

KENSINGTON POLICE PROTECTION  
AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT  
PARK BUILDINGS COMMITTEE  
AUGUST 9, 2010 MEETING  
MINUTES

Chairman, John Stein, called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**Roll Call**

**Present:**

John Stein, Chairman  
Greg Harman, COP/GM  
Jack Griffith  
Bruce Morrow  
Andrew Reed  
Andrew Mixer  
Lynn Wolter

**Absent:**

Cathie Kosel

**Guests:**

Joan Gallegos  
Ciara Wood

John Stein confirmed that everyone received his email report and said that it was too late for his report to be included in the August (KPPCSD) Board meeting packet.

John reported that there was no requirement for minutes for either the Committee or for the Board.

**Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

**Ad Hoc Committee Members/Staff Comments**

Lynn Wolter distributed copies of the amendments to the May 5 and June 15 meeting notes/minutes that had been approved by the Committee at its July 14 meeting.

**Committee – New Business**

**Review, discuss and approve the report, recommend next steps, and options for possible action for the KPPCSD Board to consider regarding the Park Buildings.**

Andrew Mixer cited points he felt were good/positive in the report compiled by John:

A. The sentence, “The Board should consider disbanding the ad hoc committee and allow the community to form a work group with periodic updates to the Board.” He is of the opinion that the Board needs an efficient working group.

B. The section, “The committee recommends that the Board approve:

1. Development of a general plan/needs assessment of the 3 park buildings
2. Create a community work group to manage the process
3. Establish an initial budget of \$20,000
4. Commit to completing the process through building(s) remodeling based on securing required financing and identifying new sources of park revenue.

C. Andrew added that he sees the \$20,000 initial budget as working capital to be used for the process, and he noted that all expenditures would need to be approved in advance.

Bruce Morrow asked that the reference to KCC, “That KCC will continue its financial support of park buildings”, be amended to read, “That KCC will continue to identify and foster capital improvements.”

Option 1 and Option 2 were discussed.

Option 1 – have the district (through a working committee) do as much work as possible and identify needed outside expertise to be contracted with on an as-needed basis.

Option 2 – hire a consultant with experience in the entire process who would manage the needs assessment through construction under the direction of the committee of Board.

Four members of the committee support Option 1.

Two members of the committee support Option 2.

One member abstained and/or supported both Options.

John described possible iterations of future committees and how those might operate, with respect to the Brown Act. There was Committee discussion about the fact that there could be ways to achieve transparency without the constraints of the Brown Act and that any Board action taken, in terms of the organization of a future committee, could/should be reviewed by legal counsel to ensure Brown Act compliance.

Jack Griffith’s recommendations:

1. That reference to the possible future “working group” or “work group” be defined and that the term be uniform throughout John’s report. The name that the committee agreed was appropriate was “Park Building Planning Committee”.

2. That, in the second paragraph of the second page, “maintenance” be added to the phrase, “the park’s ongoing financial viability” and that “donations, grants, fundraising, WW funds, and endowment” be added to the last sentence of this paragraph.

3. That “ASAP” be deleted from and that “upon completion of an approved park building plan” be added to the third paragraph of the second page.

4. That in the fifth paragraph that “starting budget” be changed to “estimated budget”.
5. That the K-groups should be approached to make contributions.

Jack’s reviewed additional recommended amendments with the committee, which were well received, and he agreed to meet with John following the meeting to ensure that these would be integrated into John’s report /document.

Lynn noted that in the second to the last paragraph on page one, there were references to the “park”. She suggested that these be amended to read, “park buildings” because the committee was asked to review the buildings, not the park.

John stated that the committee did not fulfill the direction given it by the Board. The committee responded by asking what direction was given by the Board. John replied that, “direction from the Board was directionless” but that he felt that the committee was supposed to provide the Board with “high level general options”.

The committee asked John to what extent the recreation budget shortfall and financial needs would drive what will happen. John said that the shortfall must be considered – that the buildings must generate more revenue or a tax must be considered.

John concluded by stating that he will recommend the committee’s preference to the Board but, if asked, he will tell the Board which option is his personal preference.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

