

APPENDIX A

MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., AUGUST 3, 2009**

The first meeting of this committee today lasted 1 ½ hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Bryan Diehl, Adele Govert, Bill Hansen, Hugh Jenings, Rich Matheny, Larry Nobles, Amy Recht, and Art Zoloth. Joan Dragnich, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, and Brian Belmont were out of town.

Members of the committee introduced themselves.

A discussion followed, discussing the instructions from the LMC Board, discussing the timetable, reviewing aspects of the 2004 Long Range Plan Committee, and discussing the future agenda.

The LMC Board's goal was, "to appoint a special Planning and Community Development ad-hoc Committee. The responsibilities of this committee would include review of the Long-Range Plan to assess progress, make recommendations for the next five years, and interface with other community entities."

The original timetable put forward by chairman Cahn was deemed too ambitious, not allowing time to carefully and thoughtfully construct a meaningful questionnaire and subsequent report. Thus, it is anticipated that the questionnaire to LMC members will likely be distributed to LMC members in January, with that month's Navigator.

Without going into many specifics, numerous committee members expressed concern that many of the 2004 Plan's recommendations had not been addressed by the LMC Board over the past 5 years. Many of those recommendations remain valid today. The 3 main categories to be addressed remain: 1) financial status and goals of the LMC, 2) the facilities, their maintenance and their possible future expansion, and 3) Our governing documents and how they relate a) to condo-owner vs home-owner and b) to other community entities.

It was generally agreed that the demographics are changing, and that a questionnaire is needed to determine the changes and what they mean. It was also agreed that the wording of the questions is crucial. The committee will discuss at a future meeting, what questions about finance, facilities, and governance would be appropriate.

Several committee members expressed concern that the LMC Board should take this committee's work and recommendations seriously, so that the committee's members will not have wasted their time.

Appendices "A", "B", "C" and "D" of the 2004 report were distributed to the committee members for the first time.

The committee expects to meet next in 1 week on Monday, August 10, at 3:30, at the Beach Club.

Respectfully, Michael Cahn

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., AUGUST 10, 2009**

This committee's second meeting again lasted 1 ½ hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Adele Govert, Bill Hansen, Rich Matheny, Larry Nobles, Art Zoloth, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, and Joan Dragnich.

Elizabeth Van Z. Repeated the official charge from the Board: to review the previous Long Range Plan and to prepare something going forward. There was discussion as to whether the current and subsequent boards would seriously consider our recommendations. Elizabeth re-stated her position that she would push the new board to consider and to act on our recommendations. Most likely, our report will not be complete much before new board elections, next April.

There was agreement among our committee's members that the 2004 Long Range Plan was very complete, thorough, and meaningful. While previous LMC boards had addressed a number of the 2004 Plan's recommendations, there lacked follow through. This is especially evident in the area of the up-grading-expansion of the Beach Club building. While previous voting by our community failed to reach a super-majority in favor of assessments to finance any re-build, members of our committee felt that more could have been done to obtain funding. It was reviewed that a majority of residents in the past did vote for expansion. Some other sources of revenue to consider might include: sale of the "upper parking lot", sale of the tennis courts next to the Beach Club (as it is too windy to play tennis there), and soliciting "able" residents to donate capital.

Consideration in any remodel needs to include a new member survey of demographics and opinions.

Considerations need to take into account shoreline regulations, finances, and members needs. The committee felt that more meeting rooms were needed, as well as enlargement of the "Bay View Room and the kitchen, an improved entrance, and an improved lounge.

But the desires are intertwined with the finances. This lead to a discussion of the number of available buildable lots and to the possibility of including new residents from the anticipated PLA buildout, and the revenues that might generate? If so, now would be the time to be communicating with PLA. Our committee thus felt compelled to compose a "vision", a vision that the LMC community as a whole could believe in and could get excited about. The communications committee could assist in promoting "the vision".

But, this raised other basic questions, questions about what the LMC's goals should be, or what the LMC's members want. Do they want a strictly "Private Club"? Or would they accept sharing our facilities with other members of the Port Ludlow community? Again, a new survey seems called for. If the LMC is to be able to accommodate a larger membership, then we should plan for an expanded facility. And if we intend to *attract* new condo owners to *want* to become members, then we should make our facilities desirable. There are about 200 available buildable lots remaining in North Bay, and there is expected to be a build -out by PLA of about 87 additional new residences.

Another basic question raised was whether there should be a change in the number of representatives from the condos-Admiralty vs. the homeowners? While the demographics have changed drastically, the governing documents seem insurmountable for change?

In general, several of the 2004 Plan's recommendations *have* been addressed, including reducing the number of delinquencies, and bringing the governing documents up to date.

After the above discussions, it was agreed to continue by reviewing the 2004 Plan's recommendations one by one to note whether each had been addressed by the board, whether each is still valid, whether any should be modified or brought up to date, and whether any should be addressed in a new survey?

We will meet again at the Beach Club in 1 week, Monday Aug. 17, at 3:30.

Subsequent meetings may address such questions as forming a vision, constructing a new survey, discussing interactions with entities such as PLA, The Inn, Village Council, etc. I believe that our committee has the expertise and the intellect to build on a very good base, namely the 2004 Long Range Plan. Any views contrary to those above are welcome to be aired. Suggestions are always welcome.

Respectfully,
Michael

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., AUGUST 17, 2009**

This committee's third meeting lasted almost 1 ½ hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Larry Nobles, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, Joan Dragnich, and Hugh Jenings.

The members present had some informal discussion of what is and what should be the future of the LMC facilities, and how to bring that about. It was agreed that a survey of demographics and of members' desires must come first. It may take 2 or more surveys, with the first survey asking members, "what do you want", and the second survey seeking reaction to a "vision". We should consider sending an e-mail questionnaire followed by the same in printed form. We should ask members what their priorities in the Club are; are they swimming, exercise, meeting rooms, etc? We also plan to ask Brian Belmont what he thinks is most needed in the form of facilities.

Also discussed were the questions of 1) how to finance any new building of the Beach Club

1. how to obtain the necessary votes for approval of a build-out
2. and/or how to obtain the necessary votes to change the governing documents.
3. can certain "reserve lots" be renegotiated with PLA? And then sold?

The committee was reminded of its assigned mission to review the 2004 Long Range Plan.

Thus, for our next meeting, please review the "recommendations" of the 2004 Plan beginning on page 20, noting if you think each recommendation has been addressed by LMC boards over the past 5 years, whether each recommendation remains valid, and/or whether any recommendation should be changed.

Also, for our next meeting, please review the 2004 survey questionnaire in Appendix D, and note if you would add or delete or rephrase any of the questions. We would like to keep the same general format for our new survey, to make it easier to compare answers from the old to the new survey..

Let me know if you do not have the Appendixes.

We will meet again in 1 week: Monday, August 24, 2009, at 3:30, at the Beach Club. Our meeting on the 24th will be in the Bayview Room. I plan to meet at the same time on Mondays every week here-after (except Mon., Sept 7, which is Labor Day), until further notice.

Again, comments and suggestions are welcome.

Michael 437-8223 or hildamike@cablespeed.com

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., AUGUST 24, 2009**

This committee's 4th meeting lasted 1 ½ hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Larry Nobles, Hugh Jenings, Rich Matheny, Art Zoloth, Adele Govert, and Brian Belmont (LMC General Manager).

With regrets, the committee acknowledged the resignation of Amy Recht, who had time constraints associated with family commitments.

The agenda of this meeting had been to review the recommendations of the 2004 Long Range Planning Committee and to determine whether LMC boards over the past 5 years had addressed those recommendations. Chairman Cahn reminded the members that the current board had charged this committee with this task. During the initial discussion, the committee appeared to agree that we should spend *little* time on past history, and concentrate on forward-looking goals. The purpose in assessing whether the board had addressed previous recommendations was for information and not for blame or admonishment purposes.

The committee agreed that the recommendations fell into 4 main categories, as had been outlined in the 2004 report. These categories are:

1. Facilities (especially the Beach Club)
2. Membership issues
3. Governance
4. Finance issues

There are overlaps in some areas, such that finances are crucial to any facility remodel, for instance.

Hugh Jenings then lead the committee in the discussion of each of the 2004 recommendations, taking advantage of his easily heard, resonant voice.

Beginning on page 20 of the 2004 Report, the 2004 recommendations with our presumptions of board actions, and the main discussions within our committee are as follows:

1. Before any remodel plan, town meetings and perhaps a survey of members is needed. Board response is: YES, but was more than 5 years ago, and was not recently followed up.
2. Gather information to determine *priorities* of facilities that members would support. Board response is YES, but again, more than 5 years ago.
3. Develop a “vision of the future”. Board response is NO.
4. Prepare remodel plans. Board response is YES, but not followed through.
5. Consideration of *staged* remodeling. Board response NO
6. Develop spaces within the Beach Club to support structured children's and families' activities. Board response is a *conditional* YES. We note that spaces are made available when requested, but that the LMC does not initiate most programs, but rather, that the LOA or interested individuals organize most programs.

7. Adapt under utilized areas of the Beach Club for other uses as our community may demand. Board response is a *conditional* YES. The squash court is converted to ping pong. The Bridge Deck is used for kids' movie night, art classes, and for playing bridge. However, again, much of this is under the LOA.
8. Improve the Club entry area. Board response is NO.
9. Club staff make members aware of existing programs and initiate new activities. Board response is *conditional* YES. A web site has been established and programs are posted on bulletin boards and in the Navigator. New programs are not considered.
10. Obtain more fitness equipment. Board Response YES.
11. LMC to protest resort development plans which increase housing density or that change CC&R's that eliminate the requirement that Ludlow Bay residents must become members of LMC. Also, work with the developer for resort plans that are acceptable and beneficial to all. Board response YES.
12. Preserve open space and beach access. Board response NO.
13. Plan for more and better Beach Club facilities. Board response NO.
14. Establish policy that ensures fair treatment to LMC members who support our facilities. Board response YES.
15. When assessing for growth and expansion, consider the future availability of other facilities. Board response NO.
16. Wider walking-biking paths and safety factors. Board response NO, but probably not appropriate for our LMC board?
17. Create new trails. Board response YES. The trails committee of the Village Council has achieved this with the approval of the LMC board.
18. UNDER MEMBERSHIP ISSUES: Develop a statement of LMC members' common interests followed by consensus on how to implement our goals. Board response NO.
19. Improving communication between LMC leadership and the membership. Board response YES, in that a communications committee has been established.
20. The LMC should develop and implement programs to attract a wider cross section of the community. Board response NO.
21. Make members aware of the value that our "club" adds to their property, even if they do not use the club. Board response NO.
22. Reevaluate fees and restrictions to seek equitable treatment of contract members. Board response *conditional* YES the board is apparently now considering this question.
23. Increase the involvement of children and younger family members into the planning process. Board response NO.
24. Enforce LMC regulations on owners of undeveloped lots. Board response NO
25. GOVERNANCE ISSUES: Review governing documents and make appropriate changes. Board response YES. The covenants and regulations committee has been quite active.
26. Adoption of a name change from LMC to North Bay Association. Board response NO.
27. As the By-Laws frequently refer to "services for the benefit of members", consider organizing an entity to promote and oversee programs and activities, possibly in association with the LOA. Board response NO.
28. Consider the current practice of "one vote per property owner" regardless of the number of LMC properties owned.. Board response NO.
29. Changing LMC Board representation by condo owners vs. home owners, based on current

- demographics. Board response NO. Note that this committee took no vote or stand on this issue at this time, but only considered the concept in light of the 2004 recommendations.
30. Making any necessary changes to the CC&R's re home-based businesses based on current situations. Board response YES.
 31. Requiring the operations committee assure that the CC&Rs are enforced. Board response YES
 32. FINANCE: Review our return on assets and establishing a capital improvement fund. Board response NO.
 33. Develop fund raising methods and goals. Board response NO.
 34. Develop an approach to collecting delinquencies. Board response YES. Brian Belmont has been very successful in this endeavor in the past several years.

It should be noted that this committee, in assigning a "YES" or "NO" to board responses to each 2004 recommendation, did not review records or have lengthy discussions of most board actions. It was felt that this review had little benefit, and that the committee would do well to move on to other aspects of its assignment.

There was discussion about whether to form a vision and then to ask the membership for their input, or to ask very open ended questions of the membership regarding their desires, and only then moving forward with goals and plans. This issue was not totally resolved, but it was generally agreed that we should not try to "force" any plan on the membership, such as a rebuild of the club, since this had failed in the past.

I propose that at our next meeting, we discuss our next moves, such as a survey, town meetings, meeting with the chairmen of the LMC committees, etc. Also, assuming that we will be sending out a survey, start organizing that task. Review the previous survey, consider any changes and/or additions.

The next committee meeting will be Monday, August 31, at the Beach Club at 3:30. There will be no meeting on Labor Day (Sept 7). I will be out of town Sept. 14, and thus no meeting until Sept. 21, unless you wish to meet without me on Sept 14.

Respectfully, Michael

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., AUGUST 31, 2009**

This committee's 5th meeting lasted 1 hour.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Brian Belmont, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, and Joan Dragnich.

With regrets, the committee acknowledged the resignation of Bryan Diehl, who had other conflicting obligations.

The relatively small number of committee members present made some headway in planning the direction of our efforts.

It was decided that our next task should be to compose the survey to be sent to the LMC membership. It was agreed that much of the survey should be similar to the 2004 survey. Our next committee meeting is 3 weeks away on Monday, Sept 21, so in the next 3 weeks please go over the 2004 survey on pages 2 & 3 of Appendix D. Add, subtract, and/or modify any questions, and be ready to discuss in 3 weeks.

It was decided to send 2 surveys to the membership, the first covering demographics and facilities, and the second covering finances, governance, and possibly other subjects. The reasons for 2 surveys were:

- 1- it would separate the less contentious issues from the more contentious issues.
- 2- it would shorten each survey, and thereby hopefully avoid fatigue by the members.
- 3- it would allow us to structure the second survey based on responses from the first survey.

It was suggested that the survey be expanded beyond the 2004 survey, to include questions about greenbelt, carports, boats on properties but "hidden" from view, renters use of facilities, the 2 properties-1 vote issue, etc.

It was further suggested that issues could be brought up in the Navigator, one issue per publication, requesting the membership to send their opinions to the Club, either via e-mail or via mail, or hand delivered, keeping the sender anonymous if they so desire.

Considering the importance of PLA in future LMC plans, it was suggested that Michael ask PLA to provide a representative to our committee. Furthermore, with Bryan Diehl's resignation, it was suggested that we search for another committee member who would represent our younger population.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45. The next meeting will be Mon., Sept. 21, at 3:30 at the Beach Club. Please bring your copy of the Appendices and your "survey" recommendations.

Respectfully, Michael

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., SEPTEMBER 20, 2009**

This committee's 5th meeting lasted 1 hour.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, Adele Govert, Joan Dragnich, and Brian Belmont.

The meeting was successful in reviewing the 2000 and 2004 survey questionnaires, and in making several decisions regarding our 2009 survey.

It was generally agreed that a separate questionnaire should be sent to contract members, since several questions in the survey don't apply to them, and since they have no vote in the LMC, but their opinions are important.

The demographics section of the survey remains essentially unchanged from the 2004 questionnaire.

The usage section has been modified (i.e. simplified), but is meant to produce essentially the same information. Questions regarding the use of the game room, the marina, and the golf course were deleted. The question was restated to analyze each household's use of facilities, rather than each member of each household's use. A simple outline asks whether a household uses a facility daily, weekly, monthly, rarely, or never.

Also, altered was that the "importance" of each facility or activity be evaluated simply as "high" or "low", rather than the previous scale of 1 to 3. It was our opinion that even if some members don't use a facility, that they might consider it "high" as a boost to property value or to the community as a whole.

The backside still has room for written comments.

Brian Belmont has laid out the questionnaire in 2 formats, for us to pick one. Get it on line or pick it up at the Beach Club.

Our next meeting is Monday, September 28, 2009, at 3:30 at the Beach Club. I hope to complete a questionnaire for the contract members. It shouldn't be hard. Then I believe we might start considering what advice we might give to the board re facilities, finances, etc. If you wish, I would ask the chairmen of those LMC committees to discuss issues with us. I plan shortly to ask PLA to send a representative to join us or to converse with us. Possibly, our committee could split into 2 or 3 subcommittees to go over issues, such as facilities, finance, etc. Think of a sub-committee you might like to be on.??

Michael

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., OCTOBER 28, 2009**

This committee's 6th meeting lasted 1 ½ hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, Brian Belmont, Art Zoloth, Adele Govert, Joan Dragnich, Larry Nobles, and special guest Diana Smeland (President of PLA).

A very cordial discussion between the two parties was very informative.

Up front, Diana affirmed that PLA is ready to institute the same deal with LMC that it established with the SBCA, namely that PLA would include in the sale of every new unit in North Bay, a \$2,000 fee for the LMC as well as the requirement that the buyer must be a member of the LMC, and thus pay annual assessments to LMC. That would occur if the LMC wishes it.

She described the new units planned as condos and town homes of about 1400 sq. ft. each, many of which are anticipated to be summer or vacation units only. Thus, the impact of those owners using the LMC facilities would be limited to the time they were in Port Ludlow, if they used them at all. Other units were anticipated to be rentals by their owners. She anticipated that the age of those new buyers would be between 50 and 65, mostly without children, the "baby boomers." Each new condo complex and each new town house complex would have its own "homeowners Association," as do the existing condos.

She stated that what guests at the Inn want most in the form of recreation is an exercise room, walking trails, and the golf course. The Inn is installing a very limited exercise room, but she would like access to the LMC's more extensive exercise room for Inn guests. She did not know how important the pools or tennis courts are to Inn guests, but she will attempt to research that. She did not know how great an impact Inn guests would make on the use of the various LMC facilities. PLA is unable to pay a significant fee on a regular monthly or yearly basis for use of LMC facilities by Inn Guests, but could institute a fee from individual Inn guests if they wish to use LMC facilities (if the LMC grants that privilege). We should consider a question on the next survey to obtain LMC member opinion regarding use of LMC facilities by Inn guests.

A "Conference Center Concept" for Port Ludlow is "dead" at this time.

As a "time frame," PLA finds it essentially impossible to get bank financing for its planned condos and townhomes at this time. They don't expect lending money to be available before 2012. PLA does see interest in the condo/town home units starting to appear, and expects interest to increase by 2012.

Asked, "What would PLA like from the LMC," Diana Smeland said that PLA would like to have the LMC available to new condo/town home buyers as an incentive to buy, 1) for its facilities, but even more 2) as a potential social setting in which new residents can meet existing residents.

There was some discussion of the deteriorating condition of the Beach Club. This prompted some "free thinking" about other possibilities, such as a single new "Club" for all Port Ludlow. Such a

new enlarged club could be built on the current site of PLA's offices. Another scenario might be to have two (2) classes of LMC member; one that wishes not to use the facilities and pays a lower assessment and another that uses the facilities and pays an additional fee for that privilege. Also, we might give thought to a separate voluntary fund to perhaps pay for upgrading the Beach Club.

There was also some brief discussion of making the LMC facilities available to visiting boaters, and/or the yacht club.

The meeting ended with our committee satisfied with the answers received, and with the understanding that Diana Smeland would be willing to meet with us again if we so desired. We thanked her for her time.

Bill Hansen, with Adele Govert and Joan Dragnich, will tabulate the returned surveys. Apparently there is some confusion among the 125+ residents who received their survey via e-mail. Were they going to get the survey in the mail with a return envelope? Brian will e-mail them that their survey is via e-mail only and that they can either fill it out and e-mail it back to the LMC, or they can print it out and bring it to the LMC or mail it in, in their own envelope.

I would like to meet again on Mon., November 30, at the Beach Club at 3:00 p.m., to go over the survey and perhaps start a second survey, and on Mon., December 7 at 3:00 p.m., to start discussing goals for the LMC.

I will be out of the country from tomorrow until November 20.

Happy Thanksgiving,

Michael Cahn

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., NOVEMBER 30, 2009**

This committee's 7th meeting lasted 1 ½ hours

Present were Michael Cahn, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, Brian Belmont, Adele Govert, Joan Dragnich, Art Zoloth, and Larry Nobles.

The committee discussed the return of the community survey it had sent out with the recent “Navigator” about 5 weeks ago. Many thanks to Bill Hansen, Joan Dragnich, and especially to Adele Govert who tabulated the results. Unfortunately, we received only about 209 returns, representing about 20%. Discussing the low return rate with the committee, and later with Bill Hansen, 20% is too small a percentage to be fully meaningful when the total number is only about 1,000. The reasons for the low number of returns is uncertain, but we will attempt to increase the number by sending a reminder to the residents. Elizabeth reminded us that we must resist the temptation of inserting our own biases into the responses which represent much fewer than a majority of our residents.

Likewise, it becomes difficult to progress on to issues such as “facilities” without a clear indication of what the membership wants. We have lost another of our committee, Rich Matheny, who has moved to downtown Seattle. We also became aware that Hugh Jenings is a snowbird who will not return until late Spring. At this point I believe we can carry on with our current core members, and interview others if we feel the need.

Our next meeting will be Monday, December 7, at the Beach Club at 3:00. I hope to discuss the returns and the “comments” submitted. Thereafter, our committee will be dormant until January.

Happy holidays,
Michael

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., DEC. 7, 2009**

The meeting lasted 1 ¼ hour.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Brian Belmont, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, Joan Dragnich, and Art Zoloth

Bill Hansen, our chief “statistician” was absent due to other commitments, and Adele Govert was absent due to an urgent dental problem. A general overview of the survey returns showed that most people commented on LMC “facilities”, and most of these comments urged some sort of upgrading. Several “finance” responses urged keeping assessments down. Several responses suggested that our “Club” provide more “activities”. We will try to get a more accurate count of responses, including the additional survey returns, by next meeting.

A moderately lively discussion followed with consideration of long term goals for the LMC, tying in some possible future scenarios for Port Ludlow as a whole, for SBCA, and for PLA. Would Port Ludlow incorporate as a government agency? And how should that impact LMC? Should SBCA and LMC be planning together?

Should Port Ludlow try to combine the Bay and the Beach Clubs? If a new Club were to be built, replacing both existing clubs, would it be on the current site of the Beach Club? Should we talk to PLA about acquiring the area of Harbor Master Restaurant for extra space, if that were possible?

Art Zoloth gave us some update on his Village Council 20/20 Committee. Elizabeth brought up numerous points about our Beach Club. One starting point might be to get a professional appraiser to evaluate the Beach Club as to longevity and cost of piecemeal maintenance and upgrades vs. teardown and rebuild. How long could we expect our structure to survive? Almost everyone agrees that our Club is lacking in many respects, but how many are willing to pay for real upgrade and/or rebuild? A cost analysis for LMC alone vs. for a combined Bay Club-Beach Club may be in order. There may be significant savings in a combined Club? As such, we should consider having closer discussions with SBCA.

Consideration for selling the current Beach Club site to build a “common club” elsewhere should be studied. Elizabeth pointed out that we should maintain public access to the beach-waterfront, and should maintain a certain amount of “open space” in the community.

We also discussed the desirability to increase programs at the Club to bring in more people, to get more residents involved using the Club. Bingo, dances, youth activities, etc, to promote a “need” for the club. Then, perhaps, more members would find it acceptable for us to be more aggressive.

Much of the above was discussed by the 2004 Planning Committee, but not acted on. Perhaps it is time to act. If one anticipates that PLA will leave in 10 to 15 years, more or less, and that Port Ludlow might incorporate, and that our population will increase, and that our current club building

has a limited longevity, then we should plan now for our near future direction. What should our goals be? What is important to our members?

Our committee is adjourned until after the holidays, and I will let you know of the date. Happy holidays all.

Michael

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., JANUARY 18, 2010**

This committee's 8th meeting lasted 2 hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Elizabeth Van Zonneveld, Adele Govert, Bill Hansen, Larry Nobles, Art Zoloth, and Brian Belmont.

The meeting centered on 2 main topics:

- 1) the recent survey returns
- 2) forward looking scenarios

In the survey, the demographics section was a surprise in that while there were more people here now, than there were 5 years ago, the surveys of 2004 and 2009 show some similar percentages. Thus, of persons who have resided in Port Ludlow for 0 to 10 years, the percentages were: 64% in 2004 and 58% in 2009. Likewise, the percentages of residents who have lived here for over 15 years were: 24% in 2004 and 26% in 2009.

The % of homeowners who stated that their Port Ludlow home was their primary residence in 2004 was 89%, and in 2009 was 90%.

The number of persons living in a residence remained almost identical with 16% having 1 person, 71% having 2 persons, and the remaining 13% having more than 2 persons.

The big surprise came when we looked at the "age" values. In the 2004 survey, persons over age 55 totaled 72.5% of responders, while in the 2009 survey, persons over age 55 totaled 83% of responders. And the % of youth under age 18 dropped some. We had anticipated that we would find a significant increase in the % of younger people, but that was not the case.

The surveys are not necessarily equivalent, in that the 2004 survey had over 500 returns, while the 2009 survey had only about 260 returns. It is possible that the younger residents failed to return their surveys in proportionate numbers??

There is probably some truth to this last statement, because we see that there were 23 persons listed as age 6-12 in 2004. They should now be age 13-18. The numbers for age 13-18 are now 7. Since we had twice as many returned surveys in 2004, we should multiply our 2009 figure by 2, which gives us 14, still far short of the expected number of persons. Thus, we may suspect that more young residents failed to return our survey than did older residents. Nevertheless, the percentages fail to show a trend toward a younger population.

The other part of the survey included "comments". Adele, who compiled our survey returns, insisted that she was best suited to write a draft of the findings to date. That draft will pass muster with the committee and then be submitted to the board as an interim or progress report.

In the rest of the meeting, discussion centered on forward looking. Where are we going? This part is somewhat difficult since we are not sure where "Port Ludlow" as a whole is going. We agreed that while our committee has reconvened every 5 years, that it is a "long" range planning committee, looking not only at the next 5 years, but beyond.

After discussion, it was apparent that it does not matter whether Port Ludlow incorporates or not, we are a "Homeowners Association", as pointed out by Larry.

We need to provide our best for our North Bay residents; period. The best could involve agreements with SBCA or any other entity here.

Discussion of the Beach Club future was not settled. How long could the existing structure function for us under diligent maintenance? How far in the future should we project before it needs total replacement? If that is our ultimate goal, to one day totally replace it, shouldn't we start some funding toward that goal? If we elect to gather funds, how should that be done? There seemed to be some consensus in our committee that adding significant piecemeal additions (kitchen, entrance-lounge, etc) was not practical, especially in this economy. Elizabeth and Bill have had grant writing experience and suggested that as a source of funds.

The idea was also brought up to expand available programs for various ages, to attract more people, hoping they will get enthused about coming to the Beach Club.

Also, the minor complaints or short term projects would be brought to the board's attention.

Also, the previous 2004 Long Range Planning Committee's recommendations continue to have merit, and Michael asked Elizabeth and Larry (who were members of that committee) to review the relevant parts of it.

Also, there was consideration of a second survey to ask our residents some more pointed questions, such as "how do you feel about unification of North and South? And what should be done after the developer leaves?"

Also, there was a brief discussion about the reserve fund. Some feel that it is over funded and that it only requires about 50% funding. That would free up over \$200,000 for construction. That together with grants and donations might lead to a substantial sum?

Also, it was felt that when we finally bring our recommendations to the board, that we be specific in how we would recommend proceeding, with significant detail.

Also, we discussed that many residents, when they first move here, are confused about facilities and governance, despite LOA's welcoming committee work. How can we facilitate that problem?

Next meeting: Mon., Jan 25, at 3:00 at the Beach Club.

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MON., JANUARY 25, 2010**

This committee's 9th meeting lasted 2 hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Brian Belmont, Larry Nobles, and Bill Hansen

The first part of the meeting discussed the results and meaning of the survey's demographics results. Six more surveys have been returned. These were not examined at this time. As stated before, there were essentially no changes in the demographic percentages of our residents. This would lead one to conclude that the direction of our club should remain unchanged.

However, the committee felt that we should pursue more activities for the youth in our community; that we should meet with the youth and their parents to see how or if this can be implemented. As usual, finding space for youth activities remains a challenge. Furthermore, any activities at The Club would require parental oversight and ongoing involvement.

The second part of the meeting covered the outline: "Highlights of the Long Range 2009 Survey" produced by Adele Govert. (This outline is attached). Listed as number 1 in importance, is the "Indoor Pool". This facility is a much used asset. It is used by elderly and handicapped as well as by vibrant persons. There is a need to facilitate access to our building and into the pool for the handicapped. The committee members present felt that an elevator for the building and means for entering the pool should be implemented. The pool "means" could be a hydraulic lift or a wide stairway with railing.

The temperature of the pool was discussed. Lap swimmers like about 82 to 84 degrees, while handicapped, older people like 86 to 88 degrees. We keep the pool in between these values.

Hiking trails is number 2. It was discussed to possibly extend a start point to the "Around the Bay Trail" from our Club. Beach access is present but not ideal. The tides wash away ground at the base of our steps. To try to improve this situation is difficult and may carry some liability.

Outdoor Pool is number 3. Our main complaint here is unruly youth, mainly on weekends. Brian hires extra hostesses for those times. We may need to better educate parents and youth.

Exercise Room is number 4. This is a very popular service. Complaints were centered on too little space and too few pieces of equipment. Trying to find space is very difficult. The most obvious is the handball court. Brian will try to produce a number of the people who play handball/racquetball.

We next discussed "comments about the "facilities". It is obvious that our club lacks space, adequate facilities, and extensive programs. The committee members felt that ultimately an entire new facility would be required. Responses in the survey revealed more users than non-users of the facilities, and revealed more people favoring improvements than favoring no change.

Piecemeal additions are not really practical. While some items could be added to the existing structure, such as an elevator, the spaces required for other activities require more substantial modification, namely an entirely new structure. The committee, speaking with the survey in mind, felt that a larger dance floor, a larger exercise room, additional meeting rooms, better shower-dressing rooms, an enlarged improved kitchen, etc, could practically only be accomplished through an entire new building. The existing pools would be retained. Larry Nobles noted that the LMC had received a certified architect's rendition of such a structure from the Gregovs several years ago.

Funding of such a project was discussed. It is apparent that, as in the past, there is no likelihood of obtaining the required votes to assess the LMC members for such a cost. Several responses in the survey mentioned financial limitations and keeping costs down. We feel that a voluntary capital campaign is the only way to succeed.

Briefly discussed was the possible desire to add programs to attract more people to The Club.

Also briefly mentioned was the need to closely communicate with PLA. We need to interact with them about the areas of PLA development which surround LMC, about requiring their new buyers to be LMC members, and about the LMC's acceptance of those new "members".

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Next meeting at the Beach Club will be Monday, February 8, 2010, at 3:00 PM.

The agenda will focus on a review of the 2004 Long Range Planning Committee's recommendations.

Michael

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 8, 2010**

This committee's 10th meeting lasted 1 ¼ hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Brian Belmont, Larry Nobles, Adele Govert, and Bill Hansen.

It was general consensus that we were at the point in time that we could start composing a draft of a final report to the LMC Board of directors.

We agreed that neither a 2nd survey nor a town meeting would be of benefit because the response to the first survey had been only about 26%, showing an apathy in the membership, and because we felt that our response would be a combination of opposite points of view, and we had already received those comments in our first survey.

We then discussed several options for the board to consider. These included the option to add to the Beach club piecemeal vs a total remodel. Piecemeal additions/improvements would include an updated kitchen, an elevator, improved exercise space and equipment, etc. As for either option, financing becomes an issue. In previous voting, our membership passed remodeling plans, but rejected assessments to finance the plans. Based on our survey's returns, it would be doubtful if an assessment would pass now. Thus, voluntary contributions to a capital fund and/or some other source of funding would be required. However, a cost analysis of specific building plans should first be obtained from a professional construction estimator. For all of this, the board should get approval from our membership. For that, we should present the membership with "a vision" with the cost figures.

Bill Hansen spelled out our main "needs" as conveyed in the survey. These included:

- 1) Need for more space for a) exercise b) meetings c) lounges and more.
- 2) Need for handicapped access to downstairs and pool
- 3) Need for more exercise equipment
- 4) Need for kitchen improvement

Expanding *activities* to "lure" more members to use the club should be attempted. Members should be made aware that without remodel, a great deal of expenditure will shortly be required for such things as a new roof, a rewiring project, and more.

Michael and Bill will get together to put together a draft to present to our committee. We will e-mail it out and seek critique.

Our next meeting will be Monday, March 8, at 3 PM at the Beach Club to discuss the draft.

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF March 8, 2010**

This committee's 11th meeting lasted 1 ¾ hours.

Present were: Michael Cahn, Brian Belmont, Adele Govert, and Bill Hansen

The first part of this informal meeting consisted of a free discussion about where we are now, what still needs to be done, and where we are going. The consensus was that we had most of the preliminary work done, that the lethargy and division in the community did not warrant another survey at this time, and that we could move on to recommendations for the board.

All agreed that the main issue is the Beach Club facility, with finances coming in second. We agreed that at this time, the LMC has no goal or long term plan for the Beach Club facility. We believe that the board needs to set a goal, create a vision, and research a plan of implementation to achieve that goal, whether it be merely maintaining the current club facility, or it be piecemeal additions to the present structure, or it be an entirely new structure. The belief of this committee is that piecemeal additions often create new problems, and that a whole new structure would be advisable. For instance, would the present electrical supply be sufficient to run an elevator?

We referred to our recent survey to ascertain the desires of our members. As in the past, the desires and recommendations of the membership were mixed and at odds. While a significant number of members use the facility often, and many recommended improvement, others stated that they do not use the club and would not support financing improvements beyond their current yearly assessments. We know from the past experience of trying to pass a motion to raise the assessment, that the membership did not pass it. Thus, we concurred that we should advise the board to use other methods to raise funds for any capital outlays. The most obvious source of funds would be donations and possibly grants. As PLA told us, they stand by their offer to give the LMC \$2,000 for each new condo they sell in North Bay. In addition, they will require that all new owners become members of LMC, thus paying dues (increasing our yearly income). Diana Smeland asked that the LMC make its desires known to PLA.

With this discussion in mind, the committee began to formulate its recommendations. The following are the results:

FACILITIES:

- 1) Whereas there was a wide range of responses from members regarding the Beach Club, from maintaining the current structure to building a totally new building; and whereas many complained of inadequacies in the current building including handicapped access and space limitations; and whereas the board lacks a definitive long term plan for the building; and whereas the lack of a plan leaves everyone in limbo as to how to legislate; Therefore we recommend that the board without delay formulate a definitive plan for the future of the Beach Club facility, to maintain, or to remodel, or to re-build.

- 2) Whereas a plan requiring funds requires membership support, therefore we recommend for the Beach Club facility, that the board create a vision with an implementation plan to present to the membership.
- 3) Whereas a large segment of our members do not use the Beach Club facility, and whereas this group generally sees no need to improve the facility; therefore, we recommend that the board set a goal to provide additional programs which should attract more members to the Club and which should instill in them a desire to improve the facility.

At this point, the meeting ended. The next meeting will be Monday, March 22, at 3:00 PM. The agenda will be to continue creating our recommendations. I am asking all committee members to write down their own recommendations to consider at that meeting, covering the categories of facilities, finance, governance, &/or other.

When we finish the recommendations part, we plan to go over the report as a whole.
Michael

