



RIVER VALLEY RANCH

RVR Long Range Planning Committee
Monthly Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, Oct. 17, 1 p.m.

RVR Committee Members:

John Lund, Chair
Brian Leasure (*absent*)
Kevin O'Keefe (*absent*)
Michael Banbury
Charlei Lozner (*via Zoom*)
William Brown
Cari Shurman
Carl Hostetter

Homeowner Attendees

Stan Kleban
Nina Price (*via Zoom*)

- I. **Welcome**
Committee Chair, John Lund, called the meeting to order at 1 p.m.

- II. **Approval of June Meeting Minutes**
Committee Members, Carl Hostetter and Mike Banbury moved and seconded the approval of minutes.

- III. **Public Comment**
There was no public comment.

- IV. **Report and Review McMahan Survey Results**
John Lund started by saying that ahead of the meeting, McMahan shared that they thought participation from the Long Range Planning Survey was good and solid data was submitted.

The Committee went over highlights of the McMahon Survey Results:

- 59 percent of homeowners participated in the survey.
- Sixty percent (60%) of respondents are satisfied with the plan, 17% assigned a “neutral” rating. Only 23% are dissatisfied with the plan.
- Six of the 15 components of the plan are important/very important to at least half of the respondents. These components include replacing the pool deck and tile at the pool area (77% rating important), refresh and improve the Ranch House (68% rating important), improve the pool complex (66% rating important), rebuilding and relocate the maintenance buildings (53% rating important), new furnishings at the pool area (52% rating important) and refreshing the interior décor at the Ranch House (50% rating important). The recommendation from McMahon was that these core components of the plan should be the central elements of any final improvement proposal.
- Other items to the plan that had support from the community included the bar at the pool area, new restrooms at the Ranch House, a new mail room, pool cubbies, outdoor shower and changing rooms. It was pointed out that some of those improvements were more important to new residents.
- The survey also asked homeowners to share their opinion on other items that were not on the plan but were a part of other preliminary versions of the plan including pickleball courts, fitness room remodel, a new tennis shop etc. Just under half (40%) stated that they are very to somewhat likely to support the plan if any of those projects were included.
- The report also noted that based on the survey results, it seems as if it would be appropriate for the community to propose an improvement plan that includes the top six projects and several of the plurality projects, especially those that align with the top priority work, such as bar improvements that would fit with work being done in the Ranch House. This type of plan focused on the highest-priority projects.

John then went over the results on the funding questions on the survey. Sixty-two percent (62%) of respondents are satisfied with the proposed funding plan and 14% are neutral. It was added that a neutral rating was a good thing because it leans more towards support than opposition. so over three-fourths of respondents (76%) are satisfied or do not oppose the funding plan. Twenty-four percent (24%) are dissatisfied with the funding plan.

John also featured results on how homeowners are likely to vote. Just over half

(53%) of respondents indicated they would likely vote for the Preliminary Improvement Plan if it was brought to homeowners for a vote as currently structured, while 30% indicated they are likely to vote against it. Seventeen percent (17%) are undecided.

The committee then discussed the survey results as a group. A committee member pointed out that residents who have lived here a long time seem to think the facility is fine as is and younger or newer residents seem to be more inclined to vote in favor of improvements.

The committee also went over some of the comments in the survey including feedback on the mailroom and Admin offices.

It was expressed that if the committee can honor the comment section of the survey, adjustments could be made, and we could flip many of those who did not approve of the plan as it was shared. The goal is not only to get it approved but to get it approved with a large amount of support.

A remark was made that it has become clear that we ought to find some solutions for items on the plan that members pointed out as unsatisfactory. Ashley and Carl reached out to RVR residents and architects, Kevin Kreuz and Marc Margulies for their professional input before the meeting. They have given very useful input and recommended that if improvements were done without obstructing the building too much it would be less cost affective.

Carl then shared a modified, reduced scope of the plan that members of the committee and Marc came up with. An image was shared of the “east wing” of the Ranch House with these modifications. Carl stated that putting much of the work in this area would help keep costs down.

V. **Committee Discussion of Next Steps**

Carl Hostetter stated that a next step would be to meet with RVR homeowner and architect, Marc Margulies, and tour the facility. At that point, with his recommendations, we could be in a position to return to the McMahon Group with our ideas and modifications so that they can make the changes to the drawings. Work would also be done to the OPC so that costs are competent. With these adjustments, needs can now be met at a lower price point.

It was reiterated that a 60 percent quorum and **majority vote** “in favor” would be required in order to pass a special assessment vote.

The updated plan/package could be included in a Board packet sometime in quarter one of 2024 for board viewing.

John thanked all who continue to help move the plan along. The committee will meet again on Tuesday, Nov. 14.

VI. **New Business**

There was no new business introduced.

VII. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.