

VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference and In person, 7:00 pm

DATE: Tuesday, March 28, 2023

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		
3.14.23 Minutes; 3.12 – 3.20.23 Preliminary Vouchers; February Vouchers	Hans: Motion to accept the 3.14.23 Minutes; 3.12 – 3.20.23 Preliminary Vouchers; February Vouchers Keith: Second	Motion to approve the 3.14.23 Minutes; 3.12 – 3.20.23 Preliminary Vouchers; February Vouchers Pass 4-0 (Sarah not present yet)
February, 2023 Financial Report	Elaine: There isn't enough yet to talk about. Trends so far: Commons - wages over Programs- wages under Pool – revenue down, wages up, utilities up Pt Rob – revenue down – not surprising due to the flood. Fern Cove – revenue up CIP – we moved the Fisher shop insulation to 2025, added the Paradise Ridge stall project, increased the THD engineering fee to \$271k, added the furnace replacements at Pt Rob due to the flood, and added the first \$13k insurance installment payment. Our total losses (including labor time and lost revenue) total to \$45k, \$40k of which is covered by insurance. What they are not covering are the pre-emptive fixes that protect the items in the basements going forward – like the furnaces raised off the floor and the washers and dryers on raised platforms.	

	<p>Keith: Are we doing any berm building?</p> <p>Elaine: That is on the list we are still waiting on Coast Guard approval. We want to put concrete abutments around the door wells.</p>	
Tramp Harbor Dock	<p>Elaine: At the last meeting, when we discussed the revised forecasts based on the new KC AV forecast that reduces our 2024 levy by \$300k, I informed you that we would not be able to contribute \$800k to the THD. It takes our cash flow negative in 2026 when construction would happen, and we end the year with nothing in reserves. We decided to move forward with Phase 2 with KPFF knowing we might just tear the dock down if all the grants and fundraising do not come through.</p> <p>Josh asked if we would at least have enough funding to tear the dock down in 2026. At an estimated \$250k for teardown, no -- even that would take our cash flow negative and leave our reserves around \$300k. At the last meeting, we discussed that we may have to do tear down in another year after saving for a while. After all, we have 12 years from the lease signing date (which was January, 2021). Another option might be to run another levy asking for an increased rate if people really want this dock. Best case scenario is we get all 4 grants.</p> <p>We are now under contract again with KPFF so moving forward.</p> <p>Bob: We received an email from one of the group members who thought we should go after King County, etc.</p> <p>Elaine: He also wants us to partner with a bunch of agencies and the school district and put in an education center, etc.</p> <p>Bob: I assume all avenues have been investigated? – like seeing if KC and Standard Oil are partially responsible?</p> <p>Sarah: Elaine sent out a letter.</p> <p>Elaine: I spoke to our attorney. She said no – it is our dock and property, so it's on us.</p> <p>Hans: It might be different if there was environmental remediation.</p> <p>Elaine: True, but not for just tearing down and replacing the dock.</p> <p>Hans: It is a recreational structure at this point.</p>	
Board Votes	<p>Board Vote:</p> <p>Keith: Motion to approve making the BARC Lead position $\frac{3}{4}$ time.</p> <p>Sarah: Second.</p> <p>Pass 5-0</p>	<p>Motion to approve making the BARC Lead position $\frac{3}{4}$ time. Pass 5-0</p>
Levy	<p>Elaine: I submitted my op-ed to the Beachcomber to run March 30. Just a reminder the Board op ed will be April 13 (written by Bob and Sarah). I informed Liz Shepherd of that.</p> <p>Hans: That will be good, because there might be issues to respond to after Elaine's op-ed.</p> <p>Sarah: We will not have a meeting before the deadline, so we will email to Elaine to send to you. I feel ours should be very concise – this is what happens if it does not pass, and this is why we think it is fair what we're asking.</p> <p>Josh: Would you write TLDR? (too long, didn't read).</p> <p>Sarah: If you see that, it means it's a quick summary – the cliff notes. I think we just hit it quick. We can even reference your op-ed in ours.</p> <p>Bob: At least $\frac{1}{2}$ the people on the island don't understand there are two park systems on the island.</p> <p>Sarah: More like three if you count the Land Trust. It's really confusing.</p> <p>Bob: Are we doing an op-ed or a letter to the editor?</p> <p>Elaine: You could do either. An op-ed is much longer but has a limit of words. If you want to keep it concise, a letter to the editor might be more fitting.</p> <p>Sarah: Can you put a graphic in it?</p>	

<p>Elaine: I don't know.</p> <p>Sarah: A map of Vashon with stars on where they are would be helpful.</p> <p>Hans: For me, I like to see good news, bad news, good news. Start by saying, "This will be in your mailbox; please vote. You will get these great 5 things." By the time they read your letter, they will have their ballots. So yours can be, "If you haven't already, please vote – just a reminder. And the fact is this tiny levy provides this great value. And if this tiny levy does not pass, you don't get anything."</p> <p>Sarah: And ending with a positive – your parks in great shape, so let's keep them that way. What can we say about if the levy doesn't pass, we don't open the gates to the parks?</p> <p>Elaine: You can say that. It is fact.</p> <p>Bob: You just can't say please vote for this. You cannot encourage a vote one way or the other.</p> <p>Hans: Regarding the two or three park systems, is there value to going down that path?</p> <p>Bob: Last time, there was confusion about King County coming to the rescue. There was something else.</p> <p>Elaine: It was mostly Facebook chatter about thinking KC would take over if our levy failed. I spent a lot of time addressing that. I spoke directly to the Director of KC Parks, and she said that would not happen.</p> <p>Hans: I think the third paragraph can be, "If the levy doesn't pass, the gates will close, and we will not get any support from the County." I wouldn't put that at the front. I also don't think we should say we are not King County Parks – that's not what this is about. It's okay with me if they think every park with a gate is going to close, even if it's not our park.</p> <p>Josh: I think hitting the things people will really recognize – there will not be Concerts in the Park or Ski School. These things will not happen. No pool, no programs.</p> <p>Bob: It almost goes the other way. If people assume, without knowing the difference between VPD and KC Parks, if they're so confused, they might think it is all King County. We might say, "These are the ones you are going to lose." They might be the most important ones.</p> <p>Sarah: People should know it is about volume of vote, as well. We need 60%.</p> <p>Josh: And the percent from the last general election.</p> <p>Hans: That should be a first paragraph point.</p> <p>Elaine: I will look up that link and get it to you.</p> <p>Hans: Really drive home the point that every ballot counts.</p> <p>Elaine: The big message is the 60% yes vote. I don't know that I would even mention the 40%. It's too confusing.</p> <p>Hans: The number won't drive people to vote. We need everyone to vote. So Elaine's runs the 30th. Sarah and Bob on the 13th. Know that one or two crabby people might respond to Elaine, so it would be good to address those.</p> <p>Elaine: Sarah was going to ask if VMIHA would do an op ed April 6. I have David Hackett lined up for the 20th. He'll speak as a former commissioner and for the sport groups.</p> <p>Sarah: I spoke to Char. I will double check.</p> <p>Elaine: We have yard signs that were paid for by the Foundation for the last election. I double checked the law on this. We may display campaign signs in our yards and on our vehicles as well as on other property with permission. As a private citizen, an elected official may participate in political campaigns and promote or oppose a ballot proposition, but there shall be no use of a public office or agency - no use of a public office or facilities. They cannot be placed in our parks or facilities. Private property owners must give permission. Note, we must remove signs within 10 days.</p> <p>Keith: Stay clear of the County right of way. On rural roads, it's 60 feet – 80 feet from the center line. We lost some signs for another issue.</p> <p>Elaine: I have never encountered that.</p>	<p>Action Item</p>
---	---------------------------

	<p>Keith: They were running their brush machines.</p> <p>Hans: So put them where they have been brushed.</p> <p>Keith: There is an app called Parceled that can tell you if you are on public property.</p> <p>Elaine: I'm sending the postcards to the post office Thursday and Friday. It's a timing thing. Ballots go out April 5 – Wednesday. I'm trying to time the postcards to hit around Monday.</p> <p>Keith: I have a suggestion for how to post the signs in glacial till. If you go to the Island Home Center, they have 3/8 inch rebar they will give you for free. Pound it in with a sledge hammer.</p> <p>Josh: If a business wants to display a sign, can I give it to them?</p> <p>Elaine: yes, as a citizen. We talked about doing an email campaign. Have the user group leadership send things to their members. Shall we just send out my op-ed for that?</p> <p>Hans: Yes, the genesis would be that you send something. Then we leverage that. Your op-ed is about it. Then you would want a paragraph of HTML in there. This is going to our friends and partners. Certainly, remind them this is going into people's mailboxes on Thursday. You'll send it Tuesday. We need 60%. That HTML that isn't so clear in your op-ed is you're asking them to share this and you need them to ask people to vote. We'll use your paragraph with a link to the op-ed. Send it to the email list, which includes all of us. Sarah will send it on to the horse group, and Josh to his folks, Bob to pool partners, I'll send to the sport users.</p> <p>Keith: I have a good list of the Gold Beach residents.</p> <p>Sarah: I have the Yacht Club. And I know Michael at the Sportsmen's Club.</p> <p>Elaine: I'll send that Tuesday.</p> <p>Hans: Do the highway signs remind people to vote? The two signs? A vote reminder there would be good.</p> <p>Elaine: I don't know if they're booked, but I'll check.</p> <p>Sarah: What about the theater sign?</p> <p>Hans: Someone can ask Eileen what she charges. And someone can ask the Health Club.</p> <p>Sarah: I know them.</p> <p>Josh: Can one's spouse reserve it and say vote for the levy? That's not a commissioner.</p> <p>Elaine: Sure.</p>	Action Items
Strategic Plan	<p>Elaine: I updated the schedule with the owner. Reminder that in April, we have user group outreach, and I have some employee items to do. We can take a shot at the vision. To that end, Keith sent out something on vision. The updated mission statement is attached.</p> <p>Keith: Is that policies or practices?</p> <p>Hans: We can get rid of "and policies." The point is we don't make Cadillacs.</p> <p>Bob: We have standards set by policies in terms of how parks are maintained. I don't see a problem with leaving it this way.</p> <p>Elaine: Sarah was going to take a stab at Financial Stewardship vs Environmental Sustainability for Values.</p> <p>Sarah: We decided sustainability was more about fiscal sustainability. I made a separate one and called it Environmental Responsibility. I wanted it to encompass all the areas where we can be active in achieving responsible ways to go.</p> <p>"Environmental Responsibility: We are committed to high standards of environmental stewardship throughout. We exercise best environmental practices in the care and preservation of our lands and in the operations throughout the organization. Our commitment to the environment is reflected in the decisions and actions made at the highest levels of the organization." One is at the level of what kind of fertilizer we use or paint for fields, etc. Then we have a line item for an electric truck. We can weight that decision as a Board. We already recycle. We should consider making improvements</p>	

	<p>in operations. We have an environmental policy, but we want to ensure it is put into play and is factored into decisions at the top level. I want it to approach this at all tiers. In the other values there are words that are redundant. I will send out my edits.</p> <p>Elaine: We subscribe to an NRPA monthly magazine. The one I received yesterday has an article about the legal pressure coming down on park agencies that forces more sustainable practices. For example, Seattle Parks is now mandated to use electric leaf blowers. I told Shawn to look into that for us, because what happens in Seattle will happen statewide. It would be wise to be in front of that with a value. Otherwise, it will bite you if you're not financially prepared to transition.</p> <p>Sarah: It is good for employees to think of that. For example, Paradise Ridge got sand from BARC, and Mark says we can reuse it for trails. It wasn't thrown into a landfill.</p> <p>Josh: We should make sure efficiencies are considered in operations.</p> <p>Sarah: They are often hand in hand. These things impact employee attitudes and the people who come to our parks. It is important to also highlight the things we already do.</p> <p>Elaine: We have two really talented Maintenance employees who do a lot of repurposing building material.</p> <p>Sarah: Spending \$60k to insulate a building has an environmental impact, as well.</p> <p>Josh: I look forward to you sending that out for our review. I remember Barb saying that values should also be staff driven. Have you received feedback from staff on values?</p> <p>Elaine: I did originally when we did the first Strategic Plan. I haven't with this round, but I can.</p> <p>Josh: I have a question about the Teamwork and Partnership value. The last line includes criminal justice – why are we concerned about that?</p> <p>Bob: It looks like that was added. It must have come in with the DEI additions.</p> <p>Josh: My position is that we remove it.</p> <p>Hans: How about we change it to racial justice? We added the DEI one in 2020. But this one addresses working with our partners on structural changes in the community. I think racial justice is appropriate.</p> <p>Sarah: I had some other small changes – like on the Stewardship and Sustainability one. Those words have so many meanings.</p> <p>Hans: It's not entirely about fiscal stewardship – it's also about the resources.</p> <p>Sarah: I thought conservancy would be good – “Conservancy and financial sustainability.”</p> <p>Bob: Why not just sustainability?</p> <p>Hans: It is often tied to the environment.</p> <p>Sarah: To me, conservancy is more about long term, like a legacy.</p> <p>Hans: How about long term stewardship? Sustainable stewardship? I am reluctant to go with conservancy. I want to use regular words for regular people.</p> <p>Sarah: We're kind of talking about fiscal responsibility.</p> <p>Josh: What about Stewardship and Fiscal Responsibility?</p> <p>Sarah: On Safety and Excellence, it's too wordy. I prefer we strive to support the health and well being...</p> <p>Josh: During the pandemic, the parks were literally the safe space to recreate. I think we are committed to health and well being.</p> <p>Sarah: Being committed sounds like that is more than we are able to do. We strive to support...</p> <p>Josh: Send the draft to Elaine.</p> <p>Hans: It's the first value. It's like we kind of want to. I would rather start strong without strive.</p>	<p>Action Item</p>
--	--	---------------------------

Sarah: And then there's "We work to exceed." Maybe we should just say we exceed. What would Barb do? To say we exceed expectations is presumptive, because what if we don't?

Hans: That's a judgement call we have to make. I think we can say it either way, but it has to be a core value we all embrace. Is exceeding expectations a core value? Or is striving to exceed? I think exceeding is fine. For myself, I am more for strong statements. I would also get rid of "strive to." I support you taking a cut at this.

Sarah: But somebody has to tell you that you exceeded expectations.

Bob: We don't know what their expectations are.

Sarah: I think it should be something we want to do, but they have to tell us if we actually did that. We can't say we exceed expectations.

Josh: We're assessing with people – are we delivering what they want to do?

Sarah: We know we support the health and well-being, but we don't know expectations. Striving is more humble.

Josh: Under Integrity, can we get rid of "we believe that?"

Sarah: On the DEI one, the second sentence says we are committed to expanding our awareness of and sensitivity to the importance of. I took all that out to say, "We are committed to expanding diversity by creating an inclusive..."

Josh: I think awareness and sensitivity are big parts of the work. I would like to preserve those two concepts.

Sarah: We'll just leave it.

Hans: On the headings, two of them say "commitment to." I don't think we need "commitment to" on the first and sixth one. And Teamwork/Partnership is the only one with a slash. Teamwork and Partnership or just Partnership.

Josh: Teamwork doesn't seem relevant.

Sarah: Teamwork seems internal to me.

Keith: On Professional Development, it is in the passive voice, whereas all the others are not. I would suggest we make two sentences: "We seek to provide a superior level of service to the community. This requires the attraction and continuous development of dedicated, highly motivated, and competent staff."

Bob: On the environmental, we also talked about setting an example.

Sarah: After the discussion with Barb about vision, we talked about brainstorming. There are two parts to nailing it down, then opening it back up. I was just thinking I could see what we could do for the community. I don't think that belongs in the values, but I would like to talk more about it. It's easy to forget about all the things parks can do for people and bring them together. I think that's more vision.

Bob: Barb would like to be invited back in for that.

Sarah: It would be good to have her here to help cull our ideas appropriately and lead them to goals. We can have a lot of ideas, but it needs to get boiled down to the day to day.

Josh: How much time should we budget for the vision discussion?

Hans: Just a reminder, we decided at one of the two April meetings, we'll spend some time pre-visioning. Barb's instruction was to do all our research first and then do your vision. Sarah was enthusiastic at the time and thought we should do some pre-visioning. The August meeting is when we would do the vision. We can invite Barb to support either or both of those.

Sarah: We have a lot to do. There is a lot in May. I wonder if we shouldn't email more or make a longer meeting? All brainstorming takes time. There is much to do on our own, but the visioning will need a big chunk of time.

Josh: So 45 minutes?

Sarah: I propose we go out for beer and do this.

Josh: Often strategic planning happens at a retreat, like on a Saturday.

	<p>Elaine: We have done that in the past.</p> <p>Sarah: If we get the vision down, it will help us formulate everything else.</p> <p>Hans: But Barb's instruction was to do the research first, so August.</p> <p>Bob: Would you like me to talk with her and get her input?</p> <p>Sarah: I asked her about that – about doing both at the same time. One informs the other. She said we kind of could. She originally said you have to do the current state analysis before you do the vision. She said there can be a conflict there. The current state analysis is a lot of data gathering. The vision is where you want to get – to pull yourself up to it. Your incremental changes you envision when you're doing the current state analysis may not be helping you get to where you want to be.</p> <p>Bob: You don't want to be too conscious of what's ahead when you're looking at right now – a snapshot.</p> <p>Sarah: This is left brain thinking where the vision is right brain thinking. She said it's hard to get people out of the left brain and into the right brain creative aspect. But things come up while you're looking at things. That's why it's not so bad to brainstorm in the beginning – not get into the nitty gritty, because there is still all this data to be found.</p> <p>Josh: So 45 minutes for Barb in an upcoming meeting in April to do the pre-visioning, then finalize the vision in August.</p> <p>Hans: Let's start – eat a little bit, and see where it goes.</p> <p>Sarah: We can go to my house when the weather is nice.</p> <p>Josh: My suggestion was that one of the two meetings in April we get 45 minutes with Barb. Should we do that based on Barb's schedule?</p> <p>Bob: I'll talk to her about that. Sometime in April?</p> <p>Josh: Yes, for the pre-vision visioning.</p> <p>Bob: I'll ask her about that as a concept. Right in the middle of the current state analysis is what you're talking about.</p> <p>Hans: Before, actually. We will not be reviewing any current state.</p> <p>Bob: So you're imagining what kind of vision you're moving toward while you're doing the current state analysis.</p> <p>Sarah: Without the current state, we have ideas about where we'd like it to go.</p> <p>Bob: Barb and I have talked about this. People seem to allow a vision to direct where they're going without understanding where they are right now. It can blind you to some areas you should be looking at. But I'll talk with her.</p>	Action Item
Community Survey	<p>Elaine: I went through and made my notes:</p> <p>Section 2, remove Lost Lake and Spring Beach. We are transferring to King County. Remove THD, because nobody is using it.</p> <p>Remove question 2 altogether. The Land Trust is not what we are looking for. Last time we were just looking for broad recreation habits.</p> <p>On 4 – “at least \$1.9 million” should be \$2.9 million. And it's 50%.</p> <p>Remove the Pt Rob lighthouse decking, because that is being done right now.</p> <p>5 – under park restrooms, remove VES, because that is done.</p> <p>Pool cover – I would say permanent enclosure and remove operations up to \$300k per year. We already know operation costs.</p> <p>The campground – I don't think we have the bandwidth to do a campground. Remove it.</p> <p>Sarah: I took this from the last survey. What about the Fisher Pond ADA trail?</p> <p>Hans: I would remove that. Remove the developing recreation programming and the climbing wall. Remove staffing the indoor skate park.</p> <p>Elaine: Remove the VIGA project – we don't know what they are up to.</p>	

	<p>Sarah: What about eliminating user fees?</p> <p>Hans: Take it out. I'm not planning to remove user fees.</p> <p>Elaine: Remove the VES back parking lot.</p> <p>Sarah: Do we want the dog park and the sport court?</p> <p>Elaine: I would just address the pickle ball.</p> <p>Hans: Should we get rid of Paradise Ridge? And say sport courts plural. Do we have the wayfaring signs in the CIP right now?</p> <p>Elaine: We do.</p> <p>Hans: The only thing not on the CIP is the million dollar pool. I would combine these two questions, get rid of anything that is maintenance, like the Ober Park roof replacement and drainage improvements. I'm not looking for feedback on that. Include a list of about 8 or 9 projects that are not basic maintenance.</p> <p>Josh: Just because something is on the CIP, that doesn't necessarily mean it is going to happen.</p> <p>Hans: Pool should be two things – pool maintenance, and the pool roof would be separate.</p> <p>Sarah: So we are going to put the pool roof in here? At that's \$1.5 million?</p> <p>Elaine: I bet it's closer to \$2 mil.</p> <p>Hans: It should say pool roof, because it's permanent. All these big items, we're going to say \$1.4 mil – probably blank grant. So for the roof we'll say the same thing.</p> <p>Elaine: I would get rid of the VES storage foundation – nobody cares about that. The Fern Cove roof and foundation – nobody cares. On the ivy remediation, that should be more than Burton Acres. I would say invasive species remediation in all parks at \$1/2 mil. Renovate and refurbish the Pt Rob houses – get rid of it. I would leave the BARC roof replacement and renovation – if we don't get the grant, that's a big deal at @ \$300k. Leave the roads.</p> <p>Hans: The usage question is priority and the quality/quantity question. #1, Section 2 – how often do you use these things? #3 is how would you rate the quality/quantity of parks? I have an interest in shortening the survey. As it is, it's about 100 responses. I don't think we are serving them or our needs. Question 3 is not very actionable to me. I'm not going to get more parks or change the location of parks. I suggest we remove question 3.</p> <p>Josh: What if it's quality and quantity?</p> <p>Hans: what are you going to do about quantity? If people give us property, we'll take it if it's cheap to maintain and serves our mission. I would like to prioritize the questions – cut them in half. I also would not include the use question. It is helpful to know what our most important parks are, but I already know that. It is not actionable to me.</p> <p>Bob: We already know a lot from the last survey. Not much has probably changed.</p> <p>Keith: The other thing is how you report the results of question 3 that would be useful.</p> <p>Sarah: The only thing about use is that Elaine and I will develop surveys specific to user groups or parks. It might let us know which ones to target. If we make surveys to catch people at different parks, we don't want to do all of them.</p> <p>Josh: On the other hand, what does it cost us to ask that question? It costs us nothing.</p> <p>Hans: It costs people their time. It may determine whether or not they go to the end of the survey. It took me about 15 minutes. I was sick of it after 10.</p> <p>Elaine: We got a lot of negative comments about the length of the last one.</p> <p>Hans: The demographics are at the end. We want them to do demographics. It's out of respect. I will ask people to fill this out, and I want valuable feedback. I'm not going to ask them stuff that is not added value.</p> <p>Sarah: I will incorporate Elaine's and Eric's recreation feedback if you can forward via email.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Hans: They look like current programs and how often people use them. I am interested in what people want to have. I am not interested in use. What do people think we should be doing for programs? Add programs we don't offer. The breadth we offer is pretty good as is. I like the idea of more/less/the same – if people say they want more of concerts and events, that tells us something. Skate park will be there – if people want more, we expand hours. Same with camps – more or less? Add sport camps and nature camps. That whole question you're reading from – I don't like it.</p> <p>Elaine: We don't do sports and athletics, and we're not going to. We have to be realistic about what we can and can't do. And we don't want to compete – like with the sport groups. It would be silly for us to compete against the sport groups. I would ask about things like classes, even though all those have been privatized. Do we want to compete with that?</p> <p>Sarah: I'll update this.</p>	
Insp Point Clearing – work party	Keith: At the work party, we had 28 people. One family was 3 generations. I sent pictures to Elaine and drafted an article for the Beachcomber.	
Adjourn 9:00 pm	<p>Hans: Motion to Adjourn</p> <p>Sarah: Second</p> <p>Pass 5-0</p>	

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford