

# VASHON PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

## MEETING MINUTES

Ober Park, Evergreen Room, 7:00 pm

**DATE: Tuesday, January 23, 2018**

Commissioners attending: Bob McMahon, Doug Ostrom, Scott Harvey, Karen Gardner, Abby Antonelis

Staff attending: Elaine Ott-Rocheford, Jason Acosta.

ISSUE	DISCUSSION AND OUTCOME	FOLLOW UP
<b>Call to order &amp; agenda review</b>	The meeting was called to order by Doug. Karen reviewed the agenda.	
<b>Public Comment</b>	Elaine: Captain Joe could not make it this evening but wanted me to report that his reserved tours at the Lighthouse are really up this year, indicating that the LH tour season is underway early.	
<b>1.9.18 Minutes; 1.3 – 1.20.18 Preliminary Vouchers; Nov – Dec Vouchers</b>	Scott: I move that we accept the minutes and vouchers as presented. Abby: Second Pass 5-0.	<b>Motion to accept the minutes and vouchers as presented. Passed 5 - 0</b>
<b>November, December 2017 Financial Report</b>	Elaine: Since it's the end of the year, I wanted to go through more than what I usually do. The A/P Aging Summary – I give you this (and provide for the public) every month as evidence that we pay our bills on time. At one time, this was a disaster. Balance Sheet – went through the balance sheet items. Cash Flow and B2A: 1) Levy – up \$5700 over projected, likely due to collected overdue. 2) Admin - \$46,000 under budget. a) \$21,000 in wages and benefits due to Kit's departure. Pretty much under in all categories. b) Computer tech – under \$4600. c) Election – under about \$9k. This is timing – should hit in January. d) Printing – under \$4200 due to new printer lease. e) Telephone – under \$4200, as I disbursed these to all the cost centers with phones. Wasn't sure how that would play out. 3) Maintenance – under \$20k. a) Revenue – down \$4700, but look at Commons over \$3500 – an indication that bookings moved to VISD. b) Wages were under \$9500 (this is how much gets billed to other cost centers, like lodging or the pool). Offset by payroll taxes over \$7600 due to that insane L&I rate. Net effect under \$2k. c) Materials – under \$21k due to only doing one topdressing.	

- 4) Commons – under \$26k.
  - a) Revenue – up \$3500.
  - b) Offset by \$1700 in Benefits – underestimated where Robin would land.
  - c) Big thing, of course, was the \$25k savings in the fee to VISD.
- 5) Programs – over \$10k. All Ski School revenue with no expenses offsetting. This will carry into January, as we have not been billed for the expenses yet. Expected to land \$1100 ahead.
- 6) Pool Summer – ahead \$4700.
  - a) Revenue – Down \$6500 total, \$2200 from the boiler shutdown in June and \$4200 due to budgeting for food sales and not doing it. Tried to find concierge – nickel and dime candy sales is a major accounting pain, so didn't do it this year.
  - b) Labor – down \$2800 due to the boiler shut down, but offset by those high L&I rates in taxes of \$3800. Net effect negligible.
  - c) General supplies under by \$7300, Utilities under \$3500.
- 7) Pool Winter – ahead \$8600 due to the pool not opening in October as planned but rather in January.
  - a) Of course, revenue from October was way under – only \$978.
  - b) There were expenses during that time, like utilities, supplies, and labor. We are only two weeks into January, and so far all is tracking within budget. I'll have more in the pool report.
- 8) Pool CIP is carrying into 2018 due to bills arriving later in 2017, and I can't apply for the \$75k reimbursement until the taxing agencies clear MacDonald Miller. The long and short of the totals is this:
  - a. Enduris piece complete and submitted to Enduris today. They prepaid \$42k. Total expenses were \$27k.
  - b. Grant piece is on budget, totaling to about \$112k, but labor has not been reconciled in this. Our piece in this, of course, is the budgeted amount of \$28,391.
  - c. Our additional out of pocket at this point is looking like \$34k. Big pieces:
    - i. Architect work for the bathhouse ADA = \$5800.
    - ii. Acid wash = \$6900.
    - iii. Pool lighting = \$18k, but Scott and Mike are trying to get that reduced due to dissatisfaction with the outcome.
- 9) Pt Robinson – under budget by \$3k.
  - a. Revenue ahead \$7700.
  - b. Offset by labor – over \$6700 due to allocating more to Pt Rob from Fern Cove.
  - c. All else is odds and ends.
- 10) Fern Cove – also carrying the \$48k project into 2018. At this point, the septic work is done, and the permit approval from the County may come through today! A plumber then needs to come in, hopefully by Friday. The yard is a mess, but we'll figure out how to work around that for rentals in February.
  - a. The \$9k in the hole is a result of lost revenue offset by \$17k in labor and other minimal expenses against a budgeted \$11k loss.
- 11) RFA Other – ahead \$100k. Budgeted loss was \$17k = \$10k to VIRC; \$3500 to the trail book; use of RFA funds.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Sale of property</li> <li>b. \$14k in donations.</li> <li>c. Offsets were putting in the BARC fence and the payout to VIRC.</li> </ul> <p>I projected we would be starting 2018 with \$280k. The \$354k you see includes the carry-over items to include the \$75k from KC for the pool grant. I believe we will come out ahead about \$36k over what I anticipated.</p>		
<p><b>Pool Report</b></p>	<p>Elaine: As reported earlier, January is tracking well in both revenue and expenses. Of course, we missed the first week of January, and we still have one week to go. Too, I have not seen the utility bills for a full month in full swing. Attendance is picking up, and the feedback is extremely positive.</p> <p>Karen: I have seen evidence of more advertising.</p> <p>Elaine: Yes, but we are being a little conservative due to the lifeguard issue.</p> <p>Elaine: As reported previously, however, we are really having trouble with lifeguard staffing. The problem isn't so much the number of lifeguards on staff; it's their willingness to work more than one shift per week. By the end of the month, Kelly will have sat in the LG chair herself for 59 hours. I am billing the budget for her hourly rate. Sometimes only have 1 LG (Kelly), so we will need to close if attendance picks up and having 2 on staff isn't remedied.</p> <p>Bob: Are there qualified lifeguards amongst the Seals?</p> <p>Elaine: There are now as of last weekend. They do LG for the Seals, but it's the daytime hours for VPD that are the problem. Efforts to resolve the problem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Just held another LG class the past two weekends. Hope to pick up a couple there. There will be another LG class in March.</li> <li>2) To show this is a team effort, and we're all pulling out the stoppers to make this work, me, Eric, and Jason are willing to get certified.</li> </ul> <p>Bob: You sound like you're being kind of threatening.</p> <p>Elaine: On the contrary, I would hope that gesture is seen as a team we really want this to work.</p> <p>Scott: I don't think any senior management should lifeguard. That's not what you were hired to do. I think it's great that you're stepping up, but it should be on an emergency basis only, like if somebody calls in sick. If you can't get 2 scheduled LGs per shift, bam, we close the pool.</p> <p>Bob: No, we can't do that.</p> <p>Elaine: This is totally what the Board needs to decide.</p> <p>Scott: I think we should go to market. If you offered \$50 per hour, that pool would be staffed. Somewhere between \$11 and \$50 per hour, the pool would be staffed. But there must be provisos. Let's say we go to \$21 per hour – that's \$10 over what they currently make. They would get \$5 for being scheduled, and another \$5 for working it. It falls on them to fill in and get their bonus.</p> <p>Elaine: We can't bonus.</p> <p>Robin: It's really hard to not have Kelly available to do her regular work.</p> <p>Bob: Nobody thinks she should be sitting in the LG chair.</p> <p>Elaine: We are two weeks into this. I am merely keeping you informed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) At the last meeting, we discussed adding a benefit of staff using the pool for free to attract lifeguards. Okay per MRSC as long as we have a policy that spells it out. You wanted to know what other Districts do.</li> </ul>		

- a. Mt Si View – allow all regular employees and their immediate family members 50% discounts for all programs as long as they are not bumping community members use. Does not apply to temporary/seasonal.
  - i. This would not work for us, as it is important for summer staff. I would say “currently in the employ of...”
- b. City of Fife – all staff and family free use of pool during regular pool hours. They get the “resident rate” for all other classes even if they are not Fife residents.

Submitted the amended benefits policy. Add: “All VPD employees and their immediate family members from the same household may participate in all VPD-owned recreational programs and use the Vashon Pool free of charge during normal program and pool operating hours. All lifeguards who are employed by the District for one calendar year or two seasons will be reimbursed for the Red Cross Lifeguard Certification fee and supplies (book not included).”

Doug: And this is for all Park District staff?

Elaine: Yes. It should be available for all.

Bob: What’s the total fee?

LuAnn: I paid \$210.

Bob: I’m not promoting it, but why don’t we reimburse the full LG certification fee?

Elaine: Well, we could.

Robin: The VAC offers the free use of facilities to staff. They, too, have trouble recruiting LGs. If you added the cert reimbursement piece, that would attract other LG from other Vashon pools.

Abby: Have you asked the LGs what they want? More pay? This benefit?

Elaine: We’re already paying above \$11, because wages are, indeed, an issue. We’ll see how it plays out. Some were returning staff that left at a higher rate.

Abby: My motivation in asking the question is that it doesn’t seem super appropriate to offer the benefit without knowing that it will do the trick.

Scott: The challenge isn’t the people we have as guards. The challenge is attracting those we don’t have. She is offering this as an enticement. We don’t know who they are. Can you write to the Beachcomber to help? This jeopardizes the cover. It’s not penciling out. This is an emergency.

Karen: We’re not the only ones. In Hawaii, we had the same problem. I was the safety instructor. The only thing that worked was to say, “If you will do 2 years worth of LGing, we will give you a bonus and pay for schooling.

Bob: I have heard comments that we might get more lap swimmers in the morning, and kids might be more interested in working in the morning before school. Those are the things to look at. It addresses revenue and employment needs.

Robin: You would have to have somebody open at 4 a.m.

Doug: I have another question about the benefit policy. Why just the pool? Why not other facilities?

Elaine: Like the weight room.

Robin: We currently have 2 people who use the weight room. It would be good to have more of an influx.

Elaine: You're welcome to open up the benefit to other facilities! Mt Si View does that.

Bob: This won't cost us anything. It just brings in more users.

Karen: I'm all for it!

Elaine: So stipulate free for VPD-owned programs?

Jason: No fields.

Abby: And people can't rent rooms for free.

**Karen: I move we add the benefit to the Benefits Policy as presented with the amendment that it applies to all VPD-owned programs.**

**Bob: Second.**

Elaine: One more effort to share about the LG problem is to bring in a lead Lifeguard at \$15 - \$18 per hour required to work all shifts. It takes the heat off Kelly to be that person now. I am concerned about the budget, but I think we need to give it a try.

Bob: So take one of these qualified LGs and make them the lead?

Elaine: Either that, or entice somebody new. We run the risk of having to benefit them. I'm just saying we are trying to explore all options. We are fully aware of the horrible PR this would be if the Dome season failed.

Bob: If we set up a schedule, we must be committed to maintaining that schedule. If we can't get lifeguards, then we have to close it. But that, to me, is like the ferries shutting down runs, because a worker doesn't show up for work. It's just stupid. We can't let that happen.

Doug: People would ask why we don't pay them more.

Bob: Then there is the revenue discussion. There was supposed to be an Open House. That's a big deal for revenue.

Elaine: Kelly is doing a Family Fun Night. She wants that to serve as the Open House. It would not be free.

Bob: People are blown away when they see it. We have to get people to see it. The other thing is to reach out to the Master Swimmers at the VAC. We need to have a meeting with prospective users – invite them to tell us what they want.

Robin: The main outcry from non-users is that the hours are not conducive to their needs. They want to be early in the morning. We don't have that, because we don't have LGs.

Bob: No, we set the schedule before asking people what they want. One other question is how does Scott fit into this?

Elaine: We just designed a comprehensive maintenance plan for the AFO duties. He cleans the pool, maintains the machinery, water quality, metering.

Bob: If we open early, could he do it?

Elaine: After he gets LG certified.

**Motion**  
**Karen: I move we add the benefit to the Benefits Policy as presented with the amendment that it applies to all VPD-owned programs.**  
**Bob: Second.**

<p><b>Board Votes</b></p>	<p><u>Board Votes:</u>  <b>Bob: I move that we approve the maintenance standards as amended.</b>  <b>Karen: Second.</b>  Elaine: The only change was to the wording on the minimum standards on level 3 properties, Item 2 about signage will be present subject to the ED and Maintenance Director’s discretion to state we are not maintaining this property at this time and those who enter do so at your own risk.  Passed 5-0.</p>	<p><b>Motion to approve the maintenance standards as amended.</b>  <b>Passed 5 - 0</b></p>
<p><b>PERS Resolution</b></p>	<p>Elaine: The next step to signing on with the State is to have this resolution passed and signed (read resolution).  <b>Scott: I move we approve the PERS resolution as presented.</b>  <b>Bob: Second.</b>  <b>Scott: I move we suspend the rules.</b>  <b>Bob: Second.</b>  <b>Motion to suspend the rules: Pass 5 – 0</b>  <b>Motion to approve the PERS resolution as presented: Pass 5 - 0</b></p>	<p><b>Motion to approve the PERS resolution as presented. Pass 5 – 0</b>  <b>Motion to suspend the rules. Pass 5 - 0</b></p>
<p><b>Board Subcommittees: User Community, Planning, Finance, Recreation</b></p>	<p>Doug: Since we are moving behind, how do people feel about moving forward with the next two topics?  Karen: There isn’t much to say about the Strategic Planning.  Bob: We need to get the list of priorities approved.  Elaine: I can make the subcommittee discussion really quick. At the last meeting, there was a question raised about if we are going to continue with the same subcommittees. Then it was suggested that we add a recreation subcommittee. So you need to decide if you want to move forward with that. On the recreation programming piece, Karen sent an email to me about how the planning process might go. I put together an outline from the CAPRA standard format. This is in response to Scott’s interest in ramping up the planning process as soon as possible. We’ll start it after we resolve the LG issue. If there is a committee, we’re ready to rock and roll – in a couple months.  Karen: Originally, when I was thinking about this, I wanted to start by addressing the underserved areas of the population: disabilities and seniors. We talked to the special needs person at the school and found two people for the advisory board. I would like to take this piece on. I want to give these people a format to get the information we need for special needs. I thought Abby might want to do this, too. We will get started.  Bob: Is this part of the user committee?  Scott: No, the user committee was to go to stewardship meetings, etc. This is a new committee that has emerged from the interests of the survey. I would like us to step it up more. Maybe a meeting at the library, and tell people we have money.  Elaine: I told you we were planning an open house. We set a date. Kelly and I will run it. We’d love for you to join in. It’s in the Recreation Guide. The date is March 20, 6:30 – 8:30. We have invited the whole community.  Scott: And you’ll make sure the Beachcomber covers this, too?  Karen: One of the initial findings was that you won’t get seniors and the disabled to come to an Open</p>	

	<p>House. You have to go to them.  Doug: You will get younger seniors in force.  Elaine: There needs to be several pieces of community outreach.  Scott: I volunteer to write an article in the Beachcomber. I will say we are soliciting emails, etc.  Bob: Are we agreeing that we now have a recreation subcommittee, and this is part of that subcommittee's responsibility?  Elaine: At our last meeting, that's what I understood.  Karen: It's Abby and me, basically.  Abby: If we're talking about underserved communities, I think we left some off.  Scott: We based it off the survey and how much groups should be subsidized.  Doug: I thought what we got from the survey was people don't think groups should be subsidized.  Scott: They said they should be subsidized less. There was a spectrum. It will be part of our process.  Doug: So, tonight, we need to decide if we are forming this subcommittee.  <b>Abby: I move we form a recreation programming subcommittee.</b>  <b>Karen: Second.</b>  Bob: So now we have four subcommittees?  Doug: We haven't decided that.  Elaine: Doug asked at the last meeting if the committees were going to continue.  Bob: We need a planning committee. It's going to be more than just the strategic plan.  Doug: Do the master plans need to be updated? We should figure out how to do a little bit each year.  Elaine: There are a lot more other plans after the strategic plan. I noted them on the current state analysis, to include risk management, recreation, etc. We can include the master plan updates.  Doug: Will the one planning committee do all this, or do we need separate planning committees?  Elaine: I would suggest the planning committee drives it, but everyone might want to participate based on their interests.</p>	<p><b>Abby: I move we form a recreation programming subcommittee.</b>  <b>Karen: Second.</b></p>	
<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p>	<p>Scott: The planning committee has come up with some good strategies, but I would like to see other things. It should be something that the board created, not a subcommittee. There should be consensus. If we don't all agree on everything, it shouldn't be in there.  Karen: I disagree. It does not need to be unanimous. It takes just one person to stop everything.  Scott: I'm not saying there are things that shouldn't be discussed. But for the final plan, everyone should agree. There are 13 items. I bet the five of us can agree with 10 of them. We are coming up with a vision for the Park District. The vision/roadmap should be unanimous. I disagree that it's okay that the strategic plan passes 3 to 2. It's too important.  Karen: I don't have any problem with 3 to 2.  Scott: It doesn't send a good message to the community.  Karen: We should do everything possible to work toward consensus, but if one person says no to something, then the whole plan falls apart?  Scott: If that one person says they are good with 12 strategies, did everything fall apart? No! It would be a less robust plan, but we would still have a plan.  Abby: Instead of voting on the strategic plan, the plan is just a guide. There will come a time when we</p>		

will have to vote on the specific items. I don't think it should be unanimous. Each thing will come in time.

Bob: The Strategic Plan is not the Board's authorization to do all those things. It's a way forward that we determined from doing our current state analysis. It's a general schedule. Then we get into the weeds. The Plan doesn't have to be unanimous.

Scott: I disagree. We need to send a united message to the community. There shouldn't be a split on what the Board thinks is priority.

Bob: I can only think of one item in this thing that there has been any discussion on at all, and that had to do with wages. Item 3. You had a problem with that. Everything else was fine, so we made a change to that. I was going to make a motion tonight that we approve the list and get out of this rut we are stuck in. We changed "consistent with" to "benchmarked against" other park and rec industry standards, so it wasn't necessarily tied to something. I move that we accept this (the Strategic Priorities and Goals and the Strategic Plan Schedule) as the next step in the strategic planning process.

Karen: Second.

Doug: I don't have a problem with the Priorities and Goals page, but there are many items on the schedule that we have not discussed at all. For example, should a community center even be on here? Is that something park districts even do?

Jason: All park districts have community centers.

Elaine: It's a huge piece of park districts.

Scott: The covered pool doesn't belong in this plan. We have one.

Bob: This is temporary...an experiment. The survey indicated an interest in a permanent cover. As I said, this plan doesn't authorize anything. It formalizes our thinking about what the community wants. There is no reason to get hung up on this.

Scott: The plan should be what we actually plan for. Another piece I have a problem with is benefits. There is no money until the levy passes. And the Fire District could crush. We should not discuss a hypothetical. We should talk about things in 2019. We won't have the money until 2020.

Abby: Should we discuss two different scenarios? If we have money or if we don't? Our policy says we must have a 5 year plan, even if we don't get the levy.

Scott: I am specifically talking about salaries and benefits. If there is no levy, there is no park district. I'm talking about getting enough money to operate the park district.

Karen: The only thing that will move this along is to have motion after motion after motion.

Bob: How about this, then? **I move we accept this list (the Strategic Priorities and Goals) as a way forward without the schedule at this point in time.**

**Abby: Second.**

Bob: We need to work more on the schedule. They were on the survey and in the current state analysis.

Doug: The survey said, "Would you like this? Would you like this?" It did not really illicit free comments. It seems as if things are here just because there was a degree of support for them. There may be many more things the community wants that we didn't ask them about.

Bob: Weren't you here when we went through all this?

Doug: The survey was not a satisfying process.

**Bob: I move that we accept this list (the Strategic Priorities and Goals) as a way forward without the schedule at this point in time.**  
**Abby: Second.**

	<p>Scott: The schedule needs more discussion. Number 1, does it belong there at all, and number 2, does it belong as scheduled.</p> <p>Doug: This presupposes a levy, but it doesn't say how high the levy should be. And it presupposes a bond issue, which has never passed. We have not discussed a bond issue.</p> <p>Scott: What we do leading up to the bond, how successful we are in the meantime, is the gateway for a successful bond measure.</p> <p>Karen: About the survey, at what point do we have complete information? We're the commissioners. At some point we have to make the decision about the best direction for the park district to go.</p> <p>Scott: Besides the recreation open house, when we reach out to the Beachcomber, we need to also mention we are working on the strategic plan and to ask the public to continue to email us their suggestions. Just because it wasn't in the survey, we still want to hear about it.</p> <p>Bob: We need to be careful. We spent \$30k on that survey. We can't imply we didn't get value.</p>		
<b>Adjourn</b>	<p><b>Scott: I move we adjourn.</b></p> <p><b>Bob: Second.</b></p> <p><b>Adjourned 9:00 p.m.</b></p>		
<b>Next Meeting</b>	<b>February 13, 2018, 7:00 PM</b>		