

**KTC Special Executive Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2015, 7:00 p.m.
Flame's Home**

Present: Ginette Blais, Doug Bowie, Rick Donaldson, Flame Eadie, Lynne Hanson, Jocelyn Purdie, Paula Loh, Isabelle Pollock, David Stocks, Tom Thayer

Absent: Sam Faris

Call to Order, 7:09 p.m:

Much of the push back and opposition during the vote came as a big surprise, as people spoke out at the last minute. There was much conflict and also inaccuracies in some emails written by those who were unfamiliar with club operations, and some people were emotional and wrote things that were inappropriate. Given the closeness of the vote, we are all in agreement that we should not go ahead with the project at this time and need to consider other options.

Moving forward, Paula met with Eric Davies this morning and talked through options. He read through the feedback from the membership and observed concerns about the cost and size of the project. They discussed whether they should talk to Mike Preston to reduce the size of the project and delay by a year. This would give people an opportunity to express their concerns through town hall meetings, and perhaps another vote could be held at a future meeting to provide a stronger mandate. We could consider holding a membership survey.

One member prefers a smaller clubhouse and a lower cost. She does support the 8th court and the new lights. Some of the comments indicated that people are more concerned that we should facilitate tennis rather than have a new clubhouse. One suggestion was doing it in stages, perhaps even using a trailer instead of the clubhouse in the interim, and then having a one-storey clubhouse instead.

Both Lynne and Jocelyn suggested that it is important to present options to choose from when voting, and some of the comments expressed in the vote were to go with the current clubhouse project, a smaller clubhouse, or renovating the existing clubhouse. Others on Exec were not keen to go back and revisit some of these options, feeling that they had been decisively rejected three years ago. Doug noted that at that time, most people were in favour of a new clubhouse but they were put off by the much higher cost in recent years.

Ginette observed that delaying by a year will give us a chance to look further into the options and looking into the numbers. Dave commented that things might have been very different if more members had voted, noting that approximately 100 people voted 'yes', 100 people voted 'no' and 200+ people did not get involved. What did those other 200 people think? Flame suggested that many members just didn't know enough, and didn't get involved – using Survey Monkey to elicit feedback would be a good way to increase future voter participation rate. There was much general discussion about member apathy and how to motivate people to get involved and to inform themselves.

There was some debate about whether we should go with the two vote majority, as one member thought that we should respect the decision of those who voted 'yes', but most thought that we do not have enough of a mandate. Rick suggested that the cost is the biggest concern; many people just want to play tennis and are not so interested in the clubhouse. Rick also asked whether we can proceed with some other aspects of the project and apply for the Trillium Grant to do the courts and the lights. Paula said yes, that we could apply for a grant for each aspect of the project, if it is done in stages. A few board members felt that court lights were important right now, to provide more playing time.

Some of the options we considered:

- Brainstorming to explore many more possibilities;
- Use Survey Monkey to see what people would prefer;
- Revising the clubhouse design to scale down costs;
- Developing two or more options, including renovating the clubhouse;
- Consider doing project in stages

Doug suggested that at this point, we should not decide on these right now, and instead should take more time to explore all these ideas. Tom noted that he understood that people felt uncomfortable with the size of the project and the debt, and acknowledged that there is always risk. It might be reasonable to try to reduce the debt to less than \$700K. We could try to drop the project cost by \$300,00-400,000, and will probably need to reduce the clubhouse size from 4000 square feet to 2000 square feet. Tom would like to make the next proposal attractive to most members, recognizing that there will always be some that don't want it at any cost.

Doug observed that there are three aspects to the current project and said we should look for savings in all three. First, with the demolition and new courts, you can't save very much there. Second, with courts 2 and 3, you could skip widening the courts and save \$30,000 – (you could also skip the lights, but he does

not favour that.) The third part is the clubhouse. Having one storey would save on an elevator, although it would need a bigger footprint.

There was some debate about whether we would cut back the clubhouse size too much and lose its functionality – going to one storey would take up more of the grass and negatively impact the camps, and some people do want to use the clubhouse to socialize. There could be other uses, like card games and meetings, some people would like to be members even if they don't want to play tennis. One suggestion would be to go down from 4000 square feet to 3000 square feet, taking 500 square feet off of every floor; this would also reduce the footprint. Lynne asked whether we could save money by reducing the costs on the exterior building materials proposed under the current design, and others confirmed that this would be possible. We could cut down on the size of the first floor by having smaller change rooms, reducing the number of showers, and reducing the size of the lounge and the passageways. On the second floor, building costs are generally lower per square foot – we could take out the lounge space, reduce the size of the office, store the extra files in the attic, and omit the upper deck on the north side. We can also achieve some savings by cutting down on furniture and appliance costs. There was some debate on where the hitting wall should be located.

Since we have two somewhat different approaches to a new clubhouse (2000 square feet vs. 3000 square feet), one member asked whether the Board should make the choice between these options or whether we should allow the members to choose. Some board members suggested that members will always go with the cheapest choice, although people often choose the middle option rather than the cheapest option. There was much discussion about having sufficient indoor space for the camps on rainy days. Isabelle observed that the cost per square foot for the clubhouse is quite high, but Paula pointed out that commercial costs are higher because you need durable materials and building codes are more stringent for public spaces than a residential home. We are looking at 200-300 people per day using the clubhouse during peak months, versus an average home with 2-3 people carefully walking around.

There was some discussion as to whether and how we should survey the membership with regard to their preferences and priorities. Some members thought it would be useful to know what people want, while others thought it would be misleading to ask about a range of options if we can't necessarily provide them. Flame explained that Survey Monkey mails a unique link that can only be used once per person. She will compile some preliminary questions to distribute to the board for review.

The board decided to explore options for the capital project that includes reducing the scale of the project. As previously agreed at the board meeting of October 22, 2015, the Capital Project Committee will be disbanded and a new one struck, with the proposed composition of 3 board members and 3 non-board members. We will contact the membership to solicit submissions to the board by those who are qualified and interested.

On another matter, Paula reported that she attended a meeting this morning with City staff to begin negotiations with regard to parking permits for the 2016 season. Discussion regarding parking restriction of 9-10am since it occurs during camp drop-off times; City offered to be flexible with enforcement during the drop-off time to allow parents to safely escort children inside the property. Paula outlined proposal that she presented to Council on September 1, 2015 to consider issuing annual permits for each member at a minimal cost (limited use only while on KTC property). Some discussion as to how this could be implemented. They will take proposal to senior managers for feedback.

MEETING ADJOURNED 10:00 p.m.