

Museum Board Meeting December 14, 2011 Minutes

Present: Board members Blake Matheson, Tama Olver (Secretary), John Pearse (Chair), Katie Siegler (Vice Chair)

Absent: Rebecca Barrymore, Tom Frutchey (City Manager), Ken Cuneo (City Council Liaison)

Presenters: Jim Becklenberg (Deputy City Manager), Cathy Krysyna (Assistant Finance Officer)

Members of the Public: None

Chair John Pearse called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. in the City Manager's Conference Room, City Hall.

I. Approval of Agenda

As there were no suggestions for change, the agenda was approved.

II. Approval of Minutes for the Regular Meeting of November 9, 2011

As there were no comments, the minutes were approved as submitted.

III. Public Comments

As there were no members of the public present, there were no public comments.

IV. Correspondence

Tama Olver noted correspondence from Esther Trosow dated 12/7/11 with subject "community day not for the community," dated 12/9/11 with subject "Fwd: RE: disrespectful remark about former museum personnel," and dated 12/11/11 with subject "isn't the museum free?" The correspondence is included at the end of these minutes.

John Pearse noted that we previously discussed wording in Museum brochures about admission and suggested donations. We understood that wording would change when new brochures are published. The board agreed to place an item on the agenda for our next meeting: "Update on wording in museum brochures regarding suggested donations."

V. City Council Liaison Comments

Councilman Cuneo was unable to attend as our meeting conflicted with meetings of the City Council. In his absence, there were no comments.

VI. Museum Director's Monthly Reports

John Pearse made the following comments regarding the October report:

1. Does it make sense to have next year's Community Day on the same day as a

Science Saturday? There is a lot going on during Science Saturdays that could distract from another event. Tama Olver said that she believed the Community Day event would begin after Science Saturday activities had concluded.

2. The Director's Report notes low attendance at Community Day "despite promotions." John Pearse stated that the event could have been better promoted. For example, it could have been advertised in the Cedar Street Times and Hometown Bulletin. Tama Olver additionally noted that notice could have been given more than 10 days in advance.
3. Important statistics are included in Director's Reports, however, there are no comparisons with prior periods. Such comparisons would be useful. Tama Olver volunteered to create trend reports for key statistics included in Director's Reports. Katie Siegler noted that it would be important to include as much historical data as possible. If trend reports show only the most recent periods, they might fail to show improvements that have been made.

VII. City Manager's Report

City Manager Frutchey was unable to attend as our meeting conflicted with City Council meetings. In his absence, there was no report.

VIII. Board Chair Report

John Pearse reported that regular meetings with the City Manager and Executive Director of the Museum are working well.

From John's meeting with City Manager Frutchey:

1. City Manager Frutchey affirmed that insurance for the collection, the Museum Improvement Fund, and the Facilities Management Report are all appropriate topics for our board.
2. The City Manager also affirmed our perspective that the relationship between the city and the Museum Foundation is that of a contractor, rather than a partner. The city can be viewed as a trustee.

From John's meeting with Lori Mannel:

1. Lori Mannel would like to be assured that funds spent on lighthouse doors have been returned to the Museum Improvement fund. Jim Becklenberg confirmed that the funds had been returned.
2. The working relationship between museum management and city Public Works staff is not functioning well. John Pearse suggested that the board might have a role in improving the relationship.
3. Lori Mannel believes that a professional structural review of the Museum building, especially the electrical wiring and systems, is a priority. It is an old building and there may be deficiencies that need attention.

John Pearse also mentioned that eliminating a substantial portion of the \$150,000 obligation from the city to the Foundation has been suggested. This is a possibility we should monitor. We agreed to put a related discussion on our next meeting agenda.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

A. Use and Replenishment of the Museum Improvement FundHistory of the fund

Jim Becklenberg reported that the fund contained \$380,449 on June 30, 2011. The bar for spending from the fund is high. In fiscal year 2010, \$29,000 was expended to paint the exterior and part of the interior of the museum as well as fix carpeting. The city made those expenditures in order to improve the condition of the building as a good landlord would for a new tenant. There were no expenditures from the fund in fiscal year 2011.

Jim Becklenberg provided a copy of a document created in 1969 that defines allowable uses of the fund. The document is included at the end of these minutes. He noted that donor restrictions on uses of the funds are consistent with the purpose stated in the document. He also agreed to provide any information available about donor restrictions.

Future of the Fund

Jim Becklenberg noted that the city and the Community Foundation have been talking about partnering on fund raising for the library and monarch sanctuary. In the case of the library, people who donated money to the city were given the option of approving transfer of their donations to the Community Foundation. In the case of the Museum Improvement Fund, donors are not available to sanction such a transfer. Money in the Museum Improvement Fund must remain with the city.

We collectively concluded that there are no firm plans for replenishing the Museum Improvement Fund. We are on a path to spend all of the money, albeit slowly and under tight control.

Oversight of the Fund

Jim Becklenberg agreed to invite Tony McFarlane, Senior Accountant and the person most knowledgeable about the fund, to our January meeting in order to initiate a working relationship. In response to a question from Katie Siegler about advice Jim had for the board, he suggested that the board should periodically review the fund and be involved in decisions about disbursements.

B. Insurance of the Museum Collection

Cathy Krysyna, Assistant Finance Officer and the person most knowledgeable about the city's insurance, briefed the board. Her notes are incorporated at the end of these minutes. Highlights from the briefing are:

1. The city is insured through the Public Agency Risk Sharing Authority (PARSA). Premiums are low and coverage is very high, \$1 billion in total. The Museum collection is covered under the city's insurance policy, fine arts section.
2. There is no coverage for earthquake or tsunami.
3. Losses are handled on a case-by-case basis and in cooperation with PARSA. Law enforcement and/or Public Works would be involved depending on the nature of the loss. Coverage would allow for restoration of damaged items and replacement of lost ones. Even if an item were deemed "irreplaceable," the city

- could be compensated for its loss so that another item could be purchased.
4. There should be documentation when items are on loan and the city is temporarily responsible for insuring them.
 5. Generally in the case of a loss, Museum staff would place a value on the lost item. If PARSA questioned that valuation, a third party expert could be engaged to help the two parties come to agreement.

C. Audited Financials of the Museum

The item was on the agenda for the November 16 City Council meeting.

D. Museum Board Annual Report

The board discussed the draft report and agreed to add updates from presentations on the Museum Improvement Fund and city insurance, correct typos, and improve some of the wording. Blake Matheson moved that the revised report be approved subject to final editing by Tama Olver and John Pearse and clarification of the status of City Council receipt of audited financial reports. The motion was adopted.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2012 Work Plan

Board members brainstormed ideas for a 2012 work plan as follows:

1. Review reports required by terms of the Lease Agreement between the city and Museum Foundation; forward the reports to the City Council with any comments from our review. We agreed that this is a core annual goal for the board. Tama Olver agreed to ensure that all such reports are on our annual calendar.
2. Review the Museum Improvement Fund in June and July and make recommendations to the City Council as appropriate.
3. Work with the city and Museum Foundation to develop a long-term plan for expenditures from and replenishment of the Museum Improvement Fund.
4. Increase public participation in Museum Board meetings. Perhaps hold a meeting designed to solicit public input on a topic, such as long-term plans for the Museum Improvement Fund.

We agreed to complete a 2012 work plan at our January meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Tama H. Olver, Secretary

CORRESPONDENCE FROM E. TROSOW 12/7/11:

From: Esther Trosow <etrosow@93950.com>
Subject: **community day not for the community**
Date: December 7, 2011 4:54:42 PM PST
To: alan cohen <alanpg@comcast.net>, Bill Kampe <bkampe@mindspring.com>, Carmelita Garcia <cg54@comcast.net>, dan miller <danmiller39@comcast.net>, huitt <huitt@comcast.net>, k. cuneo <kencun17@sbcglobal.net>
Cc: Blake Matheson <blakematheson129@gmail.com>, John Pearse <pearsester@gmail.com>, katiesiegler@earthlink.net, Rebecca Barrymore <Rebecca@carmel.com>, Tama Olver <tamaolver@gmail.com>, Thomas Frutchey tfrutchey@ci.pg.ca.us

I really can't believe that Ms. Mannel has the guts to call something a "community day" that looks like they just invited members of the museum's inner circle to. Perhaps if it had been announced to the general public in newspapers, maybe a flyer in some windows or on bulletin boards, or even an announcement at a city council meeting, some citizens might have known it was happening and might have attended?

The quote is from her October manager's report that was just posted at:

<http://pgmuseum.org/sites/default/files/OctReport11.pdf>

The Museum's Community Day was held on Saturday, October 22nd. Despite promotions such as the Museum's e-newsletter which is distributed to over 1,000 constituents, placing an invitation to the community on the front page of the Museum's website, and inviting the City's Museum Advisory Board, the public turn-out was disappointing. The Museum decided to have the next Community Day during a Science Saturday to promote additional public engagement.

Esther

CORRESPONDENCE FROM E. TROSOW 12/9/11:

From: Esther Trosow <etrosow@93950.com>
Subject: **Fwd: RE: disrespectful remark about former museum personnel**
Date: December 9, 2011 10:26:25 AM PST
To: Blake Matheson <blakematheson129@gmail.com>, katiesiegler@earthlink.net, Rebecca Barrymore <Rebecca@carmel.com>, Tama Olver <tamaolver@gmail.com>, John Pearse <pearsester@gmail.com>
Cc: k. cuneo kencun17@sbcglobal.net

Correspondence to Museum Advisory board (submitted as communication for the next board meeting):

Comments on recent draft meeting minutes:

- I have not been in the museum since the night of the art walk, so I don't know whether the disturbing smell persists. However, I walk by there many times a day, and have noticed that the fan (HVAC) has recently been turned back on. That may be helping. During the transition from city management to operation by the Foundation, it was not turned on. I first noticed it was not on during Bob Snyder's interim management tenure. And since then I have not heard it running.
- I think you are making a false assumption that the citizenry is happy with the museum because they don't attend your meetings.

----- Trailed at the end of this email is a string of emails about remarks made at city council during a discussion of the level of future city funding to the foundation (*the recorded meeting is at: <http://www.ampmedia.org/asx/21653.asx> about 3:54 into the meeting*).

The "weed lot" mentioned in Dr. Pearse's response to my email was actually weed-suppressing slim soloman seal groundcover, which turns brown in summer. Bruce Cowan is concerned about the relationship between sudden oak death (*Phytophthora ramorum*) and California bay laurel (*Umbellularia californica*). Mr. Cowan recently recommended (both to Ms. Mannel and the NRC) that a tanoak or tanbark oak (*Lithocarpus densiflora*) in the back garden of the museum died from symptoms of Sudden Oak Death, before that disease was understood. According to

Bruce:

"As soon as I learned more about it I asked the City to remove an unhealthy looking bay tree from the back garden, which they cut down. . . . The other oak trees at the Museum have had no symptoms of SOD so far. Even so, I would suggest removing the three young bay laurels that were planted at the Museum two years ago before they get any larger. They are beginning to grow now. One has brown-tipped leaves, a symptom of SOD spore infection."

Esther Trosow -----

On Sun, Nov 27, 2011 at 3:32 PM, Stephen F. Bailey <sfbailey@reninet.com> wrote:
John Pearse, Bill Kampe, et al.,

Esther Trosow emailed me her objection to Mr. Kampe's disparaging comment about the city-run museum and your response to her email. You may or may not care about my thoughts, but here they are:

You are judging the many decades of city-run museum management based on only the very last years of declining city support when the museum was in serious trouble. That was not representative of the preceding decades and I can assure you that management of the museum was at higher levels previously, before you were involved. The museum earned AAM accreditation multiple times under Vern Yadon's and my own directorship. That would not have happened if the state of the museum was as deplorable as you claim.

It pleases me to read reports that the museum is more secure now and continues to operate for the benefit of the citizens of Pacific Grove, Monterey County, and visitors from around the world. However, it distresses me that the current museum management and foundation have gone out of their way to burn all bridges to the museum's past personnel and to operate the museum by treating the museum's past as irrelevant and without enduring value. That clearly misunderstands some of the primary values of museums in general. The increasing disrespect that I have endured since the foundation took over the museum has alienated me and caused me to wash my hands of any further involvement in the museum, even in those rare cases when it has been requested. My understanding is that the same is true of nearly all of the 80+ volunteers that were active during my years as Museum Director; they have chosen to end their volunteer work for the museum. The current management has rejected the museum's past and will therefore go it alone, with only new people. It should not be necessary to tear down the legacy and reputation of those that worked so hard to develop the museum over decades, just in order to make the current administration look better. I do not doubt that the current administration will have many accomplishments of which to be proud after all is said and done. So did their predecessors, despite what you two are now claiming. During my twelve years as the museum's Director, we had a high level of community involvement and tried to be very open and transparent in our operations. Is that still true today? Is citizen interest in the museum's governance truly welcomed?

The fact that you have come to the museum lately is shown by your misunderstanding of some facts. For example, Brokaw Hall and other physical maintenance of the butterfly sanctuary were never under the jurisdiction of the city's Museum Department; only the Butterfly Docents and other aspects of butterfly interpretation, plus limited oversight of the habitat management, were under my control. The fate of Brokaw Hall was as political as anything in Pacific Grove, and I can happily clarify that the museum was not at fault. Conversely, the Point Pinos Lighthouse was improved very substantially during our years, regardless of how you may have seen it recently.

Please try to see beyond the past four years and don't disrespect your predecessors based on false assumptions and claims of people that were not present to witness the museum first-hand.

Sincerely,

Stephen F. Bailey, PhD, Museum Director 1992-2004

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

Subject: disrespectful remark about former museum personnel
Date: Sat, 26 Nov 2011 18:20:55 -0800
From: John Pearse <pearsester@gmail.com>
To: Bill Kampe <bkampe@mindspring.com>
CC: alan <alanpg@comcast.net>, Blake Matheson <blakematheson129@gmail.com>, "cg54@comcast.net" <cg54@comcast.net>, "danmiller39@comcast.net" <danmiller39@comcast.net>

huitt <huitt@comcast.net>, Jim Becklenberg <jbecklenberg@ci.pg.ca.us>, "k. cuneo" <kencun17@sbcglobal.net>, rudy fischer <rudyfischer@earthlink.net>, "tfrutchev@ci.pg.ca.us" <tfrutchev@ci.pg.ca.us>, Esther Trosow <etrosow@93950.com>

Dear Bill,

In my opinion, your comment, if Esther portrayed it correctly, was entirely valid. Although I was not involved with the Museum as long as Esther was, I did join the City's Museum Board in 2007, the year before it transitioned from City to Foundation management. At that time the Museum was in disarray. Despite the tireless efforts of Bruce Cowen, the back garden was a weed-lot with card-board signs marking geologic time periods. The entry-way greeted visitors with a poorly maintained marine aquarium with algal scum and a few lonely bat stars. The main permanent exhibit hall was dominated by a large inappropriate exhibit about Monarch butterflies in Santa Cruz. The permanent exhibits were not properly cared for: some of the birds had mold and insect damage, as pointed out in Paul Finnegan's final report to the City Manager on 18 December 2007, and as found out later, the baskets in the Hall of Man were deteriorating. There was no Collections Manager, and the collections in the basement were a mess; I know because when I went through some of them when helping with the "Treasures from the Basement" exhibit in 2009, I was appalled by the number of shells and other items that were unlabeled and misplaced. At that time the new Collections Curator and his interns were going through the collections, and after extensive work they are now in much better shape. It is true that the Museum was asked by the City to look after the Monarch Sanctuary and the Lighthouse, and it was home for the docents at both, as is still the case for the docents at the Sanctuary. But who can claim that either was maintained well, with Brokaw Hall deteriorating so badly that it had to be removed, and the Lighthouse also in a sorry state. To his great credit, Paul used some of the Museum Improvement Funds (improperly it turned out) to help renovate the Lighthouse, but it was hardly enough. There are lots of reasons why the Museum got in such a sorry state. But all those I worked with were doing their best to keep the Museum afloat. Paul, who I have the highest respect for, was having a difficult time keeping things together, partly because of limited support from the City. I think he had only one staff member, Ron Kettlewell, the Assistant Curator, and I do not know what Ron did. The City's Museum Board, who were supposed to advise the City about the Museum, were totally ineffective, as we really had little knowledge or direction from either the City or Paul, and we spent a lot of time trying to figure out what we were supposed to do and how we were to follow a poorly written document (Council Policy 200-5). Although Paul said the Museum should strive to be accredited by the AAM in his final report, he certainly did not push for it, and the Chair of the Museum Board actively discouraged doing so. I think it was clear to everyone involved that the Museum was in no condition to be reaccredited at that time. The major support group for the Museum then was the Museum Association, made up entirely of volunteers. They publicized and supported the opening of the temporary exhibits, were the center for the operation of the Museum store, and coordinated the docents at the Monarch Sanctuary. The Museum Association has now been folded into the Museum, with many of the members becoming members of the Museum and the immediate past-president of the Association, Frank Penner, now being a director on the Foundation's Museum Board. The Museum now has 9 employees, including a Collections Curator, and is on track to be reaccredited by the AAM. Indeed, I think the transition of the Museum from being managed by the City to being managed by a private Foundation has been exceptionally smooth to the benefit of everyone, and in particular to the citizens of Pacific Grove, who still own the Museum and can take great pride now in what their Museum has to show to the world. When the City managed the Museum, it did not, and could not, budget enough funds to maintain the Museum; it now provides less than a third of what it had budgeted before and has a well-managed, thriving Museum to its credit. What you stated at the City Council meeting seems pretty obvious to me to be true, and you need to apologize to no one.

John Pearse

----- Forwarded message ----- From: **esther trosow** <etrosow@93950.com> Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2011 at 11:47 AM Subject: disrespectful remark about former museum personnel To: "bkampe@mindspring.com" <bkampe@mindspring.com> Cc: alan <alanpg@comcast.net>, Blake Matheson <blakematheson129@gmail.com>, "cg54@comcast.net" <cg54@comcast.net>, "danmiller39@comcast.net" <danmiller39@comcast.net>, huitt <huitt@comcast.net>, Jim Becklenberg <jbecklenberg@ci.pg.ca.us>, John Pearse <pearsester@gmail.com>, "k. cuneo" <kencun17@sbcglobal.net>, rudy fischer <rudyfischer@earthlink.net>, "tfrutchev@ci.pg.ca.us" <tfrutchev@ci.pg.ca.us> Councilmember Kampe: At the November 16th council meeting, you stated that the city didn't do a very good job running the museum when it was operated by the city, and that by every metric the foundation is doing a better job. What exactly were you referring to? If you are going to make

such broad statements and insist that what you are saying is factual, I believe you need to back the assertions up with some data, derived both from museum statistics kept during the city department days and the current foundation's numbers. And while you are compiling that data, please keep in mind that not only was the museum itself involved, but also much supervisory and operational support for the lighthouse and the butterfly sanctuary, along with support for essential natural resource committee work came through the museum staff--the dunes restoration, Crespi Pond, tree issues, wildlife issues, and other areas of expertise that we no longer receive from the museum foundation staff--were available from the city museum staff. Your statement was a conveniently simplistic way of viewing the transition from a city entity to a private entity. If you doubt that the museum is now a private club, why wasn't the public invited to the foundation's recent "Community Day" that was reportedly held on October 22nd? I think you owe people like Paul Finnegan, Steve Bailey, Vern Yadon, Ron Kettelwell, the late Helen Lind, and others who served before them an apology for your thoughtless and off-hand remark. Esther Trosow

-- John Pearse Professor Emeritus, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology University of California, Santa Cruz [831-648-9245](tel:831-648-9245) e-mail: pearsester@gmail.com 183 Ocean View Blvd, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 36° 37' 12.18" N 121° 54' 22.20" W

-- John Pearse Professor Emeritus, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology University of California, Santa Cruz [831-648-9245](tel:831-648-9245) e-mail: pearsester@gmail.com 183 Ocean View Blvd, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 36° 37' 12.18" N 121° 54' 22.20" W

CORRESPONDENCE FROM E. TROSON 12/11/11:

From: Esther Trosow <etrosow@93950.com>

Subject: isn't the museum free?

Date: December 11, 2011 1:52:22 PM PST

To: alan cohen <alanpg@comcast.net>, Bill Kampe <bkampe@mindspring.com>, Blake Matheson <blakematheson129@gmail.com>, Carmelita Garcia <cg54@comcast.net>, dan miller <danmiller39@comcast.net>, huitt <huitt@comcast.net>, John Pearse <pearsester@gmail.com>, k. cuneo <kencun17@sbcglobal.net>, katiesiegler@earthlink.net and 3 more...

Cc: Jim Becklenberg jbecklenberg@ci.pg.ca.us

Council, Museum Advisory Board, Staff:

Today (Sunday, December 11, 2011), I picked up the two attached PGMNH brochures from the CofC's hospitality / visitors center near Carl's Jr., and the visitors information desk at the American Tin Cannery.

The one-page one was at the CofC, and the two-page one was at ATC. As you can see, they are very similar.

Please notice the bottom of the left-hand side: there is a suggested donation/admission charge of \$3 adults / \$5 family.

The museum foundation made the commitment to keep the museum free. Nowhere in this brochure does it state admission is free. I think that needs to be explicitly stated. The issue went through the city museum advisory board, and I think there was some talk about changing it when new brochures are printed. That was quite a while ago, and it still needs to be done. Either the foundation printed a ridiculous amount of brochures, or no one is taking them.

I think enough time has passed that is reasonable to replace these brochures. I made this same observation when the visitors center opened. When will this be updated? Also, there should be a sign prominently displayed in the lobby of the museum that states it is free.

Also, the recently updated monarch butterfly brochure that the foundation produced still states that donations go to the Museum Association. That organization no longer exists.

Thanks! Esther

DRAFTMEMORANDUM

August 6, 1969

TO: City Manager
 FROM: Director of Finance
 SUBJECT: Museum Special Funds.

With the Charter revision approved last April, the operation of the Museum is now a function of the General Fund. However, several special funds are still needed to account for bequests, donations, and Museum enterprises.

It is suggested that the Museum Improvement Fund be continued and used to account for Museum enterprises and that a Museum Trust Fund be established to account for bequests, donations, etc. The following are suggested guidelines for the uses of these two funds:

Museum Improvement Fund

This fund would be used to account for revenues and expenditures related to the Museum's special activities, such as art shows and Audubon screen tours. Any balance in this fund could be appropriated to finance Museum acquisitions and improvements which could not be accommodated within the operating budget.

Museum Trust Fund

This legally restricted fund would be used to account for bequests, donations, etc., when such gifts are given for specific Museum-related purposes. Monies in this fund could be used only as specified by the donors.

If these guidelines are satisfactory, it is suggested that the City Council formally establish the special funds by resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Fleishman [fleishman@maglaw.net]
 Friday, May 09, 2003 2:17 PM
 Stephen Bailey
 Peter Woodruff
 Museum donation records

WILLIAM S. PITT
 Director of Finance

Susan Goldbeck has made a Public Records Act request for "any testamentary documents pertaining to any museum fund or any contracts, which impose any gift restrictions". I've attached the request in PDF format. I will work on compiling what I have in my files, and if you have any such records at the museum, please let me know. The final date for production of these I've set for May 23. By carbon copy of this message to Pete, I'm asking if there are any other places in the City's files of which he might be aware of such documents.

NOTES ON INSURANCE BY CATHY KRYSYNA**Museum Collection Insurance Coverage**

The City obtains property insurance coverage for all damages through the Public Agency Risk Sharing Authority (PARSAC). PARSAC obtains coverage for its multiple participating agencies through Alliant Insurance Service, Inc.'s Public Entity Property Insurance Program (PEPIP). Due to the number of participants in this insurance plan and the number of types of coverage (real property, personal property, vehicles, equipment, business interruption, lost revenues, etc.), there are additional layers of coverage provided by various insurers as listed on the Evidence of Property Insurance. Primary coverage is a maximum of \$25,000,000 (twenty-five million) per occurrence and maximum coverage is \$1,000,000,000 (one billion) per occurrence. The City valued its property at slightly over \$74,000,000 (seventy-four million) this fiscal year.

The Museum collection is covered under *Section V, Fine Arts*, beginning on page 43 of the Master Policy for the coverage period July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2012. The collection is valued at \$3,000,000 for purposes of setting the insurance premium amount for the coverage period. This is an estimate of the collection's worth based on valuations set by Museum staff over time and increased periodically by a percentage based on trend factors set by the insurance industry or when an item in the collection is re-appraised to a higher amount. Regardless of that valuation, the City will be reimbursed for the repair or replacement cost of all damaged items. If there is no reasonably current appraised value on record, and the City is not comfortable setting a value, then an appraisal may be scheduled in order to determine the insurance reimbursement amount. Please see *Subsection C, Loss Payment Basis/Valuation* on page 45 of the Master Policy and *Subsection D Special Conditions, No. 9, Appraisal* on page 46. The deductible per occurrence is \$5,000.

If the Museum board members desire additional information, PARSAC will schedule a telephone conference with the insurance broker, or the board can provide a list of written questions and the broker will provide written responses.

Claim Process – Common Sense Approach

Respond immediately to any emergency situation just as you would at your own home (i.e. flooding, damaged walls, etc.) by calling in appropriate Public Works staff (contact Public Works Superintendent, Michael Zimmer at 648-5722 #203) or, at Mr. Zimmer's recommendation, a repair professional (plumber, contractor, etc.) to resolve the immediate issue. If Mr. Zimmer is not available, contact Buildings and Grounds Supervisor, Roque Pinheiro, at 760-0646.

For theft, contact the police (648-3143).

Then call the City (Cathy Krysyna at 648-3102). She will contact Kin Ong at PARSAC to report the situation.

Kin Ong will assign a claims adjuster who will contact the appropriate person at the City or Museum regarding the situation. The adjuster might want to call in an expert depending on the damage (i.e. water seepage into walls at Museum that could cause dampness, mold damage, etc.). If the adjuster has an expert, we might be asked to use that expert rather than our own staff or other repair company.