

# INSPIRATION SERVICES CENTER COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

August 3, 2022 | 5:30 P.M via Zoom

Attendees: Rick Coldsnow, Rick Forsman, Russ Paper, Edwin Burk, Rea Heatherington, Tom Norton, Chris Bolz, David Besel. Members of the public: Brad Wilson, Micah Kendall, Kevin Carney, Brenda Skoglund, Dave Svetz, David Adams, Kelsey Seuffer, Chalea Fields, Ryan Fields, Robert Moore, Sandra Budden, Sarah Hoffman, Stephanie Bonnet, Steve Prochazka, Tamara Thurston, Barb Smith, Tracy Nichols, Tom Haws, Debra Hoffer, Terri Gaertner, Jeffrey Bonnet, Brandon Wareing, Carla Baglione, Erica Greenberg, Marc Malezija, Vanessa Kruse, Nick French, Mike and Brenda Patrick, Lindsay Trafton, Alaina Keyghobad, Shelli Wolf. Public Alliance: AJ Beckman, Kate Innes, Justin Janca.

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Agenda was approved and the July 6<sup>th</sup> Minutes were approved.

### Summary of site selection

- Rick Coldsnow reviewed the map showing locations that were considered as potential sites and the reason(s) why each had to be eliminated.

### Review of most recent building plans

- Rick Coldsnow reviewed the current iteration of the building layout and explained the revisions that have been made in this version.
- Rea Heatherington remarked that the proposed layout works well for social functions. He noted that shade would be appreciated.
- Edwin Burk provided an estimate of \$1,300,000 for the overall construction cost.
- Russ Paper reviewed the project budget categories, noting that the total of \$1,510,000 is comprised of: permit and approvals \$100,000, building construction \$1,160,000, site work \$100,000, exterior work \$100,000, and interior furnishings \$150,000.
- Russ asked if the exterior is planned to match the current pool building exterior. AJ Beckman replied yes, they are planned to match.
- Tom Norton asked if concrete is required and whether it's the cheapest option, Edwin replied yes. Further cost reduction may be necessary, the overall building size has been reduced already.
- Tom Norton asked whether additional revenue from continued community growth offsets costs. Russ answered that it only increases the mill levy collection revenue.
- Edwin Burk said the removal of the fireplace was a good cost saving. One of the single garage doors would be a single 8'x16' garage door (cantilevered).
- Chris Bolz noted that the trees in the rendering drawing are bigger than what we'd expect and that the screening afforded by the trees would be less than what's represented on the drawings.
- Tom Norton asked about the practicality of cleaning the high windows shown in the drawings.

## Community comment and discussion

A resident asked if we've been working on this for five years, why are we only this far along. Russ Paper responded that there had been no funds available until the recent bond refinance which provided a sub-bond to fund this project. Up to this year, it had been a conceptual idea only.

Tamara Thurston commented that the Board is not considering current resident opinions and that the building is not attractive. She expressed frustration that the Board doesn't appear to be listening to the community. Russ replied that there are 1,542 homes in Inspiration, and that as part of the cost containment program, the Board authorized maintenance equipment to be purchased and staffed a maintenance technician to help control costs of ongoing maintenance. He said that this is for the greater good despite some residents being more heavily impacted.

Ryan Fields commented that of the residents he's spoken with, he hasn't come across any residents who are in favor of this project. He paid a lot premium and feels that the sand volleyball court was money wasted. He's not against the building but is against the location. Russ Paper clarified that there was no cost to the district for the volleyball court, it was funded by the developer. Rick Coldsnow said that there are typically no guarantees with lot premiums that nothing will be built there. Ryan further asked whether a vote could be taken. Rick Coldsnow noted that elected officials on the District's Board of Directors make these decisions.

Dave Svetz noted that the metropolitan district provides services to the Hilltop Club population, which is currently 65% built out. He feels that the location is reasonable. Many residents go to the Hilltop Club to ask about district issues because there is not a physical building for the district.

Brandon Wareing stated that the needs of the community members aren't being listened to or considered. He had trouble learning that this meeting was happening, he didn't see it in the email newsletters. Kate Innes responded that the meeting info is in the email newsletters. He further commented he'd like to see a larger pool instead. Russ said a larger pool is unlikely to happen for several reasons.

Tom Haws challenged the clubhouse comparison that was made in the Q&A document. He said we're boxing ourselves in by putting a maintenance building in a central location where a future clubhouse would logically go. He asked the committee whether the maintenance garage portion could be located elsewhere. He questioned what type of events would be held there and the associated noise pollution.

Erica Greenberg said no financial data for achievable cost savings has been presented yet in this process, an important step for good financial stewardship. Russ Paper provided an example that sprinkler repairs have been costly through our vendor versus doing it ourselves and AJ Beckman provided data about irrigation repair costs. Russ noted that the funds allocated must be spent on capital improvements and that the committee is tasked with carrying out the direction of the Board of Directors. Tom Norton commented that there are approximately 3,000 people in the community with 30 attending the meeting in opposition.

Kevin Carney asked what happens if we go over the 1.5-million-dollar budget. As a Hilltop Club member, he doesn't see a need for a second community center. He asked if there are further options for downsizing to ensure the final price comes in at or under budget and avoid a future special assessment.

Steve Prochazka said the info given so far has been vague in terms of why the other locations aren't suitable. He disagrees that issues such as sewer line extension and parking lot expansion costs are deal breakers. He suggested Rockinghorse Parkway and Inspiration Lane as a better location with less impact. He's been impacted by other projects in the area: the sand volleyball court construction, terraseeding activity, and the current bike path delay. He's aware of the maintenance and meeting room needs but disagrees it should be placed in the middle of the community. He thinks a true clubhouse would be a benefit to the community, like the clubhouses mentioned in the Q&A. Russ noted that the projects

mentioned are under developer control. Rick Coldsnow noted the sewer line cost issue is a service line of 250 feet to connect to the city main. Steve asked whether the bonds expire and was told there is a period of three years from the December 2021 bond refinancing date before they are considered taxable.

Nick French stated that he's a vocal opponent to this project on the principle that it's unfair for residents who paid a lot premium to then be backing to a service center. He said there are inconsistencies with the information shared and the lack of adjustment to the expected budget despite the building size being cut from 7,000 to 4,500 square feet. He asked why the lot where Toll Brothers is currently located couldn't be used for the maintenance portion while adding onto the pool building with a meeting room, separating the two functions. He expressed frustration about residents not feeling heard and not getting information ahead of time or at the July Spark event. He mentioned an example of Highlands Ranch wanting to develop open space and being sued by residents, cautioning that the District might bring legal headaches upon itself. He felt dismissed by Tom Norton's comments that only thirty residents are in attendance tonight. Rick Coldsnow commented that one of the conflicting data points was from reorienting the garage and noted that the Spark event presentation was delayed to honor and integrate resident feedback. Russ Paper said this is an iterative process rather than purposeful misinformation. Rick replied that the original building size could not have been built for the initial budget, value engineering had to be done to fit into the established budget. Edwin Burk concurred that the original budget was not a realistic match for the building size that was first proposed.

Micah Kendall thanked the volunteers on the committee for their time. She expressed frustration that it feels like the Board has already made the decision, leaving the committee to defend the decision. She asked whether a change can still be made or whether there's a process for resident action to change the outcome. Tom Norton responded that the committee is not a rubber stamp committee approving the Board's will. She asked whether she could petition or use some other avenue to affect the course of action. Rick Coldsnow noted that the committee is cognizant of impacts to residents and that this site is not designated as an open space site.

Rick Forsman introduced himself as the newest member of the Board, still orienting and learning about this project. He recognized the large amount of work that the committee has done. He explained that the Board makes not one single decision, but a series of decisions around location and other factors. He noted that the developer has created many of the disappointments that residents feel as far as making decisions without resident input. He further noted that we're still at a conceptual stage.

Public comment was closed, with Rick Coldsnow acknowledging that the feedback was very much appreciated by the committee.

### **Review of anticipated schedule**

- Rick Coldsnow reviewed a preliminary schedule document outlining estimated milestone dates. The final phase, construction, is anticipated to occur between Feb-Aug 2024.
- Chris Bolz commented that board approval of the proposed site plan before the informational event would preclude getting resident feedback on the location.
- Rick Coldsnow noted that a public hearing during the city's review process can be requested and participated in by residents.

### **Action: recommendation to Board**

The committee voted to recommend the site plan and configuration to the Board of Directors.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.