

Joint Long Range Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday, January 12, 2023, 10:00 a.m.

Agenda

- 1) Determine Quorum Present
- 2) Call meeting to order
- 3) Co-Chair Comments
- 4) Approval of the November 10, 2022 Work Session and Year-End Committee Report
- 5) Old Business
 - a. Review Revisions to the Analysis Filter
 - b. Test implementation of Analysis Filter
 - c. Discuss the inclusion of representatives from all board committees and from HG staff
- 6) New Business
 - a. Review the proposed work process and planning cycle (Attachment)
 - b. Community Survey
- 7) Residents wishing to speak on non-agenda items – time limit 3 minutes
- 8) Adjournment

Residents wishing to speak on agenda items will be given the opportunity at the time the item

is discussed.

JOINT LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT FOR NOVEMBER AND YEAR-END SUMMARY

Thursday, November 23, 2022 at 10:00 AM on Zoom and in Board Room

Committee Members:

Chair: David Kennedy

A quorum was present.

The meeting was Called to Order by David Kennedy at 10:05 AM.

Meeting “Guests” and Committee Representatives were acknowledged and welcomed for attending.

The Chair remarked and reported that the meetings that have been held to date through this year have been working sessions to develop:

- A draft Vision and Mission Statement for the Community
- A complete committee of official committee members as described in our Joint Procedure Memorandum JLRP-1
- To expand formal membership to include representatives of each of the HGA Board Committees
- Educate members as to what constitutes Long Range and Strategic Planning and adopting a reference book for guidance
- Establish a bi-weekly work schedule for the JLRP workshop to meet on the 2nd and 4th Thursday of each month at 10 am
- Create essential tools to identify and prioritize projects, programs and tasks that require long range planning to accomplish
- A process for long range and strategic planning that is quantifiable, robust, self-sustaining and easily replicated
- Identify and implement changes to the planning process that expands the input to include the whole of the Heather Gardens community as practicable as well as from outside experts, legal requirements, and desirable best practices

The committee reviewed the current draft version of the Analysis Filter and Scoring worksheet. A number of criticisms and suggestions to the wording were made by members of the committee and the outside representatives. The committee worked through a couple of examples to test the validity and usefulness of the filter tool.

David Kennedy and David Beck assumed responsibility for making the suggested changes to the tool for the next meeting scheduled for Thursday, December 8th at 10 am.

The following items are the current products of the committee to date. The next meeting of the committee will be to refine and test the Analysis Filter, begin to work through the list of existing identified potential projects and programs and review a proposed JLPC work process and planning cycle.

Draft Vision Statement:

To be the most desirable senior living community in the greater Metro area. To provide safe, affordable, high quality and diverse housing alternatives with inclusive activities and amenities to support an active lifestyle. Heather Gardens strives to be a financially sound community with a superb management and support infrastructure.

Draft Mission Statement:

It is the purpose of Heather Gardens Home Owners Association and the Heather Gardens Metropolitan District in concert with the residents to provide a safe, structurally, and financially sound, beautiful, caring, and compassionate home environment for the owners and residents of the community. It is the duty of the two mutually dependent organizations to provide first class amenities, recreational opportunities, staff and management to sustain the inherent value of the community.

JOINT LONG-TERM PLANNING: ANALYSIS FILTER: DRAFT 3 (12/1)

Our initial attempt to move a project through the “Filter” demonstrated that we were in the right direction, but refinement was necessary if the tool is to become useful in meeting our charge to proffer thoughtful recommendations. Based on our experience, the following modifications are intended to address the shortcomings of the first draft.

STEP 1

(Consistent with the first draft each item presented for consideration will undergo a SWAT analysis.)

Build on your **STRENGTHS**

Shore up your **WEAKNESSES**

Capitalize on your **OPPORTUNITIES**

Recognize your **THREATS**

If in the collective opinion of the committee the item does not address one of the four factors, that item will be given no further consideration at this time.

STEP 2

The item will be determined to be either a “Governance/Best Practices” matter or a “Physical Plant/Programming” matter. This classification will allow a more tailored filter to be used in reviewing the item. Some excellent examples of items that would be determined to be “Governance/Best Practices” are found on the work sheet under Infrastructure and Governance. Such items would be subject to a unique Filter (a product of my imagination subject to committee review, modification, and acceptance). Items considered to be “Physical Plant/Programming” matters would be subject to analysis using a modified Filter process containing elements already reviewed by the committee.

STEP 3

Apply the “Governance/Best Practices” filter to the item.

For “Physical Plant/Programming” items there must be a further determination made to place the item in the proper filter. The newly modified Filter has two tracks, “Infrastructure” and “Valued Lifestyle”. This reflects the committee’s concern that in many cases the Filter contain extraneous items that were not germane in evaluating the task.

STEP 4

Analysis ensues using the appropriate filter. The minimum standard