

History of Major Facility Upgrades in HVLA

1994 -

New sewer system & water treatment plant (since septic systems were failing).
HVLA's financial status was so shaky as to preclude any other major facility upgrades.

1995-96 -

Second court receivership.
Severe problem with assessment delinquencies.

1998 -

Annual Report: Renovation of the Hartmann Bldg. was done that year: "...new Pro Shop, Greenview Room and Restaurant, remodeled restrooms and kitchen, new air conditioning and heating systems, total compliance with A.D.A, new front entry ramp and pro shop deck and long overdue repainting, repairs, carpeting and floor coverings have created a 'like new' facility." (emphasis added)

"After four years of inactivity, HVL's five gate entrances were rebuilt, re-equipped with cutting edge technology and staffed with two 24 hour gate houses."

The "new" gate entrances are quite interesting relative to upgrades made this year (2014):

"Residents enjoy convenient access through the 'laser lanes', preferred guest privileges and computer enhanced daily guest call-in systems. The uninvited are prevented from entering our community." "HVL now has the #1 gate security system in California..."

All HVL roads resurfaced after having no major maintenance for the past 30 years. Cost \$2 million, was cover by a bank loan.

1999 -

Major upgrading and repairs were done to the community pool.

April 2001 -

Compass story by GM Jim Stewart regarding a plan to renovate the Community Center (CC).

June 2001 -

GM Stewart terminated.

Aug. 2001 -

Four Directors recalled. Bill Surber assumed the role of Interim GM along with his existing job as Controller. Nothing further about changes to the CC appears until about 2006.

2001 -

Tennis courts were resurfaced.

2006 to 2008 -

Multiple actions around replacement of the Hartmann Bldg. (HB), the CC and the Admin. Bldg.

(AB).

An engineering survey of the HB and CC was done, i.e., the "Gentry Report." This Report was done specifically to assist "the members and the Board to decide whether to continue the ongoing rehabilitation, maintenance and repair of these buildings, or to replace the structures..." In "Conclusion" this Report gives directions and costs for "renovation" of each building: \$2.56 Million for the CC and \$2.1 Million for the HB.

Architects were hired to draw plans (Ruff Associates).

A series of 3 "Town Meetings" were held in April 2007 with an outside facilitator hired to conduct them. The result of all this seems to have been that due to members' concerns about cost/affordability and fiscal impact, plans re the HB and the CC were postponed, while plans to build a new AB went forward.

Also, during this period, major turmoil within the Board led to efforts to remove, then to censure Director Tom Miller for his outspoken approach.

June 2007 -

GM, Rick Archbold, was gone ("resigned").

Jan. 2008 -

Another GM was hired in (Jim Johnson), and focus shifted to the building of a new AB.

2008-09 -

Building of the new AB (2008-09) has its own set of controversies: (1) The contractor selected had given the highest bid; (2) There were rumors of sub-contracts given to relatives of HVLA staff; (3) The contractor later appeared to go out-of-business; and, (4) There were at least two time extensions of the completion date (eventually Dec. 2009).

Feb. 2011 -

Board "workshop": decision was made to move forward on the Hartmann "replacement" and Community Center Projects, again. There were 3 "Town Hall Meetings" (Feb., April, July 2011) After the Feb. Meeting, Director Don Dornbush commented (Apr. 2011 Views) that, "as part of the planning process, we are going to look into a business plan, which will answer the big question of how do we make the food and beverage operation a breakeven, or profitable, venture? Put it this way, if we just broke even on the food and beverage operation during the last five years, we would have paid for one-half of this project with the money we spent subsidizing the operations."

July 2011 -

Only 70 members attended the Meeting July 14, 2011.

Statement by Director Dick Scott (July 2011 Views): The Gentry Engineering Report showed the Hartmann Bldg. had significant termite damage and dry-rot underneath the structure, and, that the cost to replace it was less than to remodel. GM Chapman later said that the most consistent feedback from members was, "...it is not prudent to undertake a project of this magnitude given the current economic situation."

Dec. 2011 -

GM Chapman stated that a "landscape Architect" was hired to draw plans for the topographical renovation around the Hartmann Bldg. and that ways were being considered how to "preserve the building."

The "Town Hall Meetings" did not appear to be well publicized, at least not in the Views.

2011 to 2012 -

Three (3) separate plans were put forth by different groups: (1) Lake Management Plan (Lake Committee, 2011); (2) Community Recreation Plan (Commons Committee, 2012); and, (3) Equestrian Trail Renovation Plan. All three were very well received by the Community and the Board. However, only the second one received any monetary attention with 6 of 66 recommendations acted-upon by mid-2014.

2013 -

Plans to rebuild/renovate Hartmann and the CC again came to the fore.

Again, there were 3 "Community Forums", but this time with Patton & Williams Architects presenting their "plans" for the Hartmann Bldg. and the Community Center. Member response was similar to all previous such "Meetings" but more pointed and vehement. Despite this feedback, the Board appeared to press ahead.

In the latter part of 2013 elections focused on rebuilding and surrounding fiscal issues.

2014 -

Another series of "Community Forums" were held (3).

Again, with the presence of Paddon & Williams Architects, but this time the addition of the HVLA Attorney, Jennifer Jacobsen. Members raised issues re a member vote on the building plan and/or the associated "capital expenditures", the size of the "Plan" (initially 12K sq. ft.), impact upon assessments, and funding sources. The Board characterized the "Plan" as a "replacement" of an "existing" amenity and, therefore, not subject to a member vote. The Attorney tended to support this view, unless considered otherwise by a lender.