

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference, 7:00 pm
DATE: Tuesday, August 24, 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	
8.10.21 Minutes; 8.6.21 – 8.19.21 Preliminary Vouchers; July Vouchers	Bob: Motion to accept. Doug: Second Pass 5-0	Motion to approve the 8.10.21 Minutes; 8.6.21 – 8.19.21 Preliminary Vouchers; July Vouchers Pass 5-0
July Financial Report	Elaine: Admin – ahead \$38k <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll – under \$21k – no Marshall; Sue part time. • Insurance – under \$15k – it actually went down from last year! Maintenance – ahead \$60k <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll – under \$37k. No summer temp help; apportioned out more? • Materials – under \$7k. No spring topdressing at VES. • Equipment rental – over by \$5k. Needed more porta potties due to COVID. • Outside Services – under \$7k. No spring topdressing at VES. Commons – ahead \$24k. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll – ahead \$6k. • Interlocal fee – ahead \$19k - ½ paid in due to nonuse from COVID. Programs – ahead \$20k <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll ahead \$6k. No Marshall, although Cheryl is now on 27 hours a week. • All else is reduced programs due to COVID, although Eric successfully pulled off Sailing Camp and most of BARC Skate Camp. Pool – ahead \$54k	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue down \$24k • Offset by payroll ahead \$66k • Supplies ahead \$7k <p>Pt Rob – ahead \$47k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue ahead \$15k • Payroll ahead \$19k – no Marshall <p>Fern Cove – ahead \$26k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue ahead \$14k • Payroll ahead \$12k <p>RFA – ahead \$6k – very little use of funds other than the Episcopal Church sponsoring the Latino swim lesson program.</p> <p>Tractor Lease – ahead \$6k – I thought there were three payments this year, but there was only one.</p> <p>CIP – ahead \$130k due to projects we put off this year.</p> <p>Our ending cash is just over \$800k.</p> <p>Doug: What assumptions are you making for the balance at the end of the year regarding COVID?</p> <p>Elaine: It's pretty true to what I think is happening. I did the original forecast based on what I thought would happen with COVID. It reflects very little indoor activity.</p> <p>Doug: Should we expect to be even further ahead by the end of the year based on recent COVID concerns?</p> <p>Elaine: I would think so.</p>	
<p>Board Votes</p>	<p>Board Votes:</p> <p>Bob: I move that we accept the County's offers as proposed to us for Manzanita, tideland, and Hitchings properties.</p> <p>Josh: Second.</p> <p>Hans: We voted unanimously last meeting to surplus the properties.</p> <p>Elaine: I asked our attorney if this current vote needs to be unanimous. It does.</p> <p>Hans: What are the offers?</p> <p>Elaine: Hitchings was \$85k, Tidelands \$4k, Manzanita \$230k. Total was \$319k.</p> <p>Hans: At the last meeting, we had consensus that the Hitchings property would be best transferred to the county unless there was another appropriate steward. That one might be appropriate to consider the county's proposal for Hitchings. The tidelands seem pretty irrelevant. For Manzanita, we discussed putting those on the open market, and if they don't sell, going back to the county. I don't know how they would think of this iterative approach. Are we required to take the highest offer made on the properties?</p> <p>Elaine: Yes.</p> <p>Doug: Can we reject all offers?</p> <p>Elaine: Yes.</p> <p>Hans: We might get offers on some of them.</p> <p>Doug: What you're saying, Hans, is different from the motion on the floor. I thought where we went last week was we put Manzanita and the tideland on the open market. We stipulate that Hitchings be sold to a public entity. We can reject the offers if we choose. We have a reference from what the appraisals are.</p> <p>Hans: Procedurally, that proposal would be a different motion. We need to vote on the motion in front of us. I was</p>	

just summarizing my understanding of where you wanted to go if the present motion does not pass 5-0. We should proceed with voting, then.

Bob: I am wondering, if this gets voted down, and another motion is stated to put them on the open market, who is going to have to deal with all this? It's going to take a lot of time, recognizing as we already have that there is no particular interest expressed in these properties in the past. We'll just be stirring the whole thing up again.

Doug: Including by the county.

Bob: They aren't interested, but they are willing to pay us for it.

Doug: They are expecting a quid pro quo, that we give them \$1 million worth of property.

Abby: When we started this process, there was a reason we wanted to surplus these properties. I remember being in favor of that idea at the time. Elaine, did the county approach us with this proposal?

Elaine: The original motivation in selling the properties was to build our capital funds. When we talked about putting these on the open market in the beginning, the general consensus was a concern about the optics within the community about selling public property to private individuals. I was tasked with talking to KC, and it ended up involving the Land Trust, to find out their interest in taking the properties. They were interested in the three large properties, and they would pay for the small properties as a package deal. We went to them. We started this process.

Bob: It wasn't just for the money. We also didn't want to be responsible for properties we aren't using that are not part of our mission. We are to provide recreational facilities and properties, not open land. The money was about the lack of capital funds due to the VES mess. I don't understand why we keep messing around with this. Nothing is going to change.

Doug: VES is very much part of this. VES sucked up money and time for years. All other potential ideas VPD had got shoved aside and abandoned. I talked to Emma Amiad about what she thought. She had a plan for Spring Beach, but it didn't come to fruition due to opposition from nearby homeowners. It wasn't revisited due to attention shifted to VES. We haven't spent any time talking about Spring Beach or Lost Lake, because the emphasis shifted. The difference between us or KC owning Spring Beach might not be enormous. When they owned it, nothing happened. When we owned it, nothing happened. We have never talked about the possibilities. We are remiss in not even discussing this. If we ever wanted to do something with beach property in the future, it won't be cheap. I am reluctant to say we don't need them, we won't do anything with them. They should be regarded as reserve properties, not surplus properties. I remember being concerned about selling to the public, but my thinking has changed. Manzanita will never be a park.

Bob: I call the question.

Elaine: I would interject that, since all this came up with the original motive, remember that, with our 45 cent levy rate and the effects of pro-rationing, we're going to be in big trouble in two years. We will not have any money for any capital projects at all – not even those in our Strategic Plan. The idea of developing Spring Beach is not going to happen for a very, very long time if it is determined that anything even can be done with it.

Doug: We already have properties we aren't spending any money on – like Fisher Pond. Yet they are developed properties. There a lot of options. It's not a matter of needing to spend money. There are groups like the Land Trust that are willing to develop trails. One longer term trend was that, years ago, we were going to expand programming. Sooner or later we get more money with property value changes. In the past, the Board built in expansion that may or may not come to pass. At some point, we make decisions about what we spend money on. We will have the same problems, regardless – cutting back on other things if we want to address the Strategic Plan. There is a longer term

question we are not facing – what do we do about flat property taxes? How do we make decisions about reallocating money in the face of that? We are going to have that problem, anyway. \$300k will be a band-aid. We’re still going to have this problem. Will we keep selling properties? I hate seeing the park district sold off to solve our problems.

Bob: Call the question.

Hans: What will be our commitment to the county if we were to accept the county’s offers to transfer the other three properties?

Elaine: As I have said before, it’s a hand-shake agreement. That is the original proposal made to the county.

Hans: I still think this is a good opportunity – going to a good owner at a good value. They will steward them consistent with my interests. I didn’t make the offer that we would transfer those large properties. I have no clarity about their plan for those properties. I trust them, but I would want to embark on a partnership there. What is the long term plan? They don’t need to own those properties to address invasives and put in trails. They can do it on our property. It doesn’t make sense to shift the ownership without any understanding of the future there. They have more resources to take care of that kind of work, but the ownership is more removed. The taxpayers who actually own them would lose some control. On behalf of the current owners of the properties – Vashon – I need a little more substance and clarity about the future plan there. I will vote in favor of Bob’s motion, because it is a good opportunity for those properties and for us to get necessary funding. But I can’t say, for the large properties, that I am prepared to make that arrangement.

Josh: I support the motion regarding these small properties. But I am not committing myself any further on a handshake I was not a part of. As long as we are making our positions clear, I very much agree with Hans. This opportunity to raise capital we desperately need is a bird in the hand. But I’m not necessarily going to endorse transferring the large properties without knowing what’s going to happen to them.

Bob: Now I’m lost. To me, that’s part of the deal. Agreeing to accepting their offer on these small properties is meaningless if we’re not following through on the other half of the handshake agreement.

Abby: If the lack of a plan for the future of these properties is holding this up, it would be helpful to have that. Can we ask the county to provide that for our next meeting?

Motion vote: 4 – 1 (Doug voted nay).

Doug: I move to place these three parcels on the open market with the provision that Hitchings goes to a public entity.

Hans: Second.

Doug: A handshake agreement is not unimportant. Somebody who thought they had a deal by acquiring three large parcels for the price of the three small prices might be disappointed. Maybe angry – us not fulfilling our end of the deal. If we don’t get sales on the open market, we can go back to the county.

Elaine: I don’t know how long their grant monies will be available, so that should be one consideration. I don’t know how you plan to handle Hitchings.

Hans: We are essentially accepting the County’s offer. There isn’t another public entity walking around wanting to give us \$85,000. That is 95% certain going to the County. Others here may not want to say it that way. The process for getting it to the County will be through a public offering. You and Bob raised another downside – this will be a lot of work and not the best use of staff resources.

Elaine: I’ll have to find a realtor.

Doug: That’s what realtors do. We might have to pay for it.

Elaine: I just know that one tideland piece involved a lot of meetings.

Action Item

Motion to accept the County’s offers as proposed for Manzanita, tideland, and Hitchings properties. Fail (not unanimous)

Motion to place the Manzanita, tideland, and Hitchings parcels on the open market with the provision that Hitchings goes to a public entity.

	<p>Hans: Maybe you can qualify the level of effort needed at the next meeting. I'm fine with you sharing this with Greg – that the board is looking at moving through a market offering as a process for this, knowing that the county may end up being our best partner on this. And wanting to learn more about a future partnership on the big parcels or wanting to know the future plan.</p>	
<p>Tramp Harbor Dock</p>	<p>Elaine: At the last meeting, I was tasked with sending you the written cost analysis and also with adding the cost of cutting the dock off at 180 feet and fixing it as is. I sent those to you. I also sent you the as built that shows where the -18 point is. I got out a ruler and measured it out. It appears to be about 20 feet out from the platform. I also cautioned you that it's really hard to do cost estimates when we don't know what the design or repair needs will be. These are totally shoot-from-the-hip, based on the best information I could get from various sources. I think you were just looking for a ballpark sense.</p> <p>Hans: This is super great. I love having the as built.</p> <p>Bob: Remind me again the significance of the 180 feet.</p> <p>Elaine: We own the first 180 feet of the tidelands. If we cut off the dock right there, the lease becomes irrelevant. We can do whatever we want with the dock out to 180 feet.</p> <p>Hans: On the as built, it's about 55% of the dock – at about extreme low water. It will be interesting to see if the tide markings are still valid on a 30 year old as built.</p> <p>Elaine: The survey RFQ process is due Friday. We'll get the survey done soon to get that question answered.</p> <p>Hans: If we cut it off at 180' – the cost for option 5 – that isn't pile wrapping, right? It's just fixing what needs to be fixed and replacing some poles. What is ACZA?</p> <p>Bob: It's not creosote. It's an approved pressure treatment.</p> <p>Hans: If we are in the lease, the options for the latter are pile wrap and concrete.</p> <p>Elaine: Right, assuming we just fix the first 180 feet.</p> <p>Hans: The State doesn't want ACZA on their property?</p> <p>Elaine: I don't know. They were pretty specific about it being pile wrap, concrete, or steel. I would push back on the state about metal grating, because I have learned there are fiberglass grated options that are a lot less expensive.</p> <p>Hans: What are next steps?</p> <p>Elaine: Now that we have a general sense for costs, we will get that group together to discuss design options. Find if they have strong feelings one way or the other. And it will be good for them to get a sense for costs. I'm also waiting to hear back from the State about the geoduck issue. Per your request, I forwarded the community complaints to the state instead of pushing back against the tribes, as they wanted me to do. The state may push back against the tribes to allow us in the geoduck tract. I am awaiting an answer on that.</p>	
<p>Fees:</p> <p>1) BARC building rental</p> <p>2) Wedding deposits</p>	<p><u>BARC Building Rental</u></p> <p>Elaine: Eric wants to increase the building rental rate from the standard rates of \$5.50/\$11.00/\$16.55 to \$25 or \$30 an hour. The lower rates do not cover payroll, and we cannot have an unstaffed facility. It is one way to keep costs covered. Other indoor skate facilities throughout the county are upwards of \$100 per hour.</p> <p>Bob: What does it cost to rent the pool?</p> <p>Elaine: I don't know right off hand.</p> <p>Abby: I rented it a couple years ago. It was \$175 an hour.</p> <p>Bob: That makes \$11 an hour pretty foolish.</p> <p>Elaine: This is an attempt to keep our costs covered.</p> <p>Doug: I move we increase the BARC building rental fee to \$30 an hour.</p>	<p>Motion to increase the BARC building rental fee to \$30 per hour.</p>

	<p>Josh: Second.</p> <p><u>Wedding Deposits</u></p> <p>Elaine: We currently require a \$500 refundable damage deposit. Eric wants to add a \$500 nonrefundable cancellation deposit. Both would be applied to the rental, but we would keep the cancellation deposit if they cancel after all the time and energy we put into these things.</p> <p>Doug: Is this for all facilities when we have weddings?</p> <p>Elaine: It's for Point Robinson and Fern Cove. We don't do anything for weddings at the other locations like Lisabeula. They just rent the park. There is a lot of work that goes into the weddings at the lodging facilities.</p> <p>Bob: Not to mention, if they cancel, then we lose out on renting the houses.</p> <p>Josh: \$500 is not that much in comparison to other wedding venues. Often it is up to 50% of the wedding cost.</p> <p>Bob: I move we institute a \$500 nonrefundable wedding damage deposit for weddings at Point Robinson and Fern Cove.</p> <p>Doug: Second.</p> <p>Doug: If it is COVID related, I'm not comfortable with the fee when they're doing what they're supposed to do. Many entities are waiving cancellation fees.</p> <p>Elaine: You could add that caveat.</p> <p>Josh: But that's not apples to apples. They can cancel, we keep the deposit, then they can rebook it. That's what the airlines are doing. They aren't giving their money back when people decided to travel during the pandemic.</p>	<p>Motion to institute a \$500 nonrefundable wedding damage deposit for weddings at Point Robinson and Fern Cove.</p>
<p>Surplus old playground equipment</p>	<p>Elaine: We were planning to just take the old playground equipment to the dump, but we have received a handful of community members ask if they can have or purchase it. We are keeping the wood posts to use for kiosks, as one example. But some of the main pieces of the play equipment is reusable, like the small tube slide. If people wish to bid on the pieces, I was thinking we could do a written silent bid process for all interested. They would also need to sign a liability waiver due to the equipment being older, etc. You will need to surplus the equipment for that purpose.</p> <p>Bob: As long as we have legal counsel that says we're clean on the liability piece. We're getting rid of it, because it is unsafe.</p> <p>Elaine: We have standard liability waivers, but I can get legal counsel on it if you prefer.</p> <p>Bob: I move we surplus the old playground equipment.</p> <p>Doug: Second.</p>	<p>Action item</p> <p>Motion to surplus the old playground equipment.</p>
<p>Vaccinations</p>	<p>Bob: I felt really frustrated by the revelation in the Beachcomber with somebody on the island who should be setting a good example regarding vaccinations. I'm also frustrated seeing my kids' and grandkids' futures regarding climate change. I thought there is something we can do as a district to set a good example. I don't know if we can require vaccinations for people who use our enclosed spaces. And for climate change – install more bike racks, use electric equipment, reduce our electric bills by installing solar panels. It seems a public entity should be making an effort to set an example. Is there any interest here? Stating a goal to be carbon neutral by some year?</p> <p>Is Charlie planning to get vaccinated?</p> <p>Elaine: I don't think he is.</p> <p>Doug: I wonder if he or anyone is waiting for the final FDA approval.</p> <p>Elaine: We don't have a vaccination policy. Most of our staff is vaxxed. L&I requires, for indoor facilities, we obtain either an attestation or a copy of their vaccination card. All admin is vaxxed. Of maintenance, 2 of the 5 are not; they</p>	

	<p>work outdoors, so I don't have a problem with that. One at BARC not vaxxed, but they are required to wear masks at all times. The pool all vaxxed. All Access vaxxed, which is also required by the State now. One housekeeper is not vaxxed. So 4 total. If we required vaccinations, one point to consider is that we have a really hard time staffing housekeepers and BARC. Losing them would be a real hardship on the District.</p> <p>Bob: Is there a general reason they are not?</p> <p>Elaine: I don't know the reasons for all. Of the two maintenance guys, I have spoken to one of them. He does not trust the vaccines. He feels strongly about the "My body, my choice" sentiment. Quite frankly, I can't argue with that. I'm a big pro-choice person. I can't argue with somebody wanting to make a choice about their body and not having it be mandated.</p> <p>Bob: This probably isn't the place to talk about that.</p> <p>Elaine: That's the way this guy feels.</p> <p>Bob: Do you think this final approval of the vaccines would make a difference?</p> <p>Elaine: I don't know.</p> <p>Doug: What is the State requiring? I thought the fire chief is in hot water, because it's a State requirement of him. It would apply to him and not to our maintenance people?</p> <p>Abby: That's just healthcare workers, and it applies to EMTs. That's why he is asking to have his EMT requirement removed.</p> <p>Elaine: The State requires all healthcare workers and educators. If you're even a contractor, you have to be vaccinated. Different entities are requiring it on their own. The City of Seattle has required it.</p> <p>Hans: Same with King County employees.</p> <p>Josh: And executive branch County employees.</p> <p>Hans: We could pursue a policy of requiring vaccinations if we choose. Any motions?</p> <p>No motions.</p>	
<p>Climate Change</p>	<p>Hans: Any thoughts on this for the District?</p> <p>Elaine: I'm a huge proponent of climate mitigation strategies. Before I came here I was the GM for a green building company in Tacoma. I was on the task force that wrote the climate action plan for the city of Tacoma. After that, I was a commissioner working for the City Council to oversee the implementation of that plan. We do quite a bit now, but we don't have a plan for it. CAPRA recommends having a Sustainability Plan. In preparation for this discussion, I went through the requirements. It takes a lot of time evaluating our maintenance practices, operations, recycling, buildings, energy management, even our trees, alternative modes of transportation, and promoting sustainable tourism. Even without a plan, we discuss this a lot, like the type of cleaning products we use. Maintenance is tougher, because the equipment we use requires more power than electric might provide. We have new trucks, so that would be expensive to replace. We keep our equipment in top performance, so they are fuel efficient. We do recycling, although the guys don't pick through if there is a lot of trash and dog poop bags. It's a challenge when the public doesn't follow the rules. But it's doable. I am interested in doing it, but it's a big undertaking. And potentially expensive – solar would be expensive.</p> <p>Bob: Solar has a payback. I would expect more incentives to come along. Long term you come out ahead. It needs to happen. It comes back in dollars to the District and the health of our community. I would like to participate.</p> <p>Elaine: Let me take a stab at it first. It will require working with staff. Maintenance is busy with Ober, so it might be a few weeks. I'll get started and send you what I come up with , Bob.</p> <p>Hans: Is the Ober roof on our plan list?</p>	<p>Action Item</p>

	<p>Elaine: Yes.</p> <p>Hans: And when is the next time we buy a truck?</p> <p>Elaine: It depends on what we do with our maintenance staff. If we lay one off, we would not need another truck. But if we do, we would need another truck.</p> <p>Hans: We should pursue what it would cost the District over the next 5 – 10 years on some of the major solar opportunities. You are already doing good things on sustainability, and I would be nervous about a broad sustainability plan – spending too much time covering the things you are doing anyway. I would spend more time on things like, when we replace the Ober roof, what then would it cost the District, what incentives and funding are out there to support that? With the right financing it might work. By putting panels on Ober, you might pay a little more up front to normalize it. You pay more to be a role model. Pursue electric trucks in 5 – 10 years, whatever that cycle is. And maintenance equipment – riding mowers?</p> <p>Elaine: I discussed that with Jason when we replaced the last mower. They just don't have the power we need. But technology changes.</p> <p>Bob: I just bought a battery powered chain saw. I don't see any difference.</p> <p>Doug: We could reconsider the amount of maintenance we do. I have seen signs in parks that say, "Growing, not mowing." You increase the amount of grassland.</p> <p>Elaine: We have in Point Robinson. They didn't mow the upper field for awhile – just mowed trails. Athletic fields have to be mowed. I think there is an expectation that we mow.</p> <p>Doug: This was in Maryland, and there was pushback over them not mowing any more. That is part of the education process.</p> <p>Josh: I would suggest in the proposal that you break it up into things that can be done now, and things that are long term. There is a push to do something now.</p> <p>Elaine: Most importantly, we should start by identifying the things we are doing first.</p> <p>Bob: If anyone has any ideas, share them with Elaine. I would like to work on this with you.</p> <p>Hans: My thoughts are solar on the roof; electric trucks; electric maintenance equipment where it fits in. And whether or not it's helpful to have a goal – like 50% reduction by 2030 or something. As we learn more, we can consider if that is helpful.</p> <p>Bob: The question is how you measure it.</p> <p>Elaine: It's a big undertaking. I did it at our last business. We reduced our emissions by 32% over 5 years.</p> <p>Bob: The people who sell solar panels have the facts and figures.</p>	
<p>Adjourn 8:30 pm</p>	<p>Bob: Motion to Adjourn. Doug: Second Pass 5-0</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn; Pass 5- 0</p>

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford