

VASHON PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

MEETING MINUTES

Ober Park, Performance Room, 7:00 pm

DATE: Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Commissioners attending: Lu-Ann Branch, Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Scott Harvey.

Staff attending: Jason Acosta, Elaine Rocheford.

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
Call to order & agenda review	The meeting was called to order by Doug. Doug reviewed the agenda.	
Public Comment	<p>Captain Joe: Since Analee is here, I would like to recognize the number of awards to the Beachcomber. Analee does not print the congratulations, but I would like to recognize a job well done.</p> <p>Point Robinson Open House will be Sunday, December 3. Start at noon and go until 4:00. The lighthouse Santa will be there. It's a great event. We time it on purpose to coincide with the Art Tour to draw people to the Maury Island side.</p> <p>Doug: Is this the event where the good chili is made?</p> <p>CJ: Lovingly made the night before but never lasts through the day.</p>	
October 10, 2017 Minutes Preliminary 10.6.17 – 10.19.17 Vouchers	<p>LuAnn: I move we accept the minutes and vouchers as presented.</p> <p>Scott: Second</p> <p>Passed 4 – 0.</p>	MOTION, SECOND TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AND VOUCHERS
Board Votes	<p><u>Board Votes:</u></p> <p>1) Bob: I move that the MOU be accepted as modified. Lu-Ann: second.</p> <p>Elaine: I made the changes we talked about last time:</p> <p>Item 15 and an insurance section, item 6 under VPD Roles. It does not change the material nature of the MOU. Our insurance company did agree to name the Seals as Additional Insured for our use of the Dome for our public purposes.</p> <p>CJ: May I ask what a Dome Molley is?</p> <p>Elaine: It's the anchors that go into the concrete. Anchors the Dome to the concrete.</p> <p>CJ: Oh, Molley bolts!</p> <p>Doug: Where did we land with Item 15?</p> <p>Elaine: There were no requested changes to the language.</p> <p>Doug: But are we agreed? It says projected net cost. How did we decide to evaluate the nature of the costs?</p>	

	<p>Elaine: The conversation is reflected in the minutes. We're looking at it from day 1, the projected costs all the way in a nonlinear fashion, and if, in those early months, the projected revenue or costs are off, we would add additional fundraising or cut costs, etc.</p> <p>Bob: The way I see it is we show month by month what we expect costs and revenue to be. It's a curve, and as the months go by, we plot actual against that curve. You can't just take what you have over a few months and extrapolate that over a straight line.</p> <p>Doug: And supposedly we know how to do that in a nonlinear fashion?</p> <p>Scott: Between a banker, an economist, and an engineer, I should think we can figure that out.</p> <p>Doug: That's what I'm worried about!</p> <p>Pass 4 – 0.</p> <p>2) Bob: Motion to Accept the Draft Vision Statement. Scott: second.</p> <p>LuAnn: Is the Vision Statement the document we discussed last meeting and we have in our Board packet for this meeting? All the strategies?</p> <p>Elaine: No, the Vision Statement is the glossy overview.</p> <p>Pass 4 - 0</p>	<p>Motion to accept the MOU. Pass 4 – 0</p> <p>Motion to accept the Draft Vision Statement. Pass 4 - 0</p>
<p>Maintenance Standards – Addendum to Policy #2600</p>	<p>Bob: You recall we came up with a policy that dictates standards should be set for all our facilities. It occurred to me that it might make sense, in concert with the Maintenance Management Plan, that we set three park levels. The MM Plan doesn't look at standards of appearance. We need to decide those standards to guide the MM Plan. So I put together these items to add to the policy. The staff can't know what is in our minds for standards. I wasn't planning to discuss these tonight. I included some things I didn't want to include. I thought we should meet separately first.</p> <p>Elaine: Jason, me, and Eric met to go over this if you would like to discuss our comments now or wait for another meeting. In doing a MM Plan, we are required to include standards. Jason decided the levels of 1, 2, and 3, but it really is up to the Board to decide what the standards need to be. Then we write the MM Plan to those standards. This is exactly what we need. We asked for this when we started the MM Plan a couple years ago.</p> <p>Bob: Should we discuss now at all?</p> <p>Elaine: One overall comment is "as staff time allows." We don't have staff time to dedicate to levels of perfection or absolutes. Taking item 1 as an example, all shorelines, roads, open areas...will be kept free of debris. That is an absolute. We don't have staff available to keep things pristine at all times. Same with item 3 - ...planted areas will be kept weed free. We have summer help for Ober and Pt Rob that does weeding, but it's not possible year round.</p> <p>Bob: One of the reasons for coming up with these levels is that we can't keep all properties maintained to high standards at all times. But there should be some real jewels in this system. Maybe we narrow down what the jewels are.</p> <p>Elaine: That's a fair conversation to have.</p> <p>Scott: I assumed that this was just a draft and that you and Jason would fine tune it. We don't want to set you up for failure. I think people will still love certain parks even if they are not jewels.</p>	

