

VASHON PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference, 7:00 pm
DATE: Tuesday, September 22, 2020

Commissioners attending: Hans Van Dusen, Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Abby Antonelis, Karen Gardner
 Staff attending: Elaine Ott-Rocheford

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
Call To Order	Hans called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.	
Public Comment	No public comment.	
Airport Land	<p>Truman O'Brien: I've been in communication with DeAnna Beck who is an Outdoor Grants Manager with the Washinton State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), and we don't have an answer yet. She said that there are three things they still have to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Establishing the eligibility of the Airport District to hold titles for the RCO funded property. 2) Ensuring that the transfer of the property is not a mitigation action that would conflict with RCO policy. 3) Ensuring that the property would be managed in accordance with the deed of right. <p>On the first point, I have found RCW 14.08.120 which the Airport District was founded under and currently operates under regarding specific powers of municipalities operating airports. There is one paragraph that particularly discusses property that is owned around the airport and it states "The subject property is put to a desired public recreational or other community use by the community in the immediate area of the airport," and that's exactly what this is. So that's part of our argument towards establishing eligibility.</p> <p>In terms of the mitigation action conflict, I'm unclear as to what the issue is there.</p> <p>I have a copy of the deed of right, and I don't see anything that would conflict with the Airport District.</p> <p>So what I would like tonight is to ask you, if we can address these issues, and if we can confirm this will work, would the Park District be willing to sell the two parcels to the Airport District at some agreed price. If we can get a firm yes, then we would consider moving forward with the loan application.</p> <p>Bob: I think if we can agree on a price, then yes.</p> <p>Karen: I agree.</p> <p>Abby: If the purchase goes forward, would you be able to increase the use of the airport by having more hangars?</p> <p>Truman O'Brien: We cannot have any more hangars because there isn't room.</p> <p>Abby: If we can agree on price, I say yes.</p> <p>Doug: I don't have a position.</p> <p>Hans: I would agree to selling it at its assessed value, which we've discussed at \$100,000 or \$50,000 in different conversations, and as long as the intent of the original land was preserved.</p>	

	<p>Truman O'Brien: Is there a specific price?</p> <p>Elaine: Our attorney has indicated it must be sold at fair market value, so that will determine the price. I would think approximately \$50,000 per parcel.</p> <p>Truman O'Brien: As attractive as it would be for the Airport District to have that property, if it's over \$100,000, it wouldn't make sense for the Airport District to buy it.</p> <p>Elaine: Windermere assessed the properties for \$50,000 each, so I think that's a safe figure to go with at this point.</p> <p>Truman O'Brien: In that case, we will proceed to apply for the loan, and we may not have a decision until almost November, so that gives us time to work on the RCO piece.</p>	
<p>9.8.20 Minutes; 9.5.20 – 9.17.20 Preliminary Vouchers; August Vouchers</p>	<p>Bob: Motion to accept the 9.8.20 Minutes 9.5.20 – 9.17.20 Preliminary Vouchers, and August Vouchers.</p> <p>Doug: Second</p> <p>Pass 5-0</p>	<p>Motion to approve 9.8.20 Minutes, 9.5.20 – 9.17.20 Preliminary Vouchers; August Vouchers Pass 5-0</p>
<p>August Financial Report</p>	<p>Elaine: The numbers haven't changed much since I reported finances at our last meeting.</p> <p>Levy Dollars – only off by \$5k relative to projection.</p> <p>Admin – ahead \$54k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other income ahead \$15k – copier trade; SWM fee reimbursement; and higher interest income than projected. • Payroll down \$10k – Sue only working part time • Election costs down \$12k – November less expensive than April • Professional Fees down \$13k – due to lower than expected legal fees for Tramp Harbor Dock <p>Maintenance – ahead \$32k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$18k – no rentals due to COVID • Payroll down \$21k – limited seasonal; no 2nd seasonal • Materials down \$10k – only one topdressing at VES due to lack of use • Outside services – down \$4k – also due to one topdressing • Utilities – down \$4k – not as much indoor use of facilities <p>Commons – ahead \$32k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$15k – no rentals due to COVID • Payroll down \$12k – no access staff with very limited Robin • Interlocal payment down \$33k and climbing – no use of VISD facilities <p>Programs – ahead \$23k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll down \$10k due to Marshall being part time • All else is lack of programming, but we shall discuss Eric's new efforts later in the agenda 	

	<p>Pool – ahead \$34k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$40k • Payroll down \$64k <p>Pt Robinson – ahead \$13k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue tracking ahead \$7k • Payroll down \$8k – PT Marshall and Eric doing a lot of the housekeeping <p>Fern Cove – ahead \$5k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue – down \$4k • Payroll down \$7k <p>CIP – over \$5k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agren retainage \$10k • Killed Village Green entry and the Agren art <p>Ending Cash \$779k</p> <p>Doug: Regarding the levy dollars, I read that property assessments done in 2020 are down.</p> <p>Elaine: I don't believe that will be an issue for next year. I have a report from the King County Assessments Department that says we are just shy of the implicit price deflator, which means that we could be a little below the 1%. I'll know more in the coming months.</p>	
<p>Recreation Programming</p>	<p>Elaine: Eric is working on the scavenger hunt. He's considering doing something that involves finding things like landmarks to encourage people to visit our parks, however the Ober Park playground is currently closed.</p> <p>Eric is also working on opening the BARC indoor skatepark on a reservation system similar to what we have at the pool, but we can only allow two people at a time, and it would have to be staffed to comply with the Safe Start regulations. Unfortunately, the two staff we had prior to COVID have moved on with other job opportunities, so their availability is limited.</p> <p>Eric also came up with an idea of doing a mural project in the BARC indoor building. The walls have gotten bad with graffiti. Eric thinks it would be fun to do four separate Requests for Proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Elementary school age students 2) Middle school age students 3) High school age students 4) Professional <p>One for each wall. And making a contest out of it. There would be a selection board that would include the BARC stewards, some select skaters, and our staff.</p> <p>Karen: If the graffiti is so bad, I'm concerned that the murals would get painted over and ruin the community investment in the project.</p> <p>Elaine: There is a new product that is an overlay that makes wiping off new graffiti really easy, so we just have to clean it off.</p> <p>Another idea Eric is working on is a virtual fun run that would be app-based where people would take pictures of the tracker that they use, and then have t-shirts and medals for prizes.</p> <p>Bob: Eric could talk to Colby Atwood with Passport to Pain (P2P) about that. That group has quite a thing</p>	

	going right now.	
(Agren Park)	<p>Karen: If I can interrupt for a minute, this was not on the agenda, but I just walked my dogs at Agren Park this evening. People there had three dogs off-leash tearing up the grass.</p> <p>Elaine: The field is now usable. I'm not overly concerned. People very often bring dogs and let them off-leash anyway. The field is solid. Some patches of grass still need to fill in, but the contractor has assured us that it's fine for use. That's why we took the fence down.</p> <p>Karen: Great! That's good to know, because I was worried.</p>	
Lisabeula Land Donation	<p>Elaine: At the last meeting, I informed you of our attorney's recommendation to obtain a clean title report and an environmental assessment before accepting the donation. There are two different phases of environmental assessments. Phase one is a site evaluation of potential contaminants. It involves historical research, interviews of local residents and past property owners. The result of phase one is a rendered opinion that costs between \$1,500 and \$6,000.</p> <p>Phase two involves samples, lab tests, and analytics. That can be over \$20,000, particularly in water. A reminder that the attorney cost estimate is \$1,000 - \$2,000 to review the title report. Do we want to move forward, or take the risk on not doing an environmental assessment?</p> <p>Bob: There is a lot of liability in environmental issues if they turn up on the property. What's the benefit to us?</p> <p>Elaine: Not much. It gives us a little more beach and the tidelands themselves, which provides beach activities like clamming.</p> <p>Karen: The cost is very high considering what we would be getting, though I was initially enthusiastic.</p> <p>Abby: I don't think that if we get that land it will change the way people use the park and the beach to the south. I don't think an environmental assessment is necessary, but we should do it anyway for the existing property. I would turn down the donation of this land.</p> <p>Hans: I still think it's worth considering. There is very little public land on this island where it is legal to harvest shellfish. It provides more opportunities for our community, though it is a small piece of land. It also provides more clarity on our part to the neighbors to the public's access to that land. In terms of environmental liability, we are not planning to build anything on that property, but the phase one assessment seems reasonable for narrative for our intended use. I think it's an asset.</p> <p>Bob: As long as we don't have to initially spend the \$20,000.</p> <p>Elaine: An RFP of this nature is consultant-based, which means I can't start with a price. I can call places and get quotes, aiming for \$3,000 or less.</p>	
Board Votes	<p>Board Votes</p> <p>1) Bob: Motion to approve the hydrophone project subject to the caveats of Coast Guard approval (based on our stated review period, so lack of disapproval), Use Agreement, and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).</p> <p>Abby: Second.</p> <p>Elaine: By the way, I notified the Coast Guard on 9/12 that I will assume approval if I did not hear from them by 9/18. I haven't heard back, but the request for response is in writing.</p>	Motion to approve the hydrophone project subject to the caveats of Coast Guard approval

	<p>2) Bob: Motion to increase the Lodging cleaning fees by \$25 for each vacation rental property. Karen: Second.</p> <p>3) Abby: Motion to approve the BARC Lease amendment to 2044. Doug: Second. Elaine: I need signatures by the Board Chair and Secretary, which can be done electronically or in-person.</p> <p>4) Bob: Motion to approve allocating \$10,000 for the building of park kiosks. Doug: Second.</p>	<p>(based on our stated review, so lack of disapproval), Use Agreement, and MOU. Pass 5-0</p> <p>Motion to increase the Lodging cleaning fees by \$25 for each vacation rental property. Pass 5-0</p> <p>Motion to approve the BARC Lease amendment to 2044. Pass 5-0</p> <p>Motion to approve allocating \$10,000 for the building of park kiosks. Pass 5-0</p>
<p>Paradise Ridge Bicycle Motion</p>	<p>Elaine: Karen made an initial motion to change the use of the trails at Paradise Ridge for equestrian and hiking use only, and no biking unless riding into the park on the pavement, which was amended to include the potential of a future bike course. Abby: If it makes our users more comfortable, then I would agree. Elaine: The past votes were 4-1 with Karen opposed. Abby: The bike course could be considered in the future, and policy could be changed again if the bicycling community comes back to us to discuss further. Marie Bradley talked to me extensively about her concerns</p>	

	<p>with the cyclists. I think the wording is important to amend in our master plan, which would show the equestrian community that we are taking their concerns into account.</p> <p>Mary: At the last meeting of the horse association, I pointed out that a lot of land in Paradise Ridge is very steep. We decided that what needs to be done is that the trails should be re-mapped to show elevation changes. All the parts that are not used are very steep ones and should not be part of the course. There's not space without taking part of the course that we use for competition training, as well as pleasure use. The master plan amendment, signage, and mapping changes would indicate to cyclists that they could use a different trail specifically for them.</p> <p>Hans: I don't think there is space to put in a bike course, but I also don't think we should close the trails to others.</p> <p>Karen: I still disagree about the closure of trails to cyclists.</p> <p>Bob: I agree with Karen. The master plan can be amended again at a later date to include a bike-specific trail.</p> <p>Abby: Motion to change the master plan to allow only equestrians and pedestrians on the trails and bikes only on the pavement.</p> <p>Doug: Second.</p>	<p>Motion to change the master plan to allow only equestrians and pedestrians on the trails and bikes only on the pavement.</p>
<p>Anti-Racism and Equity Policies</p>	<p>Elaine: Bob had some new input regarding the policy revisions since we tabled this topic at our last meeting. In terms of wording, he believes the revisions should state "actual or perceived race, creed, color, age, religion, gender, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, national origin, physical or mental disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, sexual practices, ethnicity, physical characteristics."</p> <p>Bob: It's a big list, and we can cut it back. I thought it important to be consistent how we phrase equity in our policies.</p> <p>Elaine: Looking at the first policy revision, "General Relationships", the wording is "care will be taken to consider the importance of diversity, and to include all interest groups equitably when all program additions or deletions are being considered". Bob's suggested verbiage is encapsulated in this statement, but whatever change is made should be added to all the policies we are discussing.</p> <p>Hans: Another option is to take an umbrella approach, and word it as "...to include all interest groups and community members equitably...", rather than identifying.</p> <p>Bob: With two of these policies, I think changes are appropriate, but in terms of harassment, I think it's important.</p> <p>Elaine: I agree. I will send out a final version before our next meeting.</p> <p>Abby: Motion to accept the amended anti-racism and equity policies as presented.</p> <p>Doug: Second.</p> <p>Hans: We'll look at the final versions next meeting then.</p>	<p>Motion to accept the amended anti-racism and equity policies as presented</p>
<p>Senior Center Update</p>	<p>Elaine: I sent the Board and staff a thank-you note for the check of \$19,290.82 for the exercise aspects of the Ober Park playground. That pays for about half. Hans, as Board Chair, please contact their Board President related to the MOU's. I sent you Liz Illg's contact information. I have all the documents ready to submit for the playground project, but I haven't heard back from the Department of Permitting, and,</p>	

	similarly, I haven't gotten a response regarding the building permit for the VES restroom since I submitted the documents on 6/3, most likely due to COVID. The grant deadline is May 2021, but I'd like to get this done this fall/winter. If that can't happen, I'm confident we get an extension.	
Adjourn 8:10 pm	Bob: I move to adjourn. Doug: Second.	Motion to adjourn Pass 5-0

Minutes by: Marshall Murray