

[Print](#)[Close](#)

Re: pool ballot

From: **Bob Wilbur** (bbwilbur@broadstripe.net)

Sent: Thu 9/20/12 7:53 AM

To: Lee Hart (lee@hart.net); 'Carol Del' (caroldchina5@yahoo.com); 'Dustin' (dustin@local519.org); John Klasell (jabcklasell@juno.com); Doug Smith (smidouglas@gmail.com); Gwyn Staton (gwynstaton1@msn.com); Dave Breining (dave.breining@gmail.com); Suzy Palmer (suzypalmer1@me.com); Ed Delahanty (whshed@live.com)

All,

I'm for anything that will solve the problem – planning is ideal because rehab issues and solution approaches have become quite nuanced and demand judicious scrutiny by a balanced group of level-headed folks. Short of that, if there is a ballot, we must try to ensure that it is an honest ballot, one that neither inflates rehab costs nor biases them low. If we are going to vote, the community must know they can trust in the ballot.

Example 1, talked with our local, resident structural engineer, John Klasell, yesterday, who conducted a structural evaluation of the building a year or two ago. He found one small area needing replacement, which sounds quite different than the profit-interested contractor that urged major reconstruction. John also wanted all to know that a bathroom cannot be added to the club house because the distance to the septic tank is too great to provide adequate pipe slope. So instead, John suggested making both bathrooms unisex and one of them ADA compliant (the cost to revamp a stall for ADA is negligible).

Example 2, Ed Del talked with Jamie Hartley at the county yesterday. Jamie felt that removal, not filling, of the pool would be necessary. That could change the razz figure dramatically. I'll try to do some research on that and get back to you later today, and Ed if you get anything more definitive from Brad Johnson, do let us know what he says (and thanks for taking that on).

From: [Lee Hart](#)

Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2012 5:29 AM

To: '[Carol Del](#)'; '[Dustin](#)'; '[Dan'l Jones](#)'; '[Jean Salls](#)'; '[Karen Shaak](#)'; '[Maria](#)'; '[Bob Peetz](#)'

Cc: '[Bob Wilbur](#)'; '[gwynstaton1msn.com](#)'; '[Suzy Palmer](#)'; '[Doug Smith](#)'

Subject: RE: pool ballot

I agree that Carol has outlined what the process should be, rather than rushing an up or down vote on razing or retaining the pool. A quick vote now does nothing to fund either the destruction or the restoration. We need to come up with a complete plan to cover either eventuality. If the membership were to vote now, with the understanding that it costs only \$61,000 to raze the pool, versus the possible cost of \$500,000 to restore it, it seems highly likely that the folks who have been sitting on the sidelines will fall in with the no pool group and the NO POOL ballot will win. Assuming that those who voted against the pool will actually step up and agree to a special assessment to cover the cost of razing it, what will we have left? The former pool location will become a wasteland.

Carol's suggestion is, by far, the best one I've heard. This plan might require a special assessment to cover the costs involved to prepare it, with further assessments down the road, to put the plan into action.

Lee

From: Carol Del [mailto:caroldchina5@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 9:17 PM
To: Dustin; Dan'l Jones; Jean Salls; Karen Shaak; Maria; Bob Peetz
Cc: Bob Wilbur; gwynstaton1msn.com; Suzy Palmer; Doug Smith
Subject: pool ballot

A Pool cover to fit our pool that meets ASTM - F 1346-91 specs - from manufacturer we consulted who google earthed our pool is **\$5000.00**. [Statutory Authority: Chapters [70.90](#) and [43.20](#), RCW. 04-18-096, § 246-260-141, filed 9/1/04, effective 10/31/04.] It can be used and removed, and re-used, as necessary.

As promised at last week's town hall meeting, I've drafted an outline of what a facilities improvement plan would look like. This is the type of document we'd need to submit if we needed to show the County, State and/or Federal agencies our plan of action for meeting ADA or other requirements. This is the kind of document we need for our community and any ballot measure we design.

It seems to me (as a planner and pool supporter in general) that this is the second step in the process. The first step is to create a steering committee. Everything has been so piecemeal and ad hoc for so long, it's time to re-group. Adding the building issues recently has complicated the already difficult problems of refurbishment. I think we need to step back and -together- develop a process and plan. I agree with Dustin on delaying a ballot on the pool issues; increasing the dues is more immanently critical in carrying out our duty to maintain our facilities.