

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference, 7:00 pm
DATE: Tuesday, September 28, 2021

Commissioners attending: Hans Van Dusen, Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Abby Antonelis. Josh Henderson 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	
9.14.21 Minutes; 9.11.21 – 9.26.21 Preliminary Vouchers. August Vouchers	Doug: Motion to approve. Bob: Second. Pass 4-0	9.14.21 Minutes; 9.11.21 – 9.26.21 Preliminary Vouchers. August Vouchers. Pass 4-0
Seals Bubble Proposal	<p>Elaine: At the last meeting, we discussed the Seals Swim Team proposal regarding the bubble replacement. We both were tasked with presenting pool usage numbers to assist with your decision.</p> <p>Randy put spreadsheets together that report on number of <i>uses</i> – not individual users. That is how they track pool use. Theoretically, it could be 50 people coming every day all year. It can still be an apt comparison against how many Seals kids there are x number of rentals in a year.</p> <p>You wanted numbers from 2019 and 2021. Since 2021 isn't done yet, I am reporting on 2019 and 2020 -- 2020 being representative of a COVID year. Total Admissions, punch cards, aerobics and lessons for 2019 = 9410. For 2020 = 5396. This pretty much includes lap swimmers, since they often use punch cards. It's down nearly 43%. We do know number of unique lap swimmers from the reservation system – 498 unique users since July, 2020.</p> <p>Danielle: Number of unique numbers is from the fall, starting in September, then goes through summer, which ends in August. 2018 – 2019 was the last pre-COVID season = 94 unique swimmers. 2019 – 2020 includes the spring COVID = 65 unique swimmers. In 2021 it was 50. We just started the 2021 – 2022 season = 40 on the team. If you add it all up, it's 250, but some of those are repeat users. Obviously, we have had a decrease.</p> <p>Elaine: And typically it's 5 days a week?</p> <p>Danielle: Yes. We do take 2 – 3 week breaks between the sessions.</p> <p>Doug: How many unique lap swimmers did we have typically pre-Covid?</p> <p>Elaine: It can be between 100 – 200 on average per month. This is since COVID.</p>	

Doug: I am more interested in pre-COVID.

Elaine: We didn't have the reservation system pre-COVID, so I don't have those numbers.

Bob: I'm trying to remember why we wanted this. I remember Doug having a concern about how many users come from off island.

Doug: I would be interested in knowing that if you have it. The question is more if off-islanders are pushing on-islanders off because of the reservation system.

Elaine: I can ask, but my sense is there are very few off-islanders.

Bob: That was an issue at the beginning of COVID just because it was hard to find a place to swim. But I think that is not an issue now.

Doug: The reason I ask is that at the time, somebody felt that our pool was being better managed than off-island so was able to be open. Out of desperation, people were coming to Vashon.

Bob: That didn't last very long. Where are we with this?

Hans: There were three parts to the financial question: VPD investing in the bubble; whether we take on the full maintenance; and the rental rate for the Seals. The users show who benefits from this? Is it a significant benefit to VPD users vs the Seals. The commissioners last week wrestled with: a) how much benefit is there for the users, and how much we want to invest in that, and b) our overall capital concerns about big ticket items. Even Elaine said, yes, it's a great resource, but we are becoming increasingly challenged with the resources we have. I think it's good to consider this in our budget deliberations this year, in addition to fees and our capacity to take on more maintenance.

Doug: When we decided on the bubble in the first place, there was concern about whether or not it would be too expensive. We set benchmarks to see if we were exceeding. That benchmark has not been meaningful because of the interchange between the summer and winter seasons, but it's a reminder that we were concerned at the time. It is reasonable to look at whether or not we're getting something for the people of Vashon in terms of users. Is it large enough to justify the expense? I'm trying to remember the budget issue 7 years ago.

Elaine: The winter budget was not to exceed \$54k per year. For the years we were tracking that, it was less than that.

Doug: It wasn't a lot less. That is the background – there has been concern all along about the expense of the bubble.

Abby: I have the same concerns. Are the Seals proposing to split the costs every time it is replaced or just this one time?

Danielle: It would be our intent to share that going forward.

Abby: I have reservations about the proposal. It may be a benefit to the community, but it's a significant cost that we didn't plan on.

Bob: Can you be more specific?

Abby: It was a want from a specific group. They did the fundraising, but the Board was concerned about future costs. Now here we are. It feels like a "nice to have" thing.

Bob: So are baseball diamonds. There has always been a large group of swimmers who have wanted the pool covered. There was a bond measure that almost passed but not quite. The proposal from the Seals let us give it a try.

Abby: To me, that indicates not a majority of the tax payers wanted it.

Bob: It was a majority. It didn't meet the percent requirement.

Elaine: It probably was subject to the 60/40.

Bob: If the majority of islanders don't use it, yet the votes were that high in favor, they clearly understand the importance of that for the community.

	<p>Abby: Things have changed with the Hospital District that wasn't around when the bubble first came on. I am concerned about our financial forecasts. Once we do this, when will the expectation be that we cover the full cost? It will make us look bad if we don't pay for it.</p> <p>Danielle: We are a long way from projecting expectations 7 years down the road. We are simply talking about this proposal. A lot can change between now and then. The hesitation previously was whether or not it would be self-sustaining beyond just the Seals. We took on all the liability then and since year round. Now we have proven it works for the community. We are asking for a partnership to continue providing that part for the community. Our numbers are down – our membership is declining. If you won't partner, I don't know what that means for us to swim on Vashon going forward.</p> <p>Abby: I wouldn't be so hesitant if we had a better financial future.</p> <p>Hans: My hope is to revisit this in our 2022 budget discussions and also dial in the proposed maintenance piece.</p> <p>Doug: VPD is paying tens of thousands per year for the bubble as it stands. We have already born a considerable expense. It hasn't just been the Seals. If the Seals involvement is down, does that mean less revenue for VPD?</p> <p>Danielle: It's per hour – not number of swimmers.</p> <p>Hans: Our commitment at this point will be to get back to you around January.</p>	
<p>August Financial Report</p>	<p>Elaine:</p> <p>Admin – ahead \$34k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll ahead \$15k • Insurance ahead \$14k – actually went down this year <p>Maintenance – ahead \$44k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll ahead \$22k – no seasonal guys; distributed more than budgeted • Materials ahead \$7k – no topdressing at VES in April • Equipment rental over \$6k – more porta potties due to COVID • Outside Service ahead \$6k – no topdressing <p>Commons – ahead \$17k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$7k • Payroll ahead \$6k • Interlocal fee ahead \$19k due to only paying ½ for the May payment <p>Programs - ahead \$17k – we did have Sailing Camp; moving forward with Ski School and the Rec Guide.</p> <p>Pool – ahead \$56k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$17k • Payroll ahead \$65k • Supplies ahead \$8k <p>Pt Rob – ahead \$60k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue ahead \$23k • Payroll ahead \$21k <p>Fern Cove – ahead \$28k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue ahead \$15k • Payroll ahead \$12k <p>RFA – ahead \$4900 – just wasn't used other than the Latino swimming lessons paid for by the Episcopal Church</p>	

	<p>Debt Service – ahead \$6700 – the tractor lease was paid off sooner than I thought CIP – ahead \$122k due to projects we are holding off on Ending cash projection is looking like \$895k. Doug: Will the Chum Run happen again this year? Elaine: I would imagine so. It was actually early this year. He is also working on a movie partnership with the theater. He is trying to keep things going. It’s tough not knowing what will be allowed and when. The Ski School is challenging, because the contact now is in CA, and what happens if somebody tests positive on the bus? Lots of new variables.</p>	
<p>Board Votes</p>	<p>1) Bob: Motion to get a septic design and estimated cost to the point of submitting for the permit. Josh: Second Doug: What if we were to close the houses and save \$100k? Elaine: All of the revenue from the houses goes to the maintenance of Pt Rob. If we didn’t have that revenue, anything to do there would come straight out of levy dollars. Doug: In past years we have lost money at Pt Rob. Recently we had a discussion about not competing, and these clearly compete with other VRBOs and other rentals on Vashon. Elaine: If you go back to the financial report in terms of expenses at Pt Rob, operationally it is \$76k a year. And the revenue is \$126k. A lot of the expense goes toward the houses, but there is maintenance there. The whole lower property being Coast Guard and the lighthouse would come out of levy dollars. Hans: Sounds like we would lose a lot of money if we closed them. Doug: Are we under any obligation to the Coast Guard to keep those houses open? Elaine: No. The stipulation in the lease is that we are allowed to do what we do, but the revenue goes toward the maintenance of the property. Bob: The Coast Guard requires that we keep the property in operating condition. If we spend \$100k, but stop making revenue, we would never make the \$100k up. Even if the septic fix puts us behind next year, at least we have made a dent in it. Elaine: We still have to maintain the houses, even if they were empty. We have to paint them, etc. Hans: I read this as we take in \$126k, we spend \$76k to maintain. In the future, we’re going to spend \$100k on a 20 year drain field, so that’s \$5k a year. We take in \$126k, then, to cover \$81k in costs that year. It doesn’t strike me as prudent to close them and not fix the septic, aside from the benefit of having those nice rental houses available. Doug: That assumes those numbers are representative of an average year. We are doing well this year because of COVID. A couple years ago we were losing money on Pt Rob. Elaine: For the past few years it has been positive. It has been an upward trend for at least the last 4 – 5 years.</p> <p>2) Bob: Motion to approve the Sustainability Policy. Josh: Second Hans: I have two questions. One: In the procedure section, I wonder if we shouldn’t have an annual report on our progress. It basically says we’ll do good stuff. Second: In terms of outcomes, under general policy areas, regarding reducing our climate footprint – it doesn’t specifically call that out. It does in a broad way, but do we want a bullet that says to specifically reduce the footprint? Bob: It mentions it in II.3 – solar, wind, etc would be used. I see this as a starting point. The next step is to create some targets. Do we need something that directs us to do that, or do we assume that from the way this is written</p>	<p>Motion to get a septic design and estimated cost to the point of submitting for the permit. Pass 4-0</p> <p>Motion to approve the Sustainability Policy as amended. Pass 4-0</p>

	<p>and agree that the next step is to pick a few strategies? The next step is strategies. Do we need a statement in here that says we're going to do that?</p> <p>Hans: No. My first concern was whether or not we call out the Greenhouse Gas emissions footprint, but it sounds like you are comfortable with coming up with actions. My other concern was whether or not we want an annual check-in. Your focus is to bite off a few actions and move forward.</p> <p>Bob: We need a report, but we need to establish the goals first then report on them.</p> <p>Elaine: There will be a plan that spins off this. That is where the goals will be identified. If you want to specify reporting on those in a policy, that's fine – it can go either way.</p> <p>Hans: That's the second step – the report. First we identify the plan and the goals. Is that in here that we'll come up with a plan? Maybe that's it – under procedures, we'll say the District will establish a plan for actions and goals to be met.</p> <p>Elaine: That is a reasonable statement to make. It does say the Sustainability Program. I would interpret that as the plan. You can certainly add something about reporting back annually.</p> <p>Bob: You're saying it's already there. It sounds like we need a statement that we're going to create a plan.</p> <p>Hans: We can adopt this with the comfort that Elaine will come up with. So under Procedure there will be mention of a plan. And it will mention planned activities and targets.</p> <p>Motion to approve the Sustainability Policy as amended.</p> <p>Hans: Feel free to run the new language by Bob and I.</p> <p>3) Josh: Motion to approve the troll installation at Point Robinson Park.</p> <p>Doug: Second.</p> <p>Elaine: At the last meeting, we discussed the concern about parking and a potential onslaught of tourists flocking to Vashon. Eric was particularly concerned due to a story he read about a troll installation in Breckenridge, CO that was a huge problem for parking and increased tourism. I spoke with the representative I am working with (who also lives on Vashon). She is not overly concerned about those issues. The Breckenridge troll was one troll in a residential area, where the Vashon troll will be one of ten trolls spread out all over the State of Washington, from Pack Forest down by Mt Rainier up to Snohomish. There will be one in Nisqually, about 5 trolls in King Co (the first one by Discovery Park). People will not flock at one time to Pt Robinson. The ferry system will make sure that we are not invaded at one time, or that it will be a spur of the moment to go and see the Vashon troll.</p> <p>Doug: Breckinridge is a tourist spot, anyway.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the troll installation at Point Robinson Park.</p> <p>Pass 4-0</p>
<p>King County Offers – Surplus Property</p>	<p>Hans: Two meetings ago we voted in favor of accepting the County's offers 4-1 but without the necessary unanimous vote. Last meeting we had the motion to put them on the market, and we declined to vote on that motion. Subsequently, Greg got back to Elaine to say the County will pause on this. I propose we now take up a motion to accept their offers.</p> <p>Elaine: One of the key points made at the last meeting is you wanted to know if KC would accept us accepting just the Manzanita offer with a commitment on how they will steward it. You also wanted to know of the County's interest in considering it as part of a package or okay as a stand-alone. Greg said they do consider it a package and will not just accept taking Manzanita as a stand-alone.</p> <p>Hans: What do you mean by the package?</p> <p>Elaine: The Manzanita, tidelands, and Hitchings properties.</p>	

	<p>Greg Rabourn: To get the funding and go before the review committee, it was presented as the donation properties as well as the sale properties as a package deal. That is what we are operating under right now, because that is what our funders were presented with. The King County Council approved it, as well. That’s why it is a cohesive package.</p> <p>Hans: So that is different from what you said, Elaine. The package includes the donation properties. We decided not to put them on the open market, and I don’t think we would get a 5-0 on that motion, anyway. I propose we go back and vote to accept the offers we have on hand and add language that we also pursue productive partnership with the County on successful stewardship of the other park district properties, knowing we will have to get further down the road on what that looks like for those larger properties. It’s not exactly what Greg is describing – that we commit to the transfer of the larger properties. It’s more that we accept the offers that do not identify the larger properties. We could even do it as three separate offers for each offer. Accept the offers and pursue productive partnership on the large properties. Any thoughts on moving forward with that type of motion?</p> <p>Doug: I appreciate the suggestion, Hans, but it looks like it’s being done on arrival of what Greg just said. They are not interested in an arrangement like that.</p> <p>Hans: We can’t predict that. We would take the motion, and the ball would be in their court.</p> <p>Greg: You just said what I was going to say. The language in the purchase and sale agreements to you did not have the contingency that included the transfer of the other properties. Right now, you are operating on the spired offer that would require an extension that both parties agree to. That gives us room to discuss next steps if you move forward to accepting the offer. We can work on the other parts of the deal as we move forward.</p> <p>Hans: Yes, we don’t know what the outcome of accepting the KC offer will be. We are not explicitly saying today that we are ready to sign over the big properties. My motion indicates the intent to discuss those other opportunities of stewardship for those properties. Neither us or Greg knows the outcome to that, but it keeps this moving forward. This is all consistent with our original mission of pursuing opportunities for revenue given our financial situation. I move we accept the County’s offers for the three properties, and we pursue opportunities to partner with KC on successful stewardship of some other VPD properties.</p> <p>Bob: Second.</p>	<p>Motion to accept the County’s offers for the three properties, and we pursue opportunities to partner with KC on successful stewardship of some other VPD properties.</p>
<p>Interlocal Meeting - VISD</p>	<p>Elaine: The Interlocal Agreement with the School District requires us to have one meeting a year. We did not have a meeting last year due to COVID, but we feel we should do it this year. Really, the only thing at this point that we need to discuss is renewing the present agreement, which expires June 30, 2022. We should discuss any potential changes or the \$75k fee. The committee would consist of Hans as the Board Chair, me, Shawn Gateman (although not required but can speak to sport group issues), one user group member, and one at-large member appointed by the Board Chairs. Darragh has been the user group member. I will forward the meeting options. Any other topics to discuss?</p> <p>Bob: The fee is always the big one.</p> <p>Hans: And what is included in the fee.</p> <p>Elaine: When we evaluated it last time, it was quite an ordeal.</p> <p>Hans: It would be good to prepare what goes into the fee number.</p> <p>Elaine: I can bring that report to the meeting.</p> <p>Doug: What is the precedent for having an agreement at all? Is this typical of park districts?</p> <p>Elaine: Yes. It is very common.</p> <p>Doug: What if there isn’t a park district?</p> <p>Elaine: City parks and city schools are common.</p>	

	<p>Doug: If there isn't a park district, do they just not offer those services? And what did Vashon do before there was a park district? There were programs. We are being forced to adopt an increasingly stringent budget, and some of these things seem like good ideas before. We need to think about what we can afford to do. Are there others that are more generously funded that can take some of the burden off of us? I think it used to be KC until local park districts could do these things instead. I would like to revisit that. What can we do about it? If they are going to treat our budget the way they are treating it, we need answers to that.</p> <p>Bob: I was on the committee last time and studied interlocal agreements all over the place. The Interlocal agreements are important, because they are the rule book on how we play together. There wasn't a single one where funds changed hands. I brought that up, and it was laughed off. If we don't pay them, they will take their ball and go home.</p> <p>Doug: In other words, they would allow these programs to disappear.</p> <p>Bob: It is unusual for money to change hands. All we are doing is scheduling their facilities.</p> <p>Doug: There must be some places that don't have a park district at all. Do they just not have programs for these kids? Or do the schools fund them?</p> <p>Hans: What you're describing, Bob, is that the rental is between the school district and the user.</p> <p>Elaine: The school district has said it is not part of their mission to provide recreation services. They are not interested in taking over the responsibility of renting their facilities to the public in the way that we do for them. So it would go away.</p> <p>Hans: We don't have a community center or gyms, so we have an arrangement to provide that through the school district for that programming. That is how we're pursuing it – by renting it from the school district on behalf of the taxpayers. If we want to cut back on that programming and send the taxpayers elsewhere, that is something we would have to take on.</p> <p>Elaine: I will look into the history of the Interlocal Agreement before and report back on that.</p>	Action Item
Tramp Harbor Dock	<p>Elaine: At the last meeting, we discussed next steps as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting a design by just biting the bullet and hiring an architect/engineer, so we know exactly what we are dealing with in terms of cost for fundraising and being prepared to apply for grants. • Organize a fundraising campaign through the Foundation. <p>As far as the Foundation goes, I met with Barb McMahon today, who has volunteered to take over getting the Foundation up and running. We discussed the Tramp Harbor Dock being a top priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline grant applications and likely awards. <p>The best options are those through the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office. There are three available that would pertain to the dock, all with \$500k limits and require a 50% match, meaning a \$500k grant means we also pay \$500k. I was told some time ago by a grant administrator there that a second grant can serve as the match for another, so I believe that would mean \$1 million in grants, and we pay \$500k. I have a phone appointment to confirm on Thursday.</p> <p>The bad news is they are on a reimbursement basis, meaning we have to pay the whole things out of pocket in advance. I will also be asking if there is any room for installment reimbursements along the way.</p> <p>All three open end of February/first of March, 2022 with applications due around 5/1. I strongly question if we will be ready. We must have match funding in place by August, 2022.</p> <p>The awards are June, 2023. We would have 2 – 3 years to complete the project.</p>	

It appears that A&E costs are reimbursable and cannot exceed 20% of the total project cost. KPFF said A&E is generally 10%.

One grant allows for acquisition and development, so it is possible we can build the purchase of the south property for \$50,000 into that grant.

A couple members of the community group asked about grants through the KC Historic Landmark Preservation process. First, then, it must be designated as an official KC Historic Preservation Landmark. The dock would likely qualify, but the grants only amount to \$30,000, no match. Can be used for A&E design.

Going on right now is a King County Parks Capital grant, but we are in no way ready. Don't know if it will be available in the future. \$500k + 50% match.

I will ask if A&E can be done now and reimbursed in an RCO grant. It is really important for fundraising and planning that we have a design now.

The RCO grants run every 2 years. The lease requires that we complete the project in 12 years. A big issue is how the community would feel about having the dock closed for at least another 2 years. But how do we feel about starting this in February, 2022 and having funding in place by August? Personally, I have big doubts.

Hans: It sounds like there are two options: starting it in February and waiting 2 years later. We should capture that in a memo that lays out both timelines, so we can have a conversation with the community about that.

Elaine: The fundraising would have to happen through the Foundation, and the Foundation is nowhere near ready to go.

Doug: \$500k is an enormous amount of money. What about a bond issue?

Elaine: It can serve as a match.

Doug: We wouldn't know the results of a bond issue, because we haven't even talked about that.

Hans: That would fit in the 2nd timeline. We could align the bond with the grant application around May, 2024, because we only want the bond if we get the grant. Maybe a pool/dock things. So that is a third option. Fundraising for a May, 2022 application, or May, 2024 application, and then an alternative scenario for May, 2024 where we ask the voters for the match.

Elaine: I will put a memo out to you first after I speak to the grant manager outlining these options plus updates from her.

Hans: So on the design, we talked about whether we can get a grant for that. You were wondering if this could apply to a future grant, but not as a stand-alone grant. You don't think there is a stand-alone grant for the design?

Elaine: The Historic Preservation grant for \$30k would apply, but that wouldn't take us very far if A&E will be \$150k. Another hiccup with that is that RCO doesn't allow for historic properties. The short answer is no, I am not finding any stand alone grants for A&E.

Hans: That becomes tricky. There is no way to fund that outside of our own budget. The only possibility is to find out if we would be paid back in the future. Unless we find a better way to fund that, we must decide if we have enough interest to move forward paying for that. You're in no particular cycle for meeting with the community group?

Elaine: We just had that one meeting – no schedule. I have had a number of emails with one member who has a lot of ideas about adding things – concession stands, boat moorage. I do have ongoing conversations with DNR. She is still considering the length issue. This came from that guy from the community who contacted her and said they are wrong about the dock length. I may have new information in the near future.

Hans: That doesn't change much for us. The question we have to ask ourselves is if we want to spend \$100k on design next year, unless there is a different approach for that. The community should know what's in front of us. We

Action Item

Action Item

	<p>might be pessimistic about putting something together for May 1, 2022 or if we wait until 2024. Regardless, there won't be a new dock for 3 – 6 years. Before the board is whether we spend our own \$100k next year. There is a risk the Board would vote against that; then we have a tear down issue. The community group should know that. That is the near term urgent problem. None of the pie in the sky stuff is relevant.</p> <p>Bob: Talk about boat ramps, etc just slows things down. It doesn't accomplish anything.</p> <p>Elaine: I think an informational note to the broader group would be the next step.</p> <p>Hans: Hopefully some good feedback or help comes out of that.</p>	
<p>Ivy Remediation - Wingehaven</p>	<p>Elaine: We discussed moving forward with addressing ivy remediation at Wingehaven this year at one of our recent board meetings. You may recall that Karen had costed this out with a contractor some time back, which resulted in establishing a budget of \$30,000. I have been exploring how to approach this with Abel Eckhardt of the Land Trust and with a representative of EarthCorps, since they do this all the time, and I have no idea how to scope this out. I have also been exploring additional funding. Abel turned me on to a King County group called the Healthy Land Project, and they are likely going to put in an additional \$10k. I also reached out to the King Conservation District, and they are likely going to put in an additional \$17k, as long as the project gets underway by February. So... I am working on getting the King County approved contractors on our small works roster, so I can start the bid process within the next 30 days. None of this is finalized, but we will likely have a total of \$57k to work with, which I hope would achieve at least an 85% reduction in the ivy there. I was there yesterday – it's like 90% ivy.</p> <p>Hans: Is your feedback from Abel that \$57k is the right amount of money?</p> <p>Elaine: The feedback from the HELP folks is that a typical project like that is around \$30k, which confirms what Karen came up with. But that's usually a first run sweep. This has been a good educational process for me for future projects.</p> <p>Abby: How is Ober coming?</p> <p>Elaine: Right on schedule, but the rains are becoming troublesome. We hope to have the equipment installed next week, but it is weather dependent. The architect has been super involved.</p> <p>Doug: When will it be done?</p> <p>Elaine: Optimistically, end of October.</p>	
<p>Adjourn 8:30 pm</p>	<p>Bob: Motion to adjourn Abby: Second Pass 4-0</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn; Pass 4-0</p>

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford