

**Property Owners Association Lake Hayward**  
**Special Meeting**  
**April 7, 2013**

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m. at the St. Joseph's Polish Society, 395 South Main Street, Colchester, by President Gail Grzegorzczak.

Quorum established: One hundred eight (108) members signed in prior to the start of the meeting.

Introduction: Gail thanked everyone for attending the Special Meeting and reminded members that information regarding the meeting and the pavilion project were in the Spring Packet, on the Lake Hayward website and blog, on our Facebook page and in the email newsletter. She asked members to provide their email addresses to help communication. She stated that the meeting was provisioned by the Bylaws and that we had a quorum. The sole purpose of the meeting was to vote on a proposal to expend monies to rebuild the pavilion, so other Association business would not be discussed. She stated that the agenda would consist of an overview of how we got to where we were, a pavilion presentation by Bob Sudell, a funding presentation by Ed Bader, questions from the floor and a vote to expend the necessary funds.

Gail thanked everyone who had attended the two Town Hall Meetings, one in October and one in March. These meetings were to answer general questions about the fire and future plans to rebuild. The committee presented some initial design requirements and asked for input and a wish list for additional consideration. It was also an opportunity for people to voice their interest in helping with the project. Gail has a list of everyone who wished to help and said that there would be opportunities to help with landscaping and equipment acquisition.

She stated that the pavilion could be built without any special assessment and thanked Ed Bader for his considerable contribution in the budgeting and analysis process

Gail reviewed the events starting with September 22, 2012, from her initial notification, the immediate fencing off of the area, the Board's compilation of everything that had been destroyed, the removal of debris and the establishment of the rebuild committee. She said that she wanted a committee with strong leadership and management skills, as well as expertise in construction.

Roll Call: Present at the roll call of the Board of Governors were Dave Edgington, Dave Glazier, Gail Grzegorzczak, Diane Nelson, Linda Nuzzo, Gary Petersen and Bonnie Sudell. Absent were Larry Lusardi and Mike Trocchi. Also present were Treasurer Lee Griffin and Budget Chair Ed Bader.

Introduction of Committee Members: Bob Sudell introduced all members, and those present described the strengths that they brought to the process. Committee members

were Bob Sudell, Larry Lusardi, Steve Nelson, Felicia Tencza, Brian Bagnati, Jason Griffing, Gary Petersen, Dave Edgington and Don Fantozzi.

Powerpoint Presentation (Available on the website):

Slide #1 showed the previous club house and pavilion.

Slide #2 showed the aftermath of the September 22, 2012 fire.

Slide #3 was a rendition of the proposed pavilion.

Slide #4 detailed the committee considerations during the planning stages, including a 50 year life span, consideration of view from upper roads, consistency with neighborhood, use of original 1921 club house elements, versatility, functionality, affordability, enhancement of Association image (comparison of pavilion to a town green as the central focal point), desire to build within the existing footprint to avoid TPZ or Inland Wetlands involvement, accommodation of member feedback and the selection of the right people for the task. The committee chose to be the general contractor for the pavilion rebuild, coordinating and supervising the trades involved. Contractors in the community have also volunteered to work with the Association to lower the costs, including a roofing contractor and an electrician. Contracts will be required of all trades, including proof of adequate insurance and hold harmless agreements.

Slide #5 showed the previous pavilion.

Slide #6 was an aerial view of the proposed pavilion, showing the proposed 36' x 36' community space, and the 12' x 36' storage area replacing the three previous sheds and providing storage space for the various committees.

Slide #7 was a rendition of the proposed pavilion, incorporating design features from the past, increased ventilation and enhanced image.

Slide #8 showed the design features of a hip roof with asphalt shingles, fiber cement board siding, stone veneer on the storage area and columns and concrete floor.

Slide #9 highlighted the efforts to reduce vandalism by raising the height of the soffits and collar ties, burying the electrical conduit, embedding the electrical outlets in the veneer, placing lights in the soffits, installing a CCTV security system (whether passive or active monitoring yet to be determined), providing security lights overnight and installing vandal resistant siding.

Slide #10 described the electrical features including 200 amp service, code compliant electrical outlets, an integrated audio system, as well as the security system.

Slide #11 highlighted the attempt to provide better ventilation through increased ceiling height and a vented cupola, and better lighting through soffit and ceiling lights.

Slide #12 explained the rationale for adding a cupola – both to break up the roof line and provide ventilation. The use of asphalt architectural shingles (color to be determined) to blend in with the neighborhood was also described.

Slide #13 described the benefits of using cement fiberboard siding on the storage area.

Slide #14 showed the tongue and groove interior finish, chosen for its durability and aesthetic appeal.

Slide #15 showed the relative position of the two porta potties, including one handicapped access. The handicapped porta pottie will enable parents to accompany their children and the addition of a second porta pottie will help alleviate use issues at functions. The porta potties will be hidden from the street by a privacy screen and lighted by the soffit lights. The committee made a conscious decision not to install

regular toilets, which would require a septic system and compliance with Inland/Wetlands.

Slide #16 described the storage area in more detail, including the feedback received from the Recreation, Social and Properties Committee as to their needs. It also explained the use of dutch doors for the east and west storage areas.

Slide #17 showed the old club house with the stone foundation, an element that the committee tried to incorporate into the new design.

Slide #18 explained how the committee attempted to tie the new pavilion aesthetically to the surrounding stone wall and the previous club house by proposing a veneer of three inch natural stone on the columns and walls of the storage area.

Slide #19 was another view of the proposed pavilion.

After the powerpoint presentation, Bob explained that the committee had struggled with cost issues, starting with our agent thinking that \$21,000 was sufficient coverage and the adjuster believing that we could replace the pavilion for \$41,000. He remarked that contractors that he dealt with on a professional basis had doubted that the pavilion could be replaced as was for less than \$120,000. After specs were developed and bids were solicited, prices ranged from \$150,000 to \$375,000. The committee believes that, by acting as general contractors and doing some of the work ourselves, the total cost should be between \$150,000 and \$175,000, not including contents.

#### Questions:

Bob was asked if the committee solicited bids from minority contractors. He replied that one of the contractors he suggested was a minority contractor, but that it was not a conscious decision to do so. He said that bids were solicited from contractors who had been recommended by members of the community.

A question was asked about the mildew resistance of the shingles. The roofing material will be mildew resistant.

A question was asked about fire protection and smoke detectors in the storage area. As the cause of the fire was thought to be an appliance, the committee looked into sprinklers but found them to be cost prohibitive.

A member was concerned about kids climbing up into the pavilion interior. Bob explained that the soffit height would necessitate use of a ladder, which would be observed, and that the shed was built into the structure of the pavilion.

A comment was made about perishables being left in the old refrigerator, with hopes that we would police ourselves in the future to avoid this issue. Bob replied that, officially, there will be no kitchen, as that would raise issues with the Health Department.

A member asked about insurance coverages. Bob replied that he and Ed Bader had met with our current broker and felt that they had not met our needs. They are meeting with additional brokers to discuss coverages and think that insurance costs going forward will be between \$20,000 and \$25,000 per year. The member asked what we

had gotten as a result of the claim, which was \$21,000 for the structure and \$9,000 for cleanup costs.

A member asked if we were replacing the existing stone wall and we are not.

A member asked if the police would be monitoring the security system and they will not be. Active monitoring is being investigated, but would entail monthly charges as well as installation of phone lines and additional equipment. The member questioned why we would monitor during the day. Bob explained that if we chose to use a monitoring company, they would monitor 24/7 whether we wanted it or not. Gail interjected that vandalism has occurred during the day as well as at night. It is our hope that we catch vandalism in the act rather than have to just view tapes to determine who and what might have caused damage.

There was a question as to whether there would be a concrete base for the storage area and if there was an issue with the Town over it. Bob explained that the previous storage sheds had concrete bases and we had simply incorporated their pads into the new design. The Town had no objections as we were working within the existing footprint.

A member questioned the post and beam construction. The contractor who submitted a bid for this construction (Post and Beam Homes in East Hampton) has been in business for over 30 years and the committee is confident in their expertise. Use of this construction was more affordable than that of stick construction.

A member asked about the bid process. Steve replied that numerous bids were being solicited for each component of construction. Acting as general contractor, we have ultimate control in the process.

Ed Bader presented and explained the attached spreadsheet, detailing financial considerations. The spreadsheet was developed by Ed, our Tax Collector, Brenda Armstrong and our Treasurer, Lee Griffin. Combining our money market balance, our checking account and weed control reserves, we have \$315,437. Anticipated remaining income and expenses through the end of this fiscal year totals \$27,000. Subtracting the \$27,000 from \$315,547 gives us \$288,547 forecasted cash available for construction and reserve requirements.

Ed explained that we have been spot treating the lake for weeds, and do not anticipate the need for a full weed treatment for three to five years. This forecast is based on conversations with both Tim Pelton and Aquatic Control. Therefore, we are reserving \$20,000 for weed control. Unallocated reserves for contingencies in the amount of \$70,000 brings the total forecasted reserves to \$90,000. Therefore, the remaining balance available for pavilion construction totals \$198,547.

Ed said that we would be asking for a total of \$175,000 for construction and \$15,000 for equipment replacement, leaving \$98,547 in reserves. Bob Sudell interjected that the

Pavilion Committee had met Saturday and had concerns about what was under the existing concrete pad (which would be removed) as well as other “unknowns” and wished to have the \$15,000 allocated for construction contingencies. Any funds not used for pavilion construction would be used for equipment, up to \$15,000.

Bob Sudell made a motion that \$190,000 be allocated for pavilion construction. The motion was seconded. Gail asked for discussion.

There was a question regarding the use of weed control reserves for pavilion construction. Ed explained that Aquatic Control had been contacted and that \$20,000 was adequate for reserves. We are currently spending about \$13,000 annually for spot treatment, and in the event that full treatment is necessary in the future, we will have built up our reserves to cover it. Gail explained that the North end of the Lake is one of the targeted areas for treatment this year. She also stated that before this year’s treatment could take place, we have to do an impact study of endangered species.

A motion was made and seconded from the floor to call the vote. It passed, indicating that the members in attendance wanted to end the discussion and proceed to vote on the motion to approve the funds.

A member questioned if we could legally take money from weed control reserves without going before the Association. The answer is the money set aside for weed treatment is basically a savings to have the funds if and when needed and when approved by DEEP. The reason for the special meeting of the association is to approve the appropriation of these funds in our account to be used for the building project. The member also questioned the monies contributed by homeowners on the other side of the Lake. Gail stated that that this money was in a separate account and is not being touched.

Gail asked for approval of the motion. It passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie F. Sudell  
Recording Secretary

Attachment

**Current Financial Position  
 March 15, 2013  
 For Members' Meeting – April 7, 2013**

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>	
	\$
CURRENT MONEY MARKET BALANCE	166,292.00
	\$
CHECKING ACCOUNT	1,505.00
	\$
WEED CONTROL RESERVE	147,750.00
<b>TOTAL CASH AVAILABLE</b>	<b>\$315,547.00</b>
<b>CURRENT YEAR (2112-2013) REMAINING INCOME AND EXPENSES</b>	
ANTICIPATED TAX REVENUES	\$8,000.00
ESTIMATED EXPENSES	(\$35,000.00)
NET OUTFLOW THROUGH JUNE 30, 2013	(\$27,000.00)
<b>FORECASTED CASH AVAILABLE FOR CONSTRUCTION AND</b>	
	\$
RESERVE REQUIREMENTS	288,547.00
<b>FORECASTED RESERVE REQUIREMENTS</b>	
WEED CONTROL RESERVE	(\$20,000.00)
UNALLOCATED RESERVE FOR CONTINGENCIES	(\$70,000.00)
TOTAL FORECASTED SPECIFIC RESERVES	(\$90,000.00)
REMAINING BALANCE AVAILABLE FOR PAVILION CONSTRUCTION	\$198,547.00
<b>FOR ACTION AT MEMBERS' MEETING-APRIL 7, 2013-APPROVAL OF</b>	
	\$
CONSTRUCTION OF PAVILION	175,000.00

	\$
EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT	15,000.00
	\$
TOTAL FUNDS TO BE REQUESTED FOR APPROVAL	190,000.00
	\$
REMAINING UNALLOCATED RESERVE BALANCE	8,547.00
	\$
SPECIFIC RESERVES	90,000.00
TOTAL UNALLOCATED RESERVES	\$98,547.00