

# VASHON PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

## MEETING MINUTES

Ober Park, Evergreen Room, 7:00 pm

DATE: Tuesday, June 12, 2018

Commissioners attending: Bob McMahon, Karen Gardner, Scott Harvey. Scott departed @ 7:20 pm.

Staff attending: Elaine Ott-Rocheford, Jason Acosta.

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
<b>Call to order &amp; agenda review</b>	The meeting was called to order by Scott. Scott reviewed the agenda.	
<b>Public Comment</b>	<p>Captain Joe: We did the last planning meeting for Low Tide Celebration which is on Saturday, the 14<sup>th</sup> of July. We're going to have the best one that we've ever had. We hope that many island people come. Every year we've traditionally had more than half the people come from off-island, we publicize off island. It's going to be a great event.</p> <p>Scott: So, why do you think this is going to be the best ever? Or is each one better than the last one?</p> <p>Captain Joe: Each one is better than the last one. This is the 14<sup>th</sup> year we have done it, so we've got it pretty well down. But every year we make a couple of changes; this year we've increased the emphasis on activities for children. In particular with a much more expanded range of activities for kids. All of us who work in this believe that if we started thinking in terms of the kinds of things we talk about at this celebration, then they will carry those forward as they move through their growing years. Every child is entitled to bring 5 lbs of sand into the lighthouse when they take the tour, and every child meticulously fulfills that requirement.</p> <p>(laughter)</p> <p>We encourage the kids to take their shoes off and get really muddy and dirty.</p> <p>Scott: Good, good. Any other public comments? Yes?</p> <p>CC Stone : You guys all know that I am forward thinking about replacing Park Commissioners and elections. This is one of my concerns going forward, how to raise public awareness, I want people to think about perhaps running for Park Commissioner in the future. So I have an idea to start placing some small ads in the newspaper where people who have served as either Park Commissioners or School Commissioners talk about why it was fulfilling for them to have these jobs. I know they're not always fulfilling and I thank you all for your service. But I don't know if you would be willing to give some thought to what you might say to your fellow citizens in order to get them to think about this possibility. Because people don't stay on the Board forever and it's important I think that we pay some attention to recruitment for these positions.</p> <p>Karen: Good idea.</p> <p>CC: So I don't know if you'd be willing to think about it, but if you would I'm not looking for a lot, just a couple of things like why you enjoy this, why you think it was a worthwhile use of your time.</p> <p>Scott: Okay. Any other public comments? Okay, we're going to move to the vote on the wage increase.</p>	

<p><b>Board Vote</b></p> <p><b>Scott Harvey statement</b></p>	<p>Scott: Now, before I get started, you already have Abby’s vote.  Elaine: I do.  Scott: Is anybody else present that – just to explain things, there was a procedural issue 10 days ago and the Board took a vote, but it was not actually valid because we did not follow procedures, so the official vote is going to be tonight. So my question is to the other Board members, are either of you going to change your vote?  Karen: No.  Bob: No.  Scott: Okay. So, things are a little out of order, sometimes we – by the way, for some reason, in the handouts, there was information that I shared with the Board, a first draft of how this would affect it, but the second draft wasn’t included so I brought a copy for anyone who was interested, as far as the impact of this action. So, what we are going to do is take the vote, and I will speak, then if the Board members wish to speak they can speak, then if the public wishes to speak they can speak as much as they want. So – with the situation as far as the vote, to accept the wage increase resolution all in favor?  And Abby votes?  Elaine: Abby votes yes.  Scott: Opposed?  <b>Board Vote:</b>  <b>Bob: I move that we accept the wage increase resolution.</b>  <b>Karen: Second.</b>  Elaine: 3 – 1 for the record.  Scott: Nearly 5 years ago, I started attending Park District meetings because I was concerned with the district’s financial mismanagement and spent two years on the Board being publicly humiliated nearly every meeting during which 100% of my motions were defeated, because I had hoped that a new Board would be elected to represent everyone on the Island. Last year I had hoped that having accumulated an adequate reserve would avoid the wasteful use of a TAN. To avoid borrowing for capital needs and having funds accumulated to address unexpected income shortfalls, we could begin responding to the many Park District survey recommendations. This year I had hope when the Board voted to invest \$100K in Recreation programs in 2019. Then tonight I lost all hope when the Board voted to ignore the wishes of the Island and make a fiscally irresponsible commitment to the Park District staff. When the previous Park District Board voted to proceed with VES, it too had substantial financial reserves, a false sense of urgency, and based upon historical levy receipts and way too optimistic estimates of costs, it believed VES made sense. Regretfully this Board does not even consider what would happen to our income stream if the Fire District raises its levy again next year, or a hospital district is approved. When VES started our Parks were very much in better condition. Now we have needs of nearly \$4M in deferred maintenance and nearly half of that amount cannot be funded by grants. Over the next decade, the increased wage motion passed</p>	<p><b>Motion to accept the wage increase resolution. Passed 3 – 1.</b></p>

tonight will dwarf what the Park District had to spend for VES, and unlike VES we will have nothing to show for it. Not a soccer field or ball field or even a covered pool.

There will be an eventual shortfall, I expect the Board will seek to delay the shortfall by financing equipment that should be purchased with cash, underfunding recreational programs, continuing to ignore deferred maintenance and increasing user fees. Both times when I ran for election I campaigned on the platform of transparency, fiscal responsibility and representation of all Islanders. I had no agenda. I was not advocating for a dog park even though I have two dogs, or more trails even though I regularly run on them. My first Board had an agenda only to serve the several hundred field users and their families, and the rest of the Islanders lost. I hoped this Board was different, but alas it is not. This time the rest of the Island lost to two special interest groups. As was the case with VES, three Board members implemented an incredibly costly plan while not only hiding their planned actions from the public but keeping it from other Board members. When confronted with facts that contradicted their rosy assumptions, none of the three supporters even wanted to discuss their flawed numbers. As Board members, we must make tough decisions, not just popular ones. One of my fellow Board members stated we had a moral responsibility to vote for the wage increase. That implies that to oppose such a motion might be immoral. I have my own opinion on what truly is immoral. But more to the point, what is irresponsible. Irresponsible is wasting \$30K on a survey and totally ignoring the results. Irresponsible is allowing me to represent to the community that we plan to invest \$100K in recreational programs next year, when this group had no intention of doing so. Keeping in mind that the investment would be less than the cost of two new employees.

Irresponsible is a plan that calls for the District to reduce the list of deferred maintenance starting in 2018, then voting to eliminate all money needed to perform this task. Irresponsible is expressing a need to hire a maintenance worker in April, then returning in May to say the person is no longer needed and their post's costs should be divided among the remaining employees. Irresponsible is basing the wage increase on the earnings of off-Island entities with zero discussion on what Vashon employers, especially the School district, actually pay. For the record, Vashon School District maintenance staff earn \$43K to \$45K per year, whereas Park District is paying \$43K to \$49K a year for its maintenance staff. Irresponsible is proposing to increase Park District property taxes by 28% in order to fund a 39% increase in staff wages with a total annual cost of \$249K after the staff compensation increased 17% in the previous three years. All of this is occurring during a time when social security costs are increasing 2%, the military received its largest increase in 9 years, 2.6%, and our own local school district is giving 4% raises.

The District's ability to float a bond to address deferred maintenance and less controversial capital needs was based on its ability to demonstrate that it had been fiscally responsible and can be trusted. Since this is no longer the case, I now oppose any such bond request. I continue to have the greatest respect for the Park District -

Bob: What was that you said?

Scott: I now would oppose any such bond request. I continue to have the greatest respect for the Park District staff, especially Jason and Elaine, who have done excellent work in challenging situations. It has been my true honor and pleasure to serve on the Board with Doug Ostrom, who has supported me on every key vote these past 4.5 years. I appreciate the support of Captain Joe, CC Stone and the rest of the Vashon community over the years. Unfortunately, with no transparency and a total disregard for the

**Discussion**

wishes of the greater community, this Board’s fiscal irresponsibility has made it impossible for me to fulfill the tenets upon which I sought this office. Therefore, it is with great sadness that I am resigning as Park District Commissioner, effective immediately. Doug, I mean, Bob, you’re the Chair.

(Scott exits)

Bob: Well, we no longer have a quorum.

Elaine: We don’t have a quorum, so we can discuss things, but we can’t act on anything.

Karen: So the rest of the agenda is not pertinent.

Elaine: Yes, we can’t vote to approve the financial report or the minutes or the vouchers, that will be at the next meeting.

Karen: Okay. You know, one of the things that we spent quite a bit of time doing was looking at the finances, despite what Scott has said. And we made what we thought was the best decision for the Park District. If we had not given raises, we would not have had anybody working, because they can all go find jobs elsewhere. So how do you have a Park District with no staff? We also- I’m the one who said we have a moral responsibility because I think people deserve a living wage. And I’m not ashamed about that and will stick to my guns about that. It does mean the probability that the \$100K that we were going to commit to recreational programs will not be \$100K, but what Abby and I have been finding – Abby and I have been working with – she’s been working with the special needs community and I’ve been working with the elderly (although I’m told I’m not supposed to use the word elderly, I’m elderly). Anyway, they have needs, but they’re not expensive needs. It’s not the kind of needs that are going to break the bank, by any stretch of the imagination. We have an issue with the playground because the equipment is old and needs to be continually fixed and we want to make sure that children are safe. But it is our collective understanding and agreement that we can in fact afford this, that we have our own figures, we argue with a lot of the assumptions that Scott made. We continue to disagree, we’ve talked and talked and talked and talked and we didn’t arrive at any conclusion about that.

Bob: I don’t know that I’m going to try to respond to everything that Scott just said. We had not seen that. I’m sure there are several things that he said that are not true, but concerning our interest in funding deferred maintenance, we’ve already taken care of some of it. I can’t remember everything he said right now, but – it seems a little odd to compare this with VES fields, I mean it’s just an order of magnitude different. But one thing I know for sure and that’s that churning and turnover in any organization is extremely expensive. And his analysis had absolutely nothing in there that reflected that sort of cost. I guess one thing we’re going to have to do now is form a nominating committee of some kind to find somebody else to replace Scott on the Board.

Karen: Right.

Robin Miller: Do people just throw their hats in and say “I’d be interested in that”?

Karen: We do have a policy for it, but I forget what the policy says

(many voices)

Elaine: You recruit, and the Board will appoint and that person will fulfill Scott’s term. And then if they choose to run for what would be his next term if he chose to run, then they would have to actually be elected. But appoint based on folks that express interest, or folks that you choose to recruit.

Robin: And how long was his term?

Elaine: Scott’s term expires a year and a half from now.

**Scott Harvey  
resignation from  
Board**

**Public Comment on  
wage issue and  
staffing**

Bob: Yeah, he came on with us, he was re-elected.

Elaine: If I can speak a bit to the financial concerns that Scott has raised, honestly, I have spent the equivalent of weeks running numbers. My first analysis was extremely, extremely conservative – 4 years worth of projections. My most recent analysis is a more likely scenario of where things are more likely going to go for the District, particularly with the next levy run. And by these more realistic estimations, both with the wage increases and \$100K worth of recreation programming, I think it's quite possible by 2022 that we have a million bucks in the bank. So to that – the point of not addressing deferred maintenance – with or without wage increases, with or without recreation programming, we've known quite clearly that it's going to be difficult for us to do anything until 2020 when we do our next levy run. It's at that point that the sky is likely to open up, and we could get a lot done. With or without a bond, a bond would certainly make things happen more quickly, but even without a bond, with a longer range strategic plan we can get it done. I'm absolutely confident we're going to get this done. And in the special meeting, I made a really, really clear point, and I mean this to the depths of my soul – we're going to be watching this like a hawk and if anything looks even a hint of 'gosh, maybe we can't do that next bucket increase, maybe we have to put it off,' if there's a hint of trouble along the way, it is our responsibility, it is our duty to do something about it, to make corrective steps. So I just fully believe that this is doable. Absolutely doable.

Karen: So do the three commissioners that voted for it.

Elaine: And ultimately, getting down to the deep concerns about employee needs, I know what's going on. I know what people are doing. I've had to replace two people in the last year, key staff members, it has set us back months. It's just been a grueling process. It's a problem that had to be addressed.

Bob: And it is also being faced by the school district right now.

CC Stone: Here's a point that I'd like to make to the Board members about why I came. Paying your staff well is a good strategy. Board members come and go, as we have seen tonight. Sometimes things happen in surprising ways. People have moved out of town, people don't serve out their terms for various reasons, sometimes you can wind up with a whole new board, people with no experience. If you don't have an Executive Director who knows what's going on, it puts everybody at such a disadvantage. You guys, you have to pay a premium price for some kind of continuity and management skill because of what happens in the political reality of these positions. So I'm going to tell you, I think you made the right decision. I don't know if that makes you feel any better.

Karen: It does.

Bob: Of course it does.

CC: I don't know that you had a viable choice and I'm going to stand with Karen and say that this is kind of the case of the golden rule. You want to treat people the way you would like to be treated. Not as a barnyard animal who you can't name because you might have to kill it. You remember those days?

Bob: I do indeed.

CC: There are people here who remember that. This is reflective of how we are as a community. Does it have some financial implications to other things? Yeah. But if it turns out it's a problem, hey, you'll let someone go. We'll only mow twice, we'll make adjustments. But it's the right thing to do. And I don't know that you had a lot of choice. I know Elaine did a lot of research- she's been asking for this for 4 years. And this was finally the day of reckoning. So thank you.

Karen: Thank you.

Mike Dawson (introduces himself): I live here on the Island and have been here for 17 years. I don't know anybody on the board. I don't know anybody on the Park District staff. But I just retired from 38 years as a professional in outdoor recreation natural resources. And I'll continue to stay on with my old employer part-time as a senior consultant. I currently work for the Pacific Crest Trails system. The reason I gave you that background: I worked for 3 different organizations and as a partner with state and federal agencies for all that time. And my last job that I just retired from is as the operations director for the Pacific Crest Trail. So I have worked for organizations that have balanced the needs of resources as Mr. Harvey seemed to think was appropriate on the backs of its employees and staff. That has resulted in a lot of turnover in those instances. And as your ED said a bit ago, the cost to the organization was terrific. The losses in how they were able to move forward the important work they were doing were tremendous. That is not the case with the last organization I worked for. In good part because the ED and I agreed that retaining staff, investing in staff, is well worth the investment. I think you all have made a brave decision given the amount of hell Mr. Harvey will undoubtedly try and stir up. But when all this comes to a head with additional elections and bonds, you'll have me speaking out loudly.

Karen: Thank you for that.

CC: Would you be interested in being a Park Commissioner?

(laughter)

Mike: Maybe later. This is the first district meeting that I have ever attended, and I wouldn't presume to run for the office without understanding more.

CC: It's on the job training and you only have one meeting a month

(laughter and Two, it's two meetings! Not in the summer – much laughter)

Karen: Anybody else have a comment?

Captain Joe: I would rather that Scott had not resigned. And the reasons for that are that when we were really in serious financial trouble, Scott was a great mover to help get us out of that. Before any of you, before even Elaine was the ED, but Luanne was still on board, we put together a little ad hoc finance committee and Scott was filling somebody else's term, he had not been elected. And he was on that finance committee, and Bill was on it, and I was on it.

CC: And Hilary?

Captain Joe: Yes, Hilary was on it and she stayed for one day. She said Piss off, I'm outta here – (Laughter). And Scott was Scott. But he also made a lot of sense financially. And as a result of that we were able to do some really good work. So I would hope that the Board in its grace would recognize that in whatever public statement it chooses to make about Scott's service. So far as the process of finding someone to fill that seat, I urge you to fill that as quickly as you can. And that you recruit and select because this is a selection process, it's not an election one, and that puts the obligation on the Board to find the right person. And that it be a person who has some financial acumen and a person who will also participate right from the very beginning. Because the audience, even if it is only I and CC and a couple of other people, are very much concerned about a couple of things. The first is that we take care of our people, and we've done that in so far as the Board has been able to do it. The other half of that is to accomplish the mission and the part of it that is of particular concern to me is this very large backlog of maintenance that has to be attacked. I have considerable experience on the Island with Boards, with Levy

**Fire District Interlocal  
Questions &  
Discussion**

elections and bond elections, and I can almost be pretty sure that unless the groundwork is laid by a solid performance for any bond election, that it will not pass.

Karen: We agree.

Captain Joe: So my urging here is that all of your financial manipulation be done not counting on a bond passing.

Karen: No.

Captain Joe: That those things be separate.

Karen: We would never do that.

Bob: There is no decision made, I mean you look at what happened with the pool – the bubble was all private money, there was no levy money that went in to that whole thing, correct?

Elaine: Correct.

Bob: And it was successful, the bubble went up, the pool operated all winter long, and it shows how that kind of thing can be done with citizen donation and with Elaine’s work on grants and the rest of us. So I think that’s probably the direction –

Captain Joe: So sometimes a Board functions very well with a person who’s a little bit prickly. And so, when you are recruiting and selecting somebody that you’re going to appoint, I would suggest that whether they are a little bit rough around the edges not be one of your criteria. Thank you.

Bob: Thank you. Any other comments? Or questions?

Karen: Guess we’re done for the night then, right?

Bob: Well –

Captain Joe: Well, you’ve got a discussion item about the fire thing –

Bob: Well, we can certainly talk about that. Do we have questions for the chief?

Elaine: I didn’t know he was coming, but I don’t have specific questions. I think that what I relayed to the Board about my meeting with Charlie is that he was most gracious about considering non-monetary options. We came back to the Board meeting and sussed out those potential options, one being Mileta Creek properties. I went back to the drawing board and realized that we had acquired those properties through a RCO grant, so they’re off the table. We have talked about potential non-monetary solutions and couldn’t come up with anything. I did do, based on what you and I spoke about, I did an analysis on this that I provided for the Board, where, using your formula, I peeled off the undeveloped properties and it amounted to about 300 acres, and came up with a new figure based on Charlie’s formula of \$5,877. So that would be another thing that we might consider.

Karen: My understanding is that the school district, with its millions of buildings, only pays you \$1,800 a year, is that correct?

Charlie / Fire Chief: That’s correct, based on student count, but that’s not – if I may, I’d like to back up to your earlier discussion. I appreciate the situation you’re in with the loss of a Board member and the upcoming levy. We recently did it, to many people’s angst, so I strongly encourage you to start now. We were always behind, working towards that levy. Organize yourselves, depend and go to Elaine, she knows how the system works and what you need and her advice is probably right-on.

So I want to be supportive of your efforts there.

My concern, and the reason I’m here tonight, is not to negotiate this agreement with you, I never intended it to be public. What brought me here tonight is I read the last three posted minutes. I don’t have minutes

from the last meeting because they're not posted yet. And to be perfectly frank, I was set aback. I think you were a little bit hard on the District. I appreciate this is a law that is not to your advantage, but it is a law. And we are both – your District and our District – are not in compliance with the law at this point, plain and simple. Because we have not been in compliance with the law for the existence of the Park District does not mean we should not be. I took exception to the phrase 'nickel and diming' – I would say two things to that regard. We didn't just go get a levy. We went to the public, the public chose to give us a levy. And it wasn't easy work, it was hard work. We didn't choose it, the public chose. They like the services we provide. Regarding nickel and diming the Park District, I believe you will find no evidence in your 35 years of budgets of paying us a dime, let alone a nickel. You do not pay money to the levy. You do not pay money to the Fire District. Any service that's ever been provided to you has been on the backs of every individual property owner. And I don't think that's very transparent. Hence the reason we're suggesting a fee be paid for service. No more, no less. We think it's fair, we think it's right to our customers and our community. The contract and the fee we presented to you, if you read the emails, I'm just saying here's where I'm starting. I never suggested it was set in stone. Never suggested we couldn't look at other ideas, I would suggest that many of the ideas Elaine's looking at, I gave you to look at. So we're flexible in that regard. I would not compare 500 acres to the School District because I have no choice in the School District fee. That is mandated by state law. It's based on student head count, period, end of story. I have no say in the matter. Same with ferries. Ferries are a much smaller component, they pay me \$6,000 a year. I have no say in that matter. It's mandated by state law, end of story. So you can see that there's no consistency, to protect the school property of several, maybe 100 acres, I don't know what the Schools' at, far less than I protect two docks. And there's no equity in the service. I get \$6,000 a year from the ferries, I pay them an average over the last 5 years of \$40,000 a year to use their service. Very similar to the situation you're looking at now. I also heard that we're 'double dipping.' Well, a) we're not. You're not paying anything into our funds. And b) I would say it's really no different than the funds you're paying to the School for the commons. Is the School double dipping? It's an interesting thought. So, I am not opposed to negotiating a fair and reasonable price. But I did not anticipate we would do it in a public forum without even engaging in a conversation. So that's why I came, to make sure you all understood where I stood. If there's any questions about any of my other agreements –

There's a lot of concern about the statue, I can talk about that as well. But I'm happy to share that with you. We work very diligently, my board and myself, to be as transparent to the community as possible. Anything we do, open doors. You don't need to sleuth. Come ask, we'll tell you everything that's going on. So that's where I am. I just wanted to be very clear with you. We'd like to partner with you, I think your vision statements suggest that you'd like to partner with your community, we're there, we're part of it. Regarding the number, you discussed how we came up with that number, I also did some digging. Since January 2016, I said, "how many times do I go to Park properties?" We go about, actually average, 8.1 times per year. Let's just say 8 times a year. When I took over this position last year, we did an assessment and we assumed the average cost of a call is \$3,200.

Karen: Is that mostly medical?

Charlie: About 80% of our calls are medical, yes, m'am. So if we just do the simple math there, the Park District costs the Fire District \$26,000 a year.

Bob: I have a question –

Charlie: Yes, sir?

Bob: Is that extra money, or is that levy money?

Charlie: All the monies we operate on right now are primarily levy, but we as a public entity, in an effort to protect our community, are looking at alternate ways of generating income.

Bob: No, I understand. My question is, when you go out on a call, you're using people who are on duty. You're paying them one way or another. So it's not really an extra cost to you to go on a run.

Charlie: No, I'm not saying it's an extra cost to me, I'm saying if it's a run to your property you're getting the service for free, you're not paying anything for it.

Bob: That I get, but you're talking about the fact that an average run costs about \$3200.

Charlie: Yes.

Bob: But in fact, it's not costing you any money that you don't already have, so it's not really more money out of your pocket to go and save somebody's life.

Charlie: I'm not suggesting it's more money. I'm saying you're dependent – you're having the property owner, who's already funding your operation also pay for your costs in a medical emergency or fire. For example, the Point Robinson fire is already a topic. Could have not gone, could have lost the lighthouse. We had 4 tenders, a fire engine, a brush truck, an aid car, a command vehicle and 10 people there for approximately 3 hours. Should there have been anything else on the Island, the Island would have been stretched and pushed. We would have been stretched and pushed to serve the Island. We were committed there, for no income. So to speak.

CC Stone: All the money that the Park District gets comes from the tax-payers.

Charlie: Right.

CC: Most of the money that you get comes from the tax-payers. So all the money comes from the tax payers, whether it comes from the Park District, it's still coming from the tax payer. Right?

Charlie: Yes, but –

CC: So it's not like it's coming out of these guys' pockets, it's coming out of the tax payers.

Charlie: That's correct. So the tax payer knows that this money goes to Parks and this money goes to Fire. So for example if I say the 8 times. 8 times a year we come there, you pay no bill. I pay 12% of my taxes to the Fire District, they've been to my house one time in the past 18 years. So there's not an equality there.

CC: No, what I'm saying is the money's all coming from the same pocket, when you talk about you and us, it's all coming out of the tax payers' pocket.

Charlie: Okay.

John Candy: As a tax payer, I thought people on this Island have been enormously generous to the Fire and Rescue service in this last levy. The idea that you would be trying to get more money out of me as a tax payer by making me pay for it through the Park District funding seems a little disingenuous.

Charlie: I appreciate that take, but you're equally comfortable that you're willing to foot a forest fire on your tax dollars.

John: Yep.

Charlie: Well, unfortunately I can't gift my services to Parks. That's a law, so we have to come to a –

Bob: That's what drives me nuts about this, and it's the same problem I had with the Commons agreement.

Karen: Right.

Bob: It's exactly the same deal. What it amounts to is a transfer of levy funds, of taxpayer money, from one district to another.

Charlie: That's correct.

Bob: There is no additional cost to anybody. There's no additional cost to the taxpayer. All it amounts to is taking money out of the Park District that is strapped for money all the time, putting it into another District that doesn't need the money. That makes no sense to me, and when you tell the story that this isn't fair to the taxpayer, if the taxpayer didn't read this discussion in the newspaper they wouldn't know the difference, they wouldn't know that money flowed in some way, although I don't know what it was, to put out the fire at Point Robinson. Why should they know that? It's not costing them any money, it doesn't cost them any extra money for you to put out the fire down at Point Robinson. Zero. They don't see that. So my question is why should we take our money that we need to run our programs and put it into your program that doesn't need the money. Other than you're talking about some law that says we have to.

Charlie: How many sports clubs use the fields for free?

Karen: None.

Charlie: None. Why not? They don't want to pay you. They want to use the fields for free. They pay taxes. The field is there. Why do they have to pay a fee?

Bob: There's not enough money to –

Charlie: Because you think I'm fat right now with the levy – I went 27 years, that's unheard of in my industry, 27 years without a tax increase. No one remembers that we went 27 years without asking for money. Unfortunately for me, I have the same economic constraints you do. I have to find ways to substantiate my budget on an annual basis.

Bob: If the law says we have to do it,

CC: State law?

Charlie: RCW, yes.

Bob: If the law says we have to do it, we're going to have to do it, but that doesn't mean that I don't feel the way I feel about it.

Charlie: And I appreciate that.

Karen: And I should also say that – I think I can speak for the Board since we've talked about this – we're not going to pay you \$11,000 a year. We're just simply not going to do that.

Charlie: I have another alternate. We can work out an apparatus, equipment and personnel fee schedule, we'll establish the cost, you don't call us, you don't pay anything. You call us, there's a schedule. Happy to do that. I think I can sell that to my Board.

John Candy: I would like to ask a question. If 80% of responses are for medical, then if a person has an incident out here on the lawn, who's a Vashon citizen, a resident taxpayer, then I guess I'm trying to understand why that should be an accrued cost to the Park District, to serve that citizen in the public space, since they pay the taxes?

Charlie: That's a very good argument, I know. I don't have a clear answer to that. But when I get there and I find out they don't live here, do I walk away?

John Candy: What I'm saying is if it's a facility that you're responding to, like this building, and the District calls you, maybe some justification could be made that it's specifically a facility cost of the Park District, so therefore they could be billed, but I can't see in any way whatsoever that responding to a citizen's safety

and medical condition on public property would be an accrued cost to the Park District. They're not causing it.

Karen: We need to find a middle ground and so we'll talk about it.

LuAnn Branch: I thought the middle ground, when I went to you guys' meetings over at the Fire District, when you guys were talking about your levy, you were deciding between 3.5% and 5% - I thought we gave you everything when we gave you the 5% instead of the 3.5%. That wasn't enough? Because you guys were deciding at the time between 3.5% and 5%, that was what I heard at the meeting.

Charlie: I don't remember the numbers, we actually had a six year levy at the time and we had 5 more years, and we can increase the budget as much as 6% but no more than \$1.50 per family.

LuAnn: And you talked about 5%, right?

Charlie: I'm anticipating for next year, as we start next year's budget, a 2% increase. I'm not looking at 5% right now. But again, happy to discuss this. I felt uncomfortable with the fact that you were debating it without our engagement. I felt slighted, to be honest. I take exception to the fact that you said nickel-and-dimed and you haven't paid a penny to the District in 35 years. I disagree, I appreciate your concern, sir, that you think this reflects poorly on us, but I think this is fiscally responsible of the District to look at alternate ways.

Bob: I think it's safe to say that we agree to disagree on this one.

Charlie: Okay. I will let you finish, I will let you debate, I encourage you to discuss the matter with us, we'll find a middle ground.

Captain Joe: So this is for the Chief, I've read the statute and I don't question the need for a contract. But unless I have misread the statute, which I don't think I have, it says that a contract has to be entered into between the two districts.

Charlie: That's correct.

Captain Joe: The statute says nothing about that it's a contract that also bears a cost.

Charlie: Right. We'll have to go elsewhere now and I don't know the RCW that reflects that, but the gifting of public funds is the next big issue.

Captain Joe: This isn't gifting, this is your mission.

Charlie: I will find the homework to bring back.

John Candy: I would like to say that I think it's reflective of people that I've been talking to, our property tax went up \$1,300. And it's getting to the point where - and we're retired - that it's going to be a strain on people. If it isn't already a strain now. I just encourage each agency and each district to think conservatively. Now I don't know what - are you talking about a capital bond coming up?

Bob: No. Not necessarily.

Elaine: Well, it would be for capital projects.

John: My feeling is, the School District isn't over yet. And it will be only a couple years before they're asking for more money.

Karen: There's a limit.

John: There's a limit, and I think you will see a reaction in a couple of years, because people will be forced to - and I'd like to see it not be an unhappy thing.

Karen: We're aware of that and concerned about that.

John: I worked for the City of Seattle for 24 years. Every agency, every organization, wants to maximize its

potential, it's just built into it. When we did budgets, we would tend to expand. I think if a citizen heard your talk right now on Vashon after that levy just passed, they might be a little –

CC: There would be hell to pay.

Charlie: Well you've actually told me you're making it public, so. And you have, in your minutes, so I understand that.

Karen: Well, nobody comes to the meetings, if that makes you feel better.

John: What I'm asking for is for people to really make an effort to coordinate, as a community; the levy that the Fire Dept passed has implications on the Park Board to give them money, and the whole thing's going to blow up. That's what's going to happen.

CC: I would really like to see you guys come to a cooperative solution on this.

Charlie: We never suggested otherwise.

CC: Well, to send a bill,

Charlie: No, I did not send a bill. I did not send a bill.

CC: It seemed like this request for funds was something of a surprise.

Karen: It was. If I recall correctly, the first thing we saw was this letter saying \$11,000 and we thought 'what?'

Charlie: We contacted the District in August.

Elaine: We went through the process of looking and talking and checking around; yes, that is true.

Charlie: So it's been an active discussion since August. In October your lawyer validated that there is an RCW, right?

Elaine: yes.

Charlie: Your lawyer made a suggestion on a fee schedule, I think it was November. I wrote back, I said, we'll start working on an agreement, you start working on property values, we'll figure something out from there. December, we got the property list from your District. We started talking about it at our house; there were no communications from December to April. April, we said okay, here's where we are. Happy to start here. Never implied it was your bill, this is your number, this is the agreement, this is the time period for the agreement, what would you like to do? Our next notice is we read in public minutes that 'we're being nickel and dimed, we're bastards, we're the bad guys, whatever.' My words, over-dramatized –

Bob: I think it's maybe time to end this discussion, and we'll come to some kind of agreement.

Charlie: Thank you.

Bob: Thank you.

Karen: Anything else?

Bob: Any other comments? We can't even vote to adjourn...

(laughter)