

Miller Peninsula Public Comments

August 19, 2024 – January 27, 2025

Dear WA Park,

I am writing to express my grave concern and strong opposition to the proposed development of Miller Peninsula State Park. The plans to further develop this area are alarming, as they pose significant risks to both the environment and the community. Adding a hotel, RV and camping sites, cabins etc will have a negative impact on the area.

The development will inevitably lead to a dramatic increase in traffic, which will strain the local infrastructure. An increase in camping sites, cabins, and RV sites will raise the risk of forest fires—a growing concern given the region's increasingly dry summers. As well as add strain on the limited aquifer serving the area. Moreover, the construction and increased human activity would severely disrupt the park's delicate forested ecosystem, endangering the diverse wildlife and plant species that call it home. The entire Miller Peninsula, with its unique combination of pristine forest canopy and accessible beachfront, would be put at unnecessary risk.

It is important to note that the area already offers a variety of camping options, including two RV campgrounds, as well as local hotels near the area. Adding more facilities will not only be redundant but will also degrade one of the few remaining natural areas where people can enjoy an unspoiled environment, containing water access and trailed walks through natural forest.

Rather than developing new infrastructure at Miller Peninsula, I urge you to consider redirecting state funds to repair and upgrade existing parks within the Washington State Park system. Improving these facilities would better serve our communities and preserve the natural beauty and ecological health of our state.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. I hope you will take my concerns into consideration and work to protect Miller Peninsula from unnecessary and harmful development.

Sincerely, ¹

I just read a wonderful description of the native plant walk that I missed last June when the Washington Native Plant Society sponsored a Study Weekend at Blyn, Washington. The description of this walk on a rainy day through the undeveloped Miller Peninsula State Park property has inspired me to write a comment to you. My family and I have been paying attention to the controversy over the proposed development there, as we were happy to see how many of our fellow NOP residents turned out to voice their concerns with the proposal for a highly developed park. We share their concern.

We would rather see this piece of property developed for the passive recreation of a well maintained trail system with separate pathways for horses, bicycles and hikers along with a couple camp grounds that would host only tent sites, no large RV hook-ups. (Your park system seems to have a plethora of RV-type campgrounds, and we have found them to be not very rewarding experiences. We do not like to be packed into a campground that has too many people/RV's in not enough natural surroundings. These campgrounds are ugly and do not seem

like a respite from the urban surroundings where we live.

You have a fabulous opportunity to develop a park dedicated to trail experiences and learning about the land and its different habitats, natural communities and ecotones, flora and fauna and underlying geologic story... and its proximity to the Olympic Discovery Trail begs trail connections to this longer regional trail resource. Your natural-setting themed park would be a wonderful destination for spending a get-away weekend for the multitudes who seek quieter, more secluded and less pampered settings. We have a megalopolis nearby with thousands who seek respite from the city.

The proximity to the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe also begs connection with them for resource management, cross-cultural education and opportunities for local ecological restoration and education. The park's western portal has close proximity to Sequim Bay, Travis Spit and possible opportunities for passive water recreation (canoeing, kayaking and sailing) and a focus on the tribal history on these lands and their sensitivity about their use. I hope your planning process has included this tribe in a very big way.

This piece of property is big enough that you could develop a separate horseback riding trail head with space for big corrals and other horse amenities, horse trailer parking and the RV camping that horse people usually enjoy.

The last thought I have is to reiterate the observation that there has been a lack of funding for our current state parks maintenance on the Olympic Peninsula, so why are you proposing another one that would require even more funding and upkeep. A quieter, lower intensity one with less infrastructure and more focus on the natural environment would be most welcome.

Sincerely,

(a family of four taxpaying and voting Washington State residents and landowners) ²

I have two priorities for this park.

One is to minimize development. This is one of the last big unspoiled parcels of land available as parks for us now and as natural capital for future generations. Please don't spoil it with development such as resorts, motorized vehicles or other tourist-focused features that degrade or contrast with this area's natural beauty and value as wildlife habitat!

The other is to facilitate use of the park by the type of users who themselves degrade their surroundings little or not at all. This means day use by hikers, bikers, kayakers etc. For camping, this means people who arrive by nonmotorized means (on foot, by bike, by engineless beachable boats, etc.). Next best is people who camp in tents in sites without utilities. There is a strong tendency recently for parks to serve people who arrive in bus-sized RVs, with huge visual footprints and often a lot of noise and other impacts. It may be necessary, given the clientele and economic imperatives, to have this kind of parking-lot "camping". But, if so, it needs to be sequestered in a way that does not impact other users and the park as a whole. An example is Ft Flagler State Park, which has one single Cascadia Marine Trails campsite. This is lovely and isolated from the RV park, but it is only one site and that accessible only to arrivals by

nonmotorized engineless boats. My strong priority is more of those, and equivalents for bikers, hikiers etc. ³

Please reconsider developing Miller State Park. Still, better trail signs would be VERY helpful. Our other state parks are falling further into disrepair as funding is too small in our state budget. Very few employees can do very little with no funding, and local volunteers in this area are already stretched thin on other ongoing projects. Miller State Park is a gem with over 210 species of plants, mostly natives identified and listed. Bears and cougars are known to be here. All of this would negatively change with more humans and development. Also, as there is only one road in and out of the entire Miller Peninsula, leading to and from Hwy 101, traffic will become a nightmare for visitors and especially residents. ⁴

I feel that it is a mistake to build roads for Camping sites, climbing walls, zip lines, tourist amenities in the center of Miller Peninsula state park. This is a wonderful smaller hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking park, just full of quiet Nature. Such an intrusion right in the center of it will ruin its ambience. Also, it presents water problems, with limited wells on the peninsula, fire danger, and narrow dead end roads which might become overcrowded. It should be left as it is, or if a campground has to be made, just a tent only one, on the east side of Diamond Point Road. ⁵

Building a campground and/ or lodge at Miller Peninsula State Park will put the Diamond Point residents in danger. There is only one road in and out of Diamond Point. If traffic is backed up due to campers coming and going it will delay emergency services getting to people in need and getting them out to a hospital. Diamond Point residents are mostly elderly people. Medical emergencies are common here.

If a wildfire starts, a much likelier scenario with people having campfires, it will be extremely difficult to evacuate the people in Diamond Point. Please consider these concerns when making a decision. ⁶

My husband and I ride bikes on the trail system at Miller Peninsula once or twice a week. This is an excellent way to get exercise and stay healthy. I would prefer that the park remain mostly as it is but with upgraded trail systems and more parking that creates easier access for all users. I have been impressed with the work that has been done at the Port Gamble trail system, and think that if the trails at miller were upgraded by evergreen mtb alliance it could be a destination for mountain bikers recreating on the peninsula. ⁷

Hi there! I just wanted to comment on the planning process of Miller peninsula state park lands. I would personally prefer to leave the property as is. No new developments. I have lived here my whole life and ride mountain bikes weekly on the trails here, and it is a great local resource for getting into nature and getting exercise. It is one of the only lowland trail systems that allows mountain biking and is rideable year round. It would be a terrible shame to see any kind of development on this beautiful land. ⁸

Miller Peninsula State park is wonderful as it is- a peaceful and winter accessible place to hike, a good wildlife habitat, a jewel tucked away from the bustle of Sequim. Developing it with RV sites, a hotel, paved roads, cabins, etc. Will destroy this place.

Please do not let this plan go into effect.

I live right near Fort Worden State Park. A lot of the buildings are in need of a paint job. I am sure it is not the only state park that needs repairs. Why spend scarce funds on development in Miller Peninsula State park when we cannot keep up with what we already have.

Instead of ruining this piece of untrammled forest, why not dedicate it for day use, educational use, a place to get away. There are already plenty of RV and hotels near Sequim. The state does not need to provide more.

In wildness in the preservation of the world. We should do our part.

Sincerely, ⁹

I have hiked with our old lady hiking group several times in Miller Peninsula State Park. It is accessible in winter when we can't get to other trailheads. It is peaceful. A jewel tucked away from the bustle of Sequim, it also provides good animal habitat.

I am horrified that this peaceful place may be developed with RV sites, a hotel, cabins, a restaurant, etc. All those things already exist in Sequim. In addition this development will cost a lot of money. I am sure that Fort Worden State Park is not the only park in dire need of repairs. I walk there almost every day and bemoan the number of buildings needing a paint job! The money it will cost to develop this state park would be better spent in maintaining the parks we have.

Instead of developing what is now a peaceful place, I would plead that Miller Peninsula State Park be reserved for educational purposes and day use. If you feel it is underused, then it needs to be advertised more on the country website or on travel sites as a great place to access the peace of our forests without having to hike a long way.

In wildness if the preservation of the world. We need to do our part.

Sincerely, ¹⁰

I spent the afternoon hiking in Miller Peninsula State Park. There were other hikers, mountain bike riders, and equestrians enjoying the park also. It seems to me that this is exactly what our state parks are for, people connecting with nature. We certainly don't need to cut down this beautiful forest and build a "destination park" in order to provide a wonderful nature experience for Washingtonians. ¹¹

Dear Commissioners,

I just spent a wonderful afternoon hiking in Miller Peninsula State Park. There were other hikers, mountain bike riders, and equestrians enjoying the park also. Shouldn't that be what our state parks are about, connecting people to nature?

Please keep Miller Peninsula State Park undeveloped and protect the beautiful forest.

Thank you, ¹²

I just returned from my weekly hike at Miller Peninsula state park having just learned of this proposed park development. After educating myself on the Parks proposed plans and reading comments from other concerned members of the public, I am deeply devastated to learn of the direction the park is heading towards. I am 27 and I've lived in WA most of my life. I love our state parks. I have worked at Beacon Rock state park as a park aide. I understand that the parks commission might want to bring more activities to draw new users to Miller Peninsula state park but the proposed Village Center concept is NOT the way to do it. I have lived in Sequim for two summers and I have fallen in love with MP, I walk my dogs there, I bring my friends and family there when they visit. The peaceful beauty of the park is so accessible compared to the longer and more mountainous hikes of the Olympics. The reasons I love the park are exactly what you seek to destroy. It's quiet, its undeveloped, the trail system feels like an adventure and even after two years I am still exploring new parts of the park. The last thing I want is to see it become something closer to Crescent lodge or even Sequim Bay state park which is a lovely campground but offers little options for day-use. A lodge, cabins, a cafe, a swimming pool and a zipline?? It is

horrifying to think of facilities of this scale being put into MP. I read through the June 2023 memorandum and I am disheartened to hear what sounds like the State Park putting their own interests above those of the public. You claim to welcome public support and yet it seems like the vast majority of feedback you are getting is against large developments. Please you must not turn this magical and pristine place into yet another lawn and parking lot. Now that I am aware of this frightening possibility trust that I will fight to prevent the loss of my favorite park. ¹³

As you consider development of Miller Park please be cognizant of the unique value of leaving this area largely undeveloped and preserved as a rare piece of second growth forest so close to so many people. It is an ideal location for those traveling along 101 as well as residents and visitors of the entire Port Townsend to Port Angeles community. There are no other accessible locations with Miller's mix of forest ecology and access to a remote beach. Those who cannot access or hike higher trails can find respite and recreation within an hour of their homes. Travelers can stop to stretch their legs on route to already developed camping, resort, and town accommodations. Washington residents from the Seattle side of the sound have abundant two-wheel drive access to trails in the Cascades and many locations near the city. Those on the peninsula need the same access to local trails. Miller Peninsula can be carefully planned to expand accessible, multi-use trails as well as preserving single-track trails for those venturing farther into the area. What it cannot accommodate is having a significant portion of land developed and taken out of the ecosystem. The remaining trails will be over-used and crowded. Those seeking a day excursion will be deterred by camping, concessions, and expanded parking. You will essentially remove a valuable and well-used and well-loved area for the people who use it now without returning value to the greater community. Those traveling with campers or on vacation have many other options for developed areas with all kinds of concessions and attractions as well as access to more remote locations. They will not be left out of the Miller Peninsula experience because they can also use it as a stop on their travels. And of course access to and from the area will be hugely impacted if it is developed much further. The 101 corridor will be more dangerous than it is now and traffic flow will of course be impeded. Finally, the ecosystem in the area is so important to maintaining the PNW way of life. It is an island refuge for birds, amphibians, and countless species that will have no other place to go as more land surrounding the area is developed. For anyone visiting or living in the area, the Miller Park is an opportunity to experience a small slice of what used to be and what must be preserved for the future. ¹⁴

. . . What do the people in "charge" do not understand : leave this place alone ! There is no need for any "development"! We do not need any kind of " zip line, hotel, entertainment . . . whatever . . . "excuse" to kill trees. There is a parking lot to the south - good enough. ¹⁵

I know the sign states that paper maps are not provided, so I took a photo of the map at the kiosk. What an unpleasant surprise when I embarked on the West Diamond Point trail!
I saw many sign posts with trail names that are not on the map at the kiosk.
Since this was only my third time to this property, I was 'not happy' to have to navigate by feel and number/direction of trail intersections.

So, several comments:

Why isn't the map at the kiosk updated to show the trail names on the sign posts?

It clearly took a lot of effort to place the posts and signs, but a lot of that is wasted if the map isn't consistent with the postings.

The East Diamond Point trail has become a very nice trail, via time and I'm sure some hard work. I walked it just after it was cut and it was a nightmare of loose soil, rocks, and roots. So kudos to the trail maintenance people.

Is there a shooting range near West Diamond Point Trail? I heard gunshots for two hours starting from 12:45 pm on October 20, including rifles, a few shotgun booms, and a bump stock? (2-3 rounds per second). Then I was out of range of the sounds. That part of the hike was unpleasant due to the gunshots.

Regards,¹⁶

I am aware that the public comment period has likely ended. Nevertheless, I would like to ask that the future Miller Peninsula State Park include one or more Marine Trail Campsites along the shoreline. The Cascadia Marine Trail is primarily located in Puget Sound and the San Juan Islands and includes over 70 locations for overnight stops. Adding additional such campsites at the Miller Peninsula makes perfect sense. Nearby, existing sites at Fort Warden, and Fort Flagler can extend the "connected" trail system to the Straight of Juan de Fuca. Meanwhile, Clallum County Parks has been working with us to add overnight sites at Salt Creek County Park, Dungeness Recreation Area, possibly other locations. Thank you for your attention to this matter!¹⁷

Dear Commissioners;

There is only one road exiting the west side Miller Peninsula. It is a winding, hilly 4-mile-long road without shoulders. It is the only exit for hundreds of residents and their families. Additionally, Hwy 101 would immediately back up with traffic as only two lanes are available and often filled with tourists. At all times, we are hyperaware of potential fires and our ability to escape. High wind speeds and dry seasons are not unusual out here. (Please consider what is happening in California at this very moment.) Our local fire department would be unable to handle much once a fire entered the woods. How does the state plan on extinguishing any fire that may erupt at a campground? Will attendants be present to supervise at all times? Where would the water come from? What is your budget? Do you plan to expand the parking lot on East Sequim Bay Road?

Thank you,¹⁸

Dear State Park Commissioners

The continuing process to develop Miller Peninsula State Park (MPSP) into a *destination park* is folly.

As you have heard over the last 4 years, park visitors as well as residents from both Clallam and Jefferson counties are opposed to this development. Frequent users of the park are dismayed to hear state parks say it is mandated to develop park areas for *all Washingtonians* while ignoring and ridiculing opposition voices. It is equally disheartening to see that the MPSP development plans contradict your own stated policies with regard to climate change and stewardship.

In a report last year, your stewardship coordinator, Andrea Thorpe, said state parks policies should be ***the pervasive culture within state parks***, and that ***environmental stewardship is everyone's responsibility***. She continued by saying ***environmental planners should look, notice and understand the environments they develop. They should not perpetuate problems within state parks by not observing effects of their actions regarding climate change, too much use and habitat destruction.***

Sadly, all of her statements seem to be unheeded as you continue to plan critical ecosystem and habitat destruction at MPSP.

1- The current plans and planning process are contrary to state parks stated environmental policies.

Road building, infrastructure and habitat loss will blow your stated goals of greenhouse gas reduction and those which address climate change beyond attainable levels. Creating an entirely new park entrance on the southern boundary is shocking. This part of the park contains some of the most dense, mature and iconic PNW forests and ecosystems at MPSP

2-Drawing from the aquifer will accelerate the process of drought for the entire area

Habitat destruction by cutting mature tree stands and their associated ecosystems will additionally deplete the aquifer, and in turn affect the functions of the environments on Miller Peninsula and the Olympic Peninsula

3-Disrupting mature forest environments will impact all plant and animal species and their systemic health throughout the local and surrounding area

4-Plans for creating new trails and lookout posts along the high bank cliffs will accelerate the erosion of the cliffs by both over use and the cutting of mature trees for viewscapes. Plans for a new trail to the beach is through an unused (no animal or people trails exist) steep ravine area will also add to the erosion in the area

5-Cutting forest habitats will heighten forest fire potential. This area has only volunteer firefighters and MPSP is bound by two small winding roads where campers, firefighters and residents will be unable to safely escape. Statements by park planners that they will 'employ best use practices' is not reassuring.

6-The Hwy 101 corridor and the entire Olympic Peninsula is not equipped to handle the additional level of traffic you are proposing.

7-There are already 2 RV parks in the immediate vicinity of MPSP and as you are aware, the Jamestown Tribe is planning on building a luxury RV park on MPSP southern border

8-State parks is already in arrears both in the budget and upkeep of parks that are already established. Instead of using millions of dollars in taxpayer funds, perhaps you should address the backlog of upgrades and day to day functions to existing parks first.

9-If established state park policies were to be followed, as well as awareness of existing climate change issues that the Olympic Peninsula is facing, one has to wonder why this destination development is still being pursued? This is not the 1980s where anything goes. We face serious issues going forward working to keep the Olympic Peninsula as a livable environment.

Development of MPSP will accelerate climate destructive processes

10-Establishing MPSP as a day use and educational park would indicate that state parks is a 21st century, forward looking department, not one stuck in the old 'build because we can' mentality

11- By creating a day use park, which only comprise 17% of all state parks, you would get closer to actually achieving your established climate policy and environmental goals instead of just talking about them in the abstract.

Sincerely, ¹⁹

To all of you on the board,

Like many people who are likely to comment on this site, I have chosen to live in Diamond Point. I am very concerned about water consumption in this park you have planned. We are all on a well system out here, and we rely on the aquifers for our water supply. However we haven't had the rain that we normally get and like many folks who live out here I am concerned about running out of water in the future. What happens to us when the aquifers run dry from thousands of tourists using water in the park? People who don't live out here don't even try to conserve water. I do my

best not to waste water in my home or on my property. Water use by campers in the proposed Park could be drastically reduced if the state chooses NOT to put in flush toilets and showers. That is my first suggestion.

I am in the park often (almost every day). There are many areas on the trails where there is **standing water throughout the winter** because it does not percolate into the soil. I hike and ride my bike on the trails on a pretty regular basis. I don't bike in the winter because there's so much mud, and bikes destroy the trails for hikers. It gets pretty messy in there in the winter. The Manzanita Trail, for example, has a wide and shallow "pond" across a certain section of the upper part of the trail that typically does not dry out until June!

I'm very curious if anyone on that board has ever spent **any time at all** in this park. Has anyone hiked the trails? I mean ALL of them, not just the old logging roads. There are many, and many of them are not even on the maps that are posted.

I'm concerned about all the trees that are going to be cut down in the park in order to develop these camping areas. Based on the maps I've seen, it looks like you are putting the campground in the area where the Madrone forest is because the state has decided that Madrones are junk trees, so who cares if they get cut down. In my opinion that is one of the most beautiful parts of the whole park, and your existing plans will destroy it. **There are areas closer to the current parking area where there are many skinny trees of 3 inches or less in diameter that could be culled to allow the larger trees to grow, and perhaps tent sites could be put in those areas.** I am okay with some development, but your plans to put in a lodge, and a Starbucks, and a climbing wall, and all the other ideas that are apparently meant to entertain humans seem to me to take away from the whole point of being out in the woods which is to escape what normally surrounds us living in the city. If you must develop the park, can you **please** keep it as a Nature Park where people go to learn about the animals and plants that live in these woods.

Aside from water and, obviously, forest fires, my other main concern is traffic. All of us who live out here, and I'm sure many who work out here making deliveries or doing repairs or construction, have experienced long waits to make even a right hand turn in the summer. It's dangerous because it's hard to see what's coming up the hill from the West, and the people traveling downhill from the East are generally doing so at much higher speeds than the posted limit. If you're going to develop the park then PLEASE fix the traffic issues **first**, which means put in a giant roundabout at the intersection of Highway 101 and Diamond Point Road. I doubt that anybody wants traffic lights here so a roundabout is the most cost effective solution. **Or** you could make the entrance farther down the road on tribal land since those folks seem to be all in on development of this park.

I have written to you on this board several times in the past few years. I will likely continue to do so even though I have a feeling that none of you really care what any of us think, and no one is going to read this email. All I can say is I'm grateful I live in a blue state and that there are enough environmentalists here to push you to do the right thing by the land. I hope that you care about preserving the integrity of Miller State Park as a thriving ecosystem as much as I do.

Sincerely,²⁰

Re: Large, commercial development proposed by WA State Parks

Dear Ms. Bromley

My concerns are related to development planning for Miller Peninsula State Park in Clallam County. Washington state faces a major budget shortfall, with calls for reductions in most agency spending. It seems like a good time to reduce expenditures for planned expansion of State Parks. More important in my mind is applying a lens of fiscal responsibility to this planning effort and asking if a resort-scale development, as has been proposed, will be a profitable endeavor for State Parks or a fiscal drain. My guess is that funds generated at a state-owned luxury lodge with commercial facilities (e.g., restaurant) will not pay off the investment of public funds required. As far as the public knows, a business analysis has not been completed to determine if a state-owned facility that directly competes with private business will not be profitable on the Miller Peninsula.

Currently, we have a largely undeveloped public lands parcel with a well established network of trails used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. ***I am not opposed to ecologically-friendly development of this park to accommodate state residents and visitors. I am opposed to our Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission getting into the luxury lodging and restaurant business.***

Last we heard, State Parks was working with a consultant and was favoring a Village Center Alternative Concept for development of Miller Peninsula State Park. This plan includes a large lodge (100 rooms), restaurant/dining area, 16-20 cabins, administrative buildings, amphitheater, and 90 RV and tent camping sites. ***This is a major change in practice for State Parks, perhaps for Washington government itself – building a large, commercial facility for public use, presumably funded with state tax dollars.***

For a normal business in development, one might ask much will the mortgage payment and maintenance costs amount to compared with revenue? As far as I can tell ***State Parks has completed no business or socioeconomic analysis and has no business plan for this development.*** No bank would lend funds for such a large development without a business plan or market analysis. Why should we commit tax dollars to this development, especially while the state budget focus is on reducing spending.

I'll admit a few more campsites would be welcome in the area, but...***is State Parks now in the business of competing with private, commercial enterprise by building lodges and restaurants?***

State Parks does a great job providing lands with recreational opportunity, camping facilities for the average-income citizens, and modest facility development. Lets focus on providing those services to our residents – not a new, government-owned hotel and restaurant and mini-village. Sincerely,²¹

RE: Comment regarding Miller Peninsula Presentation on Jan 29th

Thank you very much for your time working on the future of Miller Peninsula. Staff have generously provided time to consider the desires of users and the local community. Planner Lauren Bromley has always been willing to listen to us as the planning unfolds. For us, we are in the 2nd effort by State Parks to make Miller Peninsula an official State Park.

Our Peninsula Chapter of Back Country Horsemen has been a key partner to State Parks over the time since State Parks acquired the Miller property. We were very involved in the development of the Interim Trails Plan and the creation of the parking area on Diamond Point Rd. Members of our chapter continue to provide routine maintenance on the trails, including removing fallen trees and tread maintenance. Peninsula Chapter members built the ADA trail out of the parking lot.

We have noticed in the Update Presentation the two Alternative Land Class Proposals. These differ from other draft ones that showed trail corridors as Resource Recreation through and Natural Areas including Natural Forest. These new ones do not show that, which is a concern to us since many trails we maintain, and use are in the Natural Forest zones for both Alt 1 and Alt 2. Historically with State Parks, horseback riding isn't permitted in Natural zones including the Natural Forest zone but can be permitted in certain cases by Director permission (WAC 352-32-070 (4)). We ask that all trails at Miller that pass through Natural Forest zones continue to be recognized as open to horseback riding or corridor zoned as Resource Recreation. We look forward to continuing to assist with sustaining recreation on the Miller property. It is the high point of trail riding on the North Olympic Peninsula, enjoyed by many horseback riders, bicycle riders, hikers, and neighbors.

Sincerely,²²

Dear Parks Commission,

I am writing to comment on the proposed changes to Miller State Park.

I have written before and I continue to have grave concerns and oppose the proposed changes. There are many issues. I find it hard to believe that with the billions of dollar deficit in the state funds that this would even be considered.

The issues of wildfire risk, considering the fires in California, can not be overstated .

Water and waste disposal are also a real concern. We are after all a peninsula with limited water aquifers and wastewater runoff into the ocean.

Traffic congestion is a real issue here and will certainly affect our quality of life.

I continue to be concerned that our voices and objections to this project are not being fully appreciated. We live here and should have a voice and we should be heard.

Commercializing of this park is the very opposite of nature appreciation.

Please hear our voices,²³

As a resident of Miller Peninsula and regular, *near daily* user of Miller Peninsula State Park , I have the following questions based on my concerns regarding the planned development:

Safety: The recent fires in Southern California exposed the considerable risk to safety resulting from residents of an affected area desperately fleeing their threatened neighborhoods along narrow, 2-lane roads with no shoulder, while emergency vehicles attempted to use the same road for ingress of fire fighting equipment. In that instance, private vehicles were ultimately abandoned on the roads and their occupants fled on foot in response to the massive traffic jams, resulting in delayed emergency response.

Both East Sequim Bay and Diamond Point Roads are just that - narrow, 2-lane roads with no shoulders, providing only *one-way-in* and *one-way-out* access to residences and emergency egress to safety.

The planned development of the Park, especially overnight campers, along with increased local drought conditions will dramatically increase the risk of forest fires on the Miller Peninsula. **How will the development plans mitigate this potentially catastrophic eventuality?**

The safety concerns with regard to roads extends to the impact of the increased traffic to residents' use for commuting, etc. and inevitable increased accidents.

Water: How will the Park development plan mitigate the limited capacity of the Miller Peninsula aquifer to sustain the residents and the forest ecosystem during longer, annual drought events?

Overnight camping: With a wide variety of camping options nearby, and two RV campgrounds already located on Miller Peninsula (with a new, private, luxury RV resort planned adjacent to MPSP), why is overnight camping at MPSP a necessary part of the planned development?

Day-use Only Alternative: Have the Park planners considered an alternative that would preserve the Park as a natural forest area and make it available for day-use only and outdoor education?

Budget: How does State Parks plan to recoup the \$25+ million in costs being asked to develop this park, in light of the current, \$45 million backlog in needed repairs of other State Parks?

Public Input: Opportunities for public input to the planned development, especially by those most affected (i.e. Olympic Peninsula residents) have been woefully inadequate to-date. When will the next opportunity on the Olympic Peninsula take place?

Sincerely,²⁴

I am a resident on the south boundary of Miller Pen. Park with several concerns regarding your decisions for development of this area.

1. Due to the beauty and fire concerns, the park should be developed as a preserve for day use only. No overnight camping or recreational fires should be allowed. What plans have been made for a source of water to put out a fire?

2. In past meetings, your plans included the park access to be near mile marker 1 at the first curve in Diamond Pt. Rd. Due to limited visibility in that area and visitor back up would hinder my access to turn onto Cat Lake Rd. where I live. This is the worst placement for the entrance. What is your traffic plan both at mile marker 1 and the junction of Diamond Pt. Rd and Hwy 101? A good resolution would be to move the entrance further north where the road straightens out and there are no other roads intersecting the park entrance.

3. The "preserve" entrance should be surveilled and closed at a specific time each day to discourage homeless drug users from making a camp in the park. Recently, we've had problems with the homeless drug users infiltrating personal property, living among trees. Piles of needles have been found along with tents and cardboard boxes.

My plan would be to have picnic tables, hand pumps, pit toilets, dumpsters, self-guided trails with graphics like the Hot Rain Forest.

This information is for the 1/29/25 work session and the 1/30/25 commission meeting.²⁵

Hi Lauren:

Has your contractor finished his ground assessment and is there a report the public can see? What are your 2025-6 legislative plans, financially and otherwise? Kindly update me.

Thank you,²⁶