

**bbwilbur@frontier.com**

---

**From:** "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>  
**Date:** Sunday, October 14, 2012 10:19 PM  
**To:** "Dustin Frederick" <dustin@local519.org>; "Gwyn Staton" <gwynstaton1@msn.com>; "JoAnna Weeks" <joanna.weeks@gmail.com>; "Suzy Palmer" <suzypalmer1@me.com>; "Chris Hendrickson" <Hendrickcj@gmail.com>; "Carol Del" <caroldchina5@yahoo.com>; "Ed Delahanty" <whshed@live.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Some post meeting thoughts

Hey Dustin,

Maybe more thoughts when fresher but the quick and droopy answer re deferring to next board is that they seemed to me to be ready to delay indefinitely until something or other hit them between the eyes, like maybe next spring. Flip answer, sorry, I know but that is the way it hit me. Well, if that hit is right, then yes, it would be to defer to the next board and to keep the dialog and cost aspects open and moving. Anyone else have an insight?

Anyway, I really liked Mike Hendrickson's input re an independent structural evaluation of the building to juxtapose with Klassel's 2010 assessment that it only needs ADA stall/shower and a corner rebuild at relatively little cost (probably more in line with NW bid, or less). Mike H. could you maybe restate that by email and a bit of simple reasoning to Carol and Dustin, so they could forward that suggestion to the rest of the Board for more formal contemplation?

And thanks JoAnna for explaining – I think we all feel that mix of feelings and not knowing quite how to proceed, and your sensitive insights are valued. And Gwyn, Dustin and Carol, whether or not any of our combined efforts effect anything close to what we hope for, an open round table, we all owe you much for helping us try :) ...Bob

**From:** [Dustin Frederick](#)  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 14, 2012 6:15 PM  
**To:** [Bob Wilbur](#) ; [Gwyn Staton](#) ; [JoAnna Weeks](#) ; [Suzy Palmer](#) ; [Chris Hendrickson](#) ; [Carol Del](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Some post meeting thoughts

All---I'm sorry I could not make the meeting yesterday---just too many family issues here in Kirkland.

Bob---I could not tell from your comments ---are they going to defer to the new Board a decision to create an ad hoc committee to study the bids and create a more accurate cost assessment?

I reviewed the NW spas bid---including the heat pumps and it is 143K There is a list of items—in the “notes”---not included in the contract that may run 20K-30K  
 Factoring a 10% contingency we are still only at approximately 190K for the Pool.

I have not seen any bids on the pool building but I think it could be gutted and rebuilt using same footprint for 110K. that puts us at 300K to be funded as follows:

Three sources of funds, dues savings , donations and either an assessment or a construction loan.

1. Raise dues to 175 per year. For 2013 and increase 10% each year for 5 years. This will provide enough dues savings and reserve to provide 100K of the necessary funds. Close pool for 2013 and 2014 seasons to add to existing dues savings.
2. Raise donations over the next 12-24 months to generate between 50-75 K
3. Do a one-time assessment or take out a construction loan to fund the balance of approximately 150K. the dues increase to \$175 would be enough to pay the debt service at current rates.

Provide payment plans for those that cannot afford the dues increase and or assessment.

Dustin

---

**From:** Bob Wilbur [mailto:bbwilbur@broadstripe.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, October 13, 2012 10:25 PM

**To:** Gwyn Staton; Dustin Frederick; JoAnna Weeks; Suzy Palmer; Chris Hendrickson; Carol Del

**Subject:** Some post meeting thoughts

Hi folks,

I think, somewhat like puppies, this Board has found their nose rubbed in their own mess and is now maybe beginning to feel the way out without wanting to admit to it too publicly. One's instinct is always to save face. Unfortunately, the death threat thing has provided obfuscatory escape, even though the revealing read of that letter today seems nonpartisan – like it could have come from either side or maybe just a nut job looking for an elusive bit of a paranoid thrill.

So, my sense is to try to keep the pressure on the board to work to get a solid committee going that broadens the input and expertise. It seems they are poised to go there – maybe with more encouragement they might actually do it, if they can save face doing so. Contractor Mike Hendrickson, postmeeting said to me, a structural engineer should be able to do the whole, entire structural evaluation (pool and building) for about \$2k (not Dan's \$20-30 or Harry's \$70). I passed that on to Dan J a bit later.

Also, JoAnna, I got the feeling you were advocating for a survey type question of support or nonsupport with probably some possible price data attached, whereas I think the Board took it more as though you were advocating for their original ballot notion: vote \$1k or no pool. Wish I had asked you for clarity on that. But regardless, tangent to that, I do understand your well-meaning empathy for including all property owners, albeit with some personal unsettled mixed feelings, but none doubting your good heart. Do you feel comfortable explaining what you would hope for?

And Carol, so good to see you there, not expecting or asking for any maudlin empathy.

So, another day tomorrow but today seems to offer bits & pieces of enlightenment...Bob