	<p>CJ: Part of my job at Pt Rob is to recruit volunteers. One of the obligations of stewardship groups is to have volunteers to help. My goal is to have Pt Rob maintained to the level of what it was when it was an active Coast Guard station. We have a ways to go. We should talk about volunteer groups that are connected to other parks to have that kind of commitment. At Pt Rob, we are required by the lease to maintain it to a certain level.</p> <p>Scott: I think you make a great point. The standards should be a collaboration between the maintenance staff and groups to enhance their parks. Not run machinery, but take pride in their park.</p> <p>LuAnn: What this does, though, I think about the Pro shop at the Country Club. It has gashes in the walls. Members don't see it anymore. This creates a level where we can't pass it off and not see it.</p> <p>Bob: You have to have a plan. Let's meet separately to discuss this first.</p> <p>Doug: I understand we can't do everything. These are focused on appearance. We should think about invasive weeds. At some point, we could lose certain parks to invasive weeds. Too, it's fine to say 1, 2, and 3, but if you don't spend any time on 3, there can be disastrous consequences. I think we should be careful about categories. All our parks are important beyond appearance – it becomes a safety issue, too. I wouldn't assume we can rely on volunteers to help too much.</p> <p>Elaine: We have attempted recruiting volunteers. Some parks have active volunteers, more committed and more ownership. There are other parks where that passion does not exist. It's like pulling teeth to get people to show up.</p> <p>Scott: On an annual basis, we should reach out to the Eagle Scouts to do projects. They have to do projects every year.</p> <p>Bob: So we are going to table this for now.</p> <p>CJ: Question for the Maintenance Director: how far along are you on the MM Plan you have been working on for a long time?</p> <p>Jason: I have a few parks left. I bring in each guy in charge of the parks to work on this with me.</p> <p>CJ: Is the work you have done in line with this?</p> <p>Jason: Mine is a lot more detailed. I needed these standards to guide me.</p> <p>CJ: So these standards will be the thread that binds it all together. My only suggestion is that there be a matrix we can use as a work list.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Agenda Item</p>	
<p>Staff Reports:</p>	<p>Elaine: Unincorporated Community Service Area Grant – small grant opportunity through KC whose purpose is to fund community projects that offer unincorporated area residents the opportunity to be more connected to their communities. Top grant award is \$5k. We are applying for a new stage for Concerts in the Park and a tent canopy for shade (for Strawberry Festival, Picnics in the Park). Stage @ \$1k, canopy @ \$5k = \$6k total; grant = \$4500, 25% match = \$1500, to be budgeted in 2018. You do need to approve this due to the match requirement per policy. Scott: I move that Elaine apply for the Unincorporated Community Service Area Grant. Bob: Second.</p> <p>Elaine: Youth and Amateur Sports Grants – replaces the KCYSFG, but now 4 new options. We qualify for two, and I am applying for 2. No match required, so no approval from you.</p>	<p>MOTION: Scott: I move that Elaine apply for the Unincorporated Community Service Area Grant. Bob: Second.</p>	

- a. Unincorporated Area Facilities Grant is for a Youth Sport Capital project – up to \$250,000. Agren Ballfield Renovation regrading, installing drainage system, synthetic turf infield (optional depending on bid) = \$150,000; perimeter fence = \$25,000; road regrade = \$8500. With tax and 20% contingency = \$237k.
 - i. Currently a safety hazard.
 - ii. Mud closes the field ½ the year – completely unusable. This creates year round use.
 - iii. Road is a pothole nightmare.

Bob: What do you think the chances are that we will get this?

Elaine: Pretty good! I'm about half way through writing it. I have reached out to the sport groups for support.

Scott: So there are two main pieces, the field and the road regrade. What is the cost breakdown?

Elaine: The field should be @ \$150k, fence \$25k, road regrade \$8500.

LuAnn: So we can't build a restroom with that money?

Elaine: No, way too expensive. As a stand alone, \$100k.

LuAnn: Wasn't Village Green \$60k?

Jason: The kits are about that, but all the plumbing, electrical, concrete adds up. Romtec says to add 1 – 1.5 times what you paid for the kit itself.

Scott: What are the restrictions on this grant?

Elaine: It must be a sport facility, preferably a youth sport facility. Youth and amateur sport.

Scott: Why aren't we applying for the restroom at VES?

Elaine: We already have a \$60k grant for that. The sport groups will be fundraising for the additional costs.

Scott: Oh, okay, cool.

LuAnn: Say more about the infield turf.

Jason: Allows for year round. Grass is in the outfield, but infield gets too slick and muddy. Baseball and soccer can play there.

LuAnn: What about the drainage factor? We tried to play at Halloween, and the field was soaked.

Elaine: That is why we are doing this.

Jason: With drainage, you could have played all weekend. There

Doug: Is there a condition in the grant that the sport field be a sport field for a specified period of time?

Elaine: I did not see that condition in this grant. That was a requirement with the previous grant; for example, the \$75k grant for the pool must have a life of 15 years.

- b. Unincorporated Area Programs Grant serving a youth program – minimum \$5,000 (no max noted), but I'm going for \$25k. Pays for staff to provide lessons, camps, events. Should reduce vandalism and drug use while increasing youth evening and weekend activities.

LuAnn: So this is just for the first year?

Elaine: This would be viewed as a pilot program without costing us anything.

Scott: Then we would need to decide if it's something we want ongoing for future years.

Elaine:

Trail Signs at Paradise Ridge – per our discussion at the last meeting about the mountain bikes on Paradise Ridge Trails, the VMIHA is very grateful for our offer to post signs at the trail heads indicating equestrian and pedestrian use only.

Mary O: And no motorized vehicles. How many?

Jason: Shawn says 6. We will need to know the best spots to put them.

Elaine:

Fern Cove – Septic design is complete and awaiting the DOH permit. In the meantime, we have gone out to bid for a contractor. The hope is for all to be complete by end of November.

Doug: Are we taking reservations in the meantime?

Elaine: No. Not until we know when all is fixed. Eric has a call list.

Scott: Where are we on the insurance?

Elaine: No word. If I receive word, it will likely be in executive session. Our insurance guy said this could be a long process.

Elaine:

Recreation Programming – As was explained regarding the Ski School insurance situation, the new Enduris requirement has provided an interesting opportunity to explore bringing recreation programming in-house. Case in point is with the Ober Performance Room renters. So far, most seem able to provide COLs naming VPD as an additional insured, as it should be. But those who can't or won't – we would have to hire them as our employee and pay them a wage, charging fees for their courses that covered their wages at minimum. It seems, though, if we take that step, that we start running with this. One idea is to hold a community open house to find out about community preferences, then make decisions based on our findings. Thoughts?

LuAnn: How would that work?

Elaine: The program would be ours. The instructor would be our employee. Costs would be ours, but so would the revenue be. Fees would be based on cost recovery and how much we are willing to subsidize. Revenue share is an option. Ready to dip our toe in the tub?

Scott: Absolutely.

LuAnn: It's a bit of a Pandora's box, though, once we go there. We are creating overhead.

Scott: Absolutely.

Elaine: The purpose for the open house would be to find interest, how much to subsidize.

Bob: There was some information on this we can use from the survey.

Scott: The survey indicated this is a top priority. We need to do it.

LuAnn: I am cautious of the costs. It was hundreds of thousands of dollars in the past.

Elaine: The idea is to start by seeing what the interest is and options are before making commitments.

Doug: Before, when VPD had programs, and they were eliminated due to too much costs, the programs continued on their own, did they not? What is wrong with the current model?

Scott: The survey said the community doesn't want that model. Maybe they don't know what they are talking about, but that's what the open house would find out.

	<p>Luann: The public doesn't know the tradeoffs.</p> <p>Doug: Maybe there were programs that were lost.</p> <p>Bob: There is no reason why we can't do this where it costs us any money.</p> <p>Scott: But what I have heard is the public wants a centralized situation run through the Park District, where we do registrations, etc.</p> <p>Elaine: The advantage to us doing programming is the marketing component, the recreation guides, outreach. That is what a park district does – manages recreational activities. The folks who do it alone as a stand-alone don't have the resources that we have to advertise, do mailers, do marketing. We are an organized structure.</p> <p>Scott: Unlike past boards, we are fiscally responsible. We should crunch the numbers and do what makes sense. Maybe the current people don't want to come inhouse.</p> <p>LuAnn: Maybe it can be a hybrid thing. Before, we did everything. If the sport teams have their own model, we can work with that. We can eliminate some of the overhead.</p> <p>Scott: Let them decide what they want to do.</p> <p>Elaine: There is no question we need to do this slowly and methodically. The purpose for this discussion is to share with you my thoughts about tip-toeing back into it. It is part of our mission. It is what we should be doing.</p> <p>CJ: Great discussion. Eliminating programs happened almost overnight due to VES being so far over budget. Pt Rob was and is self-sufficient. As Elaine points out, a P&R District should do programs. There could have been improvements in how it was done before. I take a great deal of personal satisfaction knowing we are coming around again. You have to go into it looking at each opportunity incrementally and how it will make sense financially. An open house is a great idea.</p> <p>LuAnn: This is a unique opportunity. The program model we had before was pretty high end with lots of overhead. A hybrid would meet the community desire but do it financially responsible.</p> <p>Elaine: Having had conversations with the sport groups and the Ober people, I sense it will naturally be hybrid. These folks were forced to be on their own. They like their autonomy. What I like about us doing rec programming is to take this model and communicate it to the community. The community shouldn't have to seek it out. We should be informing every household.</p> <p>Scott: I would hope Anelli will help get the word out to the community when we have the open house. And to say it was in response to the community wanting rec programming from the survey.</p> <p>Doug: It might sound far-fetched, but this reminds me of Amazon. When you order Japanese food from Amazon, you're actually getting it from a Japanese food provider, not Amazon. Amazon was the conduit.</p> <p>Elaine: Yeah, you want to play soccer? Jump on the Amazon train. Call VPD, we connect you with VISC. We need to blend these programs in a way that is legal. We can't promote a private business.</p>		
<p>Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Bob: At the last meeting, Scott had a problem with the first three strategies, so we changed the wording as you see here.</p> <p>Scott: The first two are fine. I want to ask Elaine, on the survey there were hundreds of comments written. How many of them mentioned staff salary?</p>		

Elaine: There were some! You bet that resonated with me! They said “You need to take care of your people.”

Scott: In order to deliver a quality park district, who does that is the staff. If we don’t have staff, it doesn’t get done. I’m not denying you should be taken care of, but it should not be in the plan. It is a bi-product of wanting to deliver a quality product.

Elaine: I have seen a number of Strategic Plans where staff wage increases is noted as a goal. There is precedence for this. It does belong in a Strategic Plan.

Scott: Are you willing to take less programs in favor of higher wages?

Elaine: It depends on how you communicate it to the community. If you tell the community that VPD is the lowest paid like-sized park district in the Puget Sound area, and we are having trouble attracting and holding onto quality staff as a result, I think the community will see the wage issue as a priority.

Scott: It was the lowest paid staff three years ago.

Elaine: And we still are.

Scott: We have limited resources. With the pool next year, I don’t see how we can give raises.

Elaine: What if I prove to you that we can? I have run the model already.

Scott: And offer recreation programming?

Elaine: Yes!

Scott: I think it is all part of the budget process. It is not part of the Strategic Plan.

Bob: Nothing says we won’t do this in a financially responsible way.

Scott: I’m all for that statement being in the plan, but it shouldn’t be benchmarked to other districts.

LuAnn: Scott, how do we recruit and keep good staff then?

Scott: I don’t want to diminish the fantastic job Jason and Elaine have done, but we have them. Didn’t they come to us as being even less attractive then? I want to compensate them appropriately. I just don’t think we should codify it.

LuAnn: I think we should have the mindset that we compensate fairly. If you don’t, good staff leave. There is nobody here except Robin from previous staff. Elaine has crafted a great staff strategically.

Bob: Would you vote this whole thing down based on this one item?

Doug: 4 on the Strategic Priority, majority is too strong a word.

Scott: Strongly desired by Vashon citizens. Take out “majority.”

CJ: The inference is that the board will be guided by the citizens, but it is your job to make decisions on their behalf. Collect the information, but YOU decide.

Scott: And we are never going to do everything. We will choose what the thing will be. We could choose to do a dog park for good reasons even though it didn’t rate high on the survey.

Jason: Right now our sport fields are the dog parks, even though they aren’t supposed to be there. Poop all over the place. Ideally you have a dog park.

CJ: Under strengthening community projects, I would ask that we tie that to parks. To develop the Stewardship program. Add “and specific partnerships.” Under financial help, no mention of

	<p>the foundation. Elaine: The foundation is feeling iffy right now. CJ: If it dies, there are other options. LuAnn: On the 3rd item, bonding strategies? How about bond strategies. Like floating a bond. Doug: On #3, should add voter approved bond.</p>		
Adjourn	Adjourned 8:30 p.m.	MOTION, SECOND TO ADJOURN.	
		VOTE: 4-0 IN FAVOR.	
Next Meeting	October 24, 2017, 7:00 PM		