### **Time and Location**

1:30 p.m. via teleconference

The meeting was called to order by the chair at 1:32 p.m.

### Subcommittee Members Present:

Jim Beckmeyer, Steve Mahoney, George Rohrback, Rob McCray, Michael Sullivan, and Courtney Murrell Absent: Rob Kautz

## **Staff Present:**

Jon Mitchell, Miguel Sloane, Michael Salmon and Robin Bennett

#### **Board Members:**

**Jeff Connors** 

#### **Guests Present:**

Michael Fajans, Laura Lindgren, Sandi Cornell, Daniel Thompson, Larry Young, Jim Colbert, Nan Meek, John Maciejewski, and Rob McClendon

### Attachments:

- 1. Larry's presentation that was screen shared.
- 2. Larry's updated schedule due to Covid crisis.

1:32 p.m. Jim Beckmeyer thanked Robin for the logistics and went over basic virtual meeting behaviors.

Jon Mitchell mentioned the raise hand feature and encouraged everyone to utilize it.

Jon Mitchell gave a brief update on the lodge review as discussed with Larry Young and Larry's take on reviewing our historical documentation and the ccc (comfortable carrying capacity) to make sure he is understanding the information, Jon mentioned that we should consider the professional opinion of the architectural design and view point of Larry.

### 1. Programming Update- Larry Young

Larry Young joined the meeting. Jim Beckmeyer asked the task force to give a brief introduction of themselves. Larry's presentation was screen shared and can be found attached.

Jon Mitchell shared the Downhill Ski Lodge study document on the screen. Larry noted that they got a late start and the COVID-19 virus has made things a little slow. Larry stated that he has reviewed the Ecosign report and the extensive notes over the last two years that were summarized along with all the attached documents and task force meeting minutes from January of this year. Larry went over the Downhill Ski Lodge Study document and went over the scope of work and findings with the task force. He outlined the scope of service and the steps.

Larry mentioned the 1000 ccc and it he stated that it doesn't seem sufficient but it is up for discussion. He thinks the number should be a general guideline to address the needs analysis. Larry doesn't have any basis for challenging the numbers provided by Ecosign. The information provided from Larry is very brief and Larry would like to hear the thoughts from the task force. If we use the Ecosign standard your ccc is about 75% of what you want in a peak day, which would be 1300 users/skiers. Most of the numbers provided by Ecosign are based on skiers. The dining aspect is only part of the experience at the lodge and all areas are impacted. Larry believes that to be a factor in looking at 1,000 ccc. He doesn't see what the basis is by not factoring in growth at the lodge over the next several years.

Jon then asked for questions from the task force members.

Jim Beckmeyer asked if we can come back in two – three weeks and do another check in to see how Larry is doing on the project, prior to making adjustments to the approved CCC. Jim mentioned any adjustments to CCC at this time are premature.

Larry mentioned he has a timeline to get information together for the May board meeting. But he is thinking that we might need weekly meetings to keep things going forward. He will work with Jon on the timeframe and materials will be sent out in advance for review. Jon and Jim, when appropriate, will continue having weekly check-ins with Larry. Task force member will be pulled in as needed. Updates on those meeting will be provided by Jim or Jon to the task force).

Jim also stated that everyone has their opinions on the CCC and his take is 1,300 is a good peak number. He asked Larry if we should look at a more reasonable number and not the peak number.

Larry stated we need to get in to the needs analysis and not get so hung up on 1,300 or 1,350 to see where we are lacking if it is the rental area or wherever. To make this work efficiently we need to come up with 50% more space. We need to analyze what is needed for Tahoe Donner. There are budget constraints so we need to cut back in areas and make those decisions but at this stage we are just giving general direction and we need to understand the needs for space and the square foot procedures direction. Larry stated that we cannot get that precise at this point.

Rob McCray – thanked Larry for the initiation of the project and would like to hear the thoughts on the definition of ccc that Larry is using. Rob mentioned the economics on ccc we are not Sugar Bowl or North Star. Rob thinks that Larry is going to help the association make the right final decision. We have to accommodate homeowners and guests. If you can provide us with the tools to make decisions that would be valuable. Policy, pricing and affordability.

Larry stated that he doesn't really have an answer to Rob's question at this point. From the standpoint it was clear across the board and member experience it most important. There are variations of what that experience is and it seems with a pricing structure there are means to

control the public and that is a tool that can be used to keep control on peak days. Rather than increasing costs for the members.

Courtney asked what should be expected from Larry – the needs analysis will determine the space needed and at the end of the day are you coming back with a recommendation or are you coming back with multiple sizing recommendations? What are you coming back with? Larry stated that the needs analysis will get challenged and tested by each of you and we will look at the industry standards at the end its going to be the comfort level with an outcome that is developed from staff, task force and our familiarity. His understanding is that the task force will make their recommendation to the board.

Jon Mitchell noted that Larry's contract covers comparative analysis from what he determines from program analysis with design and in kind. Larry will have at least two if not three pro's and cons when we are done with this.

Courtney mentioned, Larry did state that we should plan for growth.

Steve Mahoney – thanked Larry for the presentation. He questioned the programming analysis which is very important and if you don't have a target of 1,000 or 1,300 to go off of what target are you using? Larry stated the target is 1,000 but step one in this process was the committee's recommendation of 1,000.

There was discussion by the task force members on the ccc and the demographics.

Rob McCray stated that he wanted to reinforce Jim's earlier point on adjusting the target for the ccc that the task force reached. What he thinks is important is that we have a virtual tool set so the committees involved and the board or future boards that are making the critical decisions can use the tool to understand the up and downside of final planning design decisions.

Jim Beckmeyer noted as we move forward a few days' notice for a meeting would be helpful.

At 2:25 Larry left the meeting. Please note Larry has provided an updated project schedule – attached. This is consistent with his comments early on in the meeting re a slow start.

#### 2. CFP Update - Jon Mitchell

Jon gave an update on the capital funds projections and how the downhill ski funding was broken down over the next three years to 2023. The price per sq foot for the lodge is included. The capital funds spreadsheet is set up to include the lodge, approved budget to spend \$350k on the project and moving forward \$1.1 million in 2021, \$1.5 million and \$8.2 in 2023.

Jon will provide an update at the GPC meeting on projections.

### 3. Owner Engagement - Jim Beckmeyer

Owner engagement is on hold – Lindsay was going to provide an update. Jon Mitchell stated that Lindsay was told to put owner engagement on hold due to COVID-19 crisis.

## 4. <u>Lodge Decision Criteria - Jim Beckmeyer</u>

A Lodge Decision criteria roll up was sent to the board. The plan was to boil it down and look for a common set of themes. There was so much thought and transparency and a lot of good stuff provided, the board received the whole document and nothing was edited. The board was encouraged to take the time and read the feedback provided.

Future issues to be addressed:

None

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** 

Monday, May 4, 2020 at 1:30 p.m.