

## Public Comments for the March 23, 2022 Commission Meeting

**From:** Liz Hoenig  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 9, 2022 6:31:25 PM  
**To:** Carol Hasse; Pam Petranek; Pete Hanke  
**Cc:** Charley Kanieski; Eron Berg  
**Subject:** Strategic Planning

Dear Commissioners,

With all that's happening with poplars, new lease proposals at Point Hudson and other activities- we'd like to encourage you to set a priority for Strategic Planning and an adopted Point Hudson vision very soon. Planning takes time and community involvement- and adopting both of these will allow our Port to have a clear community vision. We hope it's a vision that includes a working, community centered waterfront!

Sincerely,

Liz Hoenig Kanieski and Charley Kanieski

--

**LIZ HOENIG KANIESKI (ki/kin)**  
710 Reed Street  
Port Townsend, WA 98368  
Coast Salish Territory  
cell:360-280-0233  
Liz and Charley muse on adventures at [inwardoutwardus.com](http://inwardoutwardus.com)

---

**From:** Scott Walker  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2022 9:25:55 PM  
**To:** Dave Thielk  
**Cc:** Becci Kimball; Richard Dandridge; Cindy Jayne; Carol McCreary; Gerald Braude; Eron Berg; Carol Hasse; Pam Petranek  
**Subject:** Re: It doesn't take much to get started

Well stated David. Mobility for all of us, including the Port tenant's employees and customers, without cars must be our prime goal now. The PoPT has one of the largest parking footprints in JeffCo, which is a huge subsidy driving. If they won't step up now, when will they?

Scot

*On Mar 20, 2022, at 8:16 PM, Dave Thielk wrote:*

Closing main streets to motor vehicle traffic can be quite positive for a community, and the local economy. And it doesn't take much to get started. In other words, we don't need hundreds of thousand dollars and consulting reports to make it happen.

<https://www.theurbanist.org/2022/03/20/sunday-video-what-happened-when-they-banned-cars/>

I can imagine Water Street as a wonderful place to be with limited traffic. For those of you who read the Leader, my advocacy piece was in the paper last week. However, the direction the Port of Port Townsend is going, by formalizing large areas of the Point Hudson area into parking spaces, takes us in the opposite

direction, and will only make closing Water Street much more difficult politically in the future. But closing Water Street to traffic is the least of my concerns.

Further, it's hard for me to understand how the Port could be arguing for expanded haul out space along Sims Way, and at the same time limit boat workspace down at Point Hudson, choosing instead to designate open space for more cars.

And then there is this: When I first learned of the plan to lease open space for parking, I thought, "What? Some of the most prime real estate in all of Port Townsend is going to be dedicated to ... parking?"

And, as we all know, parking and the creation of parking for motor vehicles, works against everything we know in terms of limiting carbon and reducing greenhouse gases, making the transition to alternative transportation modalities, and creating more livable communities.

Starting about 5 years ago, the traffic in Port Townsend has soared dramatically. I know this because I am on my bicycle every day, and frequently ride both during the day and at night. I ride 12 months a year, rain or shine. The number of close calls I experience weekly, and sometimes daily, has gone up ten fold in the last five years. There has been a slight reprieve in summer traffic from covid. But I am bracing for a difficult transportation experience this summer once again.

It appears that Puget Sound Express would like to double their business. That's an excellent outcome for our community. But not if they're going to route every single visitor through Port Townsend and down Water Street. Any plan that further jams up traffic in the downtown area, makes Water Street less comfortable for pedestrians and cyclists, encourages people to be in their car rather than use alternative modalities, and reinforces the current system that produces so much carbon dioxide has no place in contemporary transportation policy.

I listened to the Port commission meeting last week after the fact. I believe that the point of views expressed by both Carol Hasse and Eron Berg contain some logical fallacies. The underlying premises of their arguments for advancing/formalizing parking are simply not valid. I think it was Carol Hasse who said in the last port commissioner meeting, (paraphrased) "I don't like the fact that we're dependent on cars, but it's the system that we have now and we have no choice but to accommodate. We need to provide parking to our tenants." My response to this kind of thinking? If you know the system is flawed, then make the changes necessary to transition to a different system. Don't reinforce the current system. And I think it was Eron Berg who said during that meeting that the visitors coming to enjoy the whale watching tours spend thousands and thousands of dollars in other ways in Port Townsend. That is a good thing, but my question to Eron is "What does that have to do with giving them parking at Point Hudson?" There seems to be some fundamental premises that need to be examined.

- 1) **The Port has an obligation to provide parking for the current tenants.** This premise is simply not true. The Port has no obligation to provide parking for anyone, for that matter.
- 2) **Economic development depends on parking.** Nothing can be far from the truth. There is a great deal of information available that contradicts this premise.
- 3) **There is nothing, or little, that can be done at the local level when it comes to climate change.** My response to this false premise is in the next paragraph.

We all know that electing another Bill Clinton, Barack Obama, or Joe Biden did not, or is not, going to make a difference when it comes to climate breakdown. Governor Inslee, often referred to as the climate change governor, has had little real impact also. We are not going to ever elect someone at the national or state level that will get us past the loss of 1/3 of all species on planet earth, and the death by starvation of perhaps a

billion human beings. We know that the biggest changes that reduce greenhouse gases are coming at the municipal level. This is true all over the world. In other words, policymakers at the city and county level are able to make and pass policies that reduce carbon. The changes that must occur to move us away from car dependent systems have to occur at the local level if we're going to change quickly enough to avert catastrophic outcomes. The Port of Port Townsend is one of those policy teams that could make a difference. But, they won't make a difference if they focus on parking as a significant outcome.

If not the Port of Port Townsend making a difference, then who? There is no one else.

I believe there's a Port Commission meeting coming up this week. Please let me know if we need to talk about this. We don't have a Transportation Lab meeting until the following week.

Dave Thielk 360-301-6005

hope through meaning; meditation through music; community through dance; freedom through bicycling

---

**From:** Marny Kittredge

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2022 7:59 AM

**To:** Eron Berg

**Cc:** Pam Petranek; Pete Hanke; Eric Toews; Linger Longer Improvement Committee; Dave Neuenschwander; Carol Hasse

**Subject:** Re: Gardiner Boat Ramp Project

Thank you Pam and Eron for your responses. And yes please be read as public comment.

Kit

*On Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 2:49 PM Eron Berg wrote:*

Hello Kit and David,

The Gardiner Boat Launch was prioritized over the Quilcene, Mats Mats and Hadlock launches for last year's grant application because of its condition and the lack of a consensus on a Quilcene plan in time for that grant cycle (we have also passed on the EDA grant cycle for the same reason). For 2022, the Port has budgeted \$51,594 in ramp fees for all of the ramps other than Quilcene, which is included in the Quilcene budget. The Quilcene ramp is the only one broken out from the ramps as a group – I don't know the history as to that distinction since the ramp fees paid allow use of all of the ramps.

My view is that building this project with significant funding from the state, in continued partnership with WDFW (who owns the upland parking), is a great success and will maintain the only publicly accessible Jefferson County boat launch in Discovery Bay.

On another note, you may be happy to know that the Port was recently awarded funding for new pump out equipment at the marinas, including Quilcene.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Eron

**From:** Marny Kittredge

**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2022 2:17 PM

**To:** Pam Petranek; Eron Berg; Pete Hanke; Eric Toews; Linger Longer Improvement Committee; Dave Neuenschwander; Carol Hasse

**Subject:** Gardiner Boat Ramp Project

Good afternoon,

Dave Neuenschwander composed this letter below and I asked him if I could share it with you. I think it has some good points and questions to consider and would appreciate a response from the Port please.

Thank you very much,

Respectfully,  
Kit Kittredge

### **Gardiner Boat Ramp Project**

The attached item concerning Design/Engineering for the Gardiner Boat Ramp is on the Port's Consent Agenda for March 23.

Unless it is removed from the Consent Agenda by a Commissioner, it will be adopted without discussion along with everything else on the Consent Agenda.

Briefly (and if I understand things properly):

- The Gardiner Ramp project was kicked off in 2020
- The cost is expected to be \$674,847 (although it is unclear if this cost is for the entire project or only for Phase 2)
  - 80% funding from the State and
  - 20% from the Port
- The attached contract is for design and engineering and will cost \$116,000
- The project is expected to be completed by 2024

Of course I may have misunderstood some things.

### **What about Quilcene?**

These items beg a couple of questions:

- One wonders why the Gardiner boat ramp has taken precedence over Quilcene
- If the Port's state goal is to have each property pay for itself, why spend money on a property that results in zero income?
  - Gardiner ramp fees vs Quilcene ramp fees
    - The 2022 Budget projects about \$11,500 in ramp fees from Quilcene
    - The 2022 Budget has no line item for ramp fees from Gardiner

Dave Neuenschwander  
142 Old Lindsay Hill Rd.  
Quilcene, WA 98376  
360.765.3151

From the unceded Territories of the traditional lands of the Dabop, Quilcene, Dosewallips, Duckabush, Skoko'bsh, Ctqwelgweli, Tahuya, Tul-e'lalap people.

PO Box 598  
Quilcene, WA 98376  
4 February 2022

RECEIVED

MAR 14 2022

Port of Port Townsend  
PO Box 1180  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

Port of Port Townsend  
Administration Office

Dear Port Manager,

I was quite dismayed to learn that the restrooms at the Quilcene Beck Marina are now locked. This evidently happened during the pandemic when I wasn't paying attention but this is a very poor decision. I don't know how much it would cost to have someone from Skookum come and clean those restrooms a couple times a week but I sure would like to know.

You don't live in Quilcene, and don't know how many people in our area live without running water or a restroom. This has, for decades, been the place that people use to shower and wash up properly. We had a joke that it was a two quarter shower day and used it when we temporarily did not have water at our house. Saturday nights there was a line up for use of the showers and it was the only access people had to hot water. I understand that you have taken out the staffing, the gas, the campground, and stripped the place of much of what was appealing, but can't you have empathy for people who have less than you do?

I was always frustrated when I saw the fancy showers at the marina in Port Townsend compared to what we had down here, but now they are locked to.

I implore you to reopen the restrooms to the public or let us know how much money we would have to raise to restore this basic community resource we have had for at least three decades if not longer. You may not think, from your desk crunching numbers how this adversely effects so many people but it does. I can't count the number of people here who live off the grid, young and old. Come to the Community Center on the weekends and see the people lined up to fill their water tanks. I know a family with two children under three who have had covid who relied on the marina for hygiene and it pains me to think they have to drive to another town to get the kids clean and showered.

I would like to know how I can work to restore this resource that is really an economic justice issue in the county where we pay lots of money for the port with so much waterfront and most of us get very little back. The marina is run down and the moorage costs so high we sold out boat, no gas available, no one monitoring it, just a red haired step-child in SoCo compared to the money spent in PT. People without water usually have two jobs and aren't likely to show up to community port meetings but they need a voice.

I look forward to know how we, as a community, can work together with the Port to restore access to decent public sanitation. In the summer Linger Longer Beach is popular and no access to the restrooms and no porta potty is more than unreasonable.

Going backwards seems so absurd, Quilcene has no other public restroom. Thank you for thinking of people who have so little who are getting by and need to have access to clean hot water and have few other options. It is cruel and uncaring and does not leave a good taste in our mouths about the Port.



K. Kennell

**From:** Richard Dandridge  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2022 8:00 AM  
**To:** Pam Petranek; Carol Hasse; Pete Hanke  
**Cc:** Eron Berg  
**Subject:** Today's commissioners meeting, Public input!

Dear Port Commissioners,

After listening to the last Port Commissioners meeting I realized that I had to contact you and suggest a course correction is in order.

Please listen to Port Commissioner Petranek and take the time needed to make the best decision you can for the long-time sustainability of port infrastructure. Climate change is here now and port facilities are more at risk than you appear to acknowledge.

I urge you to follow our County Commissioners, the other Transit Authority Board members and the Joint City and County Climate Action Committee Board members who have all added language and actions that acknowledge climate change effect on every aspect of their various operations.

I find it hard to understand what some Port Commissions are considering. The idea that the best use of the Back 40 is just to add more parking is simply staggering. At the very least this suggests a serious lack of understanding about the direct link between climate change effects, Port Facilities and our main driver of such effects, carbon from transportation emissions. It also calls into question your duty to protect the long-term health of the Port!

Pedaling On,

Richard Dandridge

---

**From:** Ashlyn Russell  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2022 12:47 PM  
**To:** Eron Berg; Eric Toews; Pam Petranek; Pete Hanke; Carol Hasse  
**Subject:** Public comment for 3/23/22 commissioners meeting (Parking)

Dear Port or Port Townsend staff and Commissioners,

Ideally our community could agree that Climate Change is an issue we can tackle head on and our already limited parking would not be a problem, our businesses would creatively encourage less driving, better shuttle service, abundant bike rental or even free clunker-bike stations.

We are a peninsula however and people are not ready to give up the necessity and convenience of driving, and those ideal alt-transportation services are not yet well established.

The 2 areas that have been casually used primarily as parking at Point Hudson for many years have not been revenue streams for the Port and have long represented a decision impasse. The one between the NWMC and PSE now has a building planned for it. That leaves the one area; the so-called 'Back 40'.

Sea Marine legitimately needs to expand onto land that cuts into that Back 40; an expansion that provides additional job creation to their already large employee base. This is of great value to the local economy for many reasons.

Tourism dependent Puget Sound Express and the Maritime Center are also extremely valuable assets here. I believe the current issue, however, is that both, by the nature of their offerings, encourage considerable vehicle traffic into historic Port Townsend. As they each expand their offerings, parking has no doubt been a top concern, yet both have advanced their expansion before resolving it. It seems to me that this puts the Port in a very awkward position somewhat unfairly.

Isn't visitor parking primarily a city responsibility that requires earnest collaboration with Jefferson Transit, entrepreneurs and all partners? From what I gather, it is not actually the job of the Port to insure excess visitor parking on port property. However, in the interest of Port tenants' prosperity, the proposed parking leases in the 'back 40' make some sense *for short term/temporary use* while the city and county really need to be the point people to negotiate with for growing businesses and their visitor parking requirements. I do not think this is an impossible ask. In the meantime, encouraging use of the Park and Ride, weekend shuttle service, getting that trolley I keep hearing about operational, and setting up creative bicycle solutions at either end of town might re-train most of our visiting public *and enhance* their experiences here. PT has the built in advantage of industry *and* tourism to balance our economy through various challenges and we should be *innovators* in solving logistical problems.

Parking is a difficult and complex issue in our changing world that clearly requires courage to resolve, and I trust our current community partners and business leaders are up to the task as never before. Just one community member's thoughts on the subject.

Respectfully,

Ashlyn Brown