

Strategic Plan Review Committee June 5, 2025

The Strategic Plan Review Committee met at the Point Hudson Pavilion at 355 Hudson St., Port Townsend, Washington. The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Members present: Robert D’Arcy, Sarah Fisken (arrived at 6p.m.), Bob Frank, Scott Freeman (virtual attendee), Dave Griswold, Stephanie Jones, Sarah Kolbeck, Pete Langley (excused), Gary Lanthrum, Martin Mills, Anne Ricker, Gwendolyn Tracy.

Staff: Deputy Director Eric Toews, and Administrative Assistant Joanna Sanders.

Key takeaways from the open house from the committee: Eric Toews summarized the meeting and the attendance of roughly 40 at the Open House. He then reviewed the changes made to date reflecting the collective committee input. On June 12, staff will return with a draft plan against which the Committee can make sure the changes reflect their input. July 9 at 9:30 a.m., all SPRC members as available are encouraged to participation in presenting the plan to the Commission.

The Committee noted the open house was not well attended either due to a lack of outreach or people are not concerned about the direction of the Port. Comments were thoughtful and many were requests for action and not necessarily strategic plan related. Further text discussion and/or suggestions were as follows:

- Staff might note in a separate list the number of items that do not fit in the plan (restrooms, for instance).
- Define or describe triple bottom line (possibly under Objective 1.1, although it is mentioned in 4.5). Cross reference Appendix A would need to cross reference 1.1 or cross reference in Appendix A Objective 1.1 or visa versa).
- Consider referencing the previous plan matrices to show how changes made their way into the capital plan or post how the matrices are structured and evaluated as website content.
- In the vision, broaden or maintain the Port’s international importance as a maintenance hub
- Discussion of how to reflect the economic benefit of the working waterfront without direct metrics, measurement, or model similar to the much-referenced economic impact study. It was noted that by definition, the Port’s mission addresses the comment. Consider adding a bullet point or new objective 4.6 such as “develop tools and systems to identify that dollar spent in the Port gets spent in the community” as well as work to communicate about the “multiplier” effect to the broader area.
- There was acknowledgement that gentrification is a problem and yet the Port cannot discriminate to provide preference for “locals.”

- Expand the language about “maritime heritage,” to include aviation and farming. Look into options, including “legacy industry” or “maritime heritage and legacy industries” while considering the concern about diluting the document with industries not central to the economy or adding text with history on when the airport was established.
- Under Objective 3.7, “partners to marine trade” (Sarah Kolbeck)
- Education is an important as part of plan and could be featured under economic vitality, internship programs. Add language about Port facilitating education opportunities and internships under Econ. Vitality.
- Consider adding a photo of the new variable travelift.
- Under Objective 3.5, in response to the concern about the use of leaded fuel, add a bullet point about encouraging projects that reduce harmful emissions
- Under Objective 1.2, consider adding after “commercial fishing aquaculture,” “tribal and nontribal fishing and aquaculture.”

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.