

## Elaine Ott-Rocheford

---

**From:** David Hackett [dlhackett@centurytel.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 07, 2013 11:27 AM  
**To:** Bob Hennessey  
**Cc:** William Ameling; Mike Soltman; Elaine Ott  
**Subject:** Re: Interlocal

I think the detailed data we compiled in 2008 is more accurate, but regardless none of it is particularly relevant.

VISD already gets tax money to maintain its facilities as does VPD. We are both expected to budget our money to provide for an adequate level of facility maintenance.

To the extent that public use causes extra wear and tear, they can be expected to cover this variable expense -- whether through a payment from VPD or a payment directly from the users to VISD if VPD is no longer the middleman.

I think \$100k greatly exceeds the expense that the public causes VISD through its use of school facilities. Water bills, mowing, heat for the gym fall within the levy. Could you provide data re the actual maintenance costs that are attributable solely to public use?

Thanks.

-- David Hackett

On Apr 7, 2013, at 10:20 AM, Bob Hennessey <[bobmhen@gmail.com](mailto:bobmhen@gmail.com)> wrote:

I found these data to be useful.

On Fri, Apr 5, 2013 at 10:01 AM, William Ameling <[wameling@ix.netcom.com](mailto:wameling@ix.netcom.com)> wrote:

I'm with David on this;

According to Bob the commons agreement reads like this

Parks gives 100K to School district. No strings attached, stay out of our business.

Somehow in your world you see two kinds of Child athletes.

School athletes are of Jr high and Above. The school district will financially support these Students.

Elementary students athletes are just a bother some park problem and if they want to use School property they can darn well pay \$100K and we will see if we can spare them some space.

Youth sports are not Park district programs. They run their own organizations and are users of Park space.

One of the purposes of Parks is to provide space for Islanders to recreate. One form of recreation is youth sports.

Over the years Vashon Parks have provided over \$1mil in capital improvements and over \$1mil in direct cash payments to the school district.

These payments were not required by law. The Parks recognized that providing facilities for all student athletes is costly, and voluntarily gave money to the schools.

So now you say "Bill don't be so absurd"

The original idea was an altruistic goal. Both Districts own and manage public assets for use of the community. Both districts voluntarily agree to cooperate to help the public use their assets. The idea was to encourage public usage. It worked, public usage is very high on both districts.

David is right. If you want to strip out all ideas of common usage and common control then maybe it's time to end this agreement.

-----Original Message-----

From: David Hackett

Sent: Apr 5, 2013 8:35 AM

To: Bob Hennessey , Bill Ameling , Mike Soltman , Elaine Ott

Subject: Re: Interlocal

I am very ambivalent about whether we should have any sort of an agreement with VISD. I have found your district's buy in and participation in the agreement to be lackluster, at best. I don't see it improving, especially when your (shifting) proposals miss the whole point of the arrangement and the focus appears to be on dismantling the few things that require occasional VISD participation and offer some oversight.

With where you appear intent on going, I don't see much value for VPD money. We have followed a zero-based budget approach this year and its time to apply it to the commons. I think that a system where users contact VISD directly may be the better approach. VISD can provide access and charge fees to use the facilities. You are taking over the theatre. Why not the rest of it. You will have the income and the control.

I don't think it does my district any good to pay VISD \$100k for the privilege of taking the blame for VISD service cuts and closure decisions.

-- David Hackett

On Apr 4, 2013, at 10:26 PM, Bob Hennessey <[bobmhen@gmail.com](mailto:bobmhen@gmail.com)> wrote:

I'll have something for you by the end of the weekend. I asked about your understanding of which facilities are in the agreement because it informs what I write. That is, if Parks believes only Parks athletic facilities are in (as opposed to all park lands open to the public) it informs my editing. It's most efficient to know up front if there are items not in dispute i.e. before I spend time writing language. So, I will assume Parks' desire is to include Parks athletic facilities. That, then, brings me to the point I perhaps inarticulately tried to make at our meeting. To wit: if Parks' desire is to have Parks athletic facilities in the agreement, then the language you sent over has the school district facilities director writing a maintenance plan for "Commons athletic fields." I checked with two board colleagues (Dan and Laura) and none of us can support having Dave Wilke spend his time doing maintenance planning for Agren or VES. This does not make sense to us and I would reiterate my earlier recommendation the agreement only deal with facilities the two districts use in common with each other. Which brings me to my final point: my understanding of agreement we've heretofore operated under is it did not include Parks fields. I have no memory of closure discussions of Parks fields (e.g. the two month closure of Agren this winter) ever coming to the Commons Committee. Nor, I would add, does the school district want to be party to these decisions. They are a matter for the Park District and it alone to decide. If you can send me your guidance on how you want this issue dealt with in the agreement and it is acceptable to us, I will revise the draft accordingly. If it's something we need to negotiate further, then I can indicate it's in dispute and I will leave those references alone.

On Thu, Apr 4, 2013 at 12:51 PM, David Hackett

<[dlhackett@centurytel.net](mailto:dlhackett@centurytel.net)> wrote:

Bob -- Are you sending a draft back? Provision by provision is fine as far as it goes, but I'm more interested in the totality of what VISD proposes. Agreements on individual clauses are provisional until we have agreement on everything.

-- David Hackett

On Apr 4, 2013, at 9:46 AM, William Ameling

<[wameling@ix.netcom.com](mailto:wameling@ix.netcom.com)> wrote:

OK by me

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob Hennessey

Sent: Apr 3, 2013 2:44 PM

To: David Hackett , ameling bill , cott ,  
"soltman.mike"

Subject: Interlocal

David, Bill: I'm persuaded to recommend to my board inclusion in the interlocal of facilities other than just those on the central school district campus. Just so I'm clear, David's red line currently reads as follows: "Elements of the Vashon Commons that are owned or leased by VPD include all park areas open to the public, excluding lodging facilities." I went to the Park District web site (below) and it references 18 facilities "hosted" by Parks. While I think a case can be made for including Parks athletic facilities in the agreement, I'm assuming you don't intend the agreement to cover Fisher Pond or the Villiage Green (even though they are "park areas open to the public.") If you agree, is language to the effect that Parks athletics facilities are included (but others not) acceptable?

[http://www.vashonparkdistrict.org/section\\_facilities/index.htm](http://www.vashonparkdistrict.org/section_facilities/index.htm)

<Use of Schools 11-12 (2).xls>