

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference, 7:00 pm
DATE: Tuesday, May 25, 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	
5.11.20 Minutes; 5.11.21 – 5.21.21 Preliminary Vouchers; April Vouchers	Bob: Motion to approve. Doug: Second Pass 4-0	Motion to approve the 5.11.20 Minutes; 5.11.21 – 5.21.21 Preliminary Vouchers; April Vouchers Pass 4-0
April, 2021 Financial Report	Elaine: Admin – ahead \$18k. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of this is Payroll ahead \$19k. Maintenance – ahead \$37k <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll tracking ahead \$30k (this includes laying off one maintenance person in September) • All else is odds and ends Commons – ahead \$19k <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$4k • Offset by payroll ahead \$4k • Fee reduced by \$18,750 for the first half Programs – ahead \$14k <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll ahead \$10k • Programs ahead \$4k – limited due to COVID • I added back in \$25k to the budget and included a part time Ops Coordinator starting in June. Pool – ahead \$46k <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$22k 	

- Labor ahead \$66k (this is based on M/W/F/S/S through the summer and MWFS in fall)
- All other costs are relatively constant and tight to budget

Pt Rob – ahead \$27k

- Revenue up \$16k
- Payroll under \$6k
- All else is odds and ends

Fern Cove – ahead \$20k

- Revenue up \$9k
- Payroll ahead \$10k

Debt Service – ahead \$4200 – I thought we had two more payments, but our last one paid it in full!

CIP – ahead \$129k this year, although we may move forward with more projects in the fall, like the ivy remediation and kiosks. Our maintenance will take care of the Fern Cove dormer in the fall, but painting will have to wait until next summer due to the booking schedule this year (we have scheduled it for next August – to be done by our maintenance). We are planning to do the foundation in the fall – currently working on that. We are hoping to save money on the dormer and painting to cover likely higher costs for the foundation, since the quote was from several years ago. The truck may be a non-issue if we lay off one maintenance guy in September. We are coming out \$3k ahead on the VES restroom.

Tracking at \$709k in reserves.

Hans: On the pool, the State has not provided new guidance on this yet, right?

Elaine: Correct. We are doing what they are allowing, like doubling up on lap swim lanes, offering family swims. They haven't said much about open swim that we can accommodate. We'll have lessons once the kids are out of school.

Hans: And family swim is when you come as a family, and open swim is anyone over a certain age?

Elaine: Yes. Family swim is similar to private rentals – same household, etc. It's a money maker for us, which is something Randy is focusing on.

Hans: When does registration start for lessons?

Elaine: Not open yet. Randy may do that five days a week. It's more the public swims that will be on the M/W/F/S/S schedule.

Hans: On the kiosk front, someone was asking about the stone sculpture at Point Robinson. It might be good to provide information on the kiosk.

Elaine: We were recently in touch with that artist. FYI, it is not a sun dial. It's a spiritual thing with some Native American significance.

Hans: It makes sense to tackle the ivy projects if we have capacity. We don't need to spend all the money in the capital projects if we don't have capacity, but good to get the ball rolling there. We can decide when to do it once we get somebody under contract.

Hans: How are we progressing on the lighthouse again?

Elaine: Nothing. Last I received a response was like in February. Beverly said I should receive the new lease in a week and will address the project list. Haven't heard back on that since. Captain Joe is making calls and may go down there in June to get to the bottom of this.

Doug: It is amazing that we're doing so well with our lodging facilities this year. Is it due to COVID, and should we expect a downturn when things get back to normal?

