



**Historic Preservation Commission  
Regular Meeting  
Thursday, May 6, 2021  
2:00 – 4:00 PM  
Online via Zoom  
See Log In Information Below**

---

---

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) will hold this meeting using a virtual, Zoom webinar platform, per Governor Inslee's "Stay Home, Stay Healthy" orders.

Members of the public will be able to call in to the Zoom meeting.

Please click the link below to join the webinar: <https://bainbridgewa.zoom.us/j/93138375561>

Or iPhone one-tap : US: +12532158782,,93138375561# or +16699009128,,93138375561#

Or Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 346 248 7799

or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656

Webinar ID: 931 3837 5561

International numbers available: <https://bainbridgewa.zoom.us/j/93138375561>

---

## AGENDA

2:00 PM **Call to Order and Attendance**

**Conflict of Interest/Disclosure**

**Introductions / *Bumgardner***

**Approval of Agenda for May 6, 2021**

**Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 4, 2021**

**Call for Public Comment / *Bumgartner***

2:15 PM Review of Permit Applications

- Permit review / recommendation

(30 minutes) Project Name: Messenger House Permit link: [PLN51717 CUP](#)

*See Attachments A and B, memos from the City Planner and Project Architect*

**Call for Public Comment / *Bumgartner***

*Application materials are in the permitting system under 'Submittals' (click on "view notes") and under 'Notes'*

Submitted: 25NOV2020 Address: 10861 Manitou Park Blvd

Description: Request to modify standard lot coverage requirements through zoning relief provisions for Local Register properties (BIMC 18.24.010.C)

**For special accommodations, please contact Planning & Community Development 206-780-3750 or at [pcd@bainbridgewa.gov](mailto:pcd@bainbridgewa.gov)**

---

---

- Alteration / Demolition Permits

The Commission may waive review, or make advisory, nonbinding comments on how alterations to potential Register-eligible properties could be done in a historically appropriate manner.

- (15 minutes) Project Name: Jesse Permit link: [BLD25487 SFR](#)

**Call for Public Comment / *Bumgartner***

Submitted: 27JAN2021 Address: 1553 NE Park View Drive

Description: Single-family residential development of the Fort Ward Battery Nash property.

- (15 minutes) Project Name: Marshall Permit link: [BLD25505 R-DEM](#)

**Call for Public Comment / *Bumgartner***

Submitted: 08MAR2021 Address: 4096 Lytle Road NE

Description: Demolish a single-family residence constructed in 1929

- (15 minutes) Project Name: Wycoff-Dickey Permit link: [BLD25492 R-DEM](#)

**Call for Public Comment / *Bumgartner***

Submitted: 12MAR2021 Address: 2040 Beans Bight Road NE

Description: Demolish a single-family residence constructed in 1902 and detached garage building constructed in 1922

3:30 PM Committee Updates

- Identifying Register-eligible Properties (*Baumgartner, Chandler, Kortum*)
- Public Education (*Baumgartner, Moreno*)
- Suyematsu Farm ( *Chandler, Hughes, Kortum*)  
*See Attachment C: Draft Implementation Plan*
- Discuss process for sending written communication from a Commissioner, group of Commissioners, and/or the Commission. (*Baumgartner*)

3:55 PM New / Old Business

- Discuss June 3, 2021 agenda / *All*

4:00 PM Adjourn

**For special accommodations, please contact Planning & Community  
Development 206-780-3750 or at [pcd@bainbridgewa.gov](mailto:pcd@bainbridgewa.gov)**

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)  
Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 4, 2021  
Call for Public Comment  
Discuss Implementation Plan/Schedule 2021 Work Plan  
New/Old Business  
Adjourn

---

**Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)**

Chair Bumgardner called the meeting to order at 2:06 PM. Commissioners in attendance were Eric Kortum, Susan Hughes, Christopher Moreno, and Rick Chandler. Brianna Kosowitz was absent and excused. It was noted that Commissioner Brianna Kosowitz will be out on maternity leave until August. City Staff present were Senior Planner Kelly Tayara, and Administrative Specialist Carla Lundgren who monitored meeting platform and prepared these minutes.

