

From: "Yahoo!" <john@valshoes.com>  
Subject: RE: [SPAM]TV interview  
Date: June 21, 2015 9:49:19 AM PDT  
To: "Executive Director" <executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org>  
Reply-To: "Yahoo!" <rtamini1969@yahoo.com>

---

David,

Let me know if I am driving you nuts with too many emails during this phase of my educating myself on the POC, the wharf, the farm, and the many past and present players.

I am trying to wrap my head around all the key issues and needs since the ultimate decisions are going to have compromises for most parties involved.

I read through the Port of Coupeville's goals and mission statements and there is language about its decisions and actions being inclusive, i.e. community kept informed and community giving input to Port. Yet much of the newspaper, TV report, blog, FMG email info is centered around the various segments of the community experiencing fear of the unknown.

Is bad news better than no news?

Should the Port (and when I write Port, I am meaning the commissioners and yourself with any input desired by all of you from the pending commissioners) come up with a strategy or campaign to increase the information flow. The goal would be to forestall some of the negative pushback that is occurring and that could have long lasting consequences for the Port and future commissioners. Ahh hah, there is the self serving side to this thought process. I knew it was there.

From Judy's email which is also posted on the Farm blog, there is a tone of the Greenbank community sensing that change is going to happen but reacting to the various unknowns. It is more than just the art gallery owners. The dog walkers are worried about having as much space or having to leash their dogs. Now there is a group you don't want to hack off. Three gallery owners - 90+ dog walkers. The sheer number of dog owners could pack a Port meeting room to the hallways.

Some of the language of the rumors makes it sound like anyone currently "using" the farm is at risk to losing their access to the farm . . . as they know it now.

I am sure the commissioners and you cannot predict at this point time with 100% certainty what the future holds.

Is there a way to come up with possible scenarios with the reasons for the change and lay it out there? Proactively present the options and why each one is an option to address the Port/wharf/farm needs.

Scenario A: county commissioners agree to take on last two years of farm bond payments IF Port gives WSU extension service the space it needs at farm with a five year lease. This change requires vacating some tenants at farm (1-3 art galleries, WCLT, the therapist, whomever). The new FMG agreement is signed off by both parties and the financial arrangements of the past are modified by this agreement. Does this scenario open doors to address the maintenance and repair needs of both assets totally? What is the net effect to the Port financially by removing paying tenants for five years to get financial relief of paying the bond payments for two years? Answer is complicated by what are current tenants would be asked to pay for rent by Port and would they stay if asked to pay higher rent?

Scenario B: county commissioners do not agree to take on last two years of farm bond payments. There is no financial incentive to change tenant mix at farm but maybe different reasons (goals) makes Port still want to change tenant mix. Would county commissions find funds to pay WSU extension office rent at farm? What happens if current tenants leave on their own volition and yet the deal with WSU extension service does not happen for 6-9 months yet the Port has signed off on paying FMG \$117,000 per year during this time?

Scenario C: WSU extension does not end up at farm, but the need for improving income to Port is addressed by various means: charging higher rent to current tenants (small improvement in cash flow), Port takes over totally from FMG and has events (concerts, whatever) that improve cash flow to Port more significantly.

Until study on wharf infrastructure is completed (if funding is approved), amount needed is unknown.

Add in the dynamics of a lot of the "Coupeville" levy payers think the FMG is getting too much money already, the Port needs an FMG agreement with a quicker or different correction option than the currently drafted agreement in my opinion.

By the way, I blew the date of the potluck dinner at the farm, wrote myself a note but did not put the day of the week and got it in my mind it was this past Saturday when it was last Wednesday. Do the two of you like guacamole? We have enough for 8-10 people.

See you around and you have to tell me about your ProMaster van the next time. I had several businesses that used cargo vans to move heavy medical diagnostic equipment to small hospitals, clinics so I have been tracking the ProMaster since Fiat/Dodge first started talking about bringing it to the states.

John

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

Subject: RE: [SPAM]TV interview

From: "Executive Director" <executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org>

Date: 6/20/15 11:57 am

To: "Yahoo!" <rtamini1969@yahoo.com>, john@valshoes.com

John,

Just a quick response to both emails....I think you are right on the mark regarding the reframing of the 'gallery' message. However, I believe there are people and entities that would welcome an opportunity to have space at the farm.... Particularly if it had an actual farm bent. Would it take a little time to install them? Probably, but... perhaps less time than we might think.

Looking forward to further discussion.

Happy Father's Day.

David Day

Executive Director

Port of Coupeville

[executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org](mailto:executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org)

Ph (360) 678-5020

Fx (360) 678-7424

**From:** Yahoo! [mailto:john@valshoes.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, June 20, 2015 8:20 AM

**To:** Executive Director

**Subject:** [SPAM]TV interview

David,

I recorded all the King5 news segments that evening and finally watched the one that did have you in it. The first segment had only the reporter at the farm talking to Rob Schouten.

The Port should have a message in place that "reframes" the FMG/tenants messages.

I took a Delft University online course recently that was about how people need to be skilled at not arguing their opponents message to the public but to respond by reframing that message into the message you want to present to the public. By reframing the other person's message, any discussion of an opponent's message gives one another chance to get your own message out. Denying the opponent's message actually just reinforces their message as being reality.

The current port directors and you are going to need a message that is used to respond to the "big, institutional WSU pushing out little, local businesses" that showed up in the King5 segment.

Perhaps the response should be anytime anyone asks about what is going on or says this FMG/tenant message,

"The Port has a responsibility to local taxpayers is to return the farm to its original focus on agriculture. Revamping the tenant mix at the farm is a key option to be more inclusive of agricultural focused entities. WSU Extension service is an excellent resource to further this returning the farm to its roots. Below market rental agreements for businesses that are not food-oriented that would offered by the management company is no longer a viable practice that can be sustained with the ongoing infrastructure maintenance needs of the farm and the wharf. The Port also sees the need to involve our children more in the farm experience than the current tenant mix offers."

I think the Port needs to get out ahead of the fact that changes will occur. Own it. Don't deny that changes are coming. Will the change be WSU Extension Service coming to the farm? Who knows for certain at this point?

But the reality is if the Port starts charging normal market rent and stop subsidizing art galleries that sell primarily to the wealthier demographic customers, there will be turnover in the tenant mix.

So messaging should be along the lines of:

Subsidized art galleries vs more kid-centric experiences at the farm

From: "Yahoo!" <john@valshoes.com>  
Subject: RE: [SPAM]TV interview  
Date: June 20, 2015 1:39:40 PM PDT  
To: "Executive Director" <executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org>  
Reply-To: "Yahoo!" <rtamini1969@yahoo.com>

---

So is the Port on the hook for the \$117K even if the spaces are empty?

There has to be small chance that if the discussion with the commissioners/WSU extension service get close but not quite resolved that current tenants would bail ship rather than wait.

Meg and I will be going to the Organic Farm School Potluck this afternoon. It will be interesting to hear Judy's read on the TV segment.

John

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

Subject: RE: [SPAM]TV interview  
From: "Executive Director" <executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org>  
Date: 6/20/15 11:57 am  
To: "Yahoo!" <rtamini1969@yahoo.com>, john@valshoes.com

John,

Just a quick response to both emails....I think you are right on the mark regarding the 'gallery' message. However, I believe there are people and entities that would welcome an opportunity to have space at the farm.... Particularly if it had an actual farm bent. Would it take a little time to install them? Probably, but... perhaps less time than we might think.

Looking forward to further discussion.

Happy Father's Day.

David Day

Executive Director

Port of Coupeville

[executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org](mailto:executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org)

Ph (360) 678-5020

Fx (360) 678-7424

**From:** Yahoo! [mailto:john@valshoes.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 20, 2015 8:20 AM  
**To:** Executive Director  
**Subject:** [SPAM]TV interview

David,

I recorded all the King5 news segments that evening and finally watched the one that did have you in it. The first segment had only the reporter at the farm talking to Rob Schouten.

The Port should have a message in place that "reframes" the FMG/tenants messages.

I took a Delft University online course recently that was about how people need to be skilled at not arguing their opponents message to the public but to respond by reframing that message into the message you want to present to the public. By reframing the other person's message, any discussion of an opponent's message gives one another chance to get your own message out. Denying the opponent's message actually just reinforces their message as being reality.

The current port directors and you are going to need a message that is used to respond to the "big, institutional WSU pushing out little, local businesses" that showed up in the King5 segment.

Perhaps the response should be anytime anyone asks about what is going on or says this FMG/tenant message,

"The Port has a responsibility to local taxpayers is to return the farm to its original focus on agriculture. Revamping the tenant mix at the farm is a key option to be more inclusive of agricultural focused entities. WSU Extension service is an excellent resource to further this returning the farm to its roots. Below market rental agreements for businesses that are not food-oriented that would offered by the management company is no longer a viable practice that can be sustained with the ongoing infrastructure maintenance needs of the farm and the wharf. The Port also sees the need to involve our children more in the farm experience than the current tenant mix offers."

I think the Port needs to get out ahead of the fact that changes will occur. Own it. Don't deny that changes are coming. Will the change be WSU Extension Service coming to the farm? Who knows for certain at this point?

But the reality is if the Port starts charging normal market rent and stop subsidizing art galleries that sell primarily to the wealthier demographic customers, there will be turnover in the tenant mix.

So messaging should be along the lines of:

Subsidized art galleries vs more kid-centric experiences at the farm

Subsidized art galleries vs healthier food research that benefits the entire island

Subsidized art galleries vs return to agricultural focus so visitors have a more defined experience (Note: first time Meg and I went to Greenbank Farm and walked down gallery row, we experienced a puzzled feeling of why are these art galleries here at a historic farm? Are we in Langley North?)

Let me know what you think.

See you next week.

John M.

From: "Yahoo!" <john@valshoes.com>  
Subject: RE: [SPAM]TV interview  
Date: June 20, 2015 4:04:52 PM PDT  
To: "Executive Director" <executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org>  
Reply-To: "Yahoo!" <rtamini1969@yahoo.com>

---

David,

I spend some time this afternoon looking over Greenbank Farm's website and found more children's activities than I thought existed. More like special events rather than permanent offerings, i.e. petting zoo.

I would guess that debating the issue of whether the farm has offering for kids could be debated from both positions of yes, they or no, they don't.

If I sound like I am headed down the wrong path or half-cocked, reign me in until I learn more. There is a lot to learn about the farm, the wharf, and the Port.

John

----- Original Message -----  
Subject: RE: [SPAM]TV interview  
From: "Executive Director" <executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org>  
Date: 6/20/15 11:57 am  
To: "Yahoo!" <rtamini1969@yahoo.com>, john@valshoes.com

John,

Just a quick response to both emails....I think you are right on the mark regarding the reframing of the 'gallery' message. However, I believe there are people and entities that would welcome an opportunity to have space at the farm.... Particularly if it had an actual farm bent. Would it take a little time to install them? Probably, but... perhaps less time than we might think.

Looking forward to further discussion.

Happy Father's Day.

David Day

Executive Director

Port of Coupeville

[executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org](mailto:executivedirector@portofcoupeville.org)

Ph (360) 678-5020

Fx (360) 678-7424

**From:** Yahoo! [mailto:john@valshoes.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 20, 2015 8:20 AM  
**To:** Executive Director  
**Subject:** [SPAM]TV interview

David,

I recorded all the King5 news segments that evening and finally watched the one that did have you in it. The first segment had only the reporter at the farm talking to Rob Schouten.

The Port should have a message in place that "reframes" the FMG/tenants messages.

I took a Delft University online course recently that was about how people need to be skilled at not arguing their opponents message to the public but to respond by reframing that message into the message you want to present to the public. By reframing the other person's message, any discussion of an opponent's message gives one another chance to get your own message out. Denying the opponent's message actually just reinforces their message as being reality.

The current port directors and you are going to need a message that is used to respond to the "big, institutional WSU pushing out little, local businesses" that showed up in the King5 segment.

Perhaps the response should be anytime anyone asks about what is going on or says this FMG/tenant message,

"The Port has a responsibility to local taxpayers is to return the farm to its original focus on agriculture. Revamping the tenant mix at the farm is a key option to be more inclusive of agricultural focused entities. WSU Extension service is an excellent resource to further this returning the farm to its roots. Below market rental agreements for businesses that are not food-oriented that would offered by the management company is no longer a viable practice that can be sustained with the ongoing infrastructure maintenance needs of the farm and the wharf. The Port also sees the need to involve our children more in the farm experience than the current tenant mix offers."

I think the Port needs to get out ahead of the fact that changes will occur. Own it. Don't deny that changes are coming. Will the change be WSU Extension Service coming to the farm? Who knows for certain at this point?

But the reality is if the Port starts charging normal market rent and stop subsidizing art galleries that sell primarily to the wealthier demographic customers, there will be turnover in the tenant mix.

So messaging should be along the lines of:

Subsidized art galleries vs more kid-centric experiences at the farm

Subsidized art galleries vs healthier food research that benefits the entire island

Subsidized art galleries vs return to agricultural focus so visitors have a more defined experience (Note: first time Meg and I went to Greenbank Farm and walked down gallery row, we experienced a puzzled feeling of why are these art galleries here at a historic farm? Are we in Langley North?)

Let me know what you think.

See you next week.

John M.