

VASHON PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Ober Park, Performance Room, 7:00 pm

DATE: Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Commissioners attending: Lu-Ann Branch, Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Karen Gardner, Scott Harvey.

Staff attending: Jason Acosta, Elaine Rocheford.

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
Call to order & agenda review	The meeting was called to order by Karen. Karen reviewed the agenda.	
Public Comment	<p>Captain Joe: Lu-Ann and I went to the memorial service for John Hopkins. John was a lovely man. Lu-Ann made some gracious remarks about how he stepped forward for the VPD. John was a marine.</p> <p>I thought Doug did well at the forum.</p> <p>Elaine: Was it well attended?</p> <p>Lu-Ann: Not really. Many listened to Voice of Vashon.</p> <p>Doug: Most were there more for the School District.</p> <p>CJ: I don't endorse candidates on my radio show, but I do encourage people to vote.</p>	
Preliminary 9/19/17 – 10/5/17 Vouchers 9/12 and 9/26 Minutes August Vouchers	<p>Bob: I have a question about the 9/26 minutes, the discussion about the section in the Seals MOU about not looking at the 4 months as a straight line. Costs and revenues are not a straight line.</p> <p>Elaine: I took the minutes straight from the recording, but sometimes it's hard to hear. Let's make sure we get that right in our discussion about the MOU later in tonight's agenda. The new minutes will reflect that there was a question about that.</p> <p>Karen: My recollection is that I agreed it is not a straight line. The minutes stated that I said it is a straight line.</p> <p>Elaine: I will correct the 9/26 minutes.</p> <p>Karen: We can vote to approve the 9/26 minutes with the correction that I support a curve, not a straight line. "I would object to looking at this as a straight line."</p> <p>Bob: I move that we accept the minutes and the vouchers with that one correction to the 9/26 minutes.</p> <p>Lu-Ann: Second</p> <p>Passed 5 – 0.</p> <p>CJ: Have you had any more luck finding a minute taker?</p> <p>Elaine: No, I ran 3 ads and received zero response. I looked into voice to text software, but that can't identify who is speaking. I would still have to go through it all to add names.</p>	MOTION, SECOND TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AND VOUCHERS WITH ONE CORRECTION TO THE 9/26 MINUTES.

	<p>Ginger Hamilton: What about a journalism student at the high school? Elaine: Great idea! I will look into that.</p>	
<p>August Financial Report</p>	<p>Elaine: 1) Admin – ahead \$32k. a. \$22k is payroll due to Kit’s departure. b. \$4k is the new printer lease savings. c. \$4k over budget in professional fees due to the attorney we hired for the Interlocal and LOSS addendum. d. \$3k under in telephone. e. All else odds and ends. Lu-Ann: So the attorney cost us more than we expected? Elaine: No, this was a flat fee that we had not budgeted. This was someone Karen hired. Karen: The intent was to look at all the leases. He said we may want to keep an eye out for when they come up for renewal. Very long leases. Nothing awful in the current leases. Doug: I thought something like VES would have to be forever? Elaine: Yes, that is a requirement of RCO. It would get complicated if the School District wanted to take the property back. They would have to pay us for any improvement we made to the property. To satisfy the grant, we would have to take that money and buy a like facility. 2) Maint – pretty much on budget. a. Under budget \$14k in materials. Offset by: b. \$3k over in payroll – specifically payroll taxes. c. \$4k under in extraordinary maintenance. d. \$3k under in equipment repairs. e. \$4k over in outside services. f. \$4k over in vehicle maint and repairs. B2A tracks these trends but don’t reflect the forecasted outcomes. 3) Commons – ahead \$24k due to the Interlocal renegotiation. 4) Programs – ahead \$500; we always budget a \$500 “rainy day” fund in case CIParks has to move to the O Space. 5) Pool Operating (Summer) – ahead \$8300. a. Revenue down \$4k due to the boiler closure. Offset by: b. Supplies down \$8k. c. Utilities down \$4k. B2A – Payroll actually levels out in the forecast. 6) Pool CIP – over \$6582 due to the extra pool lighting we had to do and the ADA engineering work. It will likely be up to \$10k over as we are hoping to acid wash the pool after all. B2A – all timing against the grant and insurance reimbursement. 7) Pt Rob - \$1600 ahead. a. Revenue ahead \$4k. b. Wages over \$4k due to focus on Pt Rob over Fern Cove.</p>	

	<p>c. All else misc ups and downs. CJ: I'm reading here that we're just about even for the year. Elaine: Forecasted to the end of the year, it should be \$1600 ahead. CJ: Eric is doing a fantastic job. 8) Fern Cove – Forecasted to be over budget \$53k in lost revenue and septic fix costs. Removed forecasted Oct and Nov revenue. 9) Other – ahead \$89k due to sale of land and RFA donations. We received another \$1k from the Beardsley Foundation.</p> <p>Ending the year with close to \$300k – \$124k extra in our operating reserve than budgeted.</p>	
Board Votes	<p>Lu-Ann: I move to accept the changes to the Employment Terms and Benefits policies as presented. Scott: Second. Passed 5 - 0</p>	<p>Motion to accept the changes to the Employment Terms and Benefits policies as presented. Passed 5-0.</p>
Seals MOU	<p>Elaine: We wanted to make sure the language in item 15 reflects the intent of the Board, how we evaluate the overall cost. At the last meeting, I was instructed to take out the piece about having a public process if we were confronted with hitting the \$68k in the forecast. What you see here is what we decided 15 should look like. Any further discussion? Scott: Item 15 is more or less how it was in the previous draft? Elaine: It is exactly the way it was with the exception of a line the Seals requested concerning a public process. Scott: I have an issue with “fully expending all efforts to remedy the problem.” That’s pretty open-ended and puts a burden on VPD. It’s not our challenge. We approved what they presented to us. To expend ALL efforts is not our job. I hope this works out, but it’s going to be difficult enough if it doesn’t without having the fault point back to us. Karen: I think we need to put our faith in the Pool Committee to remedy. Maybe the remedy is to decrease the temperature in the pool. I don’t think you can account for every potential remedy in advance. Scott: The most important thing is that we have two things in this agreement: We have a specific number of \$68k, and we also say WILL. They are absolutes. To avoid the WILL, we need to adjust the \$68k. At the end of the day, VPD is protected by this agreement that says we rolled the dice, and by definition it was a bad idean. Doug: If you read this carefully, it is exactly as Scott said. It doesn’t matter what the remedy is. Scott: The main thing is that we all will be working hard to look for remedies. Doug: I want to be sure that we don’t let it be understood that as long as things are now going okay, but we’re still way over on a longer term basis, we’re not okay.</p>	

Scott: Starting in 4 months, if we're not okay, we will have been tracking from the first month. We should be able to identify potential problems in advance with no surprises. Everyone will be working on it, and we'll see it happening.

Doug: At the end of 4 months, we're on track for \$68k, do we close the pool at that point?

Scott: Theoretically, I would think in months 3 and 4 we would see it coming and did everything we could to remedy, but if we couldn't fix it, theoretically we would shut it down in 4 months. It's important that we're trending in the right direction.

Karen: I think we have processed this enough. What is the other change:

Elaine: Bob had suggested some language for the term of the MOU. We had some debate about what sort of notice should be given after one year; Bob suggested 3 years. (read the new language).

Bob: The reason I suggested this is, the way it was first written, if somebody was having a bad day, they could request a change, but if it wasn't agreed to, the agreement would terminate. This gives either party unilateral control.

Ginger: It does protect both parties.

Karen: I am in favor of it, as well.

Jacqueline: Have you talked with Karin about this? Board can change within 3 years.

Elaine: I have not. The Board needs to vote to approve, so there is time for Karin to review. It is still open for discussion.

Scott: We won't vote to approve tonight.

Elaine: It's up to you whether or not you want to suspend the rules. Work is being done without an agreement.

Bob: What's the latest with the pool?

Elaine: The Dept of Health permit is pushing the pool opening to the end of the November.

Scott: So a couple of weeks won't make any difference.

Elaine: Construction work is being done. Are you okay with that happening without an agreement? There is still an open question about insurance.

Scott: So stuff tied to the MOU is being done or is already done? We're already operating without an agreement.

Bob: What is the issue with volunteer labor coverage?

Elaine: You all agreed at the last meeting that we would cover the Seals volunteer labor under our insurance.

Bob: And that's the part of the MOU you are uncomfortable with?

Elaine: It's just not official without a signed MOU. A new insurance piece concerns the Seals owning the Bubble, but OUR programming with the public will be under their Bubble. The Bubble itself is covered, but the question of liability coverage is still up in the air. Enduris seems okay, but I need specific language from them. It won't be a substantive change to the MOU.

Ginger: Maybe another option is if you lease the Bubble from us?

Elaine: It sounds like Enduris is going to go with what you requested.

Bob: I move that the MOU be accepted as modified.

Doug: The Bubble can collapse in windstorms and snow storms. I would think the Bubble would have to be collapsed with that sort of forecast. Who would be responsible for taking that action?

Bob: I move that the MOU be accepted as modified. Lu-Ann: second.

	<p>Elaine: In the MOU, the Seals are responsible for taking it down. But in an emergency, we need to discuss that!</p> <p>Jason: We discussed this in my AFO class. It should be Scott as the AFO guy in an emergency. He would need to watch the forecast.</p> <p>Karen: It should be our responsibility.</p> <p>Doug: So this would be 24/7.</p> <p>Bob: What kind of wind are we talking about?</p> <p>Doug: What if it's 11 at night?</p> <p>Scott: It would have to be based on a forecast.</p> <p>Jason: I think it should be our staff.</p> <p>Karen: I would not add it to the MOU. This is an operational thing.</p> <p>Scott: There must be something in CAPRA that accounts for emergencies.</p> <p>Elaine: Yes, we need an Emergency Management Plan in general. Doug also asked who is responsible for damage to the Bubble – our insurance will cover it. In item 4, if our insurance doesn't cover it, it will be on the Seals.</p> <p>Karen: We have a motion on the table. Is there a second?</p> <p>Lu-Ann: I seconded.</p> <p>Scott: We will vote on this next time.</p>		
<p>Staff Reports:</p>	<p>Karen: This is not on the agenda, because I just found out about it. At Paradise Ridge, a car came in and did some damage, scared a rider. The equestrians did their own investigating and found out who did it. Bicyclist pals went up there afterward on purpose to pay them back. There was potential for violence. Did they report it to you?</p> <p>Jason: Yes, I told our maintenance guy who is there if he sees the car to talk to them. When I was notified, she didn't provide much information. We fixed the arena – not the indoor arena.</p> <p>Doug: What about the bicyclists?</p> <p>Bob: The report I got was that there was a bicycle group that went there to practice for a race. There may have been two different incidents. Do we want to make sure that it is clear to those with good intentions that Paradise Ridge is not a place for bicycles?</p> <p>Karen: Yes, signs would be good for that.</p> <p>Jason: Shawn talked to them about putting up signs. We will follow through on that.</p> <p>Get Active/Stay Active Grant</p> <p>Elaine: Bob spoke with Foss Miller about Pacific Research's \$25k donation. He is fine with considering it a donation to the total field project. We'll simply put a plaque on the restroom building in his name. I emailed the sport group leadership about the grant, potential design, bidding out the package now, and them fundraising for the balance.</p> <p>Vashon Swim 4 All</p> <p>Elaine: At the last meeting, the Board asked, of the 150 participants, how many individual</p>	<p>Agenda Item</p>	

participants there were. 150 unique individuals? Or 1 kid taking 150 classes? Scott said counting for people who were repeat attendees, about 100 different people.

CJ: I gave CC the report from the last meeting. We both think it was a successful program. It exceeded our expectations. We will have a nice fund to carry over for next year.

Pool

Elaine: VPD Pieces fixes:

- Main Drain is done; we are now VGBA compliant. DOH approved both phases: when open, and when closed.

Jason: They checked the covers when it was closed.

- Locker Room ADA Compliance contract – starts Monday. I am still awaiting their L&I Intent.
- Boiler Repiping and Mechanical Upgrades – 90% completed. Open items are valves and variable speed drive. We cannot refill the pool until the valves are fixed. Likely a couple weeks out. We can open the conversation about swimming outdoors at that time.

Bob: We had always talked about swimming outdoors. I thought something about the Dept of Health permit would delay that.

Elaine: No, the DOH piece is relative to the Bubble.

Doug: Are these valve replacements expected?

Elaine: We knew we had to replace some valves. These were all change orders. There are 3 that are holding up the show.

Ginger: And these are all under the grant?

Elaine: Yes, they fall under the grant. The good news is that all the bids have been lower than anticipated, so we have more wiggle room within the grant to do more than we anticipated.

- Pool Lighting – coming tomorrow; done this week.
- Acid Wash – turns out Scott has found a safe way to do this. Wants it done next week. Getting quotes; could be @ \$6k. Approve? Puts the add-ons over my limit.

Karen: I thought we decided not to do it, because it was unsafe to do so?

Jason: It's not an acid wash.

Bob: The stuff is semi-gelatinous. It clings to the pool, then you dispose of it as a semi solid. They did a patch, and it made a major difference.

Elaine: I need approval to do this.

Karen: My only concern is safety. But I will trust the experts.

Bob: I move to approve.

Lu-Ann: Second.

Karen: Do we need to suspend the rules?

Elaine: Yes, we need to get this done next week while the pool is empty.

Bob: I move we suspend the rules.

Lu-Ann: Second.

Motion to suspend the rules – passed 5 – 0.

Motion to approve the cleansing process – passed 5 – 0.

**Motion to suspend the rules – passed 5 – 0.
Motion to approve the cleansing process – passed 5 – 0.**

Elaine: Seals Pieces: All is on hold. DOH – need regulatory compliant plan. Whenever a pool is modified, must show how the changes meet code. Mike and Ken are submitting the application for a “Pool Plan Review.” No further work allowed until approved. Probably a 30 day process.

Bob: Specifically as it relates to the Dome?

Elaine: Yes, but how do you feel about continuing with some of the peripheral work, like moving the slide, moving the fence? What if the plan is not approved?

Ginger: And there are things like the low flow toilets. There is a whole lot of work that needs to be done that is not necessarily related to the Dome.

Elaine: It would be good to discuss this with the Pool Committee.

Bob: We have a meeting tomorrow.

Jason: We should not be moving fences and stuff. What if DOH does not approve?

Jaqueline: Fences have nothing to do with air quality.

Jason: They may not approve having grass inside the fence during the Summer.

Bob: Let’s just discuss this in the Pool Committee meeting.

Elaine: DOH also mentioned the possibility of needing a construction permit, too. Scott is looking into that.

Karen: Oh, for heaven’s sakes! The problem with the bureaucracy in this county is that it is so incompetent. Is there anyone above this person?

Elaine: Teri is Dept of Health. That is with King County. I think Scott needs to go to Dept of Permitting and get, in writing, whether or not we need a construction permit.

Karen: Absolutely.

Ginger: When we applied for this, a construction permit was never mentioned. It’s just because they happen to be out there checking the main drain that this came up. It’s a temporary Dome; we have a temporary permit.

Karen: It is so typical. The Pool Committee needs to sort it out.

Elaine: The bottom line, though, is that it’s our name on the permit. I think it is prudent that we cross the t’s and dot the i’s. God forbid, KC comes out and makes us take down the Dome after the fact!

Bob: What’s the 6 month permit? What’s it called?

Ginger: That’s it! That’s the tent permit!

Elaine: It’s called a Special Event/Tent Permit.

Jaqueline: It has to be shown this is not a permanent structure.

Karen: So this will be discussed further tomorrow.

Scott: Is the money in from the Seals?

	<p>Elaine: Yes.</p> <p>Ski School</p> <p>Elaine: Kelly and I met with the Ski School Board, and they are thrilled about having it come back as a VPD program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First off, last meeting the Board asked: how much will our insurance go up by adding the Ski School to our policy? Only by 75 cents per labor hour for all volunteers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5 volunteers x 6 trips x 12 hours per day + 2 hours of open house = 362 hours = \$271.50 ○ Nuts and bolts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average 35 kids, ages 9 – 16. Younger okay if parents come. ▪ They are part of Ski Masters – we have reached out to them about transferring the contract. ▪ Ski School = bus transportation to Snoqualmie Summit; Roka hut for warming; extra vehicle for injuries (although we believe there should be a defined “injury” that does not warrant an AID car). Always 5 volunteers go up; 3 stay with kids if 2 leave with an injury. ▪ We are basically just coordinating the bus. Participants must do all themselves: buy their season pass; sign up for lessons; rent gear; bring their own lunch. Fee to VPD = \$170 registration. ▪ Revenue = \$170 per kid. 35 kids = \$5,950 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs = \$500 per bus x 6 trips = \$3,000 • Signs \$ 100 • Prizes \$ 100 • Volunteer aid car gas/ferry \$ 530 • Kids/Chaperone ferry \$ 168 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Profit \$2,052 • Breakeven = 23 kids. ▪ Sign-ups start 10/28. Sessions run January 6 – February 10. <p>Do you feel this requires Board approval?</p> <p>Karen: No.</p>	
<p>Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Bob: Last week I think everybody saw this Draft Vision Statement, and it has not changed since then. I would like to move that it be accepted.</p> <p>Scott: I’ll second that.</p> <p>Bob: The second part is this list of Strategic Priorities that came out of our current state analysis. Our next step is to decide what specific steps we take to get from our current state to</p>	<p>Bob: Motion to Accept the Draft Vision Statement. Scott: second.</p>

the vision. That's made up of determining the highest priority for these items on this list. How soon do we want to have these things completed? For example, CAPRA – it's easy to set a goal for when we can achieve that. Fundraising we could break down into three or four different levels. The planning committee needs to break these down and set dates.

Karen: I think one of the other things to understand is that all of this came from our survey and our own internal goals. There is a mix of things that we think is important as a Board and the user survey. Nothing in here is new, that you haven't seen before. We have reworked the list to put them in categories.

Scott: But there are things in here that have never been discussed. Some things not only should not be a priority, they should not even be on the list. Like 2 and 3 in the first section.

Karen: Why do you think that?

Scott: Let's do the "fully engaged board" one. If we were a public corporation, absolutely I agree. But we are elected officials. If Vashon wants to elect the town drunk, they have a right to do that. If all he wants is a dog park, he has the right to make that his goal for 4 years. To suggest anyone isn't doing their fair share, that is what they were chosen to do. By 2024, two, possibly 3 people will be gone from this Board – we have no idea what the new people will bring. An elected person can do whatever they want!

Lu-Ann: Scott, we have to set the bar high. The prior Board didn't even want a Strategic Plan. By saying we want fully engaged Commissioners, we should expect that!

Scott: But you have no right to expect that. And how many people are running for your seat? One. We have to accept that. You can't set a bar. Look at the person who holds the highest office in the land. There is no bar for him. They just are.

Jaqueline: I would expect the person I vote for to fully engage in their job. A person should choose to run or not if that expectation is written in the plan. I think its crazy to think the public wouldn't want a bar. This sounds awesome.

Scott: It has been common that only one person runs for a Board position. You want to scare away that one person who is willing to run with an expectation?

Lu-Ann: Yeah, I want to scare them away! Like the people who used to be on the Board who weren't fully engaged.

Karen: I disagree with you (Scott), but the way. We have a fiduciary responsibility, and we have to be integritious and willing to do the work of the Park District. If we had 5 people who were voted in but did absolutely nothing, how are they filling their responsibilities? Bob and talked about this quite a bit, knowing it would be a sticky point. It has been our observation that people will work for the one little thing they are interested in. Who is looking at the needs of the whole community? Bob and I feel strongly about having this expectation of the Board.

Elaine: There is an oath that you take when elected .

Doug: What if one person is obsessive about one activity, and spends hours dedicated to it? We should not be in the position of evaluating each other. That is not what elected officials do. We are breaking precedent if we set that expectation.

Scott: Too, as the Board chair, you are in charge of the meeting, but you are not the head of this

group. We are 5 equals. You cannot assign something to me and make me do it. There is no enforceability.

Karen: That's not what this is about. This is about having a Board that is willing to take on some assignments? I don't have to be the one to assign. I don't understand. Everyone on this Board needs to participate.

Scott: I think everyone on this Board does participate in some way. Is it equal? No. That is an unrealistic expectation. We're setting us up for failure with this as a goal. If it is written, and it doesn't happen, what do we do with that? By saying it, that doesn't mean it's going to happen. It will cause rancor. We have had disagreements, but generally this Board works well.

Karen: Let's consider how we might rephrase this.

Lu-Ann: Or Scott should consider how to rephrase this.

Scott: I'll be honest, I came on the Board, because this place was a financial mess. The only reason I'm here for 6 years is that I couldn't fix it in 2 years. Is this what I want to do forever? Probably not. I'm doing what I ran on. I'm in awe of what you and Bob have done. You have invested tons more time, but it's not me.

Karen: Your skills are valuable. I would like to come up with another way of phrasing it that works for all. If someone gets elected, they have responsibilities! I want to make sure that is part of our priorities.

Scott: I'm not saying it's not a good idea, but it doesn't belong in a Strategic Plan.

CJ: I have been a member of the Park family for years. Other Boards could not have a discussion like what you're having now. If it had, maybe those people would have felt an obligation to something greater than one agenda. Your discussion is healthy. Maybe the language should be an aspiration but not a directive. You're right for it to be expressed.

Lu-Ann: Where it says share the workload equally, it seems to say it's a problem that we are not sharing the workload equally. Are you addressing a problem?

Karen: Whether it's a Committee or Board, some will do more than others. But all should participate to the extent that they are capable of. I met someone who wants to address special needs students. It's good that someone has a particular interest.

Lu-Ann: My experience is your ability to contribute comes and goes. It's the right skill set, you have time. Other times you don't. We don't want to create a judgment call.

Karen: I hear you. I will rephrase it.

Scott: Number three! Remove the last part about conforming to industry standards. I believe that, when the Park District approved the Bubble, it eliminated all pay increases for staff. It's a matter of economics and limited resources. Maybe two years from now when we have more flexibility to move along that line. 2 and 4% increase is really common. To get to industry standards, we are talking about big number increases for our staff. Should we attempt to get there? Yes. Should it be in the Plan? No. If it's in the Plan, it puts undue pressure to meet it. If I were to ask the rhetorical question to the Island about all the deferred maintenance and programs, but rather provide increases to staff, is that what the island wanted? I don't want to ask that question.

Bob: You need to stop talking. You should said on the one hand this is something we should aspire to. Of course we should aspire to it, and of course it should be in the Plan. It's a question of when we can responsibly do it. It's not whether or not it's important. It is important! It needs to be in the Plan.

Karen: What do you two think?

Lu-Ann: If it's an aspirational Plan... how long is this plan?

Elaine: It's basically 6 years. The attempt is to capture the remainder of this levy cycle in addition to the next levy cycle.

Lu-Ann: What's happened in the past, the Board has created these Plans then put them on the shelf. Nobody looked at it, because we had too many other worries. I think if it's in the Plan now, and we keep revisiting it, we'll move toward this goal. If it's not in the Plan, it gets forgotten, and it's not a priority.

Doug: The word that strikes me is "conformance." We're not in conformance now, and to my knowledge, we have never been in conformance. There isn't agreement amongst the five of us that conforming to industry standards is even what we should do.

Bob: I used the word "conformance" as a soft word. What I meant was we need to benchmark. We need to know what's going on. We need to do it responsibly, but we need to move in the direction of what's right for our people. Maybe it needs to be worded somewhat differently.

Scott: The main thing is that the taxpayers are the stakeholders. They want programs. They want maintained facilities. We do need to pay people to maintain the facilities. To talk about compensation in a situation of limited resources – if it was a private company, and the goal was profit sharing – to even suggest that this should be a priority here – you hire people to perform tasks, and it may or may not conform to industry standards. I had a situation at my work where a candidate was great, but they wanted too much money, so they didn't get hired.

Karen: I think there is an assumption that we want to move to a payment regime immediately. This is a 6 year plan. We need to show our employees that we are slowly going to get there. That we value them. Sometimes I think one of the big differences between myself and you guys is I have managed hundreds of people. To me, one of the most valuable assets you have is your employees. I'm not saying we go into debt to do this. But we need to move it forward in a way that shows we care and is equitable. It says, "financially responsible." Nobody on this Board wants to put our finances in peril.

Scott: The other challenge I have here is I don't think conforming to industry standards is important. We are in a universe where there is only one park district here on this island. If you want to talk about comparable pay on the Island, that's fine. Like at the School District. What somebody makes on Bainbridge Island or Mercer Island is irrelevant – it's whatever.

Jason: We're not the only Park District on the island. King County Parks is here. Just today one of my guys applied for a job with the Water District, and it starts at \$3 more than where we start. Once he gets the proper certifications, he gets bumped another \$2. So there is a good chance I am going to be losing one of my guys based on wages alone.

Elaine: My comment to this is that we beg, we plead, we ask our staff to please give it another

	<p>year. It costs us to lose people.</p> <p>Jason: I told him I will do what I can to make this a good place to stay, but I can't increase his pay. I'll be honest, I have looked at other positions, not even as a manager – as a regular maintenance guy, and I would be making more money than what I make here. You go to King County – their Maintenance 3 guys make more than I make as a Park Director. Our employees know that – they look around. I don't expect the jump to happen next year, but it has to get there sooner rather than later if you want to keep good staff.</p> <p>Karen: It is possible that we rephrase this, but I think it absolutely has to say that we will develop a schedule of pay for employees over the next period of time, that there is an effort but that it's financially responsible. Our levy may not pass, a number of horrible things might happen to where we can't do it. I would like to rephrase number 2 and 3.</p> <p>Lu-Ann: Maybe Elaine can provide for us some information – I know our people are way below the industry standards.</p> <p>Elaine: I have provided that research a number of times. Where we are relative to like-size Districts in the Puget Sound area. We are still the lowest paid, and we are the worst benefited on the Island.</p> <p>Lu-Ann: The previous Board swapped people out. Somebody quits, they just hire somebody else. You can't just swap people out. It's a cost.</p> <p>Karen: I agree these conversations are important.</p>	
Adjourn	Adjourned 9:00 p.m.	<p>MOTION, SECOND TO ADJOURN.</p> <p>VOTE: 5-0 IN FAVOR.</p>
Next Meeting	October 24, 2017, 7:00 PM	