The agenda was reviewed, and it was noted that the date on the published agenda was incorrect.

There were not any conflicts of interest noted.

**Review & Approve Minutes – February 4, 2021**

**Motion:** I move to approve the minutes.

**Kortum/Chandler:** Passed Unanimously

**Public Comment**

None.

**Discuss Implementation Plan/Schedule 2021 Work Plan**

Subcommittees were formed and assigned to each work plan item.

**New/Old Business**

- Chair Bumgardner will not be available to attend the City Council meeting on April 13, 2021 and agreed that Senior Planner Kelly Tayara will present the HPC 2021 Work Plan on behalf of the HPC.
- The HPC agreed to review the Messenger House request at the April 1<sup>st</sup> agenda.

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.

Department of Planning and Community Development

## Memorandum

Date: May 3, 2021  
To: Historic Preservation Commission  
From: Kelly Tayara, Senior Planner  
Subject: Messenger House Request for Zoning Standard Modification

---

---

Day Hall, the East Lawn and the caretaker cottage, all associated with the Moran School, are listed on the Local Historic Register. The property on which they are located has been most recently been dedicated to use as Messenger Care House, a health care facility.

The property owner is in the process of redeveloping the site. Proposed redevelopment includes demolition of the assisted living wing which is attached to Day Hall and was constructed in 1986, and construction of a new 46-bed facility with assisted and independent living units in its place.

In accordance with provisions in the Historic Preservation Program, the Director of Planning and Community Development may waive or modify development standards, such as setbacks, lot coverage, and parking requirements, for designated Local Register properties (BIMC 18.24.010.C). A request for modification is processed through a minor conditional use permit.

The property is located in an R-2 residential district and health care facilities are limited to half of the standard lot coverage of 20 percent that is allowed for residential development. Lot coverage, in this context, means the portion of the site covered by buildings. The site is 7.01 acres in size. Lot coverage is limited to ten percent of the site area (30,535 square feet). The applicant proposes lot coverage of 16.8 percent (51,300 square feet).

The Director respectfully requests that the Historic Preservation Commission review the application to modify the lot coverage development standard and provide a recommendation as to whether the proposal is compatible with the historic nature of the building and/or site.



Aerial Photo 2018



Attn: Kelly Tayara  
Dept. Of Planning and Community Development  
Re: Proposal to Modify Development Standards  
Date: May 6, 2021  
Project: Messenger House Phase 2 PLN51717 / CUPA

## INTRO

The applicant is submitting this summary to assist the Historic Preservation Commission with its review of the Messenger House Phase 2 proposal. The stated purpose of the review is to establish whether the proposal is compatible with the historic nature of the building and/or site. The proposal includes a new addition to Day Hall (to replace the existing addition), renovation work to exterior of Day Hall and related site improvements as defined in the Site Plan Review application currently under review. The design for the proposed new addition to Day Hall has been based in part upon recommendations from U.S. Department of the Interior, *Technical Preservation Briefs (see Reference Materials below)*. The HPC will provide an additional review of the project when the building permit is submitted. Applicant responses are highlighted with underscore.

## ZONING CODE BACKGROUND

*18.24.010 C: Zoning Code Relief. Designated local register properties may be authorized for a use not otherwise permitted in a certain zone. The planning director may approve said use through an administrative conditional use (BIMC [2.16.050](#)). The planning director may also waive or modify development standards such as: setbacks, open space, **lot coverage**, landscape buffers and parking requirements.*

Day Hall and its related site was recently designated as a historic structure. There is no change to the existing use. The applicant is seeking zoning relief to increase the existing lot coverage from 15.9% to 16.1%. The proposal has been reviewed and modified to reflect comments by the Design Review Board and neighborhood input.

*2.16.050 I: Local Register of Historic Places Conditional Use Decision Criteria. A proposal to modify development standards (such as setbacks, open space, lot coverage, landscape buffers, and parking requirements) and/or to allow for a use otherwise permitted for a structure on the local register (including exclusive residential in the mixed use town center) shall meet the following criteria:*

- 1. Subsections D.1 through 10 of this section, Nonagricultural Minor Conditional Use Decision Criteria, including a review and recommendation from the historic preservation commission as to whether the proposal is **compatible with the historic nature of the building and/or site**; and*

The proposal is to replace the existing 1986 skilled nursing wing with a new addition. The other portions of the facility will remain largely unaltered. The new wing will follow the position of the existing wing to minimize impacts to the east open space and mature trees.

The height of the wing will be increased due to changes in the type of services provided; from skilled nursing to assisted living-independent living. The prior facility had shared rooms whereas the new facility will have separate 1 and 2-bedroom apartments. There

will be no increase in number of beds. The proposed building height will be equal to the 1917 Day Hall and within the building height allowed under prior CUP approval.

The existing wing obscures a portion of the Day Hall façade facing the East lawn. The proposed design will restore that portion of the east façade to its original design. The proposed addition is stepped down in height where it attaches to Day Hall. Careful attention has been given to selecting materials which will visually blend with Day Hall. The proposed materials will be cementitious panels to complement the cement plaster exterior and will be similar in tone. Additionally, the overall building form has been broken into segments consistent with the scale of Day Hall. The overall composition will make a clear distinction between old and new, in contrast to trying to copy the old building, confusing what was original.

The alterations to the East lawn are minimal to preserve existing mature trees and maintain the role of the open space within the neighborhood. Improvements will include new pathways meeting accessibility requirements and expanded pedestrian access for surrounding neighbors.

In conclusion, great effort has been made to complement the historic building so it can retain its significance as a focal element within the site and neighborhood. This proposal seeks to continue the long-standing role the facility has provided on the Island for the last 60 years and hopefully well into the future.

*2. The use shall be compatible with the existing design and/or construction of the structure without significant alteration.*

The proposed use within the historic building is allowed since it is a continuation of the prior use.

## **DESIGN FOR BAINBRIDGE GUIDELINES: HISTORIC PLACES**

*STANDARD 1: Design the site, buildings, and landscape to be compatible with historic buildings without directly mimicking historic architectural styles.*

### **GUIDELINES**

- a. Use site design, massing, height, rooflines, pedestrian entrances, materials, and colors to complement historic places.*
- b. Design sites and buildings in historic areas to meet the Secretary of the Interior's standards for modifications to existing historic buildings and infill development.*
- c. Design buildings to be consistent with the scale of nearby historic buildings or districts based on the context analysis.*
- d. Consider historic landscaping that contributes to the context of historic buildings.*

*STANDARD 2: Maintain the historic integrity of buildings over 50 years old listed or eligible for the national or local register of historic places.*

- a. Minimize alterations to historic buildings and properties that are inconsistent with the original design of the building.*
- b. Restore buildings to their original historic design elements when previously altered.*

## **DEPT. OF INTERIOR STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION**

New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Technical Preservation Services - National Park Service  
Excerpts from Technical Preservation Brief #14



*An addition should be designed to be compatible with the historic character of the building and, thus, meet the Standards for Rehabilitation. Standards 9 and 10 apply specifically to new additions:*

*(9) “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be **differentiated from the old** and shall be compatible with the **massing, size, scale, and architectural features** to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”*

*(10) “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, **the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.**”*

*The subject of new additions is important because a new addition to a historic building has the potential to change its historic character as well as to damage and destroy significant historic materials and features. A new addition also has the potential to confuse the public and to make it difficult or impossible to differentiate the old from the new or to recognize what part of the historic building is genuinely historic.*

*To accomplish this and meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, a new addition should:*

- *Preserve significant historic materials, features and form;*
- *Be compatible; and*
- *Be differentiated from the historic building.*

*Rather than differentiating between old and new, it might seem more in keeping with the historic character simply to repeat the historic form, material, features and detailing in a new addition. However, when the new work is highly replicative and indistinguishable from the old in appearance, it may no longer be possible to identify the “real” historic building.*

*The 1967 Administrative Policies for Historical Areas of the National Park System direct that “...a modern addition should be readily distinguishable from the older work; however, the new work should be **harmonious with the old in scale, proportion, materials, and color.**”*

## **Messenger House – Day Hall Rehabilitation**

### **Analysis of Proposed Design and Standards for Rehabilitation**

#### **Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation**

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm>

The Standards will be applied taking into consideration the economic and technical feasibility of each project.

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires **minimal change to its distinctive materials**, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
  1. Day Hall has been used to care for people for the last 70 years, a majority of its existence.
  2. The proposed use of Day Hall will not change.
  3. The proposed design makes minimal changes to the existing historic exterior of Day Hall. Many original structures at the Moran school have already been lost, but this project seeks not only to restore but to expose more of the historic Day Hall.

2. The **historic character of a property will be retained and preserved**. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
  1. The character of Day Hall will be improved by the planned restoration of its exterior envelope and reconstruction of a portion of the first floor at the south end of the building.
  2. Historic materials will be retained and restored (with the exception of the doors and windows where historically sympathetic doors and windows will be installed).
  3. The spatial relationship between Day Hall and the east lawn is retained and enhanced with new code-required accessible routes around the building and site.
  4. The spatial relationship of the new assisted living wing respects the old relationship and connection with the east lawn.
  5. Non-historic additions and changes are being removed in order to restore Day Hall to it's original appearance, including:
    1. Removal of the 1987 assisted living wing.
    2. Removal of the shed roof addition and fire escape ladder on the north end of the building.
    3. Removal of the stair addition on the west side of the building.
  6. East Lawn
    1. The existing stairs and sidewalks on the east side of Day Hall were added in 1987 and are not historic features. They are being removed to permit the installation of code-required egress pathways and accessible routes around the building.
    2. Significant trees and lawn areas will be retained.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a **false sense of historical development**, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
  1. False historicism and conjecture are avoided on this project.
  2. Restoration of Day Hall is based on detailed photos and existing historic features of the building which can be reconstructed for this project. Materials used in the restoration will be compatible with the existing historic structure.
  3. At the assisted living wing, while the materials recall the light-colored structure of Day Hall, they are differentiated by virtue of the modern materials, some colors, and construction techniques.
  4. The design of the assisted living wing avoids the potential that it is an extension of Day Hall with the "gasket" between the two buildings.
4. **Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance** in their own right will be retained and preserved.
  1. No changes to the historic property have gained historic significance.
  2. Day Hall is the primary feature of significance on the property.
  3. Additions for the memory care wing and lobbies have not gained historic significance.
5. **Distinctive materials, features, finishes** and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
  1. Distinctive materials and workmanship of Day Hall has been preserved and are being restored to return it to its historic appearance.
  2. See 2.5 above re: sidewalks and stairs at east lawn.
6. **Deteriorated historic features** will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the

old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

1. The design for this project restores Day Hall and restores the existing historic materials, colors, and finishes wherever possible.
  1. Stucco exterior finishes are being repaired in-kind.
  2. Clay tile roof areas are being replaced in-kind.
  3. In areas of restoration, the stucco and terra cotta-colored accents are being reconstructed in-kind based on historic photos.
  4. Parapet caps, scuppers, downspouts, and similar sheet metal components are being replaced in-kind.
  5. Exception: code-required changes such as door and window replacements required to comply with the Energy Code and Building Code.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. **Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place.** If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
  1. No known archaeological resources are on the property and therefore no disturbance to archaeological resources is anticipated.
9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction **will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships** that characterize the property. The new work will be **differentiated from the old** and will be **compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing** to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
  1. Preservation of Historic Materials
    1. Alterations to the historic exterior of Day Hall generally focuses on repair or replacement in-kind for historic building materials.
    2. The major departure from this approach is door and window replacement which will be with historically compatible aluminum clad doors and windows with simulated divided lights.
    3. Alterations that are minor or do not impact the historic character include:
      1. Roofing will be replaced with a new membrane roof over new rigid insulation. This will not be visible from the ground.
  2. Differentiation
    1. The addition is differentiated from the original building through:
      1. Architectural character and design (contemporary)
      2. Articulation (setbacks)
      3. Materials (steel, wood, and cementitious exterior cladding)
  3. Compatibility
    1. The proposed materials will complement the cement plaster façade of Day Hall. The predominant exterior material will be cementitious panels which will be a light buff color, similar in tone to Day Hall. Windows frames will be painted white to match Day Hall.
    2. The features of the addition will emulate those found on Day Hall. These include organizing windows into vertically aligned groupings, and projecting balconies, and simple cornice line.
    3. The scale and proportion of the addition respects Day Hall as follows:
      1. The top of the roof parapets match the original building.
      2. The height of the addition matches the three-story height of Day Hall.

3. The windows in the addition generally align with the windows of Day Hall.
  4. The height of the addition steps down one story where it joins day Hall
  4. The overall size of the assisted living addition is larger than Day Hall. However, the design breaks up the size and mass of the addition as follows:
    1. The building form is offset from Day Hall to not appear as a continuation of the original façade
    2. The angled layout of the addition helps reduce its scale
    3. The façade is divided into discrete sections to better match the proportions of Day Hall
    4. Respects the size and area of the east lawn as it currently exists (does not protrude into or fill the east lawn).
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, **if removed in the future**, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
1. Reversibility is retained by having a more limited connection to the existing south end of Day Hall. Where the 1987 addition is removed, historic materials and finishes will be replaced in-kind to match the historic exterior of Day Hall. The new addition can be removed with limited impact to the exterior of Day Hall – and that impact will be to repair materials, not original historic building fabric.
  2. The door and window replacement and other exterior features such as sheet metal elements will restore the exterior appearance of Day Hall. Individual elements can be removed and replaced at a later date, if needed.
  3. The project is reversing prior additions and interventions, as mentioned above.
    1. Removal of the 1987 assisted living wing.
    2. Removal of the shed roof addition and fire escape ladder on the north end of the building.
    3. Removal of the stair addition on the west side of the building. The new stair on the west side of Day Hall will have a lighter “touch” on the existing historic building and can more easily be removed and restored.

## MINOR CUP DECISION CRITERIA

*2.16.050 D. Nonagricultural Minor Conditional Use Decision Criteria. A nonagricultural minor conditional use or an agricultural research facility may be approved if:*

1. *The conditional use is consistent with applicable design guidelines in BIMC Title 18. The conditional use is compatible with the established and intended character of the neighborhood, considering factors that include, but are not limited to, hours of operation, the type of activities generated by the use, and the predictable levels of any adverse impacts; and*

No change in use is proposed. The intensity of the use will remain unchanged. The proposal is consistent with Design Guidelines. The proposed project is harmonious and appropriate in design, character, and appearance with the character of the site and the surrounding neighborhood. The scale of the proposed building will be similar to the existing building, even though larger than nearby residences. The sweeping front lawn from the front of the old building to Manitou Park Boulevard will remain essentially the same.

2. *The conditional use will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property; and*

The conditional use will remain consistent with prior operations on site. Most of the area around the proposed new building and parking area is heavily wooded which acts as a buffer from neighboring residences. The traffic is not expected to change.

3. *The conditional use is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable adopted community plans, including the Island-Wide Transportation Plan; and*

The proposal is consistent with Comprehensive Plan and other adopted community plans. The neighborhood is single family residential, which has co-existed for many years with the private nursing home facility.

4. *The conditional use complies with all other applicable provisions of the BIMC; and*

The proposal complies with all other applicable provisions of BIMC. The current lot coverage is existing non-conforming.

5. *All necessary measures have been taken to eliminate or reduce to the greatest extent possible the impacts that the proposed use may have on the immediate vicinity of the subject property; and*

Proposed use shall be consistent with prior operations which have existed since 1960. The proposed project will not expand the use of the facility; no new beds will be added. Increased traffic or other significant environmental impacts will not occur as a result of the project.

6. *Noise levels shall be in compliance with BIMC [16.16.020](#) and [16.16.040.A](#); and*

Noise levels shall be in compliance with BIMC

7. *The streets and nonmotorized facilities as proposed are adequate to accommodate anticipated traffic; and*

The streets and nonmotorized facilities as proposed are adequate to accommodate anticipated traffic

8. *The city engineer has determined that the conditional use meets the following decision criteria:*

- a. The conditional use conforms to regulations concerning drainage in Chapters [15.20](#) and [15.21](#) BIMC; and*
- b. The conditional use will not cause an undue burden on the drainage basin or water quality and will not unreasonably interfere with the use of properties downstream; and*
- c. The streets and nonmotorized facilities as proposed align with and are otherwise coordinated with streets and nonmotorized facilities serving adjacent properties and are adequate, safe, efficient and consistent with the Island-Wide Transportation Plan; and*
- d. If a traffic study shows that the use will have an adverse impact on traffic, including nonmotorized traffic, the impact shall be mitigated as required by the city engineer; and*
- e. If the conditional use will rely on public water or sewer services, there is capacity in the water or sewer system (as applicable) to serve the conditional use, and the required service(s) can be made available at the site; and*
- f. The conditional use conforms to the "City of Bainbridge Island Engineering Design and Construction Standards and Specifications," unless the city engineer has approved a deviation from the standards; and*

The proposal complies with above listed criterion.

9. *The Kitsap public health district has determined that the conditional use meets the following decision criteria:*

- a. The proposal conforms to current standards regarding domestic water supply and sewage disposal; or if the proposal is not to be served by public sewers, then the lot has sufficient area and soil, topographic and drainage characteristics to permit an on-site sewage disposal system; and*

*b. If the health district recommends approval or disapproval of the application the health district shall so advise the director; and*

The proposal complies with above listed criterion.

*10. The Bainbridge Island fire department has reviewed the application and determined that the conditional use will be properly designed to ensure fire protection; and*

The fire flow to the project site will be enhanced by improvement of off-site water infrastructure.

## SUYEMATSU PLAN FOR BIHPC APPROVAL

(For April 1, 2021 Meeting)

Committee on Suyematsu Farm: Eric Kortum, Rick Chandler, Susan Hughes

Committee Meeting: March 19, 2021 (Doc's Restaurant)

2021 work goals for Suyematsu Farm:

1. Public Site Improvements: Clear all brush and rubbish from structures; create parking area and public paths (requires labor).
2. Install interpretive signage: 5 outdoor signs with a "then and now" theme using historic photographs; identify structure (requires Labor and other support)
3. Cleanup large picker cabin; discard debris (requires Labor)
4. Raise funds or seek volunteer effort to stabilize two smaller picker cabins (ca. \$60K)

Seeking approval to meet these goals via the following actions:

1. **Seek partnerships:**
  - a. BI Historic Society (Eric): Labor; signage support; ideas for raising funds
  - b. BI Land Trust (Susan): Labor; ideas for raising funds
  - c. Friends of Farm (Rick/Susan): Labor; what support can they provide; how much involvement can they give since they are managing the property?
  - d. BI Japanese Committee (Rick): Labor; signage; linkage to Japanese Exclusion Memorial
  - e. BI Parks Department (Eric/Rick): Labor; Could they take the lead or provide recommendations and equipment for clearing pathways and creating public areas.
  - f. The Rotary Club (Eric): Labor; financial support
  - g. The Barn (Susan/Rick): Labor, especially associated with building signs, stabilization. Do they have people who might be interested in assisting in the Suyematsu Project.
2. **Contact granting agencies** about funding renovations; signage; promotion.
3. **Contact builders** seeking someone who might donate labor for stabilization.
4. **Contact Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington Museum Association, and Washington State Historical Society** for resources (Susan).
5. Work toward establishing a **work day** in early June (need to develop a work plan first).
6. Write an **article for Bainbridge Review/Bremerton Sun** to promote project.

Longer Range Ideas:

1. Put the Farm on the national or state register.
2. Plan an event in association with 80 year anniversary of the Japanese American Internment
3. Attend City Council meetings; build relationships with City Council.