

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference, 7:00 pm
DATE: Tuesday, September 14, 2021

Commissioners attending: Hans Van Dusen, Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Josh Henderson. Abby absent.
 Staff attending: Elaine Ott-Rocheford

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
Call To Order – Review Agenda	Hans called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.	
Public Comment	None	
8.24.21 and 8.31.21 Minutes; 8.21.21 – 9.10.21 Preliminary Vouchers	Bob: Motion to accept the minutes and vouchers. Doug: Second. Pass 4-0	8.24.21 and 8.31.21 Minutes; 8.21.21 – 9.10.21 Preliminary Vouchers Pass 4-0
Seals Bubble Proposal	<p>Susan Puz: I am the current president of the Seals Swim Team. Danielle Hinz is also here. She is the vice president. I will give an overview of the proposal. When the bubble needs to be replaced, the VPD will assume ownership of the new bubble; we will split the replacement cost 50/50 – our estimate is \$60k; VPD will assume insurance, operation, and maintenance costs; we ask for \$55 rental, which is our current fee; we would assist with finding volunteers for bubble up and bubble down.</p> <p>Danielle: We appreciate the partnership with VPD over the years. It was quite an effort getting the bubble in the first place. The Seals fundraised and bought the existing bubble. I believe we have proven the value of the bubble to the community that went far beyond the swim team. Our proposal reflects the value to the community of having year round swimming.</p> <p>Doug: It is safe to say that the new terms are significantly harder on VPD than they were in the beginning. As you pointed out, at that time, the swim team raised money to purchase the bubble. It was a community effort. With inflation, one would expect the hourly fee to go up, especially after 10 years if we’re talking about the end of the life period. There was a lot of discussion at that time whether or not this would be an extraordinary expense to VPD; since then, our financial condition has deteriorated significantly with further problems in the pipeline. It seems rather extraordinary that you would come to us with a proposal that significantly increases our burden. You mentioned that this has proven to be a community asset, but I don’t know that. When I have been there, there weren’t many people there. We have competition from the Vashon Athletic Club, which is also suffering due to the COVID crisis. We are mandated to not compete with the private sector. There are many things for us to think about</p>	

with this proposal. It is not a slam dunk in my opinion.

Bob: There is a big difference between our pool and the Athletic Club pool. They can't be compared unless you're just looking to splash around. If you're looking for a quality pool on the island, the only one is our pool (there is also the Country Club pool, but that is not well managed). Even though we would be looking at \$30k, we would be looking at grants and donations, so it doesn't have to be a huge burden on us from a capital standpoint. There are the other costs, like maintenance, which we don't have any numbers on. You'll have to give us that. \$55 per hour has been the rate since the beginning?

Elaine: It has been. Randy's perspective is that our labor costs have gone up 10% since then, so he feels a 10% increase to \$60 per hour would be appropriate. It is a rate that is consistent with what other teams are paying.

Bob: We have rates for public rentals.

Elaine: Yes, but the Seals rate is a negotiated rate.

Bob: It would helpful to have the maintenance costs from the Seals.

Elaine: I think the maintenance costs are pretty minimal. Randy says he and Derek do most of it. I wouldn't worry too much about that piece.

Mike O'Conner: I don't know when Doug has been to the pool, but it is crowded with lap swimmers. It is usually two people per lane. The usage hours by lap swimmers far exceed the usage hours by the Seals, yet the Seals are solely responsible for the burden of putting up and taking down the bubble. As Elaine said, the maintenance is minimal – I have done a lot of the maintenance. Basically it is patching holes here and there, tightening bolts. The big issue for the Seals is that, being owned by the Seals, we have sole responsibility for putting it up and taking it down, yet the vast majority of pool use is by the lap swimmers. There are probably 50 – 100 lap swimmers who use the pool on a regular basis. Winter use has been very consistent. They have no responsibility for helping with the bubble. There is now open swim. Would you require the users of the fields to help with maintenance? The Seals started this. Now it's time for VPD to step up and take it over? What do we have a park district for if they don't manage recreational opportunities. Pools throughout the state compete with private pools and the YMCA.

Doug: I don't know what the public use of the pool is. How many people and hours per week? The lap swim use seems to be a consequent of COVID. We should be looking at 2019 numbers. I also take issue with the notion of pool competition. I know people who use both pools. They each have different facilities than the other. They don't seem comparable if you're a serious swimmer, but if you're not, they can be considered competitors. I bet the Athletic Club feels the competition. People used the Athletic Club before the bubble. When King County gave out the forward thrust pools, they intended Vashon's to be outdoors only. Many institutions are failing, like the VCC. From what I heard, even the Athletic Club. We have to be careful about expanding the number or even keeping the same number in light of the financial issues so many organizations are facing. We need to put that in there, as well. I do think the two are competitive.

Bob: Regarding it being uncovered when it was built, the story is that the forward thrust movement ran out of money when it got to Vashon. It wasn't intended to be uncovered. The two pools from a lap swimming and swim team standpoint, they are nowhere near comparable. In terms of competition, they are both pools. I spoke with the Athletic Club before this happened and said if they think we are competing with you, build a pool that is competitive. Don't expect us to restrict our plans just because your pool isn't adequate. The Seals wanted our pool, because it is a decent pool for a swim team.

Susan: It's a competitive length. It is certified – 25 meters. The Athletic Pool is not.

Bob: 25 yard is the standard. I don't know why you are so fired up, Doug, but we should figure out a way to make this

Action Item

Action Item

	<p>work – fundraising. So we can keep a pool in this community that lap swimmers and the swim team can use. It wasn't used as much for open swim this year, but we can work on that. I would make a motion that we consider this strongly.</p> <p>Doug: Would you agree, Bob, that the terms offered now are less generous four years ago than what is offered now?</p> <p>Bob: By 50%.</p> <p>Doug: In real terms, the payments for the pool are reduced, and the financial responsibilities are greater than what we assumed in the past. On balance, would you agree it is a less generous proposal?</p> <p>Susan: I would like VPD to provide the information on usage. Doug, you are right that 4 years ago we paid for it and assumed all the risk. We took a big risk. The risk was that the Seals would go under due to unused. We have proved that it does work. Quite a bit of revenue has come to VPD after we paid for the bubble. Our Seals Swim Team enrollment is ½ to 2/3 of pre-COVID. We are not doing well. We will not be able to fully purchase the bubble when that time comes, even with a substantial amount of fundraising. It would make me really sad to see no bubble for the community, and the Seals would be done.</p> <p>Elaine: From a usage standpoint, I can speak to revenue dollars from public use vs Swim team use. This year, it is tracking to be the same as 2019 from a percentage standpoint. The public use is about double. Getting use numbers is a little more challenging due to repetitive use, but I'll come back with that for the next meeting. If I can throw in my opinion, theoretically I agree with the proposal. I have an issue with keeping the rate the same, since we will be increasing rates for all facilities in the near future. I think it is reasonable to go to \$60. I have no issue with VPD paying half for the reasons stated. For Board consideration, I did provide cash flow projections that include all capital projects scheduled for the next three years. Since this is an unbudgeted item in our planning schedule, I wanted to present an updated version with the pool bubble and Pt Rob septic system included. I provided projections back in April, and there have been some savings due to COVID, but current projections are still pointing downward. As a result of the 45 cent levy and pro-rationing this year, by 2024, we're heading below our cash reserve needs. This needs to be considered before accepting another unplanned capital expenditure. Remember, there will be other unexpected priorities that will crop up in the meantime.</p> <p>Bob: Doug indicated that lap swimming usage went up due to COVID. COVID shut it down at one point. When allowed again, it came up. It is untrue that COVID increased usage.</p> <p>Josh: Doug, are there any terms that would be favorable?</p> <p>Doug: I don't know. My main point is we are not in a better financial position than we were 4 years ago, yet we're being asked to do more. We need to think hard about that.</p> <p>Hans: The timeline is 2024 would be the likely replacement year?</p> <p>Susan: We think we need to buy it in 2023 to install 2024.</p> <p>Mike: We will try to get as much out of it as we can. We may get a little more time than that.</p> <p>Bob: And would it be at that point that we take over responsibility?</p> <p>Mike: It would be then.</p> <p>Hans: So we have some time on this proposal. My general thoughts are we are grateful for all the Seals have done. The proposal seems reasonable to me. We'll take a closer look as time goes on. The user fee issue will be looked at for next year's budget like we do all user fees. That's a normal thing we do.</p>	
<p>Board Votes</p>	<p>1) Doug: Motion to place the Manzanita, Tideland, and Hitchings parcels on the open market with the provision that Hitchings goes to a public entity. Hans: Second</p>	

Elaine: At the last meeting I was tasked with asking King County about their plans for Spring Beach, Lost Lake and Mileta Creek. I sent you Greg Rabourn's response. I assume you all have reviewed that.

Tom Dean: I am here to plead with you. I am with the Vashon Land Trust. Greg's proposal is a golden opportunity to surplus this land, see the revenue from it, and keep it public all at the same time. I am asking that you reconsider not squandering this opportunity. Much of our funding to acquire open space over the years has come from King County. We have the opportunity, particularly at Manzanita, to allow give to leverage that into a larger preserve in that area, another park. During COVID, people flocked to our parks and open spaces. I got a lot of comments about how people appreciated that. As a park agency, I am asking you to consider helping me in continuing to build this legacy that citizens of Vashon enjoy so much. In addition, I have 18 years of hands on experience with the real estate market on Vashon, so if you have questions about their marketability, I am happy to engage in that discussion.

Bob: Talk about marketability of those parcels, please.

Tom: At Manzanita, those parcels are small, sloped, and wet. There are no roads. These parcels are very difficult if not impossible to build on. The prices you are being offered are quite favorable. On the open market, you will have fees and find individual buyers for each one. There is a parcel similar to yours that has been on the market 150 days and has gone nowhere. The access is awful. You're going to have a hard time getting rid of those, and you'll lose Greg's deal on top of it.

Doug: This is the first I have heard of any interest in the Manzanita properties. This is great. We were presented with a proposal for multiple properties. The question for us has been whether or not to cede certain properties in order to sell Manzanita. The question is the whole package. When we look at it that way, it isn't as attractive to me.

Tom: So it's a package deal.

Doug: It was a handshake deal. I personally am reluctant to approve the deal for just selling Manzanita without the other half of the handshake also going through. The deal breaker to me is we are not just selling Manzanita but giving away other properties that are more valuable.

Tom: But you don't have the legal right to sell those.

Doug: It doesn't mean they don't have value. They are waterfront, forested land.

Hans: Is the County interested in Manzanita isolated from the others?

Greg Rabourn: I am not prepared to answer that right now. It would need to be on a parcel by parcel basis. We were operating on the whole package between the properties we buy and those that would be donated as unable to sell. Amongst that are parcels the County would buy that aren't that great. As part of the package, we are willing to take the good ones with the not so good ones.

Hans: The question is no tidelands, no Hitchings, no big properties – would the county be interested in just buying Manzanita?

Greg: I would have to evaluate that. I am not prepared to consider it right now.

Hans: And Elaine, what about the expected level of time if we attempt to sell?

Elaine: I don't have an exact response to that. It will take time preparing all the parcels with a realtor, then dealing with any potential sale. I already spent a good deal of time with Susan Lofland – going over all the paperwork, determining value. I have already spent so much time over the years on this. Quite frankly, it is surprising to me that we are talking about this again.

Hans: I understand. There are a number of paths to going forward. I'm just trying to understand those paths. To recap, the commissioners voted 5-0 to surplus Manzanita, Hitchings, and the tideland to provide resources for the capital improvements Elaine mentioned in the prior discussion. They then voted 4-1 on the County's offer, but that

requires a unanimous vote. To speak to the larger properties, that is a great opportunity to us, as well – improving access and habitat. The question of what is best for them in the future is a good question. They are big properties. It's a large transactional value to transfer from a small to a large jurisdiction. Which owner is best suited? As a stepping stone, it would be helpful to know if you would consider just Manzanita. Another option is it goes on the market and doesn't sell. Or we don't accept that offer. If there were competitive offers, we would have to accept the highest, but we wouldn't have to accept any of them.

Tom: I'm confused. In terms of the larger properties, when the Land Trust transfers properties to King County, we consider: 1) we have looted our liability legally and in terms of stewardship; 2) and we have transferred to an entity with a much larger capacity to manage the habitat. These larger properties have KC lands adjacent to all of them. It consolidates the ownership and makes it easier to manager. I don't understand what you are seeing as a downside to that transfer.

Josh: Tom, is there a difference in a realtor's commission on raw property as opposed to a home?

Tom: Raw land commissions are higher – as high as 10% total.

Bob: The only person who can answer the question about the reason for us going in this direction is Doug.

Doug: I opposed the deal last week. We were casually transferring valuable park land to an agency that might do a good job or might not do a good job. KC has not consistently managed Vashon properties in a way I would like. I felt like it wasn't a good deal to give up properties valued at \$300k and give up more valuable properties for nothing. I know we can't sell them, but that doesn't mean they aren't valuable. We are VPD – our job is to do parks. It is not in our interest to give up properties. We have vague speculation of what might happen to them.

Greg: Our intent is to manage them as open space natural areas that allow for passive use recreation that we are managing for ecological habitat and low intensity trail use. My enthusiasm for all is to manage the forests that are in dire straits – overwhelmed with ivy and other invasives. KC manage natural lands all over the County. We have crews and budgets for that sort of thing. Not interested in active use management.

Hans: What are your thoughts about a commitment to addressing that in some timeline as the owner?

Greg: I can commit to that. If you go to Manzanita right now, you can see where the KC parcels end and where the VPD properties end due to the ivy.

Hans: I share Tom's statement that the county would be a great steward. Some specificity in a commitment to when would be helpful.

Bob: That is what Doug is concerned about – how the properties will be used. He was concerned about the price – that we might get more if we sell on the open market. Might Doug bend if he has some assurance that the County will treat it as he sees is appropriate?

Doug: It isn't up to me. It is up to the Commissioners. I will not be a commissioner after this year. The commissioners must decide what to do with it. They could ignore it, like the county has ignored the Margorie Stanley Natural Area. There were trails there, but they have disappeared. It's not up to me how we might want to use it. If we keep it, it is up to the Commissioners to decide how to use it. Do we want boat ramps there? How do we deal with kayakers?

These are better decisions to be made on the local level then the County level. I'm not sure Spring Beach as a natural area is the right use. Would we fund boat ramps there? I don't know. I prefer to see VPD management of these properties. I'm not convinced the County would be a better manager. People on Vashon generally hate the county – it messes up the roads, messes up the parks. I'm not sure how the voters would view us giving this to the county.

Hans: Are we willing to vote on this motion?

Doug: I don't care to vote on it.

	<p>Bob: I agree. Hans: We will not move forward on putting it on the market, then. Tom: Are you going to entertain a new motion? Bob: The problem is it must be unanimous. And one of us has dug his heels in. Hans: I think we can discuss things that would make the offer more acceptable. I think if just selling Manzanita as a first step with a commitment to moving forward on the other properties in a partnership would be successful. With a commitment on how they will steward it. I imagine we would get a 5-0 on Manzanita. I think the island would support our action to preserve the forest. I can't speak for Greg on if his bosses would agree. Bob: So we should modify that motion and see if it flies? Hans: I hinted at a counter offer. I don't think we have a concrete plan for a motion tonight. Bob: So we will have a discussion with all five commissioners at the next meeting. Doug: We need more information about Manzanita and what the County's interest with just that might be and if is considered part of a larger package or a stand-alone. Greg: Talk to me. I am happy to answer questions, like what is behind the Marjorie Stanley property.</p> <p>2) Doug: Motion to increase the BARC building rental fee to \$30 per hour. Josh: Second Pass 4-0</p> <p>3) Bob: Motion to institute a \$500 nonrefundable wedding damage deposit for weddings at Point Robinson and Fern Cove. Doug: Second Pass 4-0</p> <p>4) Bob: Motion to surplus the old playground equipment. Doug: Second Pass 4-0</p>	<p>Motion to increase the BARC building rental fee to \$30 per hour. Pass 4-0</p> <p>Motion to institute a \$500 nonrefundable wedding damage deposit for weddings at Point Robinson and Fern Cove. Pass 4-0</p> <p>Motion to surplus the old playground equipment. Pass 4-0</p>
<p>Point Robinson Septic Failure</p>	<p>Elaine: Fortunately, it isn't a full on failure yet. We discussed this concern in our overall capital expenditure planning, but it wasn't scheduled for the near future (we scheduled 2020 – 2023). We categorized it as an item to include in a potential bond. The problems with it came to our attention a couple years ago when effluent was saturating the surface of the ground. Maintenance dug into it and found that the pipes were disintegrating and the distribution box was failing. They replaced the pipes as best they could and installed a vertical pipe that would aid in evaluating it. They were told at the time by a contractor that this was a band-aid and was bound to fail in the near future. Maintenance checks on that pipe and is finding it is often full of water. The septic needs to be replaced sooner rather than later, as we do not want a failure while people are there, then having it out of service for a month. We really need to get on this now. Bookings indicate the best time to do it is March or September, 2022. We would like to do it in March – September is too risky, and it would be disastrous if a failure occurred in the meantime. March means we need to start the process now. I included this item in the cash flow projections. It's not looking good. Our cash position is better than when I reported in April due to COVID closures and furloughs, but by 2024 we are below our reserve need, and September is tight to where we would likely need to borrow. When we last discussed this, you said we would make more pointed decisions at budget time, but I think it is important for me to keep this issue before</p>	

	<p>you. Things like this – unexpected capital failures – are going to crop up. This reflects the capital planning for 2021 and 2022. There is nothing beyond that we have planned for. So this means making this a priority over something else.</p> <p>Bob: This is Coast Guard property. Do they have any responsibility in assisting with this?</p> <p>Elaine: Not in the repair, but we do need their approval to do it. Judging by the last three years of them not coming through on any requests, I am concerned. But we have to try.</p> <p>Bob: This is capital. It’s not repair and maintenance. It is replacement of an expensive installation that has been there forever. This is going to be a tough one with rising sea level and all. We may have to have it elsewhere.</p> <p>Elaine: The lease is very clear that we are responsible for all maintenance and improvements other than the Coast Guard communication systems. This is definitely on us. Your comment about where it would go – maintenance believes this would be a fix similar to what we did at Fern Cove – running it up the hill. It will effectively be a new system -- \$100k.</p> <p>Hans: So next step is to get a design?</p> <p>Elaine: You need to approve it first. But yes, first thing is the design, then the permit, then the contractor.</p> <p>Bob: We would need design work and cost estimating before we approve the construction. I move we get a design and estimated cost to the point of submitting for the permit.</p> <p>Josh: Second.</p>	<p>Motion to get a septic design and estimated cost to the point of submitting for the permit.</p>																								
<p>King County Aquatics Grant/Capital Grant</p>	<p>Elaine: Starting tomorrow, King County is releasing two new grant programs as part of the 2019 King County Parks levy approval.</p> <p><u>Aquatics</u></p> <p>\$13 million available funding for renovation or expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities in King County.</p> <p>Up to \$100k – no match required.</p> <p>\$100,001 - \$2 million – must provide 50% of the project’s total cost.</p> <p>We applied for a King County Youth Sport grant in the spring (with no match), but it was not accepted, likely because of this grant specifically for pools. We identified the following items to address:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Parking lot lights</td> <td>\$33,572</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pool Slide</td> <td>\$52,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hot Water Heater</td> <td>\$12,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Boiler Natural Gas Burner</td> <td>\$12,746</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Solar System Pump</td> <td>\$ 3,160</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pool Plaster Liner</td> <td><u>\$154,981</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>\$268,559</td> </tr> </table> <p>Also now need:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Thermal cover</td> <td>\$ 20,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Table Test/refill</td> <td>\$ 9,113</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Architect/Design</td> <td>\$12,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DOH Permitting</td> <td>\$ 2,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KC Building Permit</td> <td><u>\$ 2,000</u></td> </tr> </table>	Parking lot lights	\$33,572	Pool Slide	\$52,100	Hot Water Heater	\$12,000	Boiler Natural Gas Burner	\$12,746	Solar System Pump	\$ 3,160	Pool Plaster Liner	<u>\$154,981</u>	Total	\$268,559	Thermal cover	\$ 20,000	Water Table Test/refill	\$ 9,113	Architect/Design	\$12,500	DOH Permitting	\$ 2,000	KC Building Permit	<u>\$ 2,000</u>	
Parking lot lights	\$33,572																									
Pool Slide	\$52,100																									
Hot Water Heater	\$12,000																									
Boiler Natural Gas Burner	\$12,746																									
Solar System Pump	\$ 3,160																									
Pool Plaster Liner	<u>\$154,981</u>																									
Total	\$268,559																									
Thermal cover	\$ 20,000																									
Water Table Test/refill	\$ 9,113																									
Architect/Design	\$12,500																									
DOH Permitting	\$ 2,000																									
KC Building Permit	<u>\$ 2,000</u>																									

	<p>Total \$314,172</p> <p>Contingency \$ 31,417</p> <p>Tax \$ 30,066</p> <p>Total \$375,655</p> <p>We need to pay \$187,828. Do you want to do this? Do you want to do a lesser amount? Should we reprioritize \$187k over something else in our capital planning? The grant is due by 10/15.</p> <p>Hans: When would this project need to be complete?</p> <p>Elaine: Two years.</p> <p>Hans: And when awarded?</p> <p>Elaine: It does not specify other than early 2022.</p> <p>Bob: It makes sense to do this in small bites – the \$100k with no match. We need to be careful to not exceed that on the total, so it doesn't flip into the match requirement. What is most important on that list?</p> <p>Elaine: Hot water heater, burner, solar system, maybe the slide. That comes to about \$78k.</p> <p>Bob: We need repairs around the edge of the pool – the tiles. The plaster is holding up okay.</p> <p>Doug: Can we get money for the bubble?</p> <p>Elaine: Maybe.</p> <p>Doug: If we do this in bites, is there some danger that something we are not doing would make the pool unusable?</p> <p>Elaine: As Bob said, the plaster is being addressed in bits and pieces. It's cracking and chipping – nothing that would close the pool, although it can be a safety issue. The lights would be nice to have for safety when it's dark out. The slide – not critical, but nice to have. Mike O'Conner says we can live with the slide for another year or two. The deal breakers: hot water heater, burner, solar pump, and thermal cover.</p> <p>Mike: The slide is showing some wear and tear, but I think we can get by another couple years. The cover is a good idea, too.</p> <p>Elaine: If we can fit it in, we might as well.</p> <p>Bob: I move we approve the \$100,000 Aquatics grant application for the highest priority repairs.</p> <p>Doug: Second; Pass 4-0</p> <p>Doug: Motion to suspend the rules.</p> <p>Bob: Second; Pass 4-0</p>	<p>Motion to approve the \$100,000 Aquatics grant application for the highest priority repairs. Pass 4-0</p> <p>Motion to suspend the rules. Pass 4-0</p>
<p>Sustainability Policy</p>	<p>Elaine: At the last meeting we discussed developing a sustainability plan with the goal of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2030. That wasn't a commitment, but something to consider. I have started working on that. It starts with adopting a policy. It also starts with identifying our greenhouse gas emissions today, which I hope to have completed for the next meeting.</p> <p>Bob: This is fantastic! Did you do this via some benchmarking?</p> <p>Elaine: Yes</p> <p>Bob: I have a question about item Roman I, number 1. What does it mean by "products?"</p> <p>Elaine: That refers to products we buy.</p> <p>Bob: This gives us cover to start getting into some strategies.</p> <p>Elaine: It creates the direction for staff to start thinking about things. It forces us to think this way.</p> <p>Bob: Motion to approve the Sustainability Policy.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the Sustainability Policy.</p>

	Josh: Second.	
Troll at Point Robinson	<p>Elaine: To recap, 10 troll sites are being chosen throughout Washington State. 8 sites are chosen. Point Robinson is one of the top contenders for the final selection. They need to know that you will approve it before they make a final decision. The artist likes the back forested area in among the trees and the nettles just above the campsites (on the bluff). We will not need Coast Guard approval, since this is on VPD property.</p> <p>Our responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site control –municipal public park, non-profit or private landowner • Responsible for providing free public access to site • Logistics support including organizing donation of recycled wood. We have been working with Dave Warren on that. • Rallying volunteers for the on-site build process. The VCA and Chamber are interested in partnering on this. • Provide liability insurance and maintenance support • Commits to raising \$25k as part of a matching grant from Scan Design Foundation (although that has been waved for us). <p>My only concern about Pt Robinson, and I know Eric has a huge concern about this, is parking and the neighbors. To me, that is the key consideration for approving this.</p> <p>Bob: There aren't many neighbors around there.</p> <p>Elaine: I just mean the increased tourist traffic. I certainly believe this will increase tourism to the island, which I think is a good thing for local business. I know people have mixed feelings about that. There is a gal from the Chamber Board working with us on this, and the Chamber is very excited about the increased tourism. But island citizens have mixed feelings. That's what I mean by the neighbors. Vashon is funny – I know so many people in Tacoma and Seattle who have never been to Vashon because the ferries are prohibitive. I don't know that we will have an onslaught of tourists.</p> <p>Hans: It is well set up for parking – the parking lot and gate are nowhere near the neighbors. If you lived there, you might be worried about people coming to the neighborhood, but it's a very popular park with a good parking lot and a good gate.</p> <p>Bob: What you're talking about is on a bluff.</p> <p>Elaine: I was thinking we should add some sort of barrier.</p> <p>Bob: I'm one of the neighbors. My neighbor has a corporate event site that brings a lot of traffic. There should be some neighborhood involvement.</p> <p>Doug: How many people are we talking about? It is true it is a popular park but not terribly over-crowded. It's a public area, and we're just adding one more public attraction to it. Do we get a say about the type of structure?</p> <p>Elaine: No. That is up to the artist. It's all about environmental stewardship. This particular theme is about salmon and orca recovery. That is the way the trolls will be designed.</p> <p>Bob: They are whimsical. There is nothing objectionable. The only complaints have been about the traffic. They are not permanent, right?</p> <p>Elaine: Right, they last as long as the community is willing to maintain them.</p> <p>Josh: Motion to approve the troll installation at Point Robinson Park.</p> <p>Doug: Second.</p>	Motion to approve the troll installation at Point Robinson Park.

Tramp Harbor Dock

Elaine: Last night, Bob, Josh and I met with 3 members of the community group to discuss the dock options. In summary, we discussed the following:

- 1) DNR got back to me with their final decision about the dock length. It cannot exceed the -18 mllw point, meaning we must remove the platform and the latter @ 20 feet of the walkway at minimum.
- 2) Dave Benham suggested we consider adding revenue generating features, such as:
 - a) Boat ramp
 - b) Overnight moorage via a floating lower dock (not allowed per the lease)
 - c) Bathroom and fish cleaning stations
 - d) Off street parking
 - e) Ramps or stairs to the beach (already one there)
 - f) Larger day use picnic areas
 - g) Covered area for classes or small gatherings
- 3) Discussed various grants and potential amounts: 2 with the State RCO (\$1/2 million each with 50% match); King County Historic Landmark grant (up to \$1 million; no details on match). Typically, grants do not cover engineering and permitting (10% of construction costs).
- 4) Discussed potential fundraising nonprofits: Sportsmen's Club; Audubon; Nature Center; Vashon Museum (if the Historic Landmark comes through). Dave: No – have it be about parks, so the messages don't get mixed. Just stick with our Foundation or do it ourselves.
- 5) Options decided upon:
 - a) Option 2 Pile Wrap (concrete is simply too expensive) – fix the first 180 feet and pile wrap the latter 140 feet with grating
 - b) If fundraising allows, Option 3 pile wrap – same as Option 2, but add a T on the end.
 - 6) Accept the land donation and buy the other property.

Next steps:

- Get a design. Have a contest amongst local architects to come up with something cool. Or bite the bullet and hire an architect/engineer to project manage this, so we know exactly the cost for fundraising. Design, permits, etc.
- Outline grant applications and likely awards.
- Organize a fundraising campaign – Foundation.

Bob: Many of those add-on ideas are impractical. There is no way you can have a boat ramp. Where are you going to park the boat trailer. We have to be realistic about this. The biggest problem we're going to have is parking, unless we have over-the-water parking. We want it to be attractive, but we can't do something that doesn't have a chance due to the practicality.

Elaine: The parcel to the south that the guy wants to sell to us allows for more parking. Dave had another interesting idea about the design. He suggested we hold a contest amongst all the local architects to do a design.

Hans: Your next steps sound good. What is the intent financially.

Elaine: I'll start with the grant applications and see if anything will cover an engineer. We really need that at this point.

Hans: That sounds great. We could move forward on initial design if we get grant support. And also the future construction grant window.

Vaccine Mandate

Elaine: After our special meeting last Tuesday, I announced to all staff that they must be vaccinated by November 1 unless they file with me a religious or medical exemption. I am quite certain that none of the four will get vaccinated. I expect one to file a medical exemption. Yesterday, I had a very interesting conversation with one who intends to file a religious exemption. This is where it gets really tricky.

Yesterday, I did a lot of research on this. The EEOC guidance concerning religious objections directs employers to provide a reasonable accommodation for employees with sincerely held religious beliefs that prevent an employee from taking a Covid-19 vaccine unless an accommodation poses an undue hardship to the employer. Before an employer balances a religious accommodation against the undue hardship to the workplace, the employer must first ascertain if the employee's religious objection is, indeed, a sincerely held belief. Employers should ordinarily assume that an employee's religious accommodation request is based on a sincerely held religious belief.

An exception to this assumption exists if an employer is aware of objective facts that question the sincerity of an employee's claimed belief. If those facts exist, the employer may request additional information to support the claimed exemption. With COVID, inaccurate information is being circulated that some people are using to claim a religious exemption. For example, some individuals have asserted their faith prohibits Covid-19 vaccination because the vaccines are composed of the cells of aborted fetuses. While this is not completely accurate, it is true that Johnson and Johnson used a replicated fetal cell line in the production of its vaccine, but Pfizer and Moderna did not. They did, however, use replicated fetal cell lines to test the effectiveness of their vaccines.

While this employee has not filed a written exemption yet, this is what we discussed. He intends to file it based on the fetal cell line use. Additional research I did on this particular subject indicates that fetal cell lines are commonly used in the pharmaceutical and biotech industries to test and create other vaccines and medications. Examples: chickenpox, rubella, hepatitis A, and rabies. Tylenol, Pepto Bismol, aspirin, tums, Ibuprofen, Ex-Lax, Tylenol cold and flu, Benadryl, Sudafed, acetaminophen, and many others.

Many organizations are requiring attestation that employees do not take these, either, to qualify for the medical exemption. Are we intending to go that route?

Bob: Sounds good to me.

Elaine: So if he says he has taken these, his exemption would not be approved. If he says no, we must approve the exemption. Assuming we allow this exemption, we must attempt to reasonably accommodate. We can to a certain extent with this employee. He works outside alone, for the most part. BUT, there are meetings and occasionally maintenance must work close together. Staff is not comfortable. Weekly testing is impractical and costly for us.

Hans: We don't have a testing protocol for someone not vaccinated?

Elaine: We discussed that at the last meeting. We decided it would be costly (we have to pay for it), time-consuming on company time, it isn't done on Vashon unless you have symptoms or exposed.

Doug: His fellow employees are uncomfortable?

Elaine: Yes. We can accommodate, but it can't participate in all maintenance activities.

Bob: How can that not be considered an undue burden on us?

Hans: If he requests a religious exemption, our options are to grant it on face value or require that he act in a manner consistent with his religious beliefs (like the attestation you presented). If he does, we accommodate and/or require testing. And if he can't attest, we overrule it. I would not advise going that direction.

Doug: It seems like a thin argument he is making. It sounds like many organizations are taking a tough line. Many religions are encouraging vaccinations, even those that have positions on the fetal cell issue – like the Catholic Church. I have heard many people claiming religious exemptions aren't even religious. They just claim something. Are

	<p>we obligated to accept their argument? Many organizations are not.</p> <p>Hans: We should be consistent with what organizations are doing. I was postulating that it isn't rational thinking here. What is our legal course for moving forward? It's not whether their reasoning is rational or thin. It's what is your likelihood of legal success? I don't know what being consistent with others looks like.</p> <p>Elaine: That's the problem I am having. It's all so new and all over the map. Many are requiring this attestation, and the religious exemption is thrown out.</p> <p>Bob: Two things: 1) is that -- it's a good move. We have to worry about the other employees quitting if they are uncomfortable being around this guy. If he attests that he doesn't take those other medications, we have to put him in a job where he isn't around them. I think the attesting is a good idea. 2) If he hasn't put any thought into this and is just stating that, then you give him the facts about these other medications, he may have a change of heart.</p> <p>Elaine: Okay – so, he has to attest. And if he says he does not take those medications, then we accommodate.</p> <p>Thanks – it feels better working through this as a team rather than me trying to wade through all this myself.</p> <p>Hans: Absolutely.</p> <p>Josh: I may not be here at the next meeting.</p> <p>Elaine: The only issue would be if we vote on the properties.</p> <p>Hans: There is currently no active motion.</p>	
<p>Adjourn 9:00 pm</p>	<p>Doug: Motion to Adjourn.</p> <p>Josh: Second</p> <p>Pass 4-0</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn; Pass 4-0</p>

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford