

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 2nd 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 replaid 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.