

VASHON PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Ober Park, Performance Room, 7:00 pm

DATE: Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Commissioners attending: Bill Ameling, Lu-Ann Branch, Scott Harvey, Doug Ostrom, Joe Wald

Staff attending: Jason Acosta, Elaine Ott

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
Call to order & agenda review	The meeting was called to order at 7:03 PM by Lu-Ann Branch. Lu-Ann read the agenda into the record.	
Public Comment	<i>Capt. Joe:</i> I have to report that Vashon All is dead. Vashon Discourse is now established. Chick Green put all the spam filters in. It is unmoderated and it is a yahoo group. It has all the long tags like all the Vashon yahoo groups.	
Vote for Board Offices	<p><u>For the Chair position.</u></p> <p><i>Scott:</i> I nominate Doug.</p> <p><i>Doug:</i> I refuse.</p> <p><i>Joe:</i> I nominate Bill.</p> <p><i>Bill:</i> No second is needed for these positions.</p> <p><i>Doug:</i> I nominate Scott.</p> <p><i>Lu-Ann:</i> Treasurer is the other desirable spot. Also available is the vice-chair position. At large is the last one.</p> <p>VOTES:</p> <p><i>Lu-Ann:</i> All those in favor of Scott for chair: Doug and Scott raised their hands. Lu-Ann abstained. Joe and Bill voted against Scott for chair. 2-0-2.</p> <p><i>Lu-Ann:</i> All those in favor of Bill for chair: Joe and Bill raised their hands. Lu-Ann abstained. Scott and Doug voted against. 2-0-2.</p> <p><i>Lu-Ann:</i> Let's do a REVOTE. All those in favor of Scott: Scott and Doug raised their hands.</p> <p><i>Lu-Ann:</i> All those in favor of Bill: Bill and Joe raised their hands. Lu-Ann abstained. Doug & Scott raised their hands against. 2-0-2.</p> <p><i>Lu-Ann:</i> OK, I will nominate myself for chair. Let's REVOTE: Doug and Lu-Ann voted for Lu-Ann. Joe and Bill voted for Bill. Scott voted for himself. 2-2-1.</p> <p><i>Lu-Ann:</i> OK, let's REVOTE: Scott voted for Scott. Lu-Ann and Doug voted for Lu-Ann and Joe and Bill voted for Bill. 1-2-2.</p> <p><i>Bill:</i> In the early years it was Emma and all men. After that it was a tired joke. Then we decided to revolve the chairs. I like that. Other variations were tried. There is precedent on all sides.</p>	VOTE FOR BOARD OFFICES:

Scott: Doug, why don't you want to be chair?

Doug: I don't think that I would be very good at it and I am not outspoken or forceful.

Scott: I just want more effective meetings. Just keep it moving.

Bill: I want to run a more brisk meeting. What is not the duty of the chair is to push an agenda. The chair cannot run around and tell people what to do as if they were the President. They put the agenda together and run the meeting. That's it.

Scott: Doug is being too modest. He understands the issues. He just has to go through the agenda. It doesn't have to be all gavel and so forth. He should reconsider.

Lu-Ann: I have always seen the role as a figurehead as well as running meetings. My concern is going forward with levy and the offices. Bill and Scott are up. I am sort of a moderate. I see both sides of the issues.

Bill: The board chair is not a position for politics. It doesn't matter. They just execute the meeting. You can't refuse an item on the agenda. It is an administration function, not a political one.

Lu-Ann: I think that the public sees it as more than an administrative function.

Bill: I don't think so, especially if we rotate chairs.

Doug: Actually, I think that Scott would be up for it.

Bill: How about the process of elimination?

Scott: If the lowest vote getter is out, then we are left with 2-2.

Lu-Ann: Scott and Doug for Scott. Lu-Ann for Lu-Ann. Joe and Bill for Bill. If we revote, we will get the same thing.

Bill: Lu-Ann, you have to vote.

Lu-Ann: No. What would it take to move someone's vote?

Bill: I nominate Joe.

Joe: I will if it helps.

Lu-Ann: OK, let's vote again. All those in favor of Joe being the chair: Bill, Joe, Lu-Ann and Doug voted for Joe. Scott voted against Joe being chair.

Bill: Joe is the chair.

For the Vice-Chair Position

Joe: (Joe assumes the chair position.) Who will be vice-chair?

Scott: I nominate myself.

Lu-Ann: I will nominate myself.

VOTE: Doug & Scott voted for Scott. Joe, Bill and Lu-Ann voted for Lu-Ann. 2-3.

For the Treasurer Position

Bill: I will nominate myself as treasurer.

Joe: OK, let's vote. Doug, Lu-Ann, Joe and Bill voted for Bill. Scott voted against Bill being the treasurer. 4-1

**JOE IS VOTED
CHAIR**

**LU-ANN IS
VOTED VICE-
CHAIR**

**BILL IS VOTED
TREASURER**

	<p><u>For the Secretary Position</u> <i>Bill:</i> I nominate Doug for Secretary. <i>Joe:</i> OK, let's vote. All those in favor of Doug for secretary: Unanimous vote in favor.</p> <p><u>For the At-Large Position</u> <i>Joe:</i> That means that Scott is at-large.</p>	<p>DOUG IS VOTED SECRETARY</p> <p>SCOTT IS AT-LARGE</p>
<p>Approve November and December 2014 Minutes</p>	<p><i>Bill:</i> I MOVE to approve the November and December 2014 minutes. <i>Scott:</i> I SECOND the motion. <i>Joe:</i> OK, Let's vote. Those in favor of approving the November and December 2014 minutes: Unanimous in favor.</p>	<p>MOTION, SECOND TO APPROVE NOVEMBER & DECEMBER 2014 MINUTES. UNANIMOUS IN FAVOR.</p>
<p>Pool Fix Report</p>	<p><i>Elaine:</i> Enduris has approved the pool cover and will send payment for that and the robotic cover arm. We are working on the drainage system. We need bids for the fix. We need approval from the DOE by next week. I invited Eric Gill to be present. We need to insure we have the School District approval regardless of who pays. We intend to ask the School District for some funds. I am not part of the School District's discussion. <i>Bill:</i> If we decide to put a permanent cover on, we have to get SD permission? <i>Elaine:</i> That is correct.</p>	
<p>Park District Survey</p>	<p><i>Scott:</i> Last year, Lu-Ann & John Hopkins put together a good survey. I propose that we do it again this year, but with the addition of two questions. One, we should ask, "Would you vote for the levy if you were to vote right now?" A second question would be, "If not, why not?" It could help us promote what is important to the public. <i>Bill:</i> The survey was statistically invalid and poorly written. It was political in nature. You run the levy and they say yes or no. That is statistically valid. Validity is the levy. Many won't participate in the survey unless someone has influenced them. It is voluntary. The order of the question affects the answer to the next question. You have to scramble questions. You have to have a nonpartisan group do it. It is too late for that. Otherwise it is political garbage. <i>Lu-Ann:</i> I think that we got good feedback. The comments were interesting. There were several things that popped out at me. <i>Joe:</i> Scott, do you want to do the questions to present to us? <i>Scott:</i> I thought the old ones were good. If the results are different from last time, it would indicate that something happened. <i>Bill:</i> We have a representative government. All five of us have different views. If someone</p>	

	<p>does not like what has happened, they let us know. <i>Lu-Ann:</i> People respond in different ways. <i>Scott:</i> We compare the answers to last year’s. There were lots of good comments. If it comes back against the levy, there will be significant work to be done. <i>Bill:</i> You could stand outside of Thriftway. <i>Capt. Joe:</i> It takes 5 minutes to put together a survey. <i>Lu-Ann:</i> Cici provided the Survey Monkey. You could reload it. <i>Bill:</i> If a professional survey was involved they would canvas. <i>Doug:</i> I figured that those answered were those that had used the facilities. If we can get people who otherwise wouldn’t make comments, it would be worth it. <i>Scott:</i> I MOVE that we put the same survey out with the addition of the question about the levy and if not, why not question. The levy would cost 23K. <i>Lu-Ann:</i> I second the motion. <i>Joe:</i> We will vote on this motion at the next meeting.</p>	<p>MOTION, SECOND TO PUT LAST YEAR’S SURVEY OUT THIS YEAR WITH TWO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.</p>
<p>VES vs. Jensen Point</p>	<p><i>Scott:</i> I put this on the agenda. There was some disagreement between Doug and Joe regarding Doug’s position about Jensen Point. <i>Joe:</i> Correction. The boat house was the issue, not Jensen Point. You could just call me if you had a question. <i>Scott:</i> What do you want to accomplish? <i>Joe:</i> Pertaining to what? <i>Scott:</i> Park district facilities. You said that the boat house is the same as VES. <i>Joe:</i> That’s not true. You can’t use the boat house 24/7. <i>Scott:</i> What about the pitching machines? <i>Joe:</i> We don’t own any pitching machines. <i>Bill:</i> Why are we talking about this? <i>Scott:</i> I’ll withdraw it.</p>	
<p>User Fees</p>	<p><i>Scott:</i> I MOVE that we adopt the User Fee/Services I prepared. “In order to be more equitable for all Vashon Park District users, I move the following amendment be made to the 2015 budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Charges for use [of the] Paradise Ridge facilities to be reduced by one-third, rounded up to the dollar; • Charges for use of fields to be increased from \$15 to \$18/player for youth groups, paying for a season; • Charges for use of fields to be increased from \$15 to \$25/player for adult groups paying for aa season; 	<p>MOTION, SECOND TO CHANGE USER FEES/SERVICES PER MOTION FROM SCOTT.</p>

- Charges for use of [the] gym to be increased from \$15 to \$18/player for youth groups paying for a season;
- All other charges for school facilities to be increased by 20%, rounded to the dollar;
- All non-profit Ober Park users that contract to rent the facility for at least 5 hours per month will receive the opportunity to advertise on Park District signs without additional charge once per quarter, on a space available basis and [for the] second time per quarter at 50% of prevailing charges;
- All non-profit Ober Park users that contract to rent the facility for at least 15 hours in any calendar quarter will have their charges by 20%;
- Fees for individual admission to the Vashon pool to be reduced from \$6 to \$5.
- Fees for individual and family passes to the Vashon pool to be reduced by 10% from the amount charged during 2013.

Scott: Funding would come from the unallocated reserve.

Doug: SECOND.

Joe: I have letters from Scott Bonney and Mark Nassutti that indicate that they do not support the Vashon Pool section of the Motion.

Scott: I have both letters and the reason I made the motion was to be equitable to all users. I had no intention of this increasing access to the pools. Some pay a disproportional amount.

Bill: Did you ask the field users about this?

Scott: They were not interested.

Bill: So what you did was to offer an increase to those who said that they didn't like your proposal.

Scott: Bonney made the "gallon of milk" analogy. Point of motion comes from you Bill. He thought it needed a more detailed analysis. The pool aspect is a place-holder. At the end of the day, the field people would pay less than the pool.

Joe: Here is the problem. The existing fee schedule is not a problem. The parks have to be maintained. You say equitable. Did you know that this would put a fee on 7 properties?

What about the other 23? They all get used.

Scott: I MOVE to suspend.

Bill: The policy is that we don't suspend rules for the hell of it. There has to be a time-critical issue. It is not exposed to the public anywhere. You came up with this yesterday. By jumping the gun you deprive people to have the time to read it and comment.

Doug: we have had multiple meetings on this issue. You may be right about the emergency issue.

Joe: Scott, we can change user fees at any time.

Scott: I want it in the budget as a placeholder. Certain funds eat up our funds. That is why I want it in the budget now. I want to fund everything.

Joe: This costs money.

**MOTION TO
SUSPEND THE
RULES.**

Doug: I want to strike the last two issues and speak more to equity.

Bill: Joe pointed out that the numbers were incorrect.

Doug: The fields are very expensive.

Joe: You assume the groups are entirely responsible for maintaining the facility. When the pool is closed you can't use it.

Bill: We have had no hue and cry to change the user fees. The only people pushing it are Mr. Scott and Mr. Reuball (sp?). There are people here who want to punish the field users. You tried to link user fees to the budget. This is political bs.

Lu-Ann: It is the people who are involved with youth groups. What groups?

Bill: It is reprehensible to put another \$3 on the kids.

Doug: If you are an incidental user, they don't pay fees. It is free.

Joe: All in favor of suspending the rules: Scott & Doug. Opposed: Lu-Ann, Bill, Joe. The original motion will be voted on at the next meeting.**

Bill: Allocation was done by the Executive Director and it was presented at the User Fee meeting. A motion to balance user fees does have my support, but when we talk about how to equalize it, it is almost impossible to come to an agreement. Scott's attempt to equalize use of Ober was changed. Some maintenance of VES was changed. I am not trying to punish anybody. I expect the Board to find the best way of managing it. The idea that I am trying to influence some kind of activity is absurd.

Hans -Soccer Board member: Certainly, you can raise the fees. If they were raised \$1,600 more, we would have to talk to the families. That is the amount your proposal would amount to. It is not clear that you need the revenue. There is capital. This is more than we can fathom. It was more of an abstention on our part. We want more opportunity for low income players. We would like to partner with you, but that has gone away. We just go by ourselves now. It does sound political. It doesn't make much sense to us.

Mark: I represent the Friends of the Pool. We were not brought into this proposal process at all. Our view is that there is nobody that has a problem with the current fees. We want a longer season. We want a cover. That is where we would like your support, Mr. Harvey.

Doug: I MOVE an amendment to take out any reference to the pool.

Bill: What Scott Bonney said is that the duty to set fees is with the Director. It is not the Board's duty. It would be micro-managing for the Board to set them. I have not seen any demonstrated need for this. I would like it to be the Director's decision.

Doug: It is the nature of our job to set user fees. It is political.

Joe: We vote on policy. Elaine could bring any proposal to the Board. It was a part of Bill's budget presentation.

Mary: The fees were set many years ago and changed by the then-director and her staff. They looked up fees in other places and worked with the user groups. David Hackett did his own fee schedule.

Lu-Ann: Then, for a while, we had no user fees. When they brought user fees back, they were about the same. Two years ago, Susan made a fee table.

**** Agenda Item****

**MOTION TO
AMEND SCOTT'S
MOTION TO
TAKE OUT ANY
REFERENCE TO
THE POOL (No
Second)**

	<p>Bill: Wendy would come in and say that these are the fees. David Hackett changed the structure. We had all these little pots, but it did not work. Wendy presented it and we voted on it. At the next meeting, I am going to propose that all fees be set by the Director and the Board will then vote on it.</p>	
<p>Vote to Approve 2015 Budget</p>	<p>Joe: There is a motion on the table. Elaine: Since the last meeting, there have been changes that I thought were important. 1) I reduced the cash carryover; 2) I removed pool cover because Enduris will cover it; 3) Point Robinson will purchase Jason’s truck and the mower; 4) VES – 2 days before Christmas County changed their mind one more time. Now, they want everything paved. So I accounted for another 40K from the reserve to accommodate that. Bill: Leave the money in the reserve so it doesn’t appear that we approve of the County’s actions. I don’t want it to show as a line item. Elaine: The project manager should be someone who knows the County, paving, gravel, etc. Then we go to the County and make them show us the RCW’s, etc. Joe: We are a moving target; you have to do that. Sit down with them and plead our case. Bill: Elaine, move the 40K and put back it back in the reserve. That shows we don’t approve. Bill: I CALL THE QUESTION on the revised budget, with 40 K moved back into the reserve. Doug: It means that we are down to a lower reserve. It sounds like we might have to do it. Bill: That is what she is talking about. I called the question. VOTE: Lu-Ann, Bill and Joe voted in favor. Scott opposed the motion. Doug abstained.</p> <p>Elaine: I would like to have the project manager job profile adopted. Bill: Nowhere does it say that the person must have experience in permitting. You may need two positions: 1) Someone to chase the County and, 2) Someone who knows construction. Joe: there are plenty of people who have these qualifications. Capt. Joe: Is there a salary line item for this position? Elaine: Yes. 58K for the package. Bill: Managing budget and time line should be added to the profile. Successfully managed projects of at least 200K. Bill: I MOVE THAT THE PROJECT MANAGER’S JOB PROFILE BE ADOPTED WITH THE ADDITION OF 1) BUDGET MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE, 2) TIME-LINE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE, AND 3) SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT OF PROJECTS OF AT LEAST 200k. Joe: SECOND to approve with the changes. Lu-Ann: implement change management program should be added***</p>	<p>MOTION ON THE TABLE TO ADOPT THE 2015 BUDGET AS PROPOSED BY ELAINE WITH 40k MOVED BACK TO RESERVES. MOTION PASSED 3-1-1</p> <p>MOTION, SECOND, TO APPROVETHE PROJECT MANAGER’S JOB PROFILE WITH THE ADDITION OF 1) BUDGET MANAGEMENT</p>

	<p>Lu-Ann: Joe can't second. I will SECOND.</p> <p>Elaine: Jason and I are gone for the next meeting.</p> <p>Capt. Joe: As built will be provided. Should be added.</p>	<p>EXPERIENCE, 2) TIME-LINE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE, AND 3) SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT OF SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE OF PROJECTS OF AT LEAST 200k AND 4) EXPERIENCE WITH IMPLEMENTING CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS, AND 5) THAT AS-BUILTS BE PROVIDED.</p> <p>**Agenda Item**</p>
<p>2015 Levy</p>	<p>Bill: I MOVE THAT WE PLACE THE LEVY ON APRIL'S BALLOT AND THAT THERE BE NO CHANGE IN THE AMOUNT (50 CENTS PER)</p> <p>Scott: I say we should lower the rate. We had our increase this last year. Again, we want to get it passed. We can operate with 5% less. I MOVE 47 CENTS PER. And 4 years.</p> <p>Bill: Elaine has a backlog of things to be maintained.</p> <p>LuAnn: Why would we reduce with Tramp Harbor pending?</p> <p>Bill: We used to go every 4 years in line with the School District. We shared expenses. They changed the law for the School District. So now it has 6 years. We could go for 6, but run the levy every 4 years. The idea behind this is that if you run a levy every 4 years with the idea being that if the levy fails, then you have two years more. The motion for 2 years doesn't preclude every 4 years.</p> <p>Truman: It is not unreasonable to ask for 50 cents. I would not vote for a 6 year levy. If you do go for 6 years I will fight it.</p> <p>Joe: Reason?</p>	<p>MOTION, NO SECOND, THAT VPD PLACE THE LEVY ON APRIL'S BALLOT AND THAT THERE BE NO CHANGE IN THE AMOUNT.</p> <p>MOTION,</p>

	<p>Truman: If you have 6 years to screw up all kinds of things can happen. Four years holds Board more accountable.</p> <p>Joe: Second – no, I can't.</p> <p>Doug: I MOVE 50 CENTS EVERY 4 YEARS.</p> <p>Bill: I withdraw my motion.</p> <p>Scott: SECOND.</p>	<p>SECOND, THAT THE LEVY BE HELD EVERY 4 YEARS AND THAT THE AMOUNT BE HELD TO 50 CENTS PER.</p> <p>**Agenda Item**</p>
<p>Staff Reports</p>	<p>1) <u>Point Robinson</u> <i>Elaine:</i> The proposal for the metal roof went out and we received only one bid. Eric is going through the pre-award process. We are looking for a new caretaker. The old caretaker resigned.</p> <p>2) <u>Tramp Harbor</u> <i>Elaine:</i> I met with Kevin Brown and his staff. The state wants the signed lease, as is, they do not want fishing there and they want us to be responsible for the neighboring properties. <i>Bill:</i> We can have a dock, no fishing and we are responsible for neighboring property? <i>Elaine:</i> Yes. We will push back. <i>Bill:</i> Has anybody like Skagit County signed on this kind of lease? <i>Elaine:</i> What it feels like is that the State wants us to remove the docks. There is no lease. <i>Lu-Ann:</i> So we would only have a parking space? <i>Elaine:</i> They would possibly force us to rebuild the dock. The engineering study is being updated. In the alternative, if it has 20 years left, we just don't sign anything.</p> <p>3) <u>Skate Park</u> <i>Elaine:</i> The bowl almost done. I drafted warnings, no liability, etc. We will post it. <i>Joe:</i> A group from Tacoma came to use it and they said that they will come back. <i>Bill:</i> You would have to send the rules on to the County. <i>Elaine:</i> I had Grindline send me actual signs that they used in other facilities. It is not the law that they have to wear helmets. <i>Jason:</i> We should just recommend that they wear helmets. Otherwise, VPD has liability if the kids are not wearing them and we do not have someone there to enforce it. <i>Mary:</i> It is the same with horses. We can only recommend. We can require helmet</p>	

	<p>at shows. Elaine: There has been no grand opening yet, but it is open. Liability now rests with Grindline Bill: I MOVE THAT THE RULES PRESENTED BY ELAINE BE ADOPTED. Lu-Ann: SECOND. Lu-Ann: I MOVE TOO SUSPEND THE RULES because the kids are already using the bowl. Scott: SECOND. VOTE: UNANIMOUS IN FAVOR OF SUSPENDING THE RULES. VOTE: UNANIMOUS IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION AS WRITTEN.</p>	<p>MOTION, SECOND, THAT THE RULES AS PRESENTED BY ELAINE BE ADOPTED. VOTE UNANIMOUS IN FAVOR.</p> <p>MOTION, SECOND, TO SUSPEND THE RULES. VOTE UNANIMOUS IN FAVOR.</p>
ADJOURN	The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.	
Next Meeting	January 27, 2015, 7:00 PM	

Respectfully submitted by:
Mary Reeves