



Kingston Tennis Club  
**Special Meeting of the Members**  
Tuesday, February 26, 2019  
7:00-9:00pm  
Walter Light Hall Auditorium, Queen's University  
19 Union Street, Kingston

MINUTES

As this was a meeting to share information and points of view on various infrastructure-related issues, we have tried to convey in these minutes as much as possible all that was shared by the attending representatives of the Meeting Requisitioners, Members of the Board and its committees, and KTC Members.

Abbreviations:

Q: Question or Comment from Audience Member

AB: Answer or Response by Board or Committee Member

RA: Answer or Response by Requisitioners Group Member

Minutes taken by Taco Meuter for Gary Wilson, acting Club Secretary, who chaired this Special Meeting.

**1. Meeting Called to Order at 7:00PM by Chloe Wilson (President)**

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

Gary Wilson, Secretary and Meeting Chair, asks that Agenda be moved.

Moved to Accept by Lars Thompson, seconded by Ben Doornekamp

Discussion:

Jocelyn Purdie Moves to Amend the Agenda, to reverse the sequence of presentations of two alternative action plans (Items 6 and 7) to permit the presentation of the meeting requisitioners (original Item 6) to go after the presentation by the KTC Board (original Item 7), and to have the discussions of Items 3-5 respectively occur immediately after each one is presented. Seconded by Lynne Hanson.

Discussion; Amendment is Carried.

Amended Agenda is Carried.

### 3. Clubhouse: Water Damage and Repairs

Doug Bowie (Chair, Infrastructure and Facilities) describes the damage caused by a burst pipe, explains that all damages are covered by our insurance. Contractors FirstonSite have already removed the damaged materials, and will fix the damage to give us an improved office (including a new floor) and Women's change room, and provide miscellaneous extra improvements: ceiling tiles in the main room upstairs, new vanity in the Men's change room, probably also stabilizing the women's toilet.

This will make the clubhouse clean, functional and safe for the next two years for campers, staff and members, but it is not a full-fledged renovation.

**Question (Q):** Why is there money for extra improvements?

**Board Answer (AB):** Cheaper material used for floor in office allows us a credit for extras.

**Q:** Value of repairs.

**AB:** \$12K-\$13K

**Q:** How much is the deductible?

**AB:** \$1000

### 4. Clubhouse: Safety Inspections

Chloe describes the Safety Inspections that have been conducted thus far.

#### **City Building Department**

Inspection with a senior building official: he suggested we contact a private engineer, architect or environmental company to assess the clubhouse, as the city building code applies to new buildings or renovations only. In addition, inspectors are not qualified to make judgments on structural or hazardous materials.

He suggested an inspection by the Fire Department, which was subsequently done.

#### **Structural Assessment**

A \$400 Initial was done during a walk-through by a structural engineer from MacIntosh Perry, to assess the scope of work for a full assessment.

Observations: Balcony was over-engineered; some areas of the clubhouse are not constructed to today's building code, but this does not make the building unsafe, and is not illegal. He found no obvious areas of concern.

The Board has approved the \$2192 Full assessment (which includes the \$400 above). This will compare the clubhouse condition to the building code requirements, and will include the foundation, but not the back shed which clearly needs repair or replacement.

### **Environmental Hazards**

A Designated Substances Report (DSR) was completed in 2015 by ASC Environmental. The review found limited amounts of lead, arsenic and asbestos in various locations and concentrations. No mould was found at that time, but this has been found since then. The board will have mould removed where found; our contractors have been made aware of the DSR and mould.

We have re-engaged ASC to assess the current condition of the designated substance-containing materials in the clubhouse (\$1900).

We have a further quote for \$1800 to assess air quality for mould after all repairs are made. This will be discussed at the next Board meeting.

### **Fire Prevention:**

Inspection by a Fire Inspector, who indicated that based on our use of the clubhouse, it is a low occupancy building not requiring a second exit. He recommended moving our smoke detector closer to the ceiling, moving the fire extinguisher closer to the exit; developing a one-page training procedure to train staff; inspecting our electrical panel although he believed it to be in good condition.

### **Property Standards:**

After a January 29<sup>th</sup> notification by the city of a complaint lodged by a KTC member, we arranged a walk through that same day, where we explained the steps that had already been taken. They were satisfied with the steps we had taken to address the concerns mentioned in the complaint. They asked for a list of planned assessments and repairs, and to be updated. They did not identify any deficiencies.

### **Summary & Path forward:**

Ensuring clubhouse safety is a priority: assessments completed thus far have not indicated that we cannot ensure a safe clubhouse this coming season at a reasonable cost. Assessments are ongoing and the board will consider its options as additional information comes in.

We will be doing a full structural assessment by MacIntosh Perry; repairing damaged areas plus some additional improvements such as mould removal; doing an electrical inspection; deciding Hazmat testing and remediation, providing updates to Property standards office; addressing issues as they arise.

Q: Is the clubhouse still vulnerable to early freezing?

AB: Yes, the clubhouse will be closed earlier next Fall.

Q: Mould Cleanup cost?

AB: Hope it to be a wash: part of the insurance.

Q: Asbestos?

AB: Since it has not been disturbed it should not be an issue at this point; ASC will confirm. Asbestos will affect the cost of demolishing or renovating.

Q: If structural issues are found, what cost will determine what we will do, when will we communicate to membership, what if additional issues are found after renovations are already begun, do we go get a temporary structure?

AB: We are going ahead now because our cost is only \$1000 to give us a safe and compliant season. Whatever happens, we won't have a brand new clubhouse this spring; we will deal with issues as they arise.

Q: Timeline for structural integrity report [MacIntosh Perry]

AB: Full Assessment on March 18; with results shortly thereafter.

Q: What is completion time; could we take insurance money instead of repairs if they are not feasible:

AB: 1. By season opening.

2. If we didn't fix the clubhouse, we would have to spend the money on an expensive trailer; fixing gets us through the Summer; the Structural Engineers would have shut down the clubhouse already if they had found a real concern. Building inspectors didn't either, nor did the Fire Department. We have to rely on those experts.

## **5. Ontario Trillium Foundation (OTF) Grant**

Doug delivers the report from the Facilities and Infrastructure Committee (Doug Bowie; Chloe Wilson, Bud Nelson, Taco Meuter; Ben Doornekamp)

Issue of the concrete pads and sub-drainage system. Our courts are made from concrete slabs overlaid with asphalt. Disadvantage: cracking from time to time. Advantages: flat, stable base for courts; slabs form a barrier between high ground water under the courts and the asphalt on top. Without the pads, the asphalt would be exposed to the water, leading to deterioration of the courts. If the pads are removed, a complicated sub-drainage system would need to be installed from the ends of the courts all the way to a catch basin on Napier [at Hill St]. A big operation. Should we do this? Ben (civil engineer) and Chloe talked with Doug Prinsen (KTC-hired civil engineer). The conclusion was that there is no guarantee that the sub-drainage system will work, but it would cost \$120-

125,000, or the bulk of the \$150K Trillium grant. On top of that, courts 2& 3 would need to be completely rebuilt at \$87K. In addition, the same issues and additional costs would arise when the future courts 1, 7& 8 are built. This drainage system only applies to 2&3.

A previous scan by Queen's Engineering students arranged by our previous treasurer Jim Martin found that the concrete pads under 2&3 are still good. Jim was highly skeptical of the proposed drainage system: because of the high water table in the neighbourhood we would be constantly pumping water from under 2&3, in essence becoming a big sump pump for the neighbourhood.

**Summary:**

More than the Trillium grant would be spent on a drainage system no one is sure will work or provide any improvements. The Committee's recommendation is to dispense with the sub-drainage/concrete pad removal and just upgrade 2&3 starting this Fall: repave with a new asphalt layer, install new lights, replace the fencing around the courts with new, higher fences, do some tree removal, resurface courts with regular paint or a rubberized surface.

We are getting quotes for these as we speak, also possibly for new lights on courts 4-6.

We expect savings of \$150,000 or a bit more, which we can eventually use for something we do know will work, such as lights on 4-6 or a major contribution to a new clubhouse.

The work will start in October and will not affect this season; Ben, who has extensive experience in this area, will volunteer to manage the work.

Q: Will courts be moved over?

AB: Up in the air; they can only be moved a little.

Q: Is OTF open to our changed agenda?

AB: The grant deals specifically with courts 2&3, but there is scope to negotiate on an ongoing basis. They want to see rebuilt courts and added lights. It shouldn't be an issue as long as we don't go below \$150K.

Q: Playing time lost to drainage issues?

AB: Zero.

RA: Issue of current 90 year age of the pads versus their original 100 year longevity. Sub-drainage is just over \$95K, to apply not just to 2&3; additional drainage for 1,7,8 and a clubhouse on the lawn is estimated at \$45K; how much can the current OTF scope be changed?

AB: The Queen's survey indicates that the pads are in terrific shape. Do we spend \$300,000 on drainage that might not work, or keep what we have

and stay within our means? There are too many unknowns at this point.  
Stay simple: if we go high risk, there might not be the rewards.  
*[\*\* \$95K did not include engineering costs or contingency costs; \$300K was for a thoroughly researched and complete project]*

Q: Why not replace pads with new pads?

AB: That's the very best, but far too expensive.

Q: Benefits of removing the pads?

AB: It might not work: Court 7 has no pads and is the worst court.

Q: Approximate cost of board's scope for grant work?

AB: Depends on type of surface chosen: close to \$200K

Q: Historical Perspective – Poor experience of Queen's ostensibly well-built asphalt courts on West campus. No guarantees.

## **6. (was 7.) Presentation by KTC Board of Proposed 2019 Action Plan**

Chloe explains the board rationale for its Action Plan.

The issue is not just whether doing the OTF project and building a clubhouse on the lawn is feasible, but whether it is the right project for the club. More works needs to be done before committing to any project. Many questions remain unanswered: the only strong membership support for a capital project was in 2012, for a two-storey clubhouse twice the size of currently proposed, including an 8<sup>th</sup> court, at a cost of \$500K to \$750K. Since then, support has hovered around 50% for lawn projects that have risen in cost to over \$1.5M. At the 2018 AGM a president was chosen who was committed to exploring other options. Other AGM questions: is our volunteer-run operating model sustainable? How will changes affect our debt capacity; are there other clubhouse options that can meet our needs more affordably. Should the club borrow to finance a major project & what is a reasonable amount of debt to ensure the long term viability of the club. Assumptions re future operating costs (e.g., club mgt./ facility maintenance) need to be assessed before debt capacity analysis can take place.

The question is not how much will the bank give us, but how much debt do we want to take on so that we can remain solvent even under adverse circumstances.

Strategic Planning is required to develop a vision for the KTC as an organization - not just a vision for its clubhouse and court arrangement. Our facilities and what we choose to spend our money on, need to support our vision.

The question remains: has something significant changed since the AGM that would cause the board to decide that committing now to the Napier St. Clubhouse project – without addressing any of the concerns raised above - is truly in the best interest of the club? My answer is NO, and a majority of the current board members agree.

We recently received the welcome news that the Ontario Trillium Foundation has awarded us \$150,000 to put towards rebuilding and adding new lights to Courts 2 and 3. Does this change the board's stance on the clubhouse project? No, it doesn't.

Having this additional funding, while certainly helpful, does not address many of the concerns raised regarding the Napier St. project proposal. It makes any project we undertake more affordable, but it does not change the fact that many members, and the majority of the elected board, are not convinced the Napier St. project is the right one for the club at this time.

Another issue is that some members have become increasingly concerned about the safety and compliance of our current clubhouse, particularly after news of the water damage caused by a burst pipe. Using our insurance coverage, we've contracted to have repairs made that will improve our kitchen and women's washroom. In any case, the board believes that a sense of urgency, especially when based on possible misconceptions of the condition of the current clubhouse, should not rush us into a costly project if we are not sure it's the right one for the KTC.

The Board has begun to address the concerns I've mentioned, and we have to balance this work with the many important tasks still in need of completion for the coming season. This Board's workload is heavy – especially for volunteers - as we are taking steps to increase clarity around our objectives, roles and responsibilities through the development of a Work Plan, as well as increase compliance in key areas (like clubhouse safety, occupational health and safety, and human resources management). Further to this, we are now tasked with carefully planning and executing a major construction project this fall with the OTF funded court and lighting work.

To reiterate what was said at the AGM, the Napier St. Clubhouse project is not off the table. The board believes that we need to carry out a careful planning process that includes determining a strategic vision for the club and a needs assessment for our facilities. Then, objectively exploring options that both meet our needs and support our vision, we can choose a project that will ensure the long-term financial health of the club. If building a clubhouse on Napier St. is truly the best project for the club, the board, with the members' input and support, will arrive at this decision.

Mike Halinski (KTC Treasurer) makes further observations:

As a newcomer to Kingston and the club Mike finds the elephant in the room to be an "Us vs. Them mentality" where each side is focused on their project and neither side

is able to have the open mind to consider the benefits of other projects. He also finds that there hasn't been enough conversation of what we want the club (not just the clubhouse) to be: high-end, serving wealthy people, or volunteer-run with or without a General Manager; Low cost, or somewhere in between. There is no consensus on what we want the *club* to be, so how can we have one on the clubhouse.

#### Action steps

1. Create a vision for everyone for what type of club we want: collect the information from members from all members.
2. Do a needs assessment for a clubhouse that serves the needs of what people want, to achieve the goals of the vision.
3. Dispel the false dichotomy of a "lawn project or renovation as is project". Mike does not necessarily see the lawn project as the higher cost project. Location is just one characteristic of the clubhouse. Characteristics need to be determined after we find out what type of clubhouse members want.
4. Once we know all that we can develop several alternative solutions for the clubhouse.

Q: Study the demographics for indoor tennis: this should be part of the mandate to gather information. Believes there is money for indoor tennis despite city protestations to the contrary.

Q: We should learn to want the kind of club we have: a high-end club does not make financial sense in Kingston. We need a low cost club as we have now, not a super expensive indoor club.

AB: The new clubhouse was never seen as high-end, high cost, just meant to improve things functionally and operationally.

Q: The Us vs. Them is the main problem. If that is not resolved we are never going to succeed.

Q: Short discussion on doing another survey(monkey) to see what kind of club we need.

## **7. (was 6). Presentation by Requisitioners of Proposed 2019 Action Plan**

Dora Nomikos speaks briefly for the originator of the meeting requisition, Mark Nelligan, who is abroad.

We have done several surveys already to determine what the membership wants; the lawn design is not extravagant, just meant to replace a neighbourly building with a modern neighbourly building.

There may be economies of scale: can we do it all at once, in order to have just one mess, one time. Mark talked to contractors and prepared a time line that shows it is



still doable this year to do both the courts and the clubhouse.

**Question (Q):** Is the 2018 Capital Project Committee still a functional committee within the board structure or is it external to the club? Does the work that Mark has done, external of the club, put the club in a potential liability position towards contractors contacted by him?

**Requisitioners Answer (RA):** We are no longer working as a committee, and no commitments have been made.

**Q:** It is critically important that we come together first, and resolve mixed messages and messengers first.

**Q:** If we tear up things, have disruptions, we should consider doing as much as we can at the same time. How much would it all cost; is the lawn option feasible? Is the risk of debt a real concern?

**AB:** The KTC Budget for 2019 has not yet been done. The Trillium grant has taken board attention away from the current focus on operations, towards governance and long term issues. The board cannot do both. Do we hire an interim or part-time GM so the board can focus on the clubhouse? That will lower annual profits and our borrowing capacity. We need to decide those as a board, before we can do a debt capacity assessment.

## **8. Open Discussion and Q&A with KTC Board members and other presenters**

**AB (cont'd):** Affordability is not the issue, divisiveness is a bigger problem.

**Q:** Divisiveness is bad for KTC: we agree on so much, but I am worried about how long a visioning exercise might take. How do we get to the point of having two or three well developed projects in reasonable time?

**Q:** Discussion on how much the lawn clubhouse project might cost.

**Q:** Issue of ageism: older members just want to play, not have tennis season interrupted by a big project. They may not join if there is a big project. They prefer the status quo, but are willing to donate money for the right project.

**AB:** Even with the Trillium grant and projected reduction in scope of the work done, the cost of the lawn project is about \$1.4M, still more expensive than the \$900K that Mike Bartlett presented at the AGM as the most we can afford to do a project.

**RA:** Renovation is not cheaper once you add in all costs.

**Q:** Issue of cost of a non-winterized building vs a new, winterized building.

**RA:** We would have more comfortable shoulder seasons with an insulated building, which is also better for staff. It's still a bare-bones clubhouse.

**AB:** A needs assessment must be done to determine needs vs wants, and their associated costs. This has not been done. We cannot jump into one project without knowing if there are alternatives that are more affordable.

**Q:** We are asking too much of a volunteer board. The project is too much money and too important: we should hire a professional club manager, who will also be an impartial observer on potential projects.

**Q:** The Club is in divorce mode – this has to be fixed first.

**Q:** We did that, voted in a board that promised to take some time to look at things. We don't need a manager, we have a great board; boards work as operational boards and governance boards all the time, but here there is an external force pushing an agenda that takes away the board's time from work on operational and governance issues to respond in meetings, emails, etc. The Board has only had three meetings; let them do their work; we can hold them accountable at the next AGM.

**Q:** We shouldn't have a fear that we can't handle a project in terms of money. We don't have to do it all at once. It's better to see what the options are. Do we have the financial resources to do a project?

**Q:** Money has to come first. The KTC lender of choice (Infrastructure Ontario) should be kept close, as they may get chopped in the current political climate, drying up our funding.

**Q:** The board will have a heavy load, but needs to share more with the membership, more regularly. Transparency will bridge the gaps that exist.

**Q:** Demographics and increases in Immigration mean there is the opportunity for our membership to grow, which would benefit from a new clubhouse and eighth court.

**Q:** What are the timelines for work on 2&3.

**AB:** The project will start in the Fall, finish by Spring 2020.

**Q:** Has the OTF grant agreement been signed? Have there been talks to change the scope? What happens if they won't accept changes?

**AB:** The Trillium grant was for \$150K, but the quoted cost for the job was \$300K, which did not include engineering costs and may cost another \$50K, so that is

\$200K of our own money, half our cash in the bank. Is that our highest priority when we still have to figure out what to do with the clubhouse? The Board has to prioritize spending: most important now is the courts and lights, and keeping the Trillium grant. Sub-drainage and removing pads is something that can happen in the future; right now we don't have a ton of money. We have to negotiate with Trillium and won't do anything that won't be allowed.

Q: The priority are the courts.

AB: If we have to spend \$200K of our cash on sub-drainage, we would rather have that go to the clubhouse.

RA: IO multi-phase financing can be obtained in stages, not necessarily all at once. You apply for the entire project and they will issue the loan in stages over a number of years. So it's not all or nothing, we use half our capital on 2&3 and then we're stuck. IO will give feedback on the best approach to take.

## **9. Wrap up and next steps (by Chloe Wilson)**

Members want a lot of communication, which we are doing our best to do and we will continue to work hard on that and share developments: Clubhouse safety, the water damage cleanup, the OTF grant. As progress is made we will share information and engage members more to collectively come together to figure out what we want for the club. A big theme of this meeting was the divide, and this is really sad, and I hope we will work through it to come to the right solution for our club soon so we can go back to enjoying being part of this. The people in this room largely put more time into this than just playing tennis and when you do you really want it to be rewarding, and we have to figure out how to get back there.

## **10. Adjournment of the Meeting at 9:07PM**