

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference, 7:00 pm
DATE: Tuesday, July 13, 2021

Commissioners attending: Hans Van Dusen, Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Josh Henderson, Abby Antonelis
 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	
6.22.21 Minutes; 6.19.21 – 7.8.21 Preliminary Vouchers	Abby: Motion to accept the 6.22.21 Minutes and 6.19.21 – 7.8.21 Preliminary Vouchers . Bob: Second	Motion to approve the 6.22.21 Minutes; 6.19.21 – 7.8.21 Preliminary Vouchers Pass 5-0
Board Votes	Board Votes 1) Bob: Move to accept the Employee Communication and Grievance Resolution Policy. Abby: Second. 2) Josh: Move to accept the Relationship with the Park District Staff Policy. Bob: Second.	Motion to accept the Employee Communication and Grievance Resolution Policy. Pass 5-0 Move to accept the Relationship with the Park District Staff Policy 5-0
Reporting Improper Governmental Action & Whistle Blower Protection Policy	Elaine: I cleaned up the references to a mayor as was mentioned at the last meeting – my editing blunder. Bob: Motion to accept the Reporting Improper Governmental Action & Whistle Blower Protection Policy. Abby: Second.	Motion to accept the Reporting Improper Governmental

		Action & Whistle Blower Protection Policy.
Public Meetings	<p>Elaine: We can still hold meetings remotely. If we go back to in-person, I need a copy of your vaccination card or an attestation that you are vaccinated per L&I requirements. But we are still allowed to do them remotely.</p> <p>Bob: It is easy to keep doing it this way. I don't know that there is much value in meeting in person other than Captain Joe saying he will come again.</p> <p>Doug: That is the reason for meeting in person. People can show up if they feel like it. It is more casual. People may not know the Zoom link. On the other hand, people might come maskless and unvaccinated. If we challenged them, we could get into a political battle about masks. I would like to avoid that battle. I am conflicted.</p> <p>Bob: Given this is not over yet, we should keep doing this until things calm down. Unless we want to go through a drill of people presenting their papers. Elaine, have you seen any complications getting your job done as a result of Zoom meetings?</p> <p>Elaine: Not at all.</p> <p>Josh: I agree with Bob. There is such a push to think we are done, but we are not out of the woods yet. I don't think we are there yet. Nobody has made a compelling argument against meeting on Zoom, so I think it is a fine thing to do.</p> <p>Abby: I have two kids who will not be vaccinated for awhile. If someone came to our meeting unvaccinated and maskless, I would leave.</p> <p>Bob: A friend of my daughter is vaccinated but picked up. She is very sick. I don't want anyone to experience that. We are smart to keep meeting remotely.</p> <p>Elaine: Just for the record, I have not received any comments one way or the other. No complaints, and conversely nobody seems to care.</p> <p>Doug: The one person who is unvaccinated and refuses to wear a mask might be the person angry with the Park District.</p> <p>Hans: Sounds like there is consensus to stay the course for now. We might reconsider when we have two new Board members. It would be helpful for collaboration to meet in person.</p>	
Pool Schedule	<p>Elaine: Since COVID restrictions lifted, demand has been intense for open swim for kids. Demand for lap swimming has been high, resulting in many complaints about the quick reservation fill when the opportunities came available at the start of every week. Throughout COVID, all we could do was reservation based lap swim and family reservations. The advantage to COVID has been that we have saved a lot of money in light of our financial concerns due to having lost \$175k from pro-rationing. When we last discussed those budget concerns relative to the pool and maintaining a reduced schedule through the summer, you said we would evaluate taking on more expenses there as we went along. Unfortunately, the timing of the restriction lift June 30 created the need for us to adjust the schedule according to demand prior to this board meeting. If we kept the M/W/F/S/S schedule, we would have had to cut lap swimming drastically to accommodate daily open swim. Based on the approved budget, I instructed Randy to move to a full regular schedule -- so added Tuesday and Thursday. That means 6 weeks of full pool schedule. We can always cut back. Thoughts about cutting back?</p> <p>Abby: I went twice to open swim, and it was awesome. I think it is worth it to the community to have it open. They are doing a great job – I felt very comfortable and safe.</p>	

Tracts in relation to the shore. They are to be at a minimum 600 feet from shore. This tract is not. In fact it's less than 300 feet from shore. I forwarded this to DNR, and their response is that the RCW he is referencing has been recoded to a new RCW. It states that commercial harvest of geoducks is not allowed in shallower depths than eighteen feet below mean lower low water. The vessels conducting harvest operations must remain seaward of 600 feet from the line of ordinary high tide. I asked this guy to send me further evidence if he still believes he is right.

- d) He feels we should push back against the Tribes, because the dock's footprint is minimal compared to the 53 acres of the geoduck tract. He feels we should present to them the use of pads for extending the dock. Geoducks bed around the pads. I have no idea what that means and asked for more information, but I told him the geoducks themselves are not the issue – it is a safety issue for harvesting.

Bob: I have never heard of them. What I imagine is they are broad-based as opposed to pilings being driven in.

Elaine: I am not comfortable pushing back against the Tribes, but if you think I should to meet the objective that we have done everything we could to save the existing footprint, I will do as you wish.

Doug: I'm not sure what public opinion is regarding the Tribes. On Saturday night there was a festival here watching the Puyallup Tribe perform. I don't see that it's just the Tribes. DNR seems to be on the same side that they are. For us to push back against the Tribes, we have a bigger hurdle than just that. It's the State government.

Elaine: DNR said they would agree to allowing the present length of the dock if the Tribes agreed. Their issue is the creosote mediation. They said they would allow a floating dock out there if the Tribes agreed.

Doug: But the Tribes don't agree.

Hans: DNR is the property owner in addition to being the owner of the geoduck tract. The relationship is us and DNR, not us and the Tribes. We are really only in discussions with DNR. To some degree, we can investigate push-back, but essentially we would be asking DNR to push back. They are managing the treaty-controlled fishery access.

Abby: One option would be to make a T at the end of the dock. With the reduction of the length, you are not losing a lot of interesting fishing, but you are losing the space where people can fish. I think going north to south is a reasonable compromise.

Bob: If this guy really digs in and pushing like this, he really is pushing against DNR. We can only do what DNR says we can do. That makes it easier on us. Is somebody going to file a lawsuit?

Elaine: Nobody has made that threat. Pushing back to DNR might satisfy them if I share their feedback with DNR. Get their final word. Are they willing to have more conversation with the Tribes in light of this feedback, and if they say no, then there it is!

Bob: That's right. And if it comes up in the Beachcomber, it's all about DNR. It's a smart way to go.

Hans: That seems like a good option. The other option is to say we see with eyes wide open what this is. We don't need Elaine to inquire with DNR about these concerns. But if everyone agrees, this option is to take these concerns to the property owner and more formally get their feedback on them. I think it's good faith to take the concerns raised to the property owner.

Elaine: I think that is a good strategy.

Hans: I am on the same page as Abby. I am not interested in pushing back against the treaty rights, regardless of scale. It's not about scale – how many acres. So you will get the feedback from the property owner, and the Board will decide how we will proceed. It saves Elaine from being the bearer of bad news.

Bob: So it is DNR we are referencing when we make our decisions.

Hans: I don't think it changes the outcome regarding the complaints. Finding another property would not be a

Action Item

- Discuss quiet time in the park
- They have changed the language on both the booking software and website that camping at Lisabeula & Pt Robinson is a single night at a park only and not multiple nights.

Bob: So by all out, you mean back to the marine trail. Who would schedule that?

Elaine: No scheduling. First come, first served.

Bob: There isn't much money to be made. This has turned into a tremendous hassle. The location is right in the middle of a neighborhood. Point Robinson is much more isolated – same with MIMP.

Doug: Kathy and I are often at Lisabeula. Kathy's reaction to the campers was, "How did they get in here?" There were at least four tents and lots of stuff. More broadly, are people going to camp there regardless of what we do? This group looks like they just did it, no matter what the arrangement is. These people were heavy duty campers with stoves, etc. Are bikers able to use it?

Elaine: Yes, the issue is no cars. The idea is it needs to be a small footprint. You're not going to lug in four tents, a cook stove, and a bunch of kids on a bicycle. Will people abuse it? Probably. It will put more on the gatekeeper having to kick people out. But if they disobey the rules, that's their problem, not ours.

Bob: In a lot of parks you see no camping signs. If there is a sign, you have to leave. Having it in the middle of a neighborhood is a bad deal.

Abby: Wasn't it a big deal to have it on the marine trail? That seemed to be important.

Elaine: The main problem we had with the marine trail was the illegal fires. That is fairly easy to manage with the gatekeeper. He does a good job of keeping that kind of nefarious behavior at bay.

Abby: Elaine, what is your preference here? It seems VA is willing to do a lot of management, and I think we should take advantage of that. Their changes they implemented seem good. People know now, and they are going to do it, anyway. It puts a lot of pressure on the gate keeper.

Elaine: My initial reason for supporting VA is the eyes and ears on the park and people signing on to the rules. People disobey rules – it happens every day in every park. You will always have the occasional bad apple. I like that people have to sign forms. People know they have a place to stay, which is a comfort to the campers and navigators. It is my preference to have them continue, but I am totally good with it either way.

Bob: I'm talking about people camping there at all other than the marine trail people.

Elaine: I am totally in favor of people camping there, on the water trail system at minimum.

Bob: And you are okay with bicycles and having some sort of reservation system?

Elaine: If VA does it. We do not have the bandwidth to take it on.

Bob: The Goodes are friends of mine. I'll see what they say.

Hans: On the biking front, we didn't say one way or the other before. Was there a practice of it? It seems VA raised the awareness of it.

Elaine: Every summer I get a handful of cyclists asking if they can camp there. The issue is keeping a small footprint.

Hans: So the issues are discontinuing camping – Elaine is not in favor of that. Discontinue bicycle camping – Elaine is not recommending that. And whether it is no reservation system like it was before or VA managing a reservation system.

Josh: If people drop in, is there a fee collected at all?

Elaine: No.

Josh: So do we want a little bit of money with somebody managing it, or no money?

Abby: That's what I understand the problem to be with VA. It's a headache. They want to keep the fee structure as is.

	<p>Hans: It is not a revenue question for us. We get \$1.70. It's if we prefer to have them booking it or not.</p> <p>Bob: And we have to consider the island residents and what they have to put up with there. I feel more loyalty to the neighbors than to the campers.</p> <p>Hans: Assuming you allow kayaks and bikes, is it less burdensome on the community to have the booking entity that filters it a bit or have the gatekeeper handle it?</p> <p>Bob: If it is managed by VA, keeping it a small party by kayak – 2 or 3 people per campsite, that's okay. It's just knowing for sure who is going to be down there and what we can expect. It has to be managed, and it's difficult.</p> <p>Doug: The alternative of keeping the bikers out may reduce problems. These people last weekend presumably drove in, but they had lots of bicycles they probably planned to ride around the island. It's closer to the ideal of Lisabeula to only allow kayakers. If you allow bikers, why not allow cars?</p> <p>Hans: Are they booked out awhile?</p> <p>Elaine: They only have about 8 reservations.</p> <p>Hans: I propose we do a follow-up discussion later.</p> <p>Abby: Yeah, I don't feel ready to take any action based on one weekend.</p> <p>Hans: Bob will follow up with the neighbors.</p>	Action Item
Surplus Properties	<p>Bob: Is there any point to me making a motion if we still have questions we need answered? Greg Rabourn said those pieces are mostly recreational and not suitable for building homes. They are pretty unusable, and we were heading in the direction of getting rid of the whole thing. But if we're going to go back and look at each individual piece, there is no point to calling them surplus at this point. Unless you think it would speed the process up.</p> <p>Hans: It doesn't sound like the County has urgency, and we don't either.</p> <p>Bob: Sounds like there needs to be some more research, then we make a decision later.</p> <p>Hans: We'll get a clarified third opinion on the Manzanita pieces and any commissioners who would like to will revisit the Hitchings to see if we want to preserve that asset.</p> <p>Abby: For what it's worth from me, I would be fine with the motion being made. I wouldn't second it, but I think we can get to where we need to be in two weeks if we want to move forward on it. It is likely I will vote to sell to King County. We can postpone the vote to the next meeting.</p> <p>Bob: In that case, I move we declare those properties to be surplus.</p> <p>Hans: No second. No motion.</p>	Bob: I move we declare those properties to be surplus. No second.
Adjourn 8:15 pm	<p>Doug: Motion to Adjourn.</p> <p>Bob: Second</p> <p>Pass 5-0</p>	Motion to adjourn; Pass 5-0

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford