

Attendees

Heather Dudley-Nollette, Jefferson County Commissioner, District 1 (former Bayside Housing & Services executive); Ben Thomas, Port Townsend City Councilmember; Apple Martine, Director, Jefferson County Public Health; Lori Fleming, Jefferson County Behavioral Health Consortium; Carolyn Lewis, Volunteer with Dove House Closet and other local efforts; Talon, recovery advocate with Recovery Cafe; Peggy Webster, OlyCAP Housing Projects and Peninsula Housing Authority board member; Julia Cochran, Winter Welcoming Center; Chris, lived experience/consumer perspective; Maggie Mitchel, lived experience/consumer advocate; Steve Evans, Co-chair, COAST (Community Outreach Association Shelter Team); Jim Novelli, CEO, Discovery Behavioral Healthcare; Linda Madison, Bayside Housing & Services; Anya Callahan, Jefferson County Public Health, Syringe Exchange/Harm Reduction Program.

DISCUSSION

1. Purpose and Context

Commissioner Dudley-Nollette opened by explaining that the meeting was exploratory in nature, designed to surface needs and brainstorm options for a potential Urban Rest Stop. The idea for this meeting was initiated by Maggie, who was invited to share background and rationale.

2. Consumer Perspective Emphasized

- Maggie shared her experience as a recovery advocate and emphasized that **consumer voices are often excluded** from service design.
- She called for direct input from people experiencing homelessness on what is *essential*—specifically hygiene facilities, privacy, and safety.
- Anya Callahan and others echoed the importance of **employing and uplifting** individuals with lived experience.

3. Needs Identified

Common and persistent unmet needs were discussed, including:

- **Basic hygiene:** functional showers, toilets, sinks.
- **Prevention of infectious disease**
- **Ventilation & overcrowding** concerns in current shelters.
- **Laundry access, lockers and other storage (bikes, etc.), mail services, and internet/telephone access.**
- **Case management space and centralized location for service access**
- **Clothing, food and supplies**

- **Access to living wage opportunities**
- **Food storage & cooking access** (e.g., fridge/freezer, microwave, and pantry areas).
- **Pet accommodations** (especially during climate events)
- **Geographic equity:** the need for *multiple rest stop-type centers* across the county (Quilcene, Brinnon, etc.).
- **Transportation access** to reduce service fragmentation.

4. Urban Rest Stop Proposal Concepts

Several location options were explored:

- **Port Townsend Yacht Club** (primary proposal by Maggie): ADA-ready, with existing showers, kitchen, and possible medical triage space. (See pp 4-5)
- **Mountain View Commons:** centrally located with some services already present. (See pp 6-7)
- **Community Centers** in Quilcene, Brinnon, and other outlying areas. (See page 8)
- **Haines Street Cottages:** could be repurposed if funding for their original use falls through. (See page 9)
- **Caswell-Brown site** and even **school facilities** were discussed as viable models or spaces. (See 10-11)
- **Identify City and County-Owned Land** with access to infrastructure (sewer, water, utilities)

5. Funding & Sustainability

- The feasibility of purchasing and retrofitting a site vs. building a new property was debated.
- Maggie proposed **solar panels on the yacht club** to generate revenue.
- Commissioner Dudley-Nollette and others emphasized that **most facilities of this nature require ongoing subsidy**.
- Fiscal uncertainties—at state and federal levels—were acknowledged, including looming cuts to programs like LEAD, REAL, and CARES.

6. Development Process & Practicalities

- Participants called for **a clearer understanding of zoning, permitting, and capital needs** assessments.
- It was noted we want to ensure that qualified people manage the project and the property post development.
- The importance of **site assessments, cost modeling, and operational plans** was affirmed.

7. Next Steps and Coordination

- A group including Viola, Maggie, Julia, Beulah, Lori, Peggy, and Heather committed to drafting:
 - A consolidated presentation for the May 8th Behavioral Health Consortium (BHC) meeting.
 - Criteria to assess all location proposals shown in Appendix A. (*All sites to be assessed using common criteria developed by the working group*)
 - Share assessments with stakeholder groups to discuss accuracy, viability and potential funding options.
- Request Available Land lists from City and County.
- Lori Fleming offered to document the discussion and help prepare materials (*See following Appendices for drafted materials to be explored by the group above.*)

SEE FOLLOWING **DRAFT APPENDICES (THESE HAVE NOT BEEN FINALIZED, BUT WILL BE USED AS TEMPLATES TO FURTHER CONVERSATION ABOUT HOW TO MEASURE AND TRACK THE VIABILITY OF VARIOUS OPTIONS – IF THIS PROJECT IS PURSUED).**

- **Appendix A: Proposed Idea Overviews (Draft) - pp 4 – 11**
- **Appendix B: Urban Rest Stop Proposal Feature Summary Table (Draft) - pp 12-13**
This table offers a descriptive comparison of site features *based on discussion to date*. It is intended to outline infrastructure, zoning, startup needs, and potential challenges without assigning ratings or evaluations. (Needs review and edits as identified.)
- **Appendix C: Urban Rest Stop Proposal Quick Comparison Grid (Draft – Example Evaluation) – pp 14-15**
This table offers an example of how sites might be visually rated based on initial impressions using ✓ (strong), ~ (partial/mixed), and X (needs major work). It is intended as a starting point for group discussion and refinement.



- **Appendix D: Mini-Assessment Form to be edited upon review, then filled out with response to agreed-upon Criteria (Draft) pp 16-18**



DRAFT APPENDIX A: OVERVIEWS FOR VARIOUS IDEAS PROPOSED

1. Urban Rest Stop Proposal: Former Port Townsend Yacht Club

Presented by: Maggie Mitchel (Housing Advocate and Consumer Voice)

Concept Overview

A consumer-driven proposal to create an Urban Rest Stop providing centralized hygiene, triage, and basic services, leveraging an available ADA-compliant facility at the former Port Townsend Yacht Club site.

Key Features

- ADA-accessible building with walk-in showers, bathrooms, and a commercial kitchen.
 - Office space suitable for basic medical triage (potential Jefferson Healthcare partnership).
 - Mail drop service for unsheltered and marine worker populations.
 - Lockers, laundry, clothing storage, and limited food preparation facilities.
 - Flexible operational hours to complement other community programs.
 - Emergency overnight capacity during extreme weather events.
-

Rationale

- Directly addresses critical hygiene and health needs identified by consumers.
 - Aligns with CDC/NIH research discouraging congregate shelter models due to infectious disease spread.
 - Responds to consumer feedback about fragmented services and transportation burdens.
 - Offers potential partnerships with marine industry and liveaboard community.
-

Sustainability Considerations

- Proposal includes installing solar panels to generate revenue through energy sales to Jefferson County PUD.
- Envisioned as a county-held asset – but new research leads us to understand that this property is currently held in a long-term lease by the PTYC and that ownership will revert back to the Port of PT at the end of 2025. In this case, the viability of this site for this



purpose is low. Initial zoning and permitting analysis indicates that the Shoreline Master Program prohibits any use at this location that is not explicitly “water dependent.”

Challenges to Explore

- Zoning considerations
 - Negotiating costs with the Port, who has expressed that rent would need to revert to market-rate after the PTYC lease expires.
 - Securing immediate capital if a purchase remains an option (research indicates that it is not).
 - Ongoing operational funding and management structure.
 - Identifying funding source(s) for rehabilitation
 - Long-term maintenance and staffing.
-

Possible next steps if this alternative is viable and pursued?

- Confirm ownership, purchase or lease options, costs and use possibilities.
- Conduct a building assessment (capital needs, maintenance, viability).
- Compare with other proposed locations using agreed evaluation criteria.
- Engage potential operational and medical partners for feasibility discussions.



2. Urban Rest Stop Proposal: Mountain View Commons Site

Presented by: Steve Evans (COAST) and supported by Julia Cochran and others

Concept Overview

A proposal to locate a centralized Urban Rest Stop at Mountain View Commons in Port Townsend, leveraging an existing community facility close to other essential services.

Key Features

- Proximity to Recovery Café, Port Townsend Food Bank, and other community resources.
 - Existing infrastructure including plumbing, gymnasium space, and potential kitchen access.
 - Walkable access from other service sites — minimizing transportation barriers.
 - Integration with existing city facilities while maintaining an independent operational model.
 - Potential use of the gym as an emergency shelter space during extreme weather.
-

Rationale

- Utilizes an existing, public facility without the need to purchase or retrofit a new building.
 - Reduces start-up costs by repurposing underutilized space.
 - Supports a "zero-barrier" model separate from overnight shelter restrictions or eligibility hurdles.
 - Offers community familiarity and accessibility.
-

Sustainability Considerations

- Public ownership of the site may reduce leasing or property costs.
 - Coordination with the City of Port Townsend would be required for shared use agreements.
 - Potential to integrate facility management costs with broader city operations.
-



Challenges to Explore

- Possible zoning or planning hurdles for day center activities (city planning department concerns were noted).
- Competing demands for space from housed community members using the Commons.
- Identifying funding source(s) for rehabilitation
- Need to ensure Urban Rest Stop maintains independent, low-barrier service delivery while operating within a city-managed space.
- Relationship with existing YMCA Services
- Behavior management and community relations in a multi-use public facility.

Possible next steps if this alternative is pursued?

- Clarify city planning and zoning limitations for expanded Urban Rest Stop services.
- Explore Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) options with the City of Port Townsend.
- Conduct an operational needs assessment for shared facility use (e.g., hours, maintenance, security).
- Compare Mountain View Commons against other proposed sites using agreed evaluation criteria.



3. Urban Rest Stop Proposal: Community Centers in Quilcene and Brinnon

Presented by: Group Discussion (not tied to a single individual)

Concept Overview

(A brief summary of the idea — e.g., using existing community centers in Quilcene and Brinnon to create decentralized Urban Rest Stops serving outlying areas.)

Key Features

-
-

Rationale

- Awareness of equitable access to services
-

Sustainability Considerations

- Capacity of operations, space, and purpose
-

Challenges to Explore

- Assessing where to start, where to grow, in what order?
(Can we realistically operate in multiple locations? In phases or at once?)
 - Infrastructure concerns
 - Respecting geography/culturally-specific approaches and varying partnerships in each location
-

Possible next steps if this alternative is pursued?

- Clarify city planning and zoning limitations for expanded Urban Rest Stop services.
 - Explore Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) options with the Community Center Operators.
 - Conduct an operational needs assessment for shared facility use (e.g., hours, maintenance, security).
 - Compare against other proposed sites using agreed evaluation criteria.
-





4. Urban Rest Stop Proposal: Haines Street Cottages Property

Presented by: Peggy Webster (OlyCAP)

Concept Overview

(Example: Redevelop Haines Street Cottages property into a new Urban Rest Stop site due to high capital needs making current use infeasible.)

Key Features

- -
-

Rationale

- -
-

Sustainability Considerations

- -
-

Challenges to Explore

- A long range option - capital fund needs are extensive and require upfront planning to envision, fund, construct and operate.
-

Possible next steps if this alternative is pursued?

- -
-



5. Urban Rest Stop Proposal: Caswell-Brown Site

Presented by: Group Discussion

Concept Overview

(Example: Integrate Urban Rest Stop functions near or alongside planned shelter developments at Caswell-Brown.)

Key Features

- Proximity to existing county financial investment and space
 - Space with expansion possibilities
 - Existing plans could be modified to include this service
-

Rationale

- -
-

Sustainability Considerations

-
-

Challenges to Explore

- Long-range planning required.
 -
-

Possible next steps if this alternative is pursued?

- Consider whether any existing plans should contemplate inclusion of this service.
 -
-



6. Urban Rest Stop Proposal: School-Based Health Centers Model

Presented by: Group Discussion

Concept Overview

(Example: Explore partnerships with existing school-based health centers to offer laundry, hygiene, and case management access.)

Key Features

- Decentralized approach to provide these services
 -
-

Rationale

- -
-

Sustainability Considerations

- -
-

Challenges to Explore

- -
-

Possible next steps if this alternative is pursued?

-
-

**DRAFT Appendix B: Urban Rest Stop Proposal Feature Summary Table (Draft)**

The following table provides a descriptive comparison of Urban Rest Stop site proposals discussed at the April 24, 2025 meeting. It summarizes each site's ownership, infrastructure, ADA accessibility, zoning considerations, startup needs, sustainability potential, and key challenges. This overview is intended to support structured evaluation without suggesting a ranking or preference among proposals.

Site Option	Ownership	Infrastructure	ADA Accessible	Zoning Status	Startup Needs	Sustainability Potential	Key Challenges
1. Former Port Townsend Yacht Club	Private (for sale?) but will revert to Port of PT ownership at end of 2025.	Showers, bathrooms, kitchen, office space	Yes	Commercial zoning may allow day center use. But SMP may preclude non-water-dependent use altogether.	If an option to purchase exists (~\$375k), minor upgrades, capital needs assessment	Solar panel revenue idea; partnership with Jefferson Healthcare or BHS JCMASH Free Clinic	Purchase cost; maintenance; tsunami zone risk
2. Mountain View Commons	Port Townsend School District, leased to City of Port Townsend?	Community facility with gym, plumbing, adjacent services	Likely (needs verification)	Complicated (city planning restrictions)	Shared-use negotiation; operational coordination	Lower facility costs; shared services possible; partnership with Jefferson Healthcare or BHS JCMASH Free Clinic	Competition for space; housed community perceptions; behavioral management
3. Quilcene / Brinnon Community Centers	Public (County)						



Site Option	Ownership	Infrastructure	ADA Accessible	Zoning Status	Startup Needs	Sustainability Potential	Key Challenges
4. Haines Street Cottages Property	OlyCAP						
5. Caswell-Brown Site	County-owned and Leased to OlyCAP						
6. School-Based Health Centers Model	School Districts (public)						
7. City and County Sites To Be Identified							

Notes:

- Startup Needs are intentionally broad (e.g., “purchase” vs. “major redevelopment”) because deeper cost assessments have not yet been done.
- ADA Accessible flags known information, but some sites (like community centers) would require site-by-site validation.
- Zoning and Permitting Statuses would need full analysis by DSD or DCD before moving forward.
- Sustainability Potential points to what might help a site maintain operations long-term (like revenue generation or partnerships).
- Key Challenges call out main risks or concerns that emerged.

**DRAFT Urban Rest Stop Proposal Quick Comparison Grid (Example Filled In)**

The following quick comparison grid offers an example of how the site proposals could be evaluated visually based on initial impressions. Sites are marked with ✓ (strong/positive), ~ (partial/mixed), or X (needs major work) across key criteria such as accessibility, infrastructure readiness, sustainability, and community support. This visual tool is intended to spark group discussion and refinement, not to finalize ratings.

Criterion	Yacht Club	Mountain View	Community Centers (Quilcene/Brinnon)	Haines Street Cottages	Caswell- Brown	School-Based Health Centers
ADA Accessibility	✓	Likely ✓				
Infrastructure Readiness	Good	Good				
Ownership & Control	Private with imminent Public reversion	Public (City)				
Zoning/Permitting Feasibility	Significant barriers?	~ (some barriers)				
Financial Startup Needs	TBD	TBD				
Sustainability Potential	TBD	TBD				
Accessibility to Target Pop.	Good	Good				
Partnership Synergies	Strong (Jeff Healthcare, BHS, Marine community)	Strong (Food Bank, Recovery Café, BHS, JHC)				





Criterion	Yacht Club	Mountain View	Community Centers (Quilcene/Brinnon)	Haines Street Cottages	Caswell- Brown	School-Based Health Centers
Community Support/Resistance	Mixed unknown	Mixed (shared use concerns)				
Capacity for Growth	Limited	Moderate				

Notes on the Example above:

- ✓ = Strong/Positive
- ~ = Partial or Mixed
- X = Not currently viable without major work
- Where appropriate, additional description can be added for more nuance.
- General guidance includes to stay exploratory and not rush to conclusion.



Site Name: _____

Location: _____ Date of Review: _____

1. ADA Accessibility

- Yes – Fully ADA accessible now
- Partial – Minor upgrades needed
- No – Major upgrades needed

Notes: _____

2. Infrastructure Readiness (Hygiene, Kitchen, Storage)

- _____ Good – Most major features in place
- _____ Moderate – Some key features missing or outdated
- _____ Poor – Major infrastructure gaps

Notes: _____

3. Physical Infrastructure Readiness (Sewer, Water and Utilities)

- _____ Good – Most major features in place
- _____ Moderate – Some key features missing or outdated
- _____ Poor – Major infrastructure gaps

Notes: _____

4. Ownership & Control

- _____ Public ownership (County, City, etc.)
- _____ Private ownership (Purchase required)
- _____ Shared ownership / Complex agreements

Notes: _____



5. Zoning/Permitting Feasibility

- ____ Allowed as-is under current zoning
- ____ Conditional (Would require a zoning adjustment or interpretation)
- ____ Not permitted without major zoning changes

Notes: _____

6. Financial Startup Needs

- ____ Low (< \$100k)
- ____ Moderate (\$100k–\$500k)
- ____ High (\$500k+)

Notes: _____

7. Sustainability Potential (Funding/Revenue)

- ____ High – Potential for partial self-sustainability
- ____ Moderate – Likely needs ongoing subsidy with partnerships
- ____ Low – Significant ongoing subsidy required

Notes: _____

8. Accessibility to Target Population

- ____ Very good – Close to foot traffic, transit, services
- ____ Moderate – Would require additional transportation access
- ____ Poor – Isolated or hard to reach

Notes: _____

9. Partnership Synergies

- ____ Strong – Near other service partners (health, food, case management)
- ____ Some – Could build partnerships, but not immediate
- ____ Few/None – Little natural synergy





Notes: _____

10. Community Support or Resistance

- ____ Likely strong support
- ____ Mixed or uncertain
- ____ Likely strong resistance

Notes: _____

11. Capacity for Growth or Flexibility

- ____ Good – Room for expansion or adaptation
- ____ Limited – Constrained site or rigid use
- ____ None – Cannot expand easily

Notes: _____

Overall Impressions

(Optional space for open notes or initial recommendations)
