- Statistics on boat launch usage currently? Why spend for boat launch that gets little use, is redundant (there are other launch sites nearby), and that you want to “obscure” (i.e. you assume no one wants to look at it?)  
Conclusion – eliminate the boat launch. If we must have a boat launch, keep it small. A larger launch attracts more traffic to a park that already has enormous issues with traffic, noise, and exhaust fumes. Have you studied effect on local traffic?
- What elements are included in “seasonal concessions.?” Are they only part of the PPA? Could you please explain timelines for each alternative? Could you walk us through sequencing of changes for the PPA?
- Design sustainability could be inched towards “high” depending on how the added parking areas are surfaced.
- Preliminary Preferred Alternative – Has the possibility of giving the cable house to PTMSC – the canteen is used for such a short season. It could easily be replaced by food trucks (giving local businesses a bonus). Perhaps this is an option to be considered as design is developed.
- Questions & Comments
  1. What is eelgrass restoration target?
  2. It seems like use of the beach was minimized as a recreation use.
  3. What is the projected demand for use of the boat launch by fishermen; especially in fishing season?
  4. How is beach area renovation and construction of new PTMSC going to be coordinated?
- Love the preferred preliminary design – minus the boat launch. An excellent launch at the part provides lots of parking. This would make the fort more environmentally sound, improve the movement of sand, decrease sound pollution and provide more non-motorized recreation opportunities.
- Is there a budget for art in the project? Is there another site for boat launch separate from the pier ‘district’  
Conflict at use with boat adjacent to pier/marine science center.

## Fort Worden State Park – Pier, Boat Launch & Marine Science Center Online & E-mail Comments

---

I am a resident of the Port Townsend/Chimacum area, and read Mr. Boxlitner's article in the 6/5/19 Leader.

I'd like to take up the offer to make brief comment on the Fort Worden pier and boat launch alternatives, as I did not make the 6/10/19 public meeting.

I am in support of alternatives that keep the pier and boat launch as part of the plan.

There are several local, recreational fisherman (including myself) that would like to maintain our opportunity to launch at Fort Worden. That launch provides a unique benefit that other more remote launches do not. It allows those of with smaller boats to safely launch within the calmer waters there, to fish along the inside of the hook. It can be quite difficult for those with smaller vessels to make the run from the boat haven around Pt. Hudson when the winds blow. Eliminating this launch will also concentrate traffic further at the remaining sites.

I also enjoy taking guests to the fort and walking out on the pier. It provides it's own unique perspective of the surrounding beauty.

I feel like the park is a place for all guests and residents to enjoy, not just those who desire an "uninterrupted view". I love the views as well, but also enjoy participating in nature. The pier and launch afford us that opportunity.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

I grew up in Port Townsend and at 29 I am still a resident. I truly love this town. I grew up hanging out on the Fort Worden Pier. I jumped off it, I ride my bike out it on a regular basis, I've fished off it..it is, to me, an important staple in the Fort Worden Park. In attending the meetings you have held over the last few months, I understand that the building that the Marine Science center runs out of is deteriorating as are some aspects of the pier itself. In assessing the options regarding the future of the pier and the waterfront down at the Fort, I hope that there is a voice for modesty and minimal added infrastructure. If there is anything that has become a trend in this town it is the rise in development. It is a beautiful town and I understand that more people want to live here and build homes, etc. But along with that has come a new urgency to glamorize the town and upgrade a lot of the sidewalks, widen roads, etc. I like the funky old Port Townsend and I hope I am not going to live to see it completely disappear. If the pier must go to fix an environmental issue due to the creosote, so be it. If the Marine Science Center would flourish better in a newer, and more stable building on shore, so be it. I support the longevity of both of those decisions. I do not support the opportunity that some people see in this "renovation" to also add in a huge boat launch. If the issue is environmental, then encouraging such large motor boats would completely defeat the purpose of the pier removal. If we provide a new boat ramp for larger motor boats, I assume the plan is also to expand the nice, smaller parking lot that has worked just fine for the past 50+, so that the boat trailers and their huge trucks have a place to park. And while that happens I'm sure the road would also "need" to be redone and widened to make way for these large boats and trailers. That is what I am afraid of happening. Similar situations keep slipping into being this town and

before we know it, this will no longer be a nice little town. Frankly, if the pier must be addressed, I say we just take it out, move the Marine Science Center to the shore and call it good. Open the whole beach up. Keep the existing launch for smaller vessels. Keep the park as wild as we can to truly allow as much nature to flourish as we can. Let that wonderful quality be what draws people to our lovely park, not some big boat launch and a draw for more vehicles.

---

Take out the boat launch. The oil and gas spill plus the additional run off from the parked vehicles will add to the stress on the local marine life. Maybe improve the launch area of Boat Haven instead. Launching boats where you have kayakers, paddle boards and swimmers is unsafe as well.

---

I attended the recent public meeting held at the Commons at Fort Worden in Port Townsend, where three alternative proposals for improvement were described--and a preferred alternative was described. I support that alternative but wish the Parks Commission had been more expansive in its vision and included renovation of the Point Wilson Lighthouse, which is physically just several hundred yards beyond the boat and pier area they are working on. The Lighthouse is also a historical treasure, and renovation would provide a nice additional income to the Fort Worden Park as park guests would want to explore it and climb it. Ignoring it now will only make future renovation more complicated and expensive as deterioration progresses. Please consider adding that additional waterfront area to the current Fort Worden renovation project.

---

Alternative scenario:

Tidal-zone/pier:

Remove concrete seawall adjacent to ramp. - (actually a groin which prohibits migration within the tidal zone and causes sand build up on the ramp).

Remove piling wall from existing pier.

Leave existing ramp.

Do environmental analysis after a year or two- discern whether further remediation needed.

Do scalable-cost renovations on existing pier (wrap/replace pilings with steel or concrete pilings) to retain Historic Significance and feel. This has the utmost importance as related to me in conversations with others; particularly my neighbors who share the view of the beach and point. There is property value at stake for 30-50 homes in this middle/upscale neighborhood.

Move MSC to shore. Reconfigure structure on dock as combo public shelter/kiosk and possible booth cafe.

Add picnic tables and benches.

Landside:

Put Campground spots on beach side of road (premium fees for beachfront quickly offsets cost)

Parking near base of bluff- mitigating runoff contamination.

Road between.

Pedestrian/bike path between RV spots and beach.

Additional thinking: I think it is very important to provide for passenger-boat access to the landing- either as part of the new launch ramp pier or the new/renovated existing pier.

Traffic to future events at the site is something we in this neighborhood have serious concerns about. Any mitigation is worthy of consideration.

A water-taxi/passenger ferry/charter boat element (service to/from Point Hudson and or Whidbey Island?) could be significant... particularly if that vessel were to be employed in combination-use with excursions related to the MSC and if it were electrically propelled for example (possibly qualifying it for grant funding).

Maybe built by local Shipwrights?

Thanks for your consideration.

Please feel free to contact me- I would enjoy the chance to share my ideas and concerns and enthusiasm for the future of the Fort.

---

Due to the lack of use and with climate changes I believe that the boat launch/ pier should be removed. Give some of the money that would have been spent on replacement to the Port Townsend Marine Science Center and then make park improvements.

---

Thanks for the presentation tonight, I hope you stopped to see the Boat Haven Launch on your way out of town tonight. If not, here is a snapshot, it's the red dot on the screen shot that says Port Townsend Boat Haven. It has 30 parking spaces, a rinse off station, two lane launch, long dock with fuel dock at end and is in an industrial area of town. It is 4 miles from Ft. Worden, and like I mentioned it has a "ramp rush" policy for crowded fishing days. Also, have you considered working with the city at the North Beach Park for a boat launch, the launch was closed but could be developed, it's out of the way and on a rocky shoreline, unlike the pristine sandy beach at Ft. Worden.

---

Thank you for listening to the opinions of our community re: the dock repair? replacement? relocation?

My main concern is that the beach has a unique and valuable character that means a lot to me, and I would hate to lose that. Our world is changing and growing and many of our old buildings and places are being taken away, replaced with modern entities which have no charm or character. I'm opposed to increased boat traffic, noise, or other environmental pollution. I hope that the changes that are coming will be positive ones and that all the above will be taken into serious consideration.

---

I would prefer:

1. Removal of the pier & creosote pilings to improve nearshore habitat
2. Moving the MSC to a new facility at the fort.
3. Removal of the boat launch to restore sand/sediment flow up and down the beach.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment!

---

The beach walk and pier are treasured recreation activities in Fort Worden. If you add an elevated boat launch you will change the whole character of the shoreline and detract from the view of the lighthouse and from the pleasure of a peaceful beach walk. Right now the shoreline is a treasure for kayakers and paddleboarders who have easy access to the water, and for walking and playing on the beach. Why is that not enough! Why do power boats need to launch here? They can get here easily enough without adding noise and congestion to the beach area.

Both visitors and locals alike have a great attachment to the pier and having a MSC over the water is so appropriate. Rehabilitate what we have by all means but keep it simple and welcoming for existing activities.

---

I attended the April 18 public meeting and commend you and your team on the meeting and approach. It is always refreshing to attend a meeting that is well run and not overtaken by one or two folks intent on grandstanding.

I included my comments during the meeting, but wanted to encourage your team to spend some time on a warm sunny day observing the recreational use of the beaches at Fort Worden.

The beach south of the pier is frequented by many families, local and out of town. Kids swim, chase crabs, jump off the side of the pier, learn to paddleboard and kayak, kick balls, dig in the sand and generally enjoy the only real beach accessible to folks who live and recreate in PT. This beach is a particular draw due to protection from winds (north) and sand deposition created by the existing pier. PT is a cool place and that water is really cold, so families migrate to the warmest, safest spot to play in the water.

The entire west side of the peninsula is private, the beaches from Chetzamoka to Irondale are cobbly, industrial or polluted. North beach is fun but often windy and a little funky for swimming when outfall from Chinese Gardens and sewage treatment plant is running.

I respect the challenges your team faces in meeting the needs of all the diverse user groups and natural systems and want to represent the perspective of the families who do not have time to attend evening meetings and participate in your planning process.

That little beach is a unique and invaluable commodity. Thanks for considering this perspective in your decision.

Just wanted to add another comment for the proposals at Ft. Worden.

I was at the Ft. Worden beach this week-end and wanted to share some pictures on how the beach was being used. It was lots of people throughout the park, biking, walking, and on the beach. Families, picnics, kids in the sand, paddle boards, kayaks, floaties, people walking the beach, bicycles on the road, people crossing the road from the Canteen and restrooms. It definitely wasn't a scene that a boat launch would fit into. The thought of a truck/trailer driving through the park to reach a launch, backing up with all the people around, and trying to launch a boat with all the activity on the water and beach would be an accident waiting to happen.

---

I am for a repaired or new boat launch near the Port Townsend Marine science center. It doesn't need to be large.

---

I support all alternatives that maintain recreational small boat access at Fort Worden by replacing the existing boat ramp with an elevated one. This is of particular urgency given the deplorable lack of maintenance and closure of boat ramps in the area by the Port of Port Townsend and other public

entities. Small boat access is key to protecting our waterways--rowers, sailors, anglers--all have a stake in ensuring our waters are clean and protected. They are also among the first to notice when things are amiss. There is no substitute for being on the water itself for developing an appreciation of how important our State waterways are to the health and economic prosperity of our communities. Thank you for consideration of my comments.

---

RE: Preferred Alternative. I think the boat launch is excessive. I am not sure about State Parks rules or the laws regarding launching small craft (kyak, canoe, similar) from beaches at state parks, but I would like to see access for craft of this size from this beach, so if a pier is required to launch these size craft, I would prefer the minimum required size. If beach launching is allowed (fee, Discover Pass, ?); I think no - pier makes better long term sense.

---

Our grand daughter has benefitted from Marine Science Center programs, and I expect her brother will as well. Because the Marine Science Center has been such a Leader, in protecting the Salish Sea, and because of the critical need to take action because of climate change, and having read the published pros and cons, I respectfully request that the piers be eliminated and the area restored to the fullest extent possible.

Decades ago we had the opportunity to be volunteer caretakers at the Saco River Campground for the Appalachian Mountain Club. When the State took over, the put-in area was expanded as was parking. We networked with the local communities to minimize impacts and educate, but were overwhelmed by the success of the primitive campground to the point that we had to close some areas to regrow, make the Manager's position a paid one, and add a River Runner to patrol, assist, and educate. We wryly joked that by the time the process had run several years, it was possible to cross the Saco dry shod, from canoe to canoe.

I appreciate better than many the dance involved in balancing access with loving a thing to death, but you asked. So, there is plenty of waterfront. And plenty of boating of all sorts. Please protect this fragile bit.

---

I live in Port Townsend and have two kayaks, so my primary uses for Ft Worden (in the area under consideration) are walking, biking, and launching my kayaks. I'm very happy that the boat ramp has been in disrepair for quite a while. It means that there are seldom large boat trailers causing traffic and parking problems. The Alternative 3, and "No Action" both meet my desire for making boat launches go elsewhere. I see many problems with increasing boat trailer traffic at Ft Worden, and prefer keeping it to a low traffic area.

---

I attended the June 10<sup>th</sup> public meeting held in the Fort Worden Commons. Having been unable to attend the earlier meeting I felt compelled to attend this one. What I wanted to address lays inside and outside of the proposed area shown that evening in the slide show. There are impacts from traffic, pedestrians, and construction I have witnessed in my 20 years living in Port Townsend that I feel are relevant in forming my opinion and recommendation.

We have lived in the neighborhood of Fort Worden, near the corner of Walnut and T streets and have watched Fort Worden turn from a state park in desperate need of an infusion of money and renovation

to what appears now into a thriving, restored, expanding destination for food, drink, conferences, music festivals and ever expanding hospitality accommodations. And this is merely what happens inside the park.

Surrounding Fort Worden are entirely residential communities that watch as traffic, noise and road erosion has increased. Which ever route chosen to enter Fort Worden State Park you must travel through these same home communities. There is no other way, unless you travel by water or air. Inside the park on most given spring and summer days the entire park comes into play. During fall and winter, visitors are encouraged by any number of events supported by the remodeling of officer's row and new rentals currently being constructed.

Outside the roads all of us travel to and from the park are in need of repair that exceeds what is done yearly by the city of asphalt patching and pounding smooth. There are continuing indications on Walnut street heading down to the park that the bluff has moved. Cherry street which is the most direct route into and out of the park will sustain the heaviest burden of increased traffic. Traffic that is now being proposed consisting of truck, trailer and boat.

Inside there seems to be enough parking for some of the fishermen and their equipment but exactly how many remains to be determined. A Ford 150 weights between 4,000 and 5,600 pounds while pulling a trailer and boat that on average may weight an additional 1,000 to 4,000 pounds.

Outside, and along the two-lane streets, the additional weight, noise and erosion will be felt by the home owners and ultimately the tax payers. Furthermore, on the inside of the park the same I predict will occur.

This is an opportunity to design and build what will not overburden the surrounding community, and still remain inviting for everyone whether they drive, walk, bus or bike. The nearby available launch site in the boat haven is located in a commercial area, close to fuel stations, food and additional parking, and has been sufficient for years.

My recommendation is to remove the existing pier, replaced with a pedestrian walkway/pier, and not to build a new boat ramp.

---

Thank you for the presentation of the Preliminary Preferred Option, in Fort Worden State Park, on June 10<sup>th</sup>. It was apparent that much thought has already gone into the project, even at this stage of planning.

It is my hope that Washington State Parks will have the courage to be bold with this project.

Fort Worden has the opportunity to be a pristine, futuristic park, and this project is make or break for that vision. The presence of a motorized boat ramp will define the characteristic of the park, and impact the experience for every citizen who enjoys the amenities of the park. Since the goal of inclusivity for varying recreation options is important to the Parks, I suggest that including a motorized boat ramp will actually have the opposite impact.

Here are my concerns about such a ramp.

- Safety. Increased motorboat activity will result in increased risks for all others in the water, and near the ramp.
- Vehicular Impact. Limiting immediate parking will not limit the use of the ramp. A plan for trailers to park further to the north, or in the upper area of the park will impact the natural beauty of the park. I anticipate a parking lot of trucks and trailers between the ramp and the lighthouse, wherever parking is available. The vehicular impact will reach beyond the park to the surrounding neighborhoods as vehicles travel toward the park, down the bumpy roads.
- Environmental Impact. Noise pollution (vehicles and boats), air pollution (idling vehicles), and environmental impact on the marine environment will impact everyone who uses the park, and the park itself.
- Aesthetics. The visual impact of the ramp is of concern to both citizens, and the pre-planning group. The fact the visual mitigation (with the pier) is a selling point for the boat ramp, is itself a statement of the detrimental aesthetic impact of the ramp.

As Joni Mitchell (or more recently the Counting Crows) put it...

Don't it always seem to go,  
That you don't know what you've got  
Til its gone  
They paved paradise  
And put up a parking lot

Eliminate the boat ramp and the Preliminary Preferred Option will be perfect.

---

I am writing to share with you my concerns about the State's Proposal for Changes to the Fort Worden Pier and the Port Townsend Marine Science Center

The existing pier supports the Marine Science Center's engaging exhibit of the marine organisms living just below the surface, educating and generating appreciation of our marine environment among park visitors and school groups. The position of the Marine Exhibit over the water is a very important part of the experience, because it helps visitors and students connect everything they can see from the pier with the dynamic ecosystem just below the surface.

The exhibit in the Marine exhibit is maintained by a continuous flow of fresh seawater pumped from below the pier. This assures that water passing through the sea life tanks has the same temperature, dissolved oxygen and other characteristics as water in our bay, and it brings living plankton to feed the many filter feeders in the exhibit. Among the plankton are larvae of organisms that settle out and become part of the exhibit too.

The pump that brings water into the exhibit is located on a beam under the building. The Seattle Aquarium, the Poulsbo Marine Science Center, the Point Defiance Aquarium in Tacoma, and the Oregon Coast Aquarium are all built at the edge of salt water bays, and their intake pumps are located close to the water, either beneath their facility or on adjacent piers. There is a reason for this. A pump above the water source creates a vacuum to pull water from below and it can only pull water to a certain height. Even a tiny leak between the water source and the pump will break the vacuum and cut off the water flow.

In looking at the diagrams of the Preferred Alternative, which would remove the pier and move the Marine Exhibit to a shore-based location, I am troubled that I don't see a plan for the sea water system. Where is the seawater pump? Where are the pipes carrying water to and from the onshore marine exhibit? Is the plan to install the pump over the water on the new visitor pier with an accessible plumbing system suspended over the road? Or is the plan to place the pump in the new building and try to suck water from up the beach through a pipe buried below the road and inaccessible for maintenance? This worries me.

I know that concerns have been raised about impacts of the existing pier on the drift-cell along the Ft. Worden beach, but I wonder if anyone has evaluated the extent to which the pier is negatively affecting marine life. I also wonder how much drift-cell disruption might be reduced by removing the close-set pilings placed along the shoreward pier as a breakwater for the small harbor, along with the concrete breakwater north of the boat ramp?

I raise these questions because I am concerned that removing the pier and moving the Marine Exhibit to a location onshore would diminish the experience of visitors, lessening their engagement with life below the surface of this spectacular beach and its potential to inspire stewardship. I am also concerned that the changes outlined in your preferred proposal will result in physical challenges that could make it logistically overwhelming for the PTMSC to continue maintaining its live marine exhibit in another location. I urge you to reconsider your plans to remove the pier.

---

I know today is the last day you will take comments and I wanted to send you some additional pictures from today (6/30) at Ft. Worden just to reiterate how the beach is being used. This beach is not the right spot for an elevated motorized boat ramp, I do hope you consider finding another location. I'm also including a picture of the Boat Haven launch today, it's less than 4 miles away, and didn't have a full parking lot, is an additional boat ramp really needed? I've added a picture of the road into the park with the cars and bikers sharing the road, a truck with a trailer/boat would be a tight squeeze on the park roads. This is just a fraction of what was going on today at the park. I love this park and it's beach, you would change it forever adding an elevated boat ramp.

I know you said you had to design for the one person that wants a boat launch but please reconsider the location, this beach is not it.

---

I know it is too late to provide comment in this round of consideration for the Fort Worden Marine Facilities Project, but hope to provide some input to you as the planner of this project. My family has been a long time resident in the Fort Worden neighborhood, living on U street between Cherry and Fir. We walk to the Fort every day, and are raising our children on the beach and forest of Fort Worden. It has been so nice to not have motorized boat traffic launching from Fort Worden ever since the launch has been in disrepair. We can safely launch kayaks, canoes, and stand up paddle boards, and it has been nice to see an increase in this type of recreation here at the Fort. I have also noticed less engine oil residue in the boat launch area, directly in front of the Marine Science Center as a result of not having so many motorized boats. Port Townsend already has multiple motorized boat launch facilities, and it seems excessive and very obtrusive to have a permanent elevated ramp here at the Fort. The Fort has really expanded its offerings and we have seen a sharp increase in visitation in the last 8 or so years, with additional trash, noise, and pollution, not to mention a plethora of invasive and noxious weeds. It feels like the Fort really cannot sustain much more before its ecological benefits start to degrade for the

long haul. As a former public land recreational planner, I urge the State to balance recreational use patterns with habitat, environmental concerns, and the consideration of peace and solitude that many who take a walk in the Fort seek. Just because a boat launch was there before doesn't necessarily mean that we need another one in the future, as this need is being met elsewhere in town, whereas there are not many launch sites for small recreational boats in sheltered areas.

We strongly value the pier for its recreational experience, to have the Marine Science Center where it currently is, and would love to see it remain, and rehabilitated.

Where is the project in its planning process? Is there another point in the project where we can provide formal comment?

Thank you for your consideration, I appreciate how complex this project can be.

---

I would like to voice some concern over the possibility that the renovations at Fort Warden might not include a boat ramp. I am very much in favor of the renovations as I understand them, but I would hate to see the boat ramp be removed from consideration. I thought the plan for an elevated boat ramp to allow natural movement of sediment and current a good one. I know that boat ramp has been somewhat under utilized in the past as it tended to silt in, but the new plan would change that.

Please include the boat ramp in the plans for fort Warden.

---

Please consider the option of an elevated ramp to replace the existing ramp at Fort Worden. It would allow the natural movement of beach sediments to migrate under the ramp and make the beach a healthier place for forage fish to spawn and, with the removal of the break wall, restore the natural beach Eco system of migrating sediments. It is an ideal location, next to the Marine Science Center, to showcase how properly thought out recreational facilities can be made to work with the environment rather than against it.

Boating facilities with access to the water are crucial and are limited. Others will not likely be built because it is extremely difficult to permit new ones.

Before moving to Port Townsend from out of the area, we used to camp at Fort Worden regularly. The boat ramp was a big draw. Boat Haven is the only other ramp in the immediate area and it is overly crowded during any fishing event with no place to park your trailer and tow vehicle. Just look at the Boat Haven ramp next weekend when Area 9 has its 4 day Chinook fishing season.

The small but vocal group of activists pushing to remove the ramp entirely are people who do not use it and could care less if the ramp disappears.

---

Is there a deadline for comment on the proposals for the new boat launch at Fort Worden? I support the elevated launch and absolutely agree that some boat launch is needed as part of the package.

---

We attended the meetings in April and June and are in support of replacing the existing Fort Worden boat ramp with an elevated boat launch that will provide access to the water for small trailers & boats. We agree that we must strive to improve habitat and plan for sea level rise, while controlling costs.

Puget Sound Anglers is a local fishing club with over seventy members in the Port Townsend area and over 5,000 in many other chapters in Puget Sound. We are a Washington non-profit corporation dedicated to preserving, protecting, and enhancing thriving populations of salmon and other species in healthy marine and freshwater environments. In so doing, we help to preserve traditions of engagement with wilderness, and of sport fishing as recreation and food source for our families, that have been passed down through generations as part and parcel of our Pacific Northwest culture.

We appreciate your planning and analysis to improve the Fort Worden beach and Marine Science Center. For several years, the boat launch has been effectively unusable for small boats with trailers. This all happened at the time when more and more people want to get out on the water and/or fish, crab or shrimp. North Puget Sound is a beautiful area with many recreational opportunities.

That boat ramp is an important recreational asset for this area. It has been underutilized recently due to the loss of the Hydraulic permit that enabled the sand to be scraped off. The elevated ramp would solve that issue by allowing the natural movement of beach sediments to migrate under the ramp. This will make the beach a healthier place for forage fish to spawn and, with the removal of the break wall, restore the natural beach Eco system of migrating sediments. I think it is an ideal location, next to the Marine Science Center, to showcase how properly thought out recreational facilities can be made to work with the environment rather than against it.

The location of this ramp is ideal to safely deploy the small recreational boats that fish Point Wilson and Mid Channel Bank since it is directly adjacent to both. Boat ramps at state parks are a crucial part of their recreational package. There are many folks that will make annual reservations here to camp and fish at Fort Worden just as I do at Cape Disappointment on the Columbia river. These boating facilities are crucial since access to the water is so limited and it is extremely difficult to permit new ones. There are less ramps now than when I moved here 40 years ago, however there are substantially more trailer-able boats.

Some local folks are trying to remove the boat ramp because it does not conform to their idea of a pristine beach. Those folks that come here to use the facilities are not here to defend them, just as I would not be able to defend against a group in Ilwaco who may want to remove the Cape Disappointment ramp, for example. These facilities are for ALL people, yet we, in Port Townsend, are the folks that the outreach is directed to, so it is up to us to have the input to affect the ultimate decisions. All of us feel that the ramp should be improved and will tell the folks that make the decision, that it is important to proceed with the new elevated ramp.

---