	<p>Elaine: I believe one reason for the uptick is due to COVID – to get away in a house. Yet, we do have a steady stream of regular renters. I am hopeful that the trend upward continues.</p> <p>Josh: What sort of analysis do you do on the rental rates? I know that Vashon Inn just opened and is around \$200 a night on Air BnB.</p> <p>Elaine: We do an analysis of rates maybe a couple times a year of other lighthouses and similar lodging facilities on Vashon to ensure we are not competing with Vashon locals per policy. We set our rates right in the middle. Eric is good about staying on top of that.</p>	
Board Votes	<p>Doug: I move we adopt the Alcohol Policy as presented.</p> <p>Bob: Second.</p> <p>Pass 4-0</p>	Motion to adopt the Alcohol Policy as presented Pass 4-0
Commissioner Code of Conduct Policy	<p>Elaine: All I have to say is what is presented contain the edits recommended at the last meeting.</p> <p>Josh: I thought it was interesting the statement about not “replying all” to board members. It would be easy to get into hot water.</p> <p>Elaine: It’s the safeguard against having discussions in violation of the Open Public Meetings Act. It is point G, last bullet point. A Board member may send information to other board members, but there cannot be a reply all. We have been careful at times to have a board member email me and have me forward to all others, but it should be just a release of information, saving discussion for an open meeting.</p> <p>Bob: Move to accept as modified at the last board meeting.</p> <p>Josh: Second</p>	Motion to adopt the Commissioner Code of Conduct Policy.
Tramp Harbor Dock	<p>Elaine: In our Zoom meeting with the tribal council and DNR, they had requested scientifically based information about pile wrapping providing 100% assurance of no creosote leaching and 100% no resin toxicity. I spoke with the principal of the pile wrapping vendor I have been dealing with called Quake Wrap. He said no such scientific data exists, but he turned me on to a new product that wraps with metal and is filled with concrete, so no resin is used. I sent links to that product and their standard product (Pile Medic) to our Tribal contact and DNR for their review but have not heard back from either. Again, they have not said no yet, so I think it is still worth pursuing the conversation.</p> <p>Doug: Why are they asking us to provide this information? Why don’t they just make a suggestion? “Here is an option that would work for us!” Don’t they consider these things all the time?</p> <p>Hans: One suggestion has been steel or concrete total replacement.</p> <p>Elaine: DNR weighed in on pile wrapping. They said they are not comfortable with the vendors they are familiar with in terms of the geoduck tract. I provided the information on Quake Wrap as a follow-up to their request.</p> <p>Elaine: I also sent a letter to the community group informing them of the Tribal Council/DNR meeting and told them of the likely outcome that the dock will have to be shortened per the Tribes. I presented the two options for length as being to the VPD/DNR line and the DNR/Pt Heyer line. As expected, the preference is to go to the DNR/Pt Heyer line, but there were some creative ideas presented in case we shorten to the VPD/DNR line. Interestingly, through a number of email exchanges, people warmed up to the idea of going to the VPD/DNR line as we discussed creative options without DNR requirements. One suggestion made to present to the Tribes were that we install interpretive signage talking about the history of island tribes and ecology of the region; give them naming rights; provide tribe only access at designated times for harvesting. I explained that none of these address the Tribe’s safety concerns, which is their main thing – 100% unimpeded access due to safety concerns.</p> <p>Doug: Are the safety concerns for the geoducks or the people harvesting?</p>	

Elaine: The people harvesting. They use divers to harvest. They don't want to worry about pilings, floating dock lines and anchors. They don't want anything in their way.

Bob: And nothing floating or hovering over the geoduck bed.

Josh: They don't want anything in or over the geoduck bed, period.

Bob: I looked at the photo you sent us today, which shows the property we own. Our property line appears to be the mean low tide line shown in the previous photo you sent us last meeting.

Elaine: What I sent you today is from the King County Parcel Viewer. I have another reason behind having sent it. I don't know how accurate that is relative to the previous photo from last meeting (provided by DNR).

Bob: The reason I ask is that, between the mean low tide line and the extreme low tide line, it is color coded purple. That goes up to the edge of the leasehold area. My question is, if we don't own that property between MLT and ELT, who does? Are we in control of it?

Hans: The illustration from last week effectively has four property lines. It has shore to MLT; MLT to ELT, which appears to be our property, or at least private property; then ELT to 18 feet, which is DNR; then 18 feet and beyond is the geoducks.

Bob: It is important to know who controls between MLT and ELT. Are we able to keep the dock all the way out to the green?

Hans: Let's get that clarified. Is the lease to mean low or extreme low?

Elaine: Other comments I received back from the community group includes the owner of the property to the north of what we own. As indicated in the photo I sent out today, we own the shaded parcel where the dock is in addition to the parcel due south of it. We own, together, @ 375 feet along Dockton Rd. The neighbor to the north offered to donate his land to us. The neighbor to the south would like to sell his to us (\$50k or less). That entire swath, then, would be about 830 feet along Dockton Rd. Now we can do something cool, like build a boardwalk, increased parking, wider platform into the water. While the community wants as deep of water as possible, I reminded them the likelihood of that is remote. So, hypothetically, consider the dock out 180 feet, and we can do whatever we want. One suggestion from a committee member was to build a floating dock off to the side and build paid moorage as a revenue source and great incentive for fundraising. The comments got positive and enthusiastic about the possibilities if it is just our property we are dealing with, plus the two additional properties. We can turn this into a positive.

Doug: It won't be for fishing. It will be for something else. Can you squid in such shallow water?

Elaine: What are your initial thoughts about accepting the north property as donation and buying the south property?

Bob: On the southern property, there is a projection out in the water that barges come in to when they offload stuff to the island. Are they paying the owner of that property for the use of that? It's at the north end of the property – like a projected bulkhead will fill in there.

Elaine: I can ask.

Josh: Is the parcel ending in 0035 the one offered or the one we currently own?

Elaine: We currently own that one.

Josh: So 0061 is the one offered.

Hans: I don't think the dock being in the mud half the time is such a great marine solution for folks. In the summer, the low tide is smack in the middle of the day. It might be okay for small boats, but the dock would be on the ground a good deal in the day. We can see how it pencils out. The extreme low vs mean low issue will be important to clarify in terms of what the lease does and doesn't get us. My inclination is still to have a pier out there. It has more utility to everyone. Also, my inclination is to say we are not interested in building on the tidelands and interested in maintaining the lease, because it doesn't cost us anything. And we are a very poor little jurisdiction, and we have no interest in interfering with the tidelands but are very interested in partnering with DNR and the tribes in helping to get our dock

Action Item

Action Item

off there if they have any opportunities we can explore and rebuilding it in an environmentally safe way. We will get out of there, but if we can partner with you in any way. Offering access to the tribes or signage is not something that feels like a good trade for rebuilding in the tidelands. We need to focus the environmental discussion now, too. It was a little convoluted between talking about building in the tidelands or next to the tidelands? Talking about pile wrapping, it wasn't clear to me we were separating what we talked about doing on our land outside of the tidelands vs in the geoduck bed. There needs to be a different discussion there. If we go back and say, no, we're not going into the geoduck tract, and we hope to partner on finding a way to get the dock out of there, which we don't have money for. That is something to clarify in terms of the environmental review. Just talk about what we're going to do on our land to mitigate our posts outside of the geoduck tract.

Josh: We can agree on how impractical it is to consider a dock that will be in mud a significant amount of time, but I do think this is a good opportunity to turn it into a really spectacular park, which we can use more of. This area doesn't have a boardwalk, and it would be a real selling point. Maybe we don't have to do an extended dock that goes off north or south for mooring, as great an opportunity as that would be. I'd be curious to see how much more usage a boardwalk would get vs a fishing pier.

Hans: What about the parking? It will be expensive. The County has to shore up that road every other year. That will be a real limiting factor in putting in a \$3 million park there. It's pretty tight! Where would we put in more parking?

Elaine: There is additional parking that comes off that southern parcel, where that fenced land area is.

Bob: You could probably get 4 or 5 cars in there. It would have to be improved.

Hans: Not a lot, though, in terms of putting a lot of money in. Somebody will want to spend some money on designs, and they might do three designs. Before that step is still the environmental piece. How narrow is our material selection decision? What are your thoughts there, Elaine? You're going to go back to them with the steel, etc. What are your thoughts on their input on our land, DNR land, vs the geoduck tract? They giving us permission to do certain types of replacement on our land, the DNR land, and the geoduck tract?

Elaine: DNR doesn't care what we do on our land. DNR has said their preference for anything on their land and going into the geoduck tract is a floating dock. We don't know where the tribes are.

Hans: They don't want the floating dock. That was DNR's idea, and they indicated it is a bad idea.

Elaine: If we didn't have the geoduck piece in the picture, I think DNR would be amenable to anything, even the pile wrapping.

Hans: That's my point – what our sense is. I think the most productive thing is to let go of the geoduck tract. Do it quickly, proactively, and in a clear and generous way. Then we can move forward on the pros and cons of the different construction methods and designs. We should reply to them and say the discussions have been productive and helpful, and we want to work with you to get that dock out of the geoduck bed. And we would like to work with you on a solution to rebuild the current dock, to be transparent that we don't have any money for that. To that degree, what are your thoughts about spending money on design relative to the fundraising and how that iterates.

Elaine: My sense is that, if we say to DNR that we want help with removal and/or anything we do outside of the geoduck bed, they will say they have no funding. I have been telling them all you are suggesting, and that has been their response – “we have no funding to help you with this.” That has been a consistent message from them from the beginning. They point us to RCO's grant program. The most we could hope for from a grant from RCO is \$1/2 million. All the rest, for design work, etc., will have to come through fundraising.

Bob: One thing kind of crazy here is the amount of dock between the geoduck tract and the edge of the leasehold area, the inshore edge, is not much.

Hans: 25% maybe.

Bob: Nowhere near. Between the grey line and the green part. You almost wonder about telling DNR we don't need

Action Item

that lease.

Hans: We're not going to talk about that any more tonight, because we don't have a clear answer about mean low or extreme low.

Bob: I suggest we put a task group together – a couple board members and Elaine – and work some options.

Elaine: I agree with Hans we need some clarification from DNR about exactly what we're talking about here. It may be they will say that will be answered with the survey. We do have to have a survey done this year. But yes, I will get some clarification on that. And to your point, Bob, I think from there it would be helpful to get a task force together and start talking about options.

Bob: Potential designs.

Hans: A survey would be helpful, but the big issue is mean low vs extreme low. Who owns between those two? So the two schools of thought are either all on our own land or on our own and DNR land – not in the geoduck tract – then we feel we have pretty good flexibility to pursue the most benign, environmental, cost effective solution as we see it. We are not going to wait for that resolution so much other than wanting to know cost and environmental impact of steel vs concrete or others. We will proceed to initial design. What does that look like and to what end? The idea is to come up with how we expect engineering and cost estimating to proceed relative to before or after fundraising and grant solicitation?

Bob: That's way ahead of what I'm talking about. I'm talking about learning more and figuring out some basic concepts we wouldn't pay any money to do. Generate some ideas, show them to you guys, and see if we're on the right track.

Elaine: There are a couple people in this community group who seem to have some skills they are willing to offer, maybe even an engineer. It might be helpful to have them in this task force.

Hans: And how do you feel about reaching out to the Tribes, telling them we have seen the light, and this is our path forward?

Bob: Seems like a little early still, unless we want to agree together that we're not going to put anything over the top of the geoducks and avoid that whole issue.

Hans: It sounds like the user group is amenable to that. I am in favor of us moving forward in general. So any conversations we have with them about pile wrapping, etc. is not about the geoduck tract. That's what I came away from the meeting with the Tribes -- maybe Josh did, too. Even if they only harvest ½ a percent of the geoducks every 50 years, the most productive thing is to walk away from that tract.

Bob: I think so, too. I don't think we are going to get anywhere with it.

Elaine: To be clear, though, about the feedback I got from the community group, any enthusiasm generated was only secondary to wanting us to try to go all the way out. There was a strong desire for us to attempt to keep the pressure on for the present footprint of the dock. My preference would be that we first get a definitive answer from the Tribes to avoid the appearance that we didn't give it our best effort. I don't think we need to even put any reasons out there to the Tribes – just simply ask what is their final response?

Bob: That would make it real easy.

Josh: I hesitate for us to go ahead and pass policy about getting out of the geoduck tract, because we give up any leverage we have. I'm with you Hans – I believe the Tribes do not want anything there, but we have more opportunity to get their help with any sort of removal before we say we're not going to do anything there. That way their interest is taken care of.

Hans: No, we have a dock in their face still, and that becomes DNR's problem. I think you can argue it either way, and they're not that much different. I still prefer us proactively, good faith gesture, "We hear you, we don't think we need to put a dock back in the geoducks, but we have a problem, though. We don't have any money, yet we have an old

dock still in the geoducks.” And that’s what we need help with. To the degree it is leverage, we are good neighbors, good land stewards, and we have empty pocket books. As opposed to, “Okay, kick us off. Are you really going to kick us off for just .5% of the geoduck harvest?” My recommendation, and I’m happy to go with you guys, they aren’t going to give that. I think there can be stories of us trying to negotiate with the Tribes, but to be honest, I wasn’t enjoying the conversation! I felt like “Here’s the white guy who just wants another piece of us.” “Can’t I put my dock here? I know we signed a treaty with you, but you won’t mind if we just…” I was, “No!” If they’re going to say no, let’s be a good partner and say no. See if they can help us, but if they can’t help us, fine. I don’t know that we get more leverage if we say, wait, did you guys really mean no? But that’s me.

Bob: I agree, Hans, that our best leverage is having that dock sit there, and if they really don’t want it there, and we have no money – if they really don’t want it there, they can help us get rid of it.

Doug: Is it reasonable to think they don’t want the dock there? They want the geoducks, but do they care at all about the dock?

Bob: They said they don’t want anything over the top of the geoducks.

Doug: That’s just the geoduck bed. But what about the rest of the dock? Do they care one way or the other?

Hans: No. That was the point of the meeting. They don’t care what happens to the left of the green line.

Doug: If we’re talking about a dock that is considerably truncated, do we know if such a dock would be useful?

Something people would use? We would be having a very different discussion if people feel they don’t really need it.

Hans: We don’t know that, and I think that is where we need to go. I don’t want to cut the users short, but I think this is in the best interest of the users that we move past the geoducks. We leave the geoduck bed aside. We get better good faith if we get out of it. If Bob does his envelope drawings with the task force, we start going there. This is what we got. We can’t go into the geoducks, because it is the Tribe’s opportunity. And we ask what people think about it. And you’re right, if there is not enough support from the public for $\frac{3}{4}$ of a dock or a boardwalk, then we’re going nowhere, because we won’t be able to raise the money to go with the grant.

Bob: We have the geography here. We can overlay some potential looks, like a T going across the end of the ELT. The T would be over water almost all the time. The only way the public can tell us what they like and don’t like is if they can see it on a piece of paper. Right now it’s just talk.

Hans: So, Bob and I are on the same page. What do you think, Josh and Doug? In terms of the approach to the Tribes?

Doug: I’m with you on this. At this point we need to start narrowing our options, so we can think about it more clearly. If we keep talking about the geoduck issue, it makes the process more complicated for us. I don’t think we will get resolution on the geoduck issue that is in our interests. What’s the point in pursuing it?

Josh: I want to be clear – I have never said we should rebuild the dock in the geoduck tract or that we negotiate or try to work something over on the Tribes where they cave on that. I don’t hold that position at all. I just want to make sure we don’t say, “Hey, we totally get we shouldn’t be there, and we’re not going to rebuild there, and they’re not like, ‘cool, get rid of it now.’” I don’t want them to say, okay, get rid of it, and we’re not going to help you pay to get rid of it.

Hans: But the landscape is that we don’t have a relationship with the Tribes; we have a relationship with DNR. To some degree, it’s hard for them to push the removal issue prior to 2050 in terms of their outcome.

Doug: What’s the 2050 point?

Hans: That’s when they would harvest again.

Elaine: The terms of the lease stipulate that we have to remove the dock within 12 years. As of the date of the signing of the lease.

Josh: Are we making a motion to decide on something?

Hans: I don’t think it needs a motion. I’m just seeing what kind of consensus we have.

	<p>Bob: We're just talking about going ahead with an informal task group to do some sketches to help make better decisions about some of the things you're talking about, Josh.</p> <p>Elaine: So what I'm hearing is you are suggesting I offer up to the Tribes and DNR that we are not going to do anything in the geoduck bed, period. And we need some financial help to deal with that portion of the dock. Correct?</p> <p>Hans: As it stands, yes. Our point is we still want to provide for continued recreational use of the site. Now we're going to look for funding. We don't have a solution to removing the old dock at this point.</p> <p>Bob: We're going to feel better about saying something in those concrete terms if we have a little better idea what our options are on the dock if we don't go out into that area. Do we have some date for when we need to make this decision and make it public to these people, or can we think about it some more?</p> <p>Elaine: We can certainly think about it as long as we need to. It may be, in the meantime, that the Tribes come back to us with their decision against. I suspect that will happen, anyway.</p> <p>Bob: Right, so that doesn't change much about what we have to do, which is to keep our thinking moving.</p> <p>Elaine: So you're suggesting, Bob, we get this task force together first, come up with some designs, and sell the concept now to the community group?</p> <p>Bob: Right. Get them to buy in on, well, if we can't go all the way out, maybe we go out and have a T head along the ELT where we most of the time have water. Watch birds, and whatever. I don't think we should push the idea of a boat landing facility at this point. That may be something in the future. The thing about bringing boats in there is that, once you're there, there really is no place to go. You're not near the community. It seems to be more a place for islanders to get over the water.</p> <p>Josh: So the task force will be operating under the assumption that whatever we do there is not going to be going into the geoduck bed at all.</p> <p>Elaine: The community group is certainly hearing that message from me – that I strongly suspect that we are not going to get the geoduck bed.</p> <p>Bob: Let me know, Elaine, when you want to start the group.</p> <p>Josh: I would like to be in the group.</p> <p>Elaine: I'll reach out to a couple of the community members. In the meantime, I'll get the answers to the MLT/ELT question.</p>	Action Item
VES Lights	<p>Elaine: We were originally scheduled to get the lights fixed yesterday and today. Based on that, I mailed Gay a letter stating we would need to use our roadway to fix the south lights, remembering, of course, that it's really the north lights that are the problem. She did not respond. Rather, she called the School District, being the owners of the property, to say she is having work done on the road those days. Turns out, Qualite had to cancel and will schedule. A neighbor took it upon herself to speak with Gay, anyway, and Gay told her she will not, under any circumstances, allow us access to "her private driveway." The school district feels our attorneys should get in front of this. We already have a judgment against her, and with the last go-round, we had a writ of execution drafted. I'm fine with that for the future but prefer to not deal with it in this circumstance. But that's just me. I would like your thoughts on whether or not we should pursue this legally now to get the south lights done. She will put up a fight, I guarantee it. We will likely have to get the sheriff involved again. Is it worth it to get those south lights done?</p> <p>Bob: Where are the light standards? Are they on the road side or the field side of the fence?</p> <p>Elaine: On the field side.</p> <p>Bob: What's to keep us from doing it on the field?</p> <p>Elaine: It destroys the field.</p> <p>Bob: There are boom lifts with wide tires designed to go on fields. We should find out if there is any way to do it that</p>	

way.

Elaine: We did last time when she blocked the roadway. We did look into it. We can't do it without damaging the field.

Doug: For Josh, long before any of us were connected with the Park District, this all went to the State Supreme Court on related issues. There is quite a history here already.

Elaine: We spent \$60,000 pursuing this in the past, yet she still believes that is her road. That we have taken property from her.

Bob: I can't understand why she chooses to be such a roadblock in this. How is it benefiting her other than making her happy that she is screwing us up?

Elaine: That's a good question. I have had so many conversations with her about this.

Hans: What are the options?

Elaine: Pursue this legally and get the south lights done, which will be ugly, or just walk away from having the south lights done.

Josh: I don't know why we would walk away when we have the materials here and a user group who has expressed concern about how the lights function. It seems short-sighted to not do half.

Elaine: We have about two weeks to deal with this. Last time when she held up the show, it took several days to get the writ of execution done. I need to get ahead of it before Qualite comes out again.

Hans: And the south lights are part of the problem for the neighbors?

Elaine: Not nearly as bad as the north lights. We will absolutely get the north lights done. It would be nice to get it done and say to the neighbors, if there is still a problem in the future, that we have done all we can do.

Hans: What is your recommendation?

Elaine: My preference is to not deal with Gay.

Hans: Is there anything productive by reaching out to the neighbors? We'd like to do them both. We'll do the north ones, but the south ones will be a significant legal battle.

Elaine: I did put a note out to the neighbors. That is what got Betty Edwards involved. Nobody else spoke up. I told them either we pursue this legally, or we walk away from the south lights.

Bob: I don't think the neighbors to the south have much of an opinion about the south lights. What they are seeing is the north lights. They won't know how much is coming off the south lights until the north lights are fixed. The light from the south lights shine on the school and into the trees. Have we gotten any complaints from neighbors to the north?

Elaine: I have not received any comments from neighbors to the north as a result of the south lights.

Hans: Where does Qualite come from?

Elaine: I think Midwest.

Hans: They are flying in specifically to do this?

Elaine: Yes. And they are putting in \$39,000 worth of visors free of charge.

Hans: So it's a one shot thing. They won't come back after we see how it works out.

Elaine: Correct.

Hans: We have the visors, so we could pay someone else to do it if we have to postpone, not being able to get access.

Bob: So we would be paying somebody else?

Hans: Yes, but that is because we didn't have a choice.

	<p>Doug: Does she get along with these neighbors? Can they pressure her to go along with it?</p> <p>Elaine: Betty tried. Gay dug her heels in and said absolutely not.</p> <p>Doug: Maybe another would be more persuasive.</p> <p>Elaine: I asked all of them. Nobody else volunteered.</p> <p>Bob: The key is that we don't know the effect of the south lights on the south neighbors until the north lights are fixed.</p> <p>Doug: There is reason to believe the south lights will not be a problem, since they are positioned downward.</p> <p>Hans: I hear two Commissioners intuit that the south lights are probably not a problem. One Executive Director really, really not wanting to do this fight all over again. I'm willing to skip them, sit on the visors, and maybe pay somebody else down the road to install them.</p> <p>Bob: I am leaning that way, too. I walked all over that place looking at them, and the only real issue was the north lights.</p> <p>Doug: We all gathered on the north side of the field and concluded that the north lights were not doing as the south lights were.</p> <p>Josh: Is there anything we can do to get Gay's support? Put her name on a plaque or something?</p> <p>Elaine: You be my guest to try. Alright, we just won't do the south lights. I will let Qualite know to leave the lights with us and any associated hardware. I will let the neighbors know.</p>	<p>Action Item</p>
<p>Adjourn 8:30 pm</p>	<p>Bob: Move to adjourn</p> <p>Doug: Second</p> <p>Pass 4-0</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn; Pass 4-0</p>

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford