

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference and In person, 7:00 pm

DATE: Tuesday, December 13, 2022

Commissioners attending: Josh Henderson, Hans Van Dusen, Bob McMahon, Keith Prior, and Sarah George.

Staff attending: Elaine Ott-Rocheford

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
Call To Order – Review Agenda	Josh called the meeting to order at 7:00 and reviewed the agenda.	
Public Comment	<p>Diane Emerson: I am here for the discussion about Inspiration Point. Marie Bradley is on vacation.</p> <p>Citizen: Linda and I are here to represent FIDO and to listen as you approve the budget. We are pleased to know at the last meeting you put the dog park in as your contingency. We hope you keep it there, because we are continuing to put our energy into that project.</p> <p>Kell: I am here for the Tramp Harbor discussion.</p> <p>Hans: Maybe we should move Inspiration Point here, then Tramp Harbor, then the budget.</p>	
Inspiration Point View Clearing	<p>Keith: We met at Inspiration Point. Aaron Jones from Island Forestry gave us an estimate that was in your board packet. The current situation could be taken care of this coming year. If we get bids parallel to what is here, we could engage the Park District to take care of a chipper and dump truck and staff to handle that. It would be good to do it this fall through spring, so the ground soil is settled before next fall. Do we need a geologic permit for this?</p> <p>Elaine: I spoke with Abel Echardt about that from the Land Trust. He said no if we are just limbing and taking out brush. Yes if we take out trees.</p> <p>Keith: About 4 maples would need to be dropped. They are in a gully. They are adjacent to Mike's property. They are not stable where they are. They could break down right where they are. There is some talk about taking down that ewe tree in that planter. If we do it this spring, we need bids. Aaron Jones did not give me a scope of work. He just gave quotes for 5 and 10 days.</p> <p>Elaine: The idea is that we would be paying for this?</p> <p>Keith: The idea is that the Foundation would raise the money. If they can't, it would be on us.</p> <p>Elaine: Any VPD monies we put into this at all triggers public works, and it is our project. We have to bid it. I would do the permitting, bids, contract, and manage it. There is a bandwidth issue that goes along with 2023. We have a lot scheduled already for 2023. That would be my concern. I totally support the project. On the CIP plan, we planned on that in 2026.</p>	

	<p>Hans: I would not recommend we try to do this in 2023. It's a lot for us to manage. It seems reasonable to move it to another year. And sounds like the planned \$50k would be significantly less with this volunteer group. It sounds like it will be a parks project. Maybe 2024, but we know how 2023 projects could slip into there.</p> <p>Elaine: Most 2023 is Pt Rob, and those must be done in 2023 while we close the houses. 2024 is doable.</p> <p>Keith: I think this group would be amenable to that, but the cost of the bids would go up.</p> <p>Elaine: If they can raise funds and take it on themselves, that would be great.</p> <p>Sarah: A big consideration is that, when you have community movement then postpone it, then you might lose that. I am concerned about losing the momentum.</p> <p>Elaine: I agree. But I am concerned about how much I'm taking on in 2023. Remember, we also need to do the Strategic Plan in 2023. And all of this is gearing up toward grant writing. I am excited about Marie Bradley's enthusiasm about this – she is fantastic and gets things done, but I can only take on so much.</p> <p>Hans: So we're willing to put it in 2024 as a park's project. But if people raise the money and execute it for 2023, we can support that.</p> <p>Sarah: That sounds good. I thought I was hearing that Elaine has to do it no matter what.</p> <p>Elaine: Only if VPD funds are used.</p> <p>Josh: How does the volunteer project work, then?</p> <p>Elaine: They would submit a written proposal, we would have an agreement in writing – an MOU. There is a little bit of time that goes into it, but not much.</p> <p>Josh: So if this was fully funded by the community, and they were ready to rock and roll in the spring, there is nothing that would stand in the way? And if VPD funds, then we do it in 2024.</p> <p>Elaine: Right. It would be good to get the contractors on our small works roster. That makes the bid process easy.</p> <p>Diane Emerson: Would you be amenable to volunteers coming in and doing some clean up work in the meantime?</p> <p>Elaine: That would be great. I told Marie that I will need the volunteers to fill out volunteer packets.</p> <p>Diane Emerson: I told Marie people can drop debris off at my place.</p>	
Tramp Harbor Dock	<p>Elaine: Turns out Adam Bergman is unable to attend this evening. You all asked at the last meeting that Adam come up with another option that includes a budget of \$2 - \$2.5 million; minimum 61" or 6' (6' - 8') limited to a single row of piles; limited to no step-outs; just one platform on the end.</p> <p>Attached is an alternative with a 6' wide trestle and a 6' wide ELL at the end to maximize pier area at the -18' MLLW mudline. The platform would be 6' x 30'. They reduced the number of two pile groups, but left some in there as their calculations were showing fairly significant movement under wind and wave action. It isn't a failure issue but the dock would be quite flexible with a single monopile at every bent and he was certain people would start to feel uncomfortable in moderate wind events.</p> <p>The cost is still coming out in the \$2.7M range, and they are skeptical of any scenario that gets down to between \$2m and \$2.5 even with more analysis. It really seems like a \$3M dollar budget is what we keep landing on given the amount of risks and unknowns and the current bidding environment.</p> <p>We could potentially look at more short term repairs, especially if DNR would be ok with not replacing the deck outside of the leasehold area. We could potentially jacket the most critical piles, leave the deck and rebuild just the ELL portion with new piling but that would likely mean some more maintenance down the road. I doubt DNR would approve that, and I think we have also determined repair is not where we want to go.</p> <p>Hans: Correct.</p>	

	<p>Elaine: This is probably about the best we are going to get.</p> <p>Hans: My hope was for a 15 x 30 platform. He didn't address why he didn't include that?</p> <p>Elaine: No, I suspect the budget was driving his choice of the smaller platform. Obviously, larger would be more expensive.</p> <p>Bob: I remember last meeting where someone said the platform would be best if it were facing south.</p> <p>Elaine: That was Sarah's desire. That would require DNR approval to be outside the footprint.</p> <p>Sarah: Ask Kell if that matters. I was told fishing would be better on the south side.</p> <p>Kell: Personally, being perpendicular to the depth is good on the end. I do feel 8' minimum on that ELL is best.</p> <p>Elaine: We can tweak that.</p> <p>Hans: He didn't address my questions: Is there any room in the contingency and the design for efficiencies?</p> <p>Elaine: He kind of did last meeting, remember? He did not feel we could tweak the contingency much. In the design, we know that should be more like \$400k. The contract is \$455k, and we already spent \$50k.</p> <p>Hans: This is all-inclusive from 2022.</p> <p>Elaine: Right. He should have fixed that. It should be \$400k there.</p> <p>Josh: You said we need the contingency. And that is in here. You said we need \$3 million earlier.</p> <p>Elaine: That's what he said – that we are leaning in that direction. But I do have news. I have told you about a couple KC grant selection committees I sit on. As a result, I get advance news. I just found out about a KC grant that might get us another \$1 million toward this project. Details: no match!; grant is due March, 2025; approved August, 2025; contracted October, 2025, which works well for our timing with the RCO grants and the construction plan. It also can serve as the match for the RCO grants, although we would have to have \$500k in the bank at the time of the RCO application. The ONLY hitch to this – the grant is for expanding and improving recreational opportunities and not for required mitigation. I am working with full transparency with the grant manager about the creosote mitigation requirement vs the fact that the dock is closed and in need of capital improvement.</p> <p>RCO – due May, 2024; initial approval October, 2024; awarded June, 2025. \$1.5 million</p> <p>KC – due March, 2025; approved August, 2025; contracted October, 2025. \$1 million</p> <p>I can apply for the RCO grants, and we would have to have \$1/2 million in the bank to prove we have the match. But this KC grant would ultimately serve as the match. We could just bank our \$1/2 mil for something else. I hope to find out soon if the dock is eligible.</p> <p>Keith: Is it both? Or either/or?</p> <p>Elaine: That isn't clear. That is why I am asking.</p> <p>Bob: Creosote or not, the dock is useless as it is. It seems we have a strong case.</p> <p>Elaine: I agree, but I want to make sure we are okay. I don't want to rely on this, then find ourselves \$1 million short.</p> <p>Kell: So, how does this impact timing for construction having to wait until October, 2025?</p> <p>Elaine: It would mean construction would be in 2026. But at that point, we should be really ready to roll. I don't think we should stop with our plan to fundraise.</p> <p>Hans: It's 4 months later than the state award.</p> <p>Josh: I appreciate that you are being totally above board with the County.</p> <p>Elaine: Any questions to send back to Adam? Or any decisions about moving forward?</p> <p>Hans: I move we move to design of an approximate \$2.7 million dock including contingency, with an approximately 6' wide walkway to an at least 12' x 30' platform at the end.</p> <p>Josh: Does that fit within the footprint?</p>	<p>Motion to move to design of an approximate \$2.7 million dock</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Elaine: It might bump up to the -18 line, but we have received permission from DNR to bring the platform on the inside of the platform footprint.</p> <p>Kell: It would be good to clarify with Adam that, with the stronger backing, what is the allowable width for the cheapest amount?</p> <p>Elaine: We will get into the weeds like that when we move into this next phase.</p> <p>Bob: Second.</p> <p>Hans: We can discuss more in January before the final vote. The potential additional funding is fantastic, but again, it's a potential. What the motion does not include is just removing the dock or a fuller replacement. With more state or county money, we could push for a wider dock, but I'm not comfortable with that. That's a lot of ifs! Aside from the fundraising, now we're talking about two grant agencies and if they award or not. You have to multiply all that against some sort of contingency percentage likelihood we are going to succeed.</p> <p>Elaine: I agree. All the grants do is put us in a great position in the end with that extra \$1 million.</p> <p>Hans: Yeah! I would love to have the dock be 8' or more, but knowing what I know about our resources – the fundraising will be great and will be needed, but I don't feel I can...</p> <p>Josh: Did Adam ever give us an answer about standard width of materials? It may be cheaper to do that.</p> <p>Elaine: No.</p> <p>Hans: We can ask about that when we get into the design.</p> <p>Bob: Whatever we do, that dock as it exists is coming down. Will that be funded through the grants as well? Or is that part of our \$800k contribution?</p> <p>Elaine: It's part of the grants. The replacement is the whole process.</p> <p>Bob: I wonder about treating the teardown as a separate project. I'm just thinking about the timing of everything – having the matching funds and the timing of the grants. I hate to get into a VES Fields situation where we're committed but not funded. The removal of the dock doesn't necessarily have to wait.</p> <p>Elaine: Actually, it probably does. There may be some permitting that relates to both. And economies of scale gained from mobilizing the contractor only once.</p> <p>Hans: That's my sense – it's one design, one permit, one big project. And the funding agencies are looking to fund the recreational piece, not the loss of recreation.</p> <p>Hans: My motion should also say "in such fashion as improves the environment of the dock." We got that kind of feedback – to improve the environment. That should also be our intent. Another topic should be what community follow-up we want to do? I guess we can discuss that in January. We got some 60 people who wrote in. It would be good to close the loop on that.</p> <p>Elaine: the Beachcomber will cover this, so that's easy. Speaking of feedback, Sarah and Keith, did you guys want to move forward with the survey you designed?</p> <p>Keith: I think Sarah and I should discuss it again.</p> <p>Josh: I don't know what the purpose would be, since we have a motion to move forward with one of the options.</p> <p>Sarah: If we do a survey, an important question to ask should be: if we had to float a bond, what would be the amount would they be willing to pay? What if we don't get the grants? Through a bond or fundraising, what are people willing to commit to?</p> <p>Keith: A bond should not be an issue, since we have discussed that extensively. However, there is a possibility we could do fee for service. That could be a question -- how much would the fishermen be willing to pay to use the dock?</p> <p>Hans: I'm not in favor of that. So Keith and Sarah can bring something to us in February.</p>	<p>including contingency, with an approximately 6' wide walkway to an at least 12' x 30' platform at the end in such fashion as improves the environment of the dock.</p> <p>Action Item</p> <p>Action Item</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Sarah: What other information would be useful at this point?</p> <p>Bob: Hans's motion is not a decision to go ahead with anything. Rather, it is to be the basis for additional discussion.</p> <p>Hans: Right. There will be more discussion, then a vote. Some Commissioners may not be in favor of the motion; some may want a survey to drive their decision.</p> <p>Bob: The survey asks what they have done with the dock in the past, and what they plan to do in the future. I think many people are in favor of having a dock just because they like the idea. They don't necessarily want to use it ever. There is no survey question that gets to that.</p> <p>Keith: The feedback so far is a smattering covering all bases. Future planned uses are most important to me. It could impact the design.</p> <p>Sarah: If Commissioners or staff have questions, bring them to the next meeting. Design questions?</p>	
11.22.22 Minutes; 11.19.22 – 12.8.22 Preliminary Vouchers	<p>Bob: Motion to approve the 11.22.22 Minutes and 11.19.22 – 12.8.22 Preliminary Vouchers.</p> <p>Hans: Second.</p> <p>Pass 5-0</p>	Motion to accept 11.22.22 Minutes; 11.19.22 – 12.8.22 Preliminary Vouchers. Pass 5-0
2023 Budget	<p>Elaine:</p> <p>Levy - At the last meeting we discussed when we might run our levy. I am bringing this up, because these things sneak up on us a lot faster than you think. We talked about when others might be running a ballot measure. Eric Pryne and I discussed scheduling another meeting, so we are working on that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eric says the Hospital District will not have a ballot measure this year. They do not need to as long as they live within the 1% increase. • Fire – will be going for a lid lift, renewing the 6 year/106%. August. • School – will likely not have a bond measure until 2025. <p>Dates for submitting resolutions are as follows:</p> <p>April 25, 2023 – 2/24/23 – last day to file; resolutions due; explanatory statement & committee appointment form due;</p> <p>2/28 – pro/con statements due</p> <p>August 1, 2023 - 5/12/23</p> <p>November 7, 2023 – 8/1/23</p> <p>Validation – must receive 60% in favor; at least 40% of the voters from the last general election must vote.</p> <p>We really should decide by end of January, so I can get the committee formed and attorney statement written.</p> <p>Bob: Have we been talking about April?</p> <p>Hans: Yes. There is nobody's coattail to ride to get out the vote – we'll have to do that on our own. On the other hand, there won't be a lot of confusion about others. Also, it gives us another opportunity. There is no reason not to do April. At any time, we should consider a motion of 45 cents in April.</p> <p>Bob: Does the ballot measure mention the lid lift? Is that part of the levy? Ordinarily we can only go up 1%. There has to be approval for a lid lift.</p> <p>Hans: It isn't a lid lift. We're just setting it at 45 cents.</p>	

	<p>Bob: All a lid lift really means is being able to go in excess of the 1%. It also must be approved by the public. I'm clueless as to how that happens.</p> <p>Hans: Our levy is running out. We must go before the voters. We don't get a choice.</p> <p>Bob: But how can we go above 1%? That leads to the budget, which shows a 50% increase in the levy.</p> <p>Elaine: The 1% limitation is only within our levy cycle. In the 4 years. But when we run our levy again, that is what the voters approve, then we start the 1% process all over again.</p> <p>Hans: We go from 32 cents to 45 cents.</p> <p>Bob: Where does the money come from? Property taxes don't go up by 50%</p> <p>Elaine: No, property taxes do go up.</p> <p>Hans: And what we estimate is just a projection. We don't know what property values will be in 2024. We pass a levy, then we skate along for 4 years and barely go anywhere, no matter what property values do. And then we have to do this step adjustment to keep up with inflation.</p> <p>Bob: It's affected by this gigantic increase in property values.</p> <p>Elaine: There is no way to sugar coat it. By going to our 45 cent rate, it is an increase in property taxes for the voters. You understand that, in order to stay within the 1% year to year, our rate gets eroded.</p> <p>Bob: I don't know how the property owners will feel about that.</p> <p>Elaine: We do tell them. We tell them what it is going to cost them. We are very transparent about that. That is part of our marketing – it educates.</p> <p>Hans: 45 cents has been in our budget discussions, but that is something we can discuss. Maybe we want 42? Maybe we don't want to hit people's pocketbooks that hard, but that means we can't afford the wage increases we are giving or the capital projects we have in mind. We have that option, though.</p> <p>Bob: So that affects everything.</p> <p>Elaine: Oh, yes, and it's not good.</p> <p>Hans: It's good to communicate the increase, but I think it provides tremendous value. We take very little for what we produce. Our grant success is phenomenal. If we did a survey on that issue, I suspect we would get a lot of support. We are a low tax, and we provide a lot of service. I am comfortable keeping our rate at 45 cents, particularly compared to other Districts.</p> <p>Bob: Don't get me wrong. I agree with the value we provide.</p> <p>Elaine: It is always good to have this discussion.</p> <p>Hans: We don't need to make a decision tonight.</p> <p>Elaine:</p> <p>Fees – Hans suggested we raise fees again 5% relative to one year from the last one. We actually did that in January last year, but it effectively didn't hit anyone until April. So we can shoot for that. New fee structure attached.</p> <p>Hans: Okay. When we vote on my motion to approve the budget, let's have a separate motion on the fees in January. We can reach out to the user groups in the meantime, so we are fully transparent. And it's 5% across the board on everything?</p> <p>Elaine: Yes.</p> <p>Hans: Do we like round numbers at the pool? That goes up to \$7.30.</p> <p>Bob: That's a round number. Most people use punch cards, anyway.</p> <p>Elaine:</p> <p>Access - Mike is willing to stay on Tuesdays at \$20 and picked up Thursdays. Tania is willing to pick up Fridays due to the \$20 wage. A new housekeeper will be a substitute. I have advertised in the BC, FB, and through VISD – no response from</p>	<p>Action Item</p>
--	---	---------------------------

any of those. Hans suggested we promote it as an internship during the day for Eric – can't if it's a student – can't work during school hours, and they are limited to 20 hours per week.

Elaine:

Pool - Derek – At the last meeting I presented the issue of Derek wanting to increase his hours to 30 hours per week (up from 15). He wants more due to his kids growing up, and he needs to start considering college. He currently makes \$22.60 per hour. He researched pool maintenance wages and feels he should be paid commensurate with industry = \$27.95.

Benchmarking indicated the Covington Pool was similar to Derek in that it's a maintenance and lifeguarding role – paid \$24.81 to start to \$29.62 tops. You landed on \$25, because it was too big a jump going from \$22.60 to \$27.95.

Derek is not happy about \$25/hour. Derek's points raised:

- 1) When we increased the lifeguard wage range awhile back to entice new hires, somehow Derek got missed (average increase was \$1.50).
- 2) He has been underpaid since taking on the pool maintenance. Hired as a lifeguard just for something to do. Money was not the issue, so he did not challenge it. Now it is the issue. He just wants to be square with industry standards.
- 3) He will leave end of this school year if not making a wage that works for him (he is a licensed electrician).
- 4) Okay with taking \$25 effective immediately if he gets the 9% increase Jan. 1, but that just gets him to \$27.25.
- 5) Our regular maintenance guys start at \$28.17.

At the last meeting, you were concerned about Derek making too close to what Randy makes. I said Randy made \$60k+, so the assumption was that was \$30 an hour. Randy makes \$66k+ so is \$32/hour.

I have left the budget with Derek at \$27.95.

Josh: How did you communicate to him what the Board's decision was?

Elaine: Just told him. It was via email. I explained it was too big a jump. He then asked to make an appointment to come talk to me. He wasn't being a jerk at all. He said he thought there was a priority that we pay industry standards. He feels he has been overlooked in our efforts. The Covington job is the anchor to his argument, because that is his job description.

Bob: We don't want to lose him.

Dog park people leave and say they appreciate that we have allocated \$25k from the contingency.

Hans: We do have money in our capital plan to support the dog park with fundraising support from the community, but we moved it to 2024, because, a) we have too much on our plate for 2023, and b) we want to consider the design questions.

Citizen: We appreciate you telling us this.

Hans: Keith can continue working with you on the design challenges.

Bob: We don't want to lose Derek. That decrepit pool, and the whole mechanical system – he knows it, he babysits it. We would be in bad shape if we lost him. And he's a great guy.

Josh: I don't want to cut off our noses to spite our face, but I do not like the precedent we are setting. This is open record. Any employee can look back and see that they can go to Elaine, Elaine will go to the Board, and they say it's not good enough and threaten to walk.

Bob: Where are all the key players right now with their wages and potential desire for more money? Are we really at risk of this? It seems to me we are in a good place with the others.

	<p>Elaine: We are. We made all the other adjustments with those two \$50k buckets that were based on careful evaluation of us vs like-sized districts in the area. Derek's position was not part of that. His was not considered a key position at the time. We are pretty darned close to industry with all the others.</p> <p>Josh: Essentially he is telling you, if we don't pay him \$27.95, and he goes to Covington, and they pay him the top of that wage scale, that is a delta of \$130 a week. He is willing to commute to Covington?</p> <p>Elaine: No, he would go back to being an electrician – or something else. He is just saying this is what he is worth.</p> <p>Bob: He did exactly what I would have done. I really like him, his work ethic. He is a strong family man. He is the right kind of employee for what we need there, especially given that pool is falling apart. It will be a challenge keeping it going for the next several years before we can address it. That pool is coming on 50 years with no significant improvements. I am in favor of the \$27.95.</p> <p>Sarah: If the pool is as you say, his job as maintenance will become more significant than lifeguard over time. I defer to Elaine. She is intimate with the budget and what she needs. I support what she wants.</p> <p>Keith: I agree.</p> <p>Hans: I was supportive of it last week. It is in line with industry standards. No motion is necessary, because it would be approved within the budget. Josh has highlighted a process question that we should address in the future – a wage table, a wage review committee – a process that is not so clunky. We need to consider how best to partner with the ED on this in the future.</p> <p>Bob: Is there a policy on this?</p> <p>Elaine: There is an old policy that spoke to the step increases, but you overrode that in favor of the buckets. We need to update the policy. Josh is right to request this, and we need to prioritize it next year.</p> <p>Hans: We need to minimize the back and forth with staff on this issue.</p> <p>Josh: I don't like that we don't have limits within which to negotiate. And we can't compensate somebody based on how much we like them. We have a lot to do on this.</p> <p>Elaine:</p> <p>CIP – removed \$50k 2023 contingency; at first we allocated \$25k to pickleball and \$25k to a dog park then decided to move those to 2024. I moved the projects from 2022 here that have not yet been addressed. On the CIP spreadsheet, I rounded THD to \$2.7 mil, not \$2.8 mil, because the issue was the \$400k fundraising; this way all the pieces add up correctly: \$1.5 m grants, \$800k VPD, and \$400k fundraising.</p> <p>Hans: on the dog park, that is back to Sarah and Keith to figure that out.</p> <p>Keith: We need to look at other options. What will be an impediment will be a cost for them. Whatever satisfies the equestrian community will be quite dear. I suggested looking at the piece behind the LDS church, but they didn't want to look at it.</p> <p>Hans: They need to understand we are okay with putting this \$50k in 2024 for a dog park and/or pickleball to be married with community funding. AND, the board is not yet comfortable with Paradise Ridge as the location.</p> <p>Sarah: It is great that groups approach us. But is there a better process for looking at these things? How do we consider them relative to committed projects? When these things come up, what is the best way for us to field them? We want to respond to the community but also be careful how we load the District. I'm thinking about needing a process for ideas we cannot solve in one meeting.</p> <p>Josh: Maybe whomever is the chair can field some of that before them coming to the Board. I can't imagine a process where we all review these things outside a Board meeting. So just one person review?</p>	<p>Action Item</p>
--	--	---------------------------

	<p>Sarah: I’m thinking something more clearcut than that – like something on the website. When they come to the meeting, we just say, “This is how this works” or we prepare something to give them ahead of time. Elaine gives them something in advance of the meeting – “This is what you need to know.” As a group, we decide the best way to move forward when a new group comes before us. We can control the new projects to some extent. Even just asking Elaine to cost out putting in a new driveway. She only has so many hours in a day. We can talk about this down the road – consider as a project.</p>	
Board Vote	<p>Hans: I move we adopt the 2023 budget as amended and the 2023 – 2027 Capital Improvement Plan. Bob: Second. Hans: My motion was actually “Adopt the 2023 budget and the 2023 – 27 Capital Improvement Plan.” It’s good for the Board to weigh in there. It should be that without too much formality. Obviously, the CIP will change, but this is it for now. Note the view restoration is now in 2024. Delete the dock’s footnote #11 – it’s old. And footnote 4 – solar? Elaine: It’s a question to consider. A design for future solar. Hans: Take the question mark off. It’s a separate design consideration. And after Tramp Harbor, get rid of the word “full” – it should just be Dock Replacement. I’ll do a separate motion in January on fees, but just a note that this budget includes the \$18k in increased fees. Pass 5-0 Hans: Motion to adopt the 2023 Fee Schedule. Effective January 1, but it allows for the transition process. Elaine: Yes, basketball and Lacrosse are usually in play, so that will hit in April for them. It takes awhile to update the software. We’ll shoot for January 1. Keith: Second. Hans: You’ll send a note to the sport groups? The context for us is that our costs are up 15 – 20%. We are asking for a contribution to our higher costs. Elaine: Yes.</p>	<p>Motion to adopt the 2023 budget as amended and the 2023 – 2027 Capital Improvement Plan</p> <p>Motion to adopt the 2023 Fee Schedule. Effective January 1, but it allows for the transition process.</p> <p>Action Item</p>
King County Grants 2023	<p>Elaine: New King County grant cycle coming up for Aquatic Facilities and capital projects. Due March 15. 1) Aquatics - \$100k no match. Anything over requires 50% match. Per policy, since there is no match, I am moving forward with applying for the \$100k Aquatic grant. I am working with Derek to identify our needs. Anything over \$100k requires a 50% match. 2) Capital –Up to \$1 million available – no match – due March, 2023. I would prefer applying for the BARC building – great need here due eliminate vandalism and break-ins, needs a new roof, enclose for heat and dry conditions. That said, it would work for pickle ball or a dog park. I would like to apply for the BARC building enclosure like the other grant we tried for but did not get. We get more bang for the buck with this vs a dog park or pickle ball courts. It reduce our CIP on that line. Josh: Potentially we take the savings there to apply to either. All agree.</p>	
Staff Reports	<p>Elaine: Maps – A very nice Vashon citizen approached me, the Land Trust, and David Kimmett of King County about wanting to organize a uniform set of trail maps for all public properties on Vashon. What an awesome idea! The Land Trust has offered to GIS all trails and KC has offered to format them. From there, we will have maps available by print, digital, and even potentially as an app. Bob: All trails on the island? Or just the parks? Elaine: All public properties. Hans: You said sets, so one for each.</p>	

	<p>Keith: Paper or digital?</p> <p>Elaine: Both. For the website, and people stop in a lot asking for maps.</p> <p>Elaine:</p> <p>Invasive DIY workshop – first one had 6 people at Wingehaven. We will have more.</p> <p>Elaine: I may put some dollars for advertising in the BC for these.</p> <p>Hans: This is great – any way you can promote it would be great. Some communities provide free composting as a motivator. Composting ivy on a particular weekend makes people think about getting out and doing it. Talk to the County about that. You get a voucher to take it to the transfer station.</p> <p>Sarah: I love this. You can't compost it on your property, or it will grow again.</p> <p>Elaine:</p> <p>Rec Programming - I sent you the latest email blast of recreation programming.</p> <p>Elaine: Keith and I went to the guest speaker. It was well attended generated some lively discussion afterward.</p> <p>Bob: Was there talk about people buying up homes and not living in them?</p> <p>Elaine: Yes. Before the talk started, a couple shared with me how they see VPD doing such cool things. They like the community activities and events we are doing, which came off our Recreation Program Plan.</p> <p>Keith: Did PSE give us money for that?</p> <p>Elaine: Yes, \$2,000.</p> <p>Keith: Maybe have Bruce Haulman do a talk on the census on Vashon. He has done several talks, and they are very unique.</p> <p>Hans: I am really pleased with our programming.</p>	
<p>Adjourn 8:45 pm</p>	<p>Bob: Motion to adjourn Hans: Second Pass 5-0</p>	

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford