

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference, 7:00 pm
DATE: Tuesday, May 11, 2021

Commissioners attending: Hans Van Dusen, Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Josh Henderson. Abby Antonelis 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	
4.27.20 Minutes; 4.24.21 – 5.10.21 Preliminary Vouchers	Josh: Motion to approve. Doug: Second Pass 4-0	Motion to approve the 4.27.20 Minutes; 4.24.21 – 5.10.21 Preliminary Vouchers Pass 4-0
Board Vote	Board Vote: Bob: Motion to approve the amendment to the Ober Park architect for \$2540 Josh: Second Pass 4-0	Motion to approve the amendment to the Ober Park architect for \$2540 Pass 4-0
Financial Projections 2021 - 2024	Elaine: As we discussed at the last meeting, due to having been pro-rated \$175k this year, projections indicate that continuing on with our current level of spending will result in a catastrophic financial situation by 2024 where reserves will be depleted to \$200k (under our \$400k requirement), and we will be borrowing on a TAN again. It was clear that it was a downward spiral with each succeeding year. The assumptions were that our levy rate would be 45 cents including one new levy run at 45 cents; we would move forward with our capital spending planned for 2021 and 2022 but no capital projects going forward; \$75k recreation programming; inflation and wage increases at 3%; a \$75k interlocal fee; one user fee increase during the four years.	

We discussed areas of adjustment, which I updated in the attached projections. New assumptions include:

- 2.5% inflation and wage increases;
- user fee increases of 5% every year;
- an interlocal fee of \$75k (although this should be challenged);
- just over \$50k recreation programming (includes BARC wages) where we would continue with Concerts in the Park and one recreation guide, but all other programming would pay for itself; that is pretty much what we are doing now. The \$75k is to increase programming – more events, but we have been unable to do events.
- cutting the pool to 4 days per week during the fall/winter/spring (currently doing under COVID), and 5 days per week summer. Randy feels this would work with lap swim and some of the higher yield activities (like family rentals). Not as much open swim during the week.
- Not replacing the Operations Coordinator position until 2022 (Eric is okay with this as long as recreation programming expectations are as described in this cut back; more pressure to do programming squeezes him relative to lodging). At that, we may consider the position part time going forward if rec programming is reduced in this way.
- Cutting 1 staff member (likely maintenance).

This results in a give of \$400k for capital projects over and above those planned for 2021 and 2022.

Remember, we will receive a nice sum for surplus properties being accepted by King County where we asked for \$500k. I am continuing to work with them on this – currently they are looking at assessed market values. My sense is they will offer in the neighborhood of \$300k. This gives us \$700k for capital projects given these cutback recommendations I am presenting. Either way, it is less than our capital projects dictate, but we can make a substantial dent, depending upon grants and how the Tramp Harbor Dock shakes out. We need that kind of buffer to address capital projects.

I also want to address Hans's input from the last meeting.

1) Hans asked *if we adopted the 2021 budget prior to final action by other local districts?* – Yes. But remember, we discuss actual and forecast in our financial reports, so the forecast is true to reality.

And now we are reviewing potential under-spending options for that adopted budget based on pro-rationing? Is that correct? I would characterize this as reviewing current *over-spending* for that adopted budget because of pro-rationing.

2) *2022-24 assumptions*

- *COLA and Inflation* - Yes 3% seems high relative to recent local inflation and public sector wage increases. Yes, this is adjusted to 2.5%.

- *Fees* - Yes reasonable to include fee increases. That is accounted for at 5% every year.

- *2024 levy revenue* - I am prepared to ask for, and believe voters could approve, a slightly higher rate for 2024-2027, if needed. Also long-term vashon real estate suggests strong 'reset' on property values might be a higher boost. Yes, this would be great if there is room, but all indications are that there will not be. We will be in trouble as it is in the 50 cent gap if Roads, Library, and Best Starts go through. We go back to the \$5.90 in January, 2027. We know that will be tight if we can't get that corrected again. I don't think we can

count on any help from the County accommodating a higher rate.

3) 2021 Adjustments - I support some underspending.

- Labor - I'd like to see us add staff asap, and not delay or delay full-time. I believe we are understaffed and this impacts our ability to deliver on our strategic plan, CIP, programming, outreach, and could impact current staff retention. (And recruit beyond Beachcomber as needed.)

We are stretched in certain areas – lodging and rec programming (meaning, Eric). But if the pressure is off in rec programming, he can manage both on his own. As it is, there is not enough for the Operations Coordinator to do full time due to limited activities from COVID. And maintenance has its issues – one in particular. In September to get us through the summer. Leaving in a year anyway; terrible attitude; unproductive; least skilled. More of a detriment than a help. Shawn thinks we can do it.

- Programming - OK to reduce some, but I'd like to provide ratepayers some of planned additional programming later this year. We are providing what we have in the past, just nothing new. Something has to give! Our big buckets are rec programming (including the pool), CIP, and staff.

- CIP - If we have CIP management capacity, I support delivery on some of our 2021 projects in 2021. Delaying to 2022 does not necessarily improve our 2021-2023 financials.

These projections assume all CIP planned for 2021 and 2022 are addressed in 2021 and 2022.

- Communication - I support a monthly VPD eletter to broad constituents. I support May update with update 2021 prorating impacts, adjustments, and also summer programs available to ratepayers.

I agree, but only after we decide the broader plan. The community needs to know the impact from pro-rationing.

Doug: As I understand the pro-rationing thing, it doesn't apply to 2021. It applies for a few years, then it stops again. During those intermediate years, we are reduced, and as the years progress, we get less. Basically, after this year, we are back to the same situation as we were before the other local taxing districts did their thing. And after 5 years, we are back in it again. Is that right?

Elaine: The \$175k pro-rationing and property value reduction is affecting us in 2021. That's a big hit! It's not something we can recoup. Even if we go back to 45 cents, as you know, it's still tight. If we had not been pro-rationed this year, it would have been tight, but doable. Our 52 cent ask accommodated all the capital projects. We knew that at 45 cents, we could not do a lot of the projects. So this \$175k hit really hits operations.

Doug: From a PR perspective, people will say they knew we had this problem with the other taxing districts, but now that has been fixed. So now you're telling us we still have this problem. It may be hard to explain.

Elaine: That could be true, but it doesn't change the simple reality that we got kicked \$175k. There is no way to recoup that. We already know we can't do all the capital projects. That \$175k hits us in operations. We can't get ahead of that.

Bob: And we'll be getting the full 45 in subsequent years after 2021? Or will we continue to be pro-rationed? That 50 cent gap is quickly filling up, as well.

Elaine: We don't know. All indications are that, if the three KC levy increases hit, we will pro-rationed to 39 cents if all three go through – even in the 50 cent gap. You can think of this as another protective measure just in case. But that isn't the assumption – the assumption is that our 45 cent rate will be protected. There is a great risk that we will be

pro-rationed again. We did hear back from McDermott. There is no protection there for us right now, and I am not getting the sense that we will be protected.

Josh: You said you anticipated the County would offer us \$300k for the surplus properties rather than the \$500k. What motivates you to say that?

Elaine: The KC point person on this program lives on Vashon and is actually a friend. It's a shoot-from-the-hip sense I have gotten in discussing this with him. They must go by assessed values, and they have hired assessors to do this work. That's not to say we can't reject it and insist on the \$500k, but they could decide not to move forward.

Josh: We can counter offer again.

Elaine: We can certainly try. FYI, there was a motion made some time ago that all sale of surplus properties will go toward CIP. You always have the option to reverse that and put it to operations.

Josh: You also said you would recommend eliminating a maintenance position in September. Why not right now?

Elaine: To get us through summer – our busiest season. We ordinarily bring in 2 seasonal in summer, and we have one scheduled now.

Doug: The reason we adopted the motion to put sale of surplus properties to CIP is that it is a one-time event. We can't do that year after year to support operations. It would not be sustainable to put it to operations.

Hans: And the sale of surplus property is not included in these projections?

Elaine: Correct.

Hans: So, the original 2021 budget did not reflect the \$175k reduction, and you are asking us to make adjustments to the budget to account for that reduction. In 2023, you show a reserve of \$795k, which reflects the extra \$400k you have made available over and above the required \$400k reserve. And this would be available for capital projects in 2023 or 2024 – whenever we chose to do it. So we would buy down operations to preserve more for capital in the future. I am not completely willing to sacrifice 2021 – 2023 for money in the bank in 2024 when we would have the opportunity to pass a new levy. Yes, there is risk from the county measures, but I am not so pessimistic that the county will not help us. We don't know the outcome of that, for sure. We have the potential revenue of the land sale. My concern is that we are putting a lot of money in the bank for 2024 when we could have a new levy and for capital in 2023 when we might also have additional revenue for that. We are going to sacrifice delivering programs for our taxpayers. Programs is sacrificing from \$75k down to \$50k, whether we have ½ a year with a ½ time person or not. Neither of those are significant. Our opportunity to deliver programs will change COVID-wise over the course of this year. I think we can deliver more if we have more staff.

Bob: When does this current legislative bill come to an end?

Elaine: End of 2026.

Bob: To a certain extent we're putting money in the bank for when that hits. If it's not renewed, we're in trouble.

Hans: I don't favor putting the ratepayers' money in the bank due to that uncertainty.

Elaine: But remember, this isn't saving for a rainy day. This is the reality of what has happened from the \$175k hit. It's dragging us down every year, and then we're in trouble in 2023. We'll be below \$400k in our reserves in 2023 alone.

Hans: You list it as \$800,000.

Elaine: No! That \$800k is due to the adjustments I am recommending! If we don't make these adjustments, we're in trouble! Referring back to the last meeting, those projections were carrying on as per usual with our current operations.

Hans: Nobody suggested that. It's really only about this \$400,000 – the excess we have in 2023. What we're going to

spend it on. What we're going to add back in. We're going to retain a lot for the bank in 2024, whether we're going to spend it on capital along with the additional revenue we get in. We're really just talking about 2021. It's good to have a healthy discussion and make decisions about 2021 and beyond based on future cash flow projections, but we're certainly going to revisit this in December, regardless, when we do the 2022 budget. So this is just about adjustments for this year. Of the reserves that we have, \$100k at this point this year; \$324k at the end of next year; \$395k at the end of 2023. So it's about whether we spend any of that on programming and staff in 2021, really. What do you have for programming in 2022?

Elaine: Just over \$50k every year.

Hans: What does the rec guide cost?

Elaine: About \$5k per.

Hans: Do we spend a combined \$100k on additional programming and staffing – some combination. Of that \$400k.

Elaine: So your sense is that I should go back and add more to programming and staffing?

Hans: That's just me. Move forward on a ½ FTE that might expand in the future and include additional programming for the second ½ of this year. I don't think that has downstream impacts, like you have the position there in 2022. If we choose to hire the person now, that has negative cash flow impact on us outside of this year's spending on that position, because it is already budgeted for 2022. Likewise, the programming decision we can make monthly. We can adopt it here as budgeted. That's the decision for 2021. I think we can afford it.

Bob: What you're saying is that we should go ahead and spend up to the \$400k reserve.

Hans: It might be less than that for the remaining 6 months of this year, actually.

Bob: You think we should not be putting money in the bank. Not cutting back to the extent that we have reserves this high. Provide programs and worry about later later.

Hans: I wouldn't characterize my view as not worrying about later now, but in my view of later, I feel that is prudent.

Bob: Remind me, Elaine, what the yearend cash amounts were using the previous assumptions you made based on current spending levels.

Hans: I'm not suggesting that and none of us are.

Bob: That's the other end of the spectrum – hold to the \$400k reserve requirement.

Josh: It would be helpful for me to know what we're going to get for the rest of 2021 if we restore programming. What is the taxpayer going to get?

Elaine: In recreation programming, what we budgeted for with the assumption that everything was going to be fine outside COVID – back to normal operations – ski school, BARC staffed and with camps, sailing camp, concerts in the park, several community events in the neighborhood of \$10k - \$15k each, movies in the park. With the cuts I am suggesting in this discussion, it would cut back BARC staffing some, maintain ski school and sailing camp, concerts in the park, one recreation guide (not two).

To answer your question, Bob, the end of 2024 under normal operations would be \$296k, but we're completely out of money in September of that year. We would need a TAN. 2021 reserve would be \$750k; 2022 \$414k; 2023 \$334k, 2024 \$296k.

Bob: Maybe we should take another approach that keeps us out of the TAN trouble.

Hans: To reiterate, nobody is endorsing that end of the spectrum. We changed a number of assumptions – 8, 10 assumptions. I'm just talking about two of them. Nobody is talking about going below the reserves on any of these years. There are questions about how we will handle impacts from the county, how we will handle our levy rate in 2024.

Action Item

	<p>Bob: Are you suggesting we just stay where we are here and look at it on a year to year basis?</p> <p>Hans: I said that. We will look at it year to year – adopt a budget every year. Our only real question of significance is how we want to adjust the 2021 budget – what guidance we want to give the Executive Director to reduce the 2021 budget. She will reduce the 2021 budget from what we adopted in December, and we’re just providing some guidance on how much and in what way she reduces it. Even my suggestions reduce the 2021 budget, and for sure in December, by requirement, we will adopt the 2022 budget as we’re looking at cash flow for the years ahead. It’s all helpful to look at, but we’re just making decisions for the next 7 months. On the maintenance position, my thought is that if you feel you can be more efficient in the fall with maintenance at reduced staff, absolutely look at those efficiencies. It’s in your court how you do that. Also, in the landscape of that, will it be challenging to reduce a maintenance position and add the Operations Coordinator at the same time?</p> <p>Elaine: We talked about that. The optics don’t look so good. However, it’s justifiable, because they are two different areas – two different focuses.</p> <p>Hans: So we’re really just talking about what month that Operations Coordinator happens.</p> <p>Elaine: I did assume for 2022 going forward, that Operations Coordinator position would be full time.</p> <p>Hans: I think that’s a good assumption. We’ll review for 2022, but if you hire early as part time, because you think it’s a good idea, then you will say this is what I have for you now, and it might turn into a full time position pending Board decision.</p> <p>Elaine: What are thoughts about the pool schedule? Currently, the schedule is the COVID reality. But as things pick up, that’s a pretty big chunk of change.</p> <p>Hans: We should review that again in a few months.</p> <p>Elaine: That’s reasonable. Wait and see.</p> <p>Hans: Does anyone think we should adopt a revised budget? It’s fine for the ED to underspend consistent with what we propose. I’m not so sure we need to adopt a revised budget, because she’s just proposing to underspend in certain areas.</p> <p>Elaine: I don’t feel I need an official budget revision.</p> <p>Bob: As far as the pool is concerned, I think we need to wait until COVID comes to an end. It won’t happen until fall anyway. The current reduced schedule seems to be satisfying everyone.</p> <p>Josh: Are you able to put into dollars how much revenue the District lost as a result of the pandemic?</p> <p>Elaine: Not at my fingertips, but I can certainly get that.</p> <p>Josh: I wonder if we might be eligible for relief from the American Rescue Plan. The County has been eligible.</p> <p>Elaine: I will look into it.</p> <p>Doug: Don’t forget that our revenues are down, but our costs are down, too. It could be a hard argument to make.</p> <p>Hans: There are billions available for shovel ready capital in that thing. Maybe your association of parks can advise. They’re looking to write a lot of checks.</p>	Action Item
<p>Commissioner Code of Conduct Policy</p>	<p>Elaine: I looked at three different code of conduct policies and incorporated them according to common expectations then added the “violation consequences” section as we discussed.</p> <p>Bob’s additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Several of the other documents included policies covering an elected official’s use of district facilities and equipment for their own personal financial gain. Words to the effect that ‘no official shall request permit or use district vehicles, equipment, materials or facilities for personal use or profit.’” Yes, this would be appropriate to add. 	

	<p>2. “Another that I saw prohibits recording of private conversations. Important in our case?” Given that it is illegal in Washington State to record a conversation without the other party’s consent, this might be redundant. The first point (a) states that “Board members shall conduct themselves in accordance with all laws,” so it is covered there.</p> <p>Bob: I agree with you. It is not necessary.</p> <p>3. “One agency went to great lengths to prohibit exercising of undue influence over others for personal gain, preferential treatment, or to cause other elected officials or employees to deviate from acceptable behavior, among other prohibitions.” Yes, this would be good to add.</p> <p>Doug: What would be an example of what would fall under this?</p> <p>Bob: It is addressing a heavy-handed commissioner, exerting influence, throwing one’s weight around.</p> <p>Doug: It sounds like politics. Somebody might have a particular project they favor. Now they might benefit from it emotionally. So that would be improper? It’s not illegal. It doesn’t seem like the kind of thing we should prohibit.</p> <p>Elaine: If it’s in there as a protective measure, the violations page states the board would make a decision about whether or not they feel it is inappropriate. I think Bob’s point is to have it in there to be identified as potential problem.</p> <p>Doug: But if it’s in there, it could be used against somebody inappropriately. Particularly because it’s so vague. It’s more a theoretical problem than an actual problem. It could arise in a negative way. I don’t see the need for it.</p> <p>Bob: It’s just something I picked up in another policy. It may not apply to a park district board of commissioners.</p> <p>Josh: I could see it characterized in a number of different ways. It seems like a rule against being a jerk. I think we are fairly nimble to where we could discuss it if it is a problem.</p> <p>Bob: Fine with me if we exclude it.</p> <p>4. “I had a hard time understanding the first sentence of the paragraph (third from the end) that describes the makeup of the Ethics Committee. Are you saying that once the committee is formed, its members or the General Counsel will decide whether or not it’s appropriate for the committee to be advised by the District’s General Counsel or another outside counsel? Seems a bit circular. Maybe it would be sufficient to just state that the committee can bring in counsel for advice if it’s deemed by the committee to be appropriate.” Your simplified language here makes more sense.</p> <p>Bob: It is less circular.</p> <p>Elaine: I can make those adjustments and bring this back to the next meeting, or you can approve as amended.</p> <p>Hans: Just bring it back, so it is easier to see.</p>	
<p>Alcohol Policy</p>	<p>Elaine: There is a need for this due to an increase in outdoor weddings in parks, likely due to COVID, but it likely is just getting to be a thing. Outdoor parks like Lisabeula where there is public around. It is easier to manage at Point Robinson, since we have weddings in the meadow or houses, and at Fern Cove. I took this policy from several other different park districts. It’s pretty standard. It is what we do for weddings at the lodging facilities, anyway, but this solidifies it. It can be sent to people for standard procedure.</p> <p>Hans: There is not one now?</p> <p>Elaine: No. But we should have one. We inherited weddings with alcohol from past process, but I feel we should formalize it in a policy.</p> <p>Hans: Are there any elements you wrestled with?</p> <p>Elaine: No, it’s pretty standard.</p> <p>Doug: The way I read it, they come to us, they get permission. Then they go to the Liquor and Cannabis Control Board</p>	

	<p>to get permission. They need both permissions. It may take more time than they realize. What happens if they get permission from us, then they forget to go to the Liquor and Cannabis Board? Then they have the event. Are we liable in some way? Are we liable in any event if something goes wrong?</p> <p>Elaine: They have to have all of that paperwork in to us 7 business days before the event. They can't have the event if we don't have the proper paperwork in place.</p> <p>Doug: Much of it they have to do themselves. They have to get the right alcohol – no whiskey. What if they don't? Are we on the hook for that?</p> <p>Josh: Would we have a responsibility to do any enforcement, since we have site control? Does somebody need to go by and make sure they are following the rules?</p> <p>Elaine: They are supposed to have an event coordinator who must be onsite ensuring compliance. That is in the policy.</p> <p>Bob: Is there a document they sign that has hold harmless language in there?</p> <p>Elaine: Absolutely.</p> <p>Bob: Well, that's what covers us, if we are held harmless by the renters.</p> <p>Elaine: We have hold harmless language in all our facility rental documents.</p> <p>Doug: If that is the case, if they serve whiskey, it isn't our issue.</p> <p>Elaine: We can't be at every activity policing things. You can extend that to all our rentals.</p> <p>Doug: I move we adopt the policy as presented.</p> <p>Bob: Second.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the Alcohol Policy.</p>
<p>Staff Reports</p>	<p><u>Best Starts for Kids Levy</u></p> <p>Elaine: McDermott got back to us. This is what he said: "To answer your question about whether the Parks and Recreation District is protected from prorating within the next iteration of Best Starts for Kids, I am seeking legal opinion on the ballot measure legislation and next steps will depend on those answers. As with any of the special districts named in the legislation, any funds made available to offset prorating must align with Best Starts for Kids goals.</p> <p>However, at this point it doesn't appear that any junior taxing district is expected to experience prorating as a result of Best Starts for Kids. The most recent analysis by the Office of Economic and Financial Analysis (OEFA) from March forecasts that no junior taxing districts are expected to experience prorating, and that analysis didn't consider the additional protection provided by HB 1034."</p> <p>This is true but does not consider the impact of Roads and Library lid lifts. We know Roads is coming in August, and Library is inevitable.</p> <p><u>Ober Park Playground Layout</u></p> <p>Elaine: We are still awaiting costs, but we came up with the attached as a means of cutting costs – rather than placing three pods around the playground, we would have all the exercise equipment in the present toddler section. As a result, we eliminate the need for concrete curbing. Too, the pod layout surrounding the playground presented challenges with the memorial trees. The committee agreed to this. The other option was to lay out the exercise equipment in three pods throughout the playground. Remember, we are looking for cost reductions to make way for adding drainage throughout.</p> <p>Hans: Who is on the playground committee? They are still active?</p> <p>Elaine: Karen was. Abby, members of the Senior Center, Bob Horsley – retired architect and former commissioner.</p>	

Hans: There are no parents with young kids other than Abby?

Elaine: No.

Doug: Is there a tradeoff with this proposed change? Are we giving something up?

Elaine: No. The idea was so adults and members of the ADA community could be active while kids play.

Hans: Was there a broader contributing entity before when selections and decisions were made?

Elaine: Oh, yes – huge. One of the reasons for the board vote for the amendment at the start of the meeting was due to the increased architect costs from the community survey we did. We couldn't do the planned public meetings due to COVID so did the survey instead for equipment selection. It was a great response – promoted through the school district and facebook.

Hans: There isn't a universe of 20 – 30 people that were involved earlier that we can give updates to?

Elaine: No.

Hans: It is a little bit of a risk that people will be surprised. But the survey was good.

Tramp Harbor Dock

Elaine: Hans, Josh, and I met with members of the Tribal council and DNR in a Zoom meeting. We discussed options for maintaining the present length, whether that be through pile wrapping the existing pilings, replacing with concrete pilings, and a floating dock. My sense is that the dock length, including a floating dock, will not be approved. Floating dock still presents interference with the geoduck tract due to the need for pilings or anchors. They insist on there being no interference from harvesting. Their primary concern was safety. Too, future leases will require a fee for any disturbance (they will let us know how much). The attached picture shows the geoduck tract in gray. We would lose the platform and estimated 60 – 80 feet in length. They will likely make us remove that.

Next steps:

- 1) VPD -- attempt to provide information on Quakewrap with heavy science proving 100% guarantee of no leaching with a proven success rate. How deep would excavation be into the substrait. 100% guarantee of no epoxy leaching. They could not find a pile wrap organization that could provide this information. When I have spoken with Quakewrap, they said that kind of information isn't available.
- 2) DNR – will look into Quakewrap, as well. They strongly prefer a floating dock if anything.
- 3) VPD – in survey, find out the percent of tidelands affected by the geoduck tract.

They said the likely option would be to allow the pier to go out -18 points mean to zero tide, or “zero tide is 18 feet deep.”

Hans: It's the line between the green and the gray on the right. The geoduck tract starts at 18 feet below mean low tide. It effectively cuts it off on the capital letter A of SOAL.

Bob: So what we would be leasing would be the 30 – 40 feet of the state owned land. Why not just cut it off at the boundary, so we wouldn't have to lease it anymore?

Hans: That's a relevant question.

Doug: I would think the question is do we have a useful dock at that point? Would people want to use it?

Hans: We're left with a couple of options. The floating dock is something DNR proposed specifically for the geoduck area. Our sense from the tribe was no. Options: rebuild in the footprint that are either rebuild as a standing pier; pile wrap as a standing pier; or rebuild with concrete or steel; or build with a pier that just goes to the DNR land and a floating dock to the geoduck. My sense from the tribe was it is not worth pursuing any of those. They were not keen on us putting structure in the geoduck bed. Josh raised the question, so how big is this geoduck tract, and what's

Action Item

with this teeny bit out of a very large tract that may or may not be harvested? The point is it is land that the tribes have rights to. If the tribe chose to harvest it, it would have little to no effect on the tribe. But there is not an arena of logic to this. This is the tribe's right, and I felt like just another white guy trying to argue about a little piece of their historic rights. Do you guys have a sense of those options? – keeping the full length of the pier and/or floating dock into the geoduck duct?

Josh: I thought I heard a member of the tribe say if we did anything, we would have to do a Cultural Resource Assessment to make sure there are no artifacts. Apparently there were villages there. If we did anything, we would have to pay for the assessment. Do we know how much the assessment costs?

Hans: I think Elaine, Josh, and I agree that preserving the current length is not productive to pursue now that we had that meeting. The next question is we either draw the line at the green/grey or at the brown/green. It just gets those few feet. The green/grey might be worth it – the lease is 0 dollars and might be worth it to the users. The next step is to interact with the user group on that. It would be good to put some bright flagging on the dock at those two places, so you can see it when you drive by.

Bob: That's a great idea.

Hans: There is some functionality to it. In terms of a dock either to end on our property or into the DNR piece, the question is how to proceed there. The pile wrap discussion has mostly been around the impact to the geoducks from being in the bed. Now we're saying we're not going to do that. The wrap discussion, then, is different. We're not planning to remove the dock in that area then retain or rebuild the dock to the left. A part of my intuition was thank you so much for that great meeting; the VPD is not going to move forward with putting anything in the lease; we are looking forward to either retaining the current remaining dock by pile wrapping it within our own land and within the DNR land not in the geoduck tract or replacing it to scale. We have no money for any of those three options. We're just trying to iterate our way through this then figure out how much money we need from the state or fundraising. Can we go back to them and see if they have advice as to how we would pursue that? They all would want somebody to fund tearing the whole thing down, and if we want to replace with steel or concrete from the DNR land on in, fine. But we have no money for that. We get the geoduck thing. But we think there is a lot of benefit to our users to make this happen. So any partnerships they are aware of would be helpful. That's where I see this going. But to Bob's point, let's put some flagging out there. It doesn't make sense to give up even if it's a shorter distance.

Elaine: I don't know how we would do the flagging thing. Another alternative would be for me to send this map out to that user group committee and just tell them – give them the visual. I think that would be adequate.

Hans: For sure send them the map.

Elaine: I will get feedback from them on that and report back.

Hans: That threshold question is a financial one. Is it worth doing the dock to the grey line for a couple hundred thousand dollars? Sure. For a couple million dollars? That's the question.

VES Lights

Elaine: Qualite is coming out May 24 and 25. They will adjust all lights and attach light shields – at no cost to us. This is good for the north lights, which are the predominant problem. They would also like to do the south lights, which means they have to use the access road that Gay Rosser holds an easement. I am confident she will be a problem. I have reached out to the neighbors to talk with her about this but have not received a response.

Bob: It would be crazy not to do the whole thing. We have to at least attempt.

Action Item

	<p>Elaine: I am attempting.</p> <p><u>VES Restroom</u> Elaine: We sold the restroom trailer! Still working on the plumbing due to the commercial parts required, but we are confident we will have it ready next week. From there, we will have 6 weeks to get the restroom installed – tight, but doable.</p> <p><u>Lisabeula Tideland Donation</u> Elaine: Almost complete. Deed prepared. Excise tax affidavit being prepared.</p> <p><u>Trolls</u> Elaine: I participated in a Zoom meeting with Thomas Dambo and all the other interested park agencies yesterday. It will be very competitive, but my contact, who lives on Vashon, is really pushing for Vashon. Thomas will be out in June, so we will find out then if Vashon is a contender. In the meantime, the committee hopes to finalize the plan, so you can vote to approve it. Zero Waste Vashon is very interested in participating. I have also reached out to VCA to partner on finding volunteers for building and maintenance. Bob: That article was interesting where it pointed out the effect on the neighbors with all the traffic and tourism. We will have to consider that. It isn't a question of whether or not we want one, but where will we put it? Elaine: My contact is really pushing for upper Point Robinson. I am partial to Ober Park – I think it's a better location for accommodating more traffic. Bob: I agree.</p>	
<p>Adjourn 8:45 pm</p>	<p>Bob: Move to adjourn Doug: Second Pass 4-0</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn; Pass 4-0</p>

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford