

# VASHON PARK DISTRICT (VPD) BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

## MEETING MINUTES

Teleconference and In person, 7:00 pm  
**DATE: Tuesday, September 24, 2024**

Commissioners attending: Sarah George, Bob McMahon, Josh Henderson, Hans Van Dusen, and Keith Prior.  
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  |   |   |
| 9/10/2024 Meeting Minutes; 9.6.24 – 9.19.24 Preliminary Vouchers; August Vouchers | Keith: Motion to approve the 9/10/2024 Meeting Minutes; 9.6.24 – 9.19.24 Preliminary Vouchers; August Vouchers<br>Bob: Second<br>Pass 5-0   | Motion to approve the 9/10/2024 Meeting Minutes; 9.6.24 – 9.19.24 Preliminary Vouchers; August Vouchers<br>Pass 5-0 |
| Inspiration Point   | Elaine: Bob prepared a summary of his and Barb's meeting with a contractor.<br>Bob: We corralled Brian Novotney to meet us and take a look, offering ideas about thinning and removing trees (which would be worst case scenario). There will be three view corridors: from the parking lot to the Burton Peninsula; another across to Dockton; and another over Maury Island and the top of Mt Rainier with a bit of water view. Our opinion is that it's such a broad expanse of trees there that any idea of getting it back to what it used to be would be very expensive, resulting in a lot of trees coming down. We want to find some spots where it would be reasonable to limb or remove some weed trees.<br>There are three photos in the summary I provided. There is one where you see just two trees – that's the view toward Dockton. Another shows essentially a huge maple tree, where you can see through it to Burton Peninsula. The other is a bunch of brush and hazelnut trees – getting that down would open the view to Mt. Rainier. As we looked at the potential |   |

view corridors, we figured these three would be the easiest way and least expensive way to get a view through there. The Mt Rainier view would be easiest, as it involves taking down some brush and topping trees in the way. The one with the maple tree – the simplest way would be to take the maple down, but as Elaine pointed out, that would require a permit. That would delay the process, and nobody wants to take trees down. But trying to limb a maple is tough, because the branches grow from the bottom straight up. We can shift the viewpoint to the left of the maple by limbing up some of the fir trees to the left. So the best approach is the view corridor approach. It should take 8 – 10 days to accomplish at \$18 - \$20k.

Keith: It was suggested that we let the branches remain onsite. A permit should not be required for that.

Elaine: In looking at the KC website, anything larger than a 6" diameter tree would require permitting.

Marie Bradley: We talked about topping the trees, and the landowner there said we could let the limbs stay. I don't know if topping is considered removal.

Elaine: Topping is not removal. We're talking about actually removing the tree would require a permit.

Marie: We figured we don't need to remove a tree to open the view. There is quite a bit of view to the left.

Bob: Also remove some of the limbs on the left side to keep the tree alive. The main thing is do we agree that the corridor idea makes sense? If we do, we have an estimate and a job description you can use.

Elaine: So, if we're in agreement, that is the scope.

Hans: I remember talking about this before – the corridor and limbing idea. I am on board with that scope.

Sarah: That is also my understanding, and I agree.

Bob: Do we feel good about the \$20k in the Invitation to Bid?

Elaine: That is fine. But the question from the last meeting is whether or not we will front the money, and the Foundation pays us back, or do we want to wait for them to raise all the money, and they fund it. You wanted a fundraising plan from them if the former. I know Marie wants to do it in phases, but that would not be practical for the contractor.

Marie: It would be phased from the signage coming later. I want this to get done. It keeps getting delayed. I don't understand. I feel muzzled as far as asking for donations. It has been in the VPD budget. I would appreciate the help. It is losing momentum.

Bob: There are certain steps that must be taken before publicizing it. The Board needs to be in agreement.

Marie: This project has been ready to go for a year and a half.

Bob: It has not been ready to go. The Board needs to decide how we proceed before turning it over to the Foundation.

Elaine: Do we agree that the next step is to have the Foundation give the fundraising plan presentation? That was where we left it last. Then we would decide who funds it. So that's the next step.

Marie: The plan is to ask for donations. I haven't been able to do that. I haven't been able to get an article in the BC.

Josh: I can speak to the delays I have put in this. I don't have enough information to front you money.

Bob: We just need a few more steps before we can turn it loose.

Marie: What do you need from me?

Bob: You need to talk to Barb. She understands there needs to be a fundraising plan presented to the Board.

Elaine: The issue is we need \$20k in hand one way or the other, whether the Foundation fundraises for it, or we pay or front it. That is the way to do it now. That is the decision point.

Keith: We put money aside in the CIP for a dog park. We can use that to fund this project.

Bob: I think it's best to have this discussion when the Foundation's plan is presented to us.

Elaine: I'll ask Barb if she can do that at the next meeting.

|  |  |      |            |    |             |     |            |  |
|--|--|------|------------|----|-------------|-----|------------|--|
|  | <p>Hans: For me, this is about moving something up in our adopted CIP now that was planned for the future. That is what I'll be looking at when we adopt the new CIP in the coming months. It will be if we think that is appropriate in context of other CIP projects.</p> <p>Marie: I'm still not clear what you want in a fundraising plan.</p> <p>Bob: Again, I would refer you back to Barb.</p>  |      |            |    |             |     |            |  |
| <b>August, 2024<br/>Financial<br/>Report</b> | <p>Elaine:</p> <p>Admin – over \$6700</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payroll taxes – over \$9k – surprise IRS bill in January</li> <li>• Election costs – over \$11k – carryover from 2023</li> <li>• Insurance – over \$7k – higher than anticipated</li> <li>• Professional fees – under \$12k – accounting and legal fees under average</li> </ul> <p>Maintenance – ahead \$6k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payroll – ahead \$6k</li> <li>• Supplies – over \$4k</li> <li>• Materials – ahead \$6k – will do topdressing this year and another next year</li> <li>• Equipment rental – over \$8k – porta potties</li> </ul> <p>Commons – over \$15k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payroll - over \$17k – working more than anticipated due to drop in programs and increased club sports</li> <li>• Interlocal fee – ahead \$3k – didn't charge what we expected</li> </ul> <p>Programs – ahead \$27k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payroll – under \$26k</li> </ul> <p>Pool – over \$6900</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payroll - over \$6k</li> <li>• Utilities – over \$6k</li> </ul> <p>Pt Rob – over \$12k</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revenue – rental revenue down \$13k</li> <li>• Donations - \$10k from the Keepers for the flagpole, which is up. The flag raising ceremony is Oct. 1.</li> <li>• Equipment rental – over \$9k – extra porta potties and service due to the troll</li> </ul> <p>Fern Cove – over \$26k – all lost revenue</p> <p>CIP – ahead \$13k – Pt Rob road change in scope. That project started today and should be completed tomorrow.</p> |      |            |    |             |     |            |  |
| <b>Tramp Harbor<br/>Dock</b>                 | <p>Elaine: As I explained to you via email, I received the grant scores for the two RCO grants for Tramp Harbor Dock. The grant manager stated we will likely be fully funded for the \$500,000 ALEA grant, and we will not be funded for the \$1.6 million WWRP grant.</p> <p>The ALEA grant will not do us much good without the WWRP grant, so we need to decide next steps. I outlined some options that we can discuss.</p> <p>1) Pare this back to a smaller/narrower dock @ \$2 million and apply for the full King County grant for \$1 million. The funding breakdown would be as follows:</p> <table> <tr> <td>ALEA</td> <td>\$ 500,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KC</td> <td>\$1,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>VPD</td> <td>\$ 200,000</td> </tr> </table>  | ALEA | \$ 500,000 | KC | \$1,000,000 | VPD | \$ 200,000 |  |
| ALEA   | \$ 500,000   |      |            |    |             |     |            |  |
| KC   | \$1,000,000  |      |            |    |             |     |            |  |
| VPD  | \$ 200,000   |      |            |    |             |     |            |  |

Foundation \$ 300,000

That said, based on my last two cycles on the selection committee, I highly doubt we would be awarded \$1,000,000 from the King County grant. But we can try!

Bob: It's not going to be the dock anymore. We decided against the narrower version for a lot of reasons.

2) Fundraise for the additional \$1.6 million (total fundraising needed = \$1.9 million).

Elaine: I think that is highly unlikely.

3) Float a bond.

Elaine: My opinion is it would fail.

Sarah: If we don't think a bond would pass, how much would the community be behind the idea?

Josh: What would be the process?

Elaine: It would have to be voter approved. People's property taxes would go up through the life of the bond.

Josh: So it's for a short period of time. It would not be permanent.

Elaine: I have never done a bond, so I don't know everything about it. I know we would need to go through legal counsel. I think you decide through them what that time period would be for the bond.

Josh: Would it be delineated on my tax breakdown as a separate item?

Elaine: Yes.

Bob: It's like a loan that would be paid back through taxes. We have staked our reputation on never doing that.

4) Try for the WWRP grant again in two years (this would require an extension on the ALEA grant). Before applying and in talking with the grant manager, she said the odds of being funded was really good, because all projects were funded in the last cycle. That said, there were only 4 applications; this time there were 12. It was a lot more competitive. It turns out they are only funding 4 – 6 of these projects. It looks like this was a competition factor. The question is do we want to take that risk? The advantage is that it gives the foundation a lot more time to fundraise. We would still need to go for the KC grant for the \$600k. There would also be an inflation factor if we're adding a couple of years. We'll have to push out the permits. It's complicated. There is always the risk we will not get the KC grant, and there is the risk that we don't get this one again.

5) Remove the portion of the dock on DNR tidelands (160 feet), so the existing dock remains at 180 feet long. We would not be beholden to the DNR requirements any longer. The cost estimate to repair the full existing dock was \$312,000 in 2015. Perhaps we can use the ALEA grant for the repair of the first half of the dock, and we fund the removal of the latter half.

Bob: At low tides, it wouldn't even be over the water.

Elaine: It would mean shifting gears and having the engineers reevaluate it from a repair standpoint.

Bob: The repair option for the full dock was about the same or more than the replacement.

6) Remove the entire dock for \$250,000.

Bob: Going back to the bond, that means asking the island to put their money where their mouth is. That means the money gets spread around to everybody. The way we're approaching it now is that people who really care about it pay with donations.

Josh: Are you able to ask for a bond amount? Or does it have to be the full price of the project?

Elaine: You ask for the bond amount.

Josh: There is a difference between asking for a \$1.5 million bond vs a \$3 million bond. We should just do it for the amount of the one grant -- \$1.6 million.

Keith: In the short term, we need to extend one of the last two options to the tribes. It intrudes into the shellfish tract. We have an obligation to get the dock out of there. We either shorten the dock or remove it, and build what we want new.

Elaine: I don't think you can do that. My understanding is that, once you remove the dock, putting in a new one has to be part of the same project due to the permit process. Once you remove it, I think DOE says no. Also, the cost will increase, because you have to mobilize twice.

Keith: I would go for shortening the dock, and doing that immediately.

Sarah: What all would need to be done if we shorten it and repair the remainder?

Elaine: There are some failed pilings, which I can't remember which ones relative to the whole dock. There are 11 that are in bad shape. Some risers need to be fixed. The planking is fine.

Sarah: Of all the options, where do you lean?

Elaine: I lean toward at least exploring applying for the WWRP again. It gives the Foundation more time to fundraise. The engineering has been spent.

Bob: It would be a shame, since all the money has been spent.

Elaine: My second choice would be to cut it off at 180' and getting it fixed.

Sarah: In the case of waiting, how much does that change things with the engineers? They have said we can extend the permits.

Elaine: I don't believe it changes the permits in principle, but I believe some have to be resubmitted.

Sarah: What other considerations should we think about if we take that path?

Elaine: It's all risk – risk of not getting that grant again, but then we would be no worse off than we are now. We're just pushing off the decision two more years. There is a secondary risk of not getting the KC grant, but it's worth a try.

Sarah: Does waiting two years free of funds for other more immediate projects?

Elaine: It shifts things. We would move our \$200k contribution out. It doesn't change the total. It just rearranges things. Yes, it would free things up for now.

Sarah: There is a benefit, then, to addressing some other pressing issues.

Bob: There is nothing wrong with making a decision to try again in two years. Do the best we can to retain the money we have already been granted. In the process of agreeing to that, we can say in our news report about this that there are other possible approaches we can take, but this is what we prefer. We know that this is the dock design we feel is the best. The others would be half giving up. It doesn't seem to me that there is much choice here.

Elaine: I think there would be a public concern about us having spent the engineering money if we don't continue on the original path.

Bob: We have this momentum – we ought to keep going. We can present the other options to the community in two years if it doesn't work out.

Josh: My sense for option 4 is it extends the timeline for fundraising, and any other half assed attempt at this is going to be half assed. I would rather have egg on our face from having wasted money on engineering drawings with the hopes of doing something well than the version of, "Wow, you spent all that money, and you gave us something we literally can't use."

Bob: Another approach is to say we're going to hold off for a couple years. The other alternatives that would result in the dock that we want is to float the bond or attempt to fundraise for the \$1.6 million. Put those in the announcement, and maybe somebody with money would give us the \$1.6. Those three alternatives get us what we're looking for.

|           |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|
|           | <p>Elaine: Maybe the foundation will end up fundraising more, so we don't have to ask for \$1.6 million. That may be more palatable to the grant selection committee. To the community, we need to be honest about what happened – we didn't get this grant that was fully funded in the past; this time it was very competitive. So we're going to try again.</p> <p>Josh: We can use these two years for campaigning and doing communication work for more public buy-in for the project. It's an opportunity to write something in the Beachcomber – "as a reminder, these are all the things we have done up to this point." We can spell out the options, and say we're going for another round of grants. If we don't get them, we're going to have to make a decision if we're going to remove it or get a bond to replace it. For now, we say there are other options that we don't think are worthwhile.</p> <p>Hans: Process-wise, we should engage with the community – at least with Kell and the dock supporters. I don't think we should make a decision prior to engaging with our partners on this. My thoughts are along the lines of what you all are saying. I think it's fine to say what the other options are, but I don't think fundraising \$1.6 million is a good option, nor is going after the KC \$1 million. Nor is the short dock – over mud a lot of the day, even though it's easier to pull off. The retry is the way to go. The bond is a possibility as a back-up plan – it puts it the community to decide – it's not us deciding. The tertiary would be removing it, but we would have to figure out the funding. Sounds like we have consensus today. We can make a motion on it today and vote next meeting, but that might be getting ahead of our partners.</p> <p>Elaine: When you say partners, do you mean just the Foundation? Or do you mean the broader advisory group?</p> <p>Hans: Just the Foundation.</p> <p>Sarah: When would we talk to the Beachcomber? I agree with Hans about communicating with the Foundation.</p> <p>Elaine: I will talk to Barb tomorrow. I plan on attending their meeting Monday, Oct 7. We'll talk with them fully then and get their input.</p> <p>Bob: That is a meeting for the Friends of the Dock.</p> <p>Elaine: I'll talk to Barb about Foundation input. Sarah, to your question about the Beachcomber – just like Fern Cove, I prefer we raise this after we have a solution in place. We would share all the alternatives we evaluated to arrive at the plan.</p> <p>Bob: Our plan, then, is to still go after grants and continue with the fundraising efforts.</p> <p>Elaine: You all will decide on the plan October 8 at our next meeting. Meanwhile, I will also talk to RCO about extending the ALEA grant; get feedback on the WWRP grant; and the engineers about consequences to permitting. That way you will have better information about your decision.</p> <p>Josh: We should invite Kell and Lisa to the next meeting.</p> |  |
| Fern Cove | <p>Elaine: Regarding the caretaker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VHH received approval from their Board to move forward with entering into an MOU.</li> <li>• Rent – VHH uses the HUD affordable rent standard for determining rent amounts. Their standard for a 3 bedroom is \$2885 as the highest, then we would deduct the value of the assigned duties. I valued the duties at \$25 per hour for what amounted to as 24.07 hours per month, so \$601.75. That would make the rent \$2283 per month. That feels like affordable housing to me.</li> <li>• They have 4 households that have applied for this. That is one good thing that came out of the BC article.</li> <li>• Vashon Nature Center looked at the Carriage House. There is a hole in the roof, and it would need insulation, drywall, heat/electricity, and better flooring for an indoor exhibit. They are not interested in an indoor exhibit unless those things are done, which I don't think we want to spend money on. They are interested in using it as an outdoor covered space with outdoor-rated exhibit panels. They have offered to clean it up inside to make it look</li> </ul>  |  |

more inviting and create some stream-based outreach panels to put on the walls and some seating for people who wanted to relax and picnic in there. It would be an unmanned outdoor covered exhibit space and the caretaker could just open it during the day and close it at night when they open and close the gate.

This would still require maintenance to fix the roof and the drainage so the floor doesn't continue to flood in rains.

I have reached out to RCO about this being an allowable use, just to get in front of it. So you all feel good about that?

Keith: Yes.

Elaine: Meanwhile, something else came up that I said I would bring to you. I received a call from a guy who I believe is Native. He is not part of an organized group, but he has an affiliation with the Puyallup Tribe. He took this idea to the Land Trust, but they declined with the same concerns I have about his proposal. Also to the School District, and they said no. He wants to use the Belle Baldwin house as a cultural and educational center for the Native community. They would have canoe ceremonies where tribes throughout the region could access the property by water. I told him there is a caretaker component to this, which he said they would handle, although nobody would live there. I told him if he wants to explore this, I would need a business plan that would include insurance and a funding plan for renting the space. He reached out to a woman with the Puyallup Tribe who he said is excited about this. The Land Trust and School District said no due to the lack of structure to it. I have reached out to RCO about this being an allowable use.

Bob: How would this work with the caretakers that would be living there?

Elaine: There would not be a caretaker living there. They would be the user of the house.

Josh: Did he get back to you with a business plan? Is there a timeline for that?

Elaine: No.

Bob: It would need to be a very clear plan, because if it flops, we're right back where we started from.

Elaine: I told him the ship has kind of sailed, since we are working with Vashon Household and the Nature Center. It doesn't feel right to just stop our plan and shift gears. I'm sure this idea would take months to put together.

Bob: Since the ship has sailed, why would we consider this? What is the pressure to do it?

Josh: I would think it could be a use that is better aligned with our values.

Elaine: But is it aligned with our mission? Personally, I don't think it is. Too, one of the stipulations in the grant is that, if it's not used as an allowable use, it would have to be open to the public. I told him this. If it is just for tribal use, and not for public use, I would imagine the grant agency would have a problem with that. I am hoping to hear from them this week.

Bob: Under this use, there would not be somebody there all the time. With somebody living there, we know it would be cared for and problems noticed. As our asset, the caretaker makes more sense.

Keith: Since you asked for a business plan, once you get that, and we find out if it's an allowable use, that's when we would make our decision.

Josh: You can tell him it's an interesting idea, but we would really need to see a very detailed plan.

Bob: And by a deadline, because the ship is semi-sailing.

Elaine: If RCO says yes, I will say the business plan idea and come back to you.

Hans: My feeling is we have a plan in place for 2025 for the stewardship of public access to the land. We should go with that. That doesn't preclude something else in the future. We'll have a lease with a resident for a period of time. We need to move forward making sure we can maintain the access and stewardship of the land. Perhaps in the future.

Elaine: That would give him time to get his plan together and present it as a possible future use. Also, Hans, I doubt RCO would feel the open house is an allowable use. I'm thinking we should not do an open house for that reason.

Hans: I don't know that I agree it would not be an allowable use, but I hear your concern.

|                                 |   |   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
|                                 | <p>Elaine: Would you like me to explore that with RCO?</p> <p>Hans: Not at this point.</p>  |   |
| <b>Wingehaven Road Easement</b> | <p>Elaine: King County needs to do some road work on Cunliffe to stabilize the road. This requires that they obtain two easements onto the Wingehaven Park property. They will pay us \$3,000. The temporary easement expires 1/31/31 after the completion of the construction of the road work. The permanent easement gives them access to maintain the road. If we don't accept this, they will exercise Eminent Domain and take it, anyway. My recommendation is we take the \$3k, sign the documents, and be done with it.</p> <p>Keith: I agree.</p> <p>Josh: Just to clarify, if they exercise eminent domain, the court has to establish the value, so there's a chance it would be more than \$3k. But I agree the best way forward is to say yes.</p> <p>Bob: Motion to approve granting King County the temporary and permanent easements at Wingehaven.</p> <p>Keith: Second.</p> <p>Elaine: If you can suspend the rules, it would be good to get the documents back to KC.</p> <p>Bob: Motion to suspend the rules.</p> <p>Keith: Second.</p> <p>Pass 5-0</p> <p>Motion pass 5-0</p>  | <p><b>Motion to approve granting King County the temporary and permanent easements at Wingehaven. Pass 5-0</b></p> <p><b>Motion to suspend the rules Pass 5-0</b></p> |
| <b>2025 Budget - COLA</b>       | <p>Elaine - Josh and Hans are recommending 3% for a 2025 COLA for staff. I looked up the CPI, which was 3.1% for Seattle, but 3% is fine. FYI, levy dollars at this point are \$1,968,677. I estimated \$1,936,099, so \$32k more than projected! I will present the first draft of the budget at the next meeting.</p>   |   |
| <b>Staff Reports</b>            | <p><u>Edan Reframed</u></p> <p>Elaine: Are you familiar with that little garden called Edan Reframed at BARC? It is an absolute mess.</p> <p>Bob: Who is supposed to maintain it?</p> <p>Elaine: I have been in touch with the woman who put it in. She is supposed to maintain it, but she moved off the island years ago. I have talked to the Garden Club to maintain it, but they aren't interested. I can't find anyone to maintain it. The signs are all tagged, and the bees are out of control. Eric got stung three times when he went in there. It is meant to attract bees, which is not a good thing in a park full of kids. The fence is falling apart. It's really not part of the culture at BARC. I spoke with the woman, and she agreed it's time to remove the garden. We are going to replace it with a Gaga ball pit from an Eagle scout. We can have the balls available in the building.</p> <p><u>RCO Compliances</u></p> <p>Elaine: The final outstanding issue was the Hitchings property we transferred to King County. We needed to transfer the grant requirements, so that was just approved by RCO. We are now 100% compliant with RCO going forward.</p> <p><u>Vashon Pickleball Club meeting</u></p> <p>Elaine: We had a meeting last Tuesday. 5 people showed up. We are running a blurb in the BC for a community meeting 10/14, inviting the neighbors from BARC. Judith will do another presentation.</p> <p>Bob: At the last meeting we discussed the funding for the pickle ball project. There seems to be confusion about who is running the show. The Foundation has collected money. Is there anything in the MOU about how that will be handled?</p> |   |

|                            |   |                    |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------|
|                            | <p>Elaine: I haven't updated the MOU, because I'm waiting for Barb with feedback from her board about what they want to do. Where we left it, we talked about Barb's thought that the foundation would only support it from a PR standpoint. The Vashon Pickleball Club will do the fundraising, and RJ's Kids will receive the funds.</p> <p>Bob: The foundation is in a little awkward position, because it's in their marketing pieces.</p> <p>Elaine: My takeaway from our last meeting with me, Barb, Judith, and Baruch was that Barb was actually relieved that they would not be involved.</p> <p>Bob: I think they are concerned about their reputation.</p> <p>Elaine: I will talk with Barb further.</p> <p>Hans: Since Parks is not able to fund it, what is the fundraising amount needed?</p> <p>Elaine: About \$110k is the likely target.</p> <p>Hans: Are the pickleball reps comfortable with that?</p> <p>Elaine: They didn't say one way or the other. They just said they would get on it. No concerns were raised.</p> <p><b><u>2021 – 2023 Audit</u></b></p> <p>Elaine: This is now underway. We have always passed with flying colors, and I have no concerns. Bob will be the Board representative for the risk assessment. He is most familiar with the financial system, since he is treasurer.</p> <p><b><u>Pool Bubble Ownership</u></b></p> <p>Elaine: Originally, the bubble was understood to be owned by the Seals. With this bubble, the question came up about who owns the new bubble. We are paying for half of it. I feel we should own it going forward, and their half should be considered a donation.</p> <p><b><u>ED Job Description</u></b></p> <p>Josh: Hans and I want to do a more robust performance appraisal for the ED. I have set up a timeline. We first need to understand Elaine's job. I imagine your job description does not match the reality of what you do. I would like for you to update your job description and bring it to the next meeting. On the 22<sup>nd</sup>, I will operationalize everything from the job description, and create that into a scale. Once that is completed, we will hand it out to everyone for feedback. Last time we did senior staff and board members. I would like for you to have the opportunity to evaluate yourself. That would be good to have due by November 19<sup>th</sup>. Then it goes to Sarah on the 3<sup>rd</sup>. Sarah would give it to you to review on the 10<sup>th</sup>.</p> | <b>Action Item</b> |
| <b>Adjourn<br/>8:30 pm</b> | <p>Keith: Motion to adjourn</p> <p>Bob: Second</p> <p>Pass 5-0</p>  |                    |
|                            |   | 9                  |

Minutes by: Elaine Ott-Rocheford