

June 28, 2015

Via e-mail:

President Len Welsh [lwelsh@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:lwelsh@kensingtoncalifornia.org)

Vice President Pat Gillette [pgillette@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:pgillette@kensingtoncalifornia.org)

Director Chuck Toombs [ctoombs@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:ctoombs@kensingtoncalifornia.org)

Director Vanessa Cordova [vcordova@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:vcordova@kensingtoncalifornia.org)

Director Rachelle Sherris-Watt [Rsherriswatt@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:Rsherriswatt@kensingtoncalifornia.org)

District General Manager Kevin Hart [khart@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:khart@kensingtoncalifornia.org)

To: Board of Directors and General Manager of the KPPCSD

I am writing to you all as you consider additional funding for the Kensington Police Department.

I have read Jim Watt's excellent analysis of your apparent intention to raise additional revenue for this purpose. I do not have the financial acumen that Jim does, but having worked previously with the predecessor of Price Waterhouse Coopers and as a tax lawyer, I think his analysis sound and I agree with his conclusion that:

*Our police have good salaries and fabulous pensions. Moreover, the forthcoming Board meeting will consider a budget filled with extras for the police department and not a cent for upgrading the Community Center to make it safe for our kids and grand kids. The Board should not vote for this inflation adjustment.*

My view of the efforts that the Board seems to be taking to find extra revenue to support our Police Department is simple. The Board seems to be looking at every possible source and reserve of additional **revenue**, taking over the financial reserves of the prudently operated Kensington Fire Department, to additional tax and franchise revenues.

I do not understand why no mention is ever made by the Board that they have undertaken measures to reduce the **excess expenses** of operating the Kensington Police Department. The discussion is always about finding additional revenues and reserves to appropriate; I do not recall at least an equal amount of attention being paid to controlling excess expenses.

The community knows that we have an excessively compensated – when compared to communities in California of the same size as Kensington --police department with salary and fringe benefits of over \$2,000,000 annually. The community residents pay for these salaries and fringe benefits. Many are fixed income retirees. They do not dream of such luxuries.

The community knows that in the embarrassing (and possibly criminal) event increasingly known as "Reno Gate," half of our 10 person police department was not needed in Kensington and was therefore vacationing together in Reno. The community knows that we have an excess of officers such that the Police Department can make them available to participate in activities on other counties. Despite the apparent excess of staffing, the Police Department budget shows

“overtime” of \$45,000 and “incentive pay” of approximately \$50,000, and a “recruitment” expense of \$6500.

The community knows we have 5 police supervisors –with their attendant high compensation levels—supervising 5 supervisees, reflecting what seems to be a history of trumped up promotions in order to artificially raise salaries, without any assessment as to what our policing needs levels are.

The proposed budget shows “communications and radio operations” budgeted at \$180,000 and car expense of \$80,000, with a discussion of needing to replace more police cars, as existing cars are said to have reached 100,000 miles policing our 1 square mile police service district. Questions have been raised, and not answered, regarding Police Department policies as they relate to the authority for officers to use our community’s vehicles when the officers are not on duty. The claim that the residents must buy more police cars since existing cars have reached the 100,000 mile mark patrolling Kensington, raises questions as to how “the community purchased cars” are being used.

Before it decides whether to make a financial commitment, a Kensington family considers the “need” for the expenditure and if there is a “need,” looks at both how to improve the family’s “revenue/income” side as well as how to reduce the “expense” side of the family’s financial situation.

Regardless whether a Kensington resident sees themselves as conservative or progressive, Republican or Democrat, I believe that in our educated Kensington community we consider ourselves financially “prudent.” If my belief is accurate, the corollary is that all Kensington residents wish their elected representatives to act in a manner that reflects the community’s expectation that our tax money will be spent prudently by the Board, with a full consideration of “needs” and not only where additional revenue and cash reserves may be found, but also where expenditures may be reduced.

On the specific matter of the cost inflator being considered by the Board, I reiterate that I agree with Jim Watt’s recommendation that

*Our police have good salaries and fabulous pensions. Moreover, the forthcoming Board meeting will consider a budget filled with extras for the police department and not a cent for upgrading the Community Center to make it safe for our kids and grand kids. The Board should not vote for this inflation adjustment.*

Thank you for your consideration.

A. Jan Behrsin, resident

## Lynn Wolter

---

**From:** Marilyn Stollon <mstollon@sonic.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 06, 2015 9:44 PM  
**To:** Lynn Wolter; Kevin Hart  
**Subject:** Fwd: Letter to Board, re Board Meeting 5/13, was not included in the record

Dear Lynn,

I was reviewing the recent packet and the minutes from various meetings, I see that surprisingly my letter, dated May 13 was not included for some reason, possibly an oversight ? during the time your arm was in a cast. Regardless, I am re-forwarding it to you to add to the record. Pls amend.

Do I need to formally do this at the board meeting? Parliamentary procedure?? I hope not!

Also, I am presuming that if I speak at a meeting and hand you my spiel or not, that it will make it into the record, if not, then please notify me as to the reason.

We have had this discussion before that you create a summary of the minutes, however, if I speak I want to be noted on the speaker list and to have my question and response etc. included, just as everyone else's comments are covered.

This has not occurred recently from what I can tell, but I am just checking to verify that my comments are being documented.

Regardless of what/how people say it ,(but respectful of course ) the minutes are a record documenting our progress from all perspectives and it needs to be inclusive.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Stollon

**From:** Marilyn Stollon <mstollon@sonic.net>  
**Date:** May 13, 2015 2:36:25 PM PDT  
**To:** [lenwelsh@gmail.com](mailto:lenwelsh@gmail.com), [pgillette@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:pgillette@kensingtoncalifornia.org),  
[ctoombs@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:ctoombs@kensingtoncalifornia.org), Vanessa Cordova  
<[vanessa.cordova.kppcsd@gmail.com](mailto:vanessa.cordova.kppcsd@gmail.com)>, Rachelle Sherris-Watt  
<[shwatt@sbcglobal.net](mailto:shwatt@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Cc:** [Lwolter@kensingtoncalifornia.org](mailto:Lwolter@kensingtoncalifornia.org)  
**Subject:** Letter to Board, re Board Meeting

Dear Board Members:

We will be unable to attend the meeting on Thursday, May 14 and would like to weigh in on the agenda items.

While I was opposed to the extra fees for an analysis of the MOU and financial analysis, I was quite pleased with the thorough work that was performed to create a balanced report with some clear indications of the district's financial pitfalls and potential costs, if we continue on this track.

The report in various scenarios clearly states the MOU is not sustainable after 2 years, and raises questions about benefits, pensions compared with other depts, and major unforeseen costs. We do not seem to have a good contract regardless of Mr. Toombs and Ms. Gillette's intentions at the time.

Clearly, I doubt there is public support for such a move for short term thinking to approve a contract so extravagant, that stretches the budget, when most folks understand and recognize the need to live within their means. If the MOU were to be approved for 2 years, do you think in negotiating a new contract you can get employees to give back benefits and wages? Just look at SJ, SF, Contra Costa County..not easy to achieve and very contentious undertaking that will further create ill will between the PD and the public. The exact opposite of the "healing" that we want to see.

So, if the logical question that you move towards is, do we look shortterm or longterm, go with a 2 year contract, or scrap it and start again with something that might be sustainable, if all the other issues can be resolved i.e. ( GM, COP separation, better management, code of conduct for cops at hire to avoid the Barrow situation). **Then, I say scrap the MOU, no 2 year term, and start over, please.**

I do not think that the PD needs a contract immediately. Other depts are working without a contract, their existing one is viable and highly beneficial to them, as the report indicates.

\*\*The community is clearly seeking a discussion of all of the options as presented by the KPOA meeting and panel i.e. contracting out pros and cons, consolidation, cost of maintaining our police as is, separating the GM and COP functions.

Regarding the report and ongoing costs I would like to add what I see are some omissions of potential costs:

1. Potential for lawsuits, and associated costs. K has had sexual harassment , Workers Comp, and the writ to just name the most recent coming to mind. It has to go in the pool of possibilities.

2. Harmons retirement costs? Not sure how that impacts the budget, but his incredibly high rate of pay will be a factor. I heard he is retiring.

3.The costs for building construction are low. As most people know when building or remodeling, the costs are always higher than budgeted for unforeseen issues, delays, costs.

4. We were told that the PD computer system etc are not updated in a former board meeting. I am sure the related costs of consultants and new equipment will not be cheap.

These are certainly things to consider as we go forward with trying to get accurate forecasting and hopefully an attempt to live within a budget that has good reserves and not on the edge of deficits.

I urge you all to do the responsible thing, to follow the advice and recommendations /warnings of the Public Law Group consultants, after all we are paying for this good advice to improve Kensington, and I know that is what

everyone's goal is in the long run.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Stollon

John Gaccione

Block Captains of Eldridge Court

\*\*\*Please include this in the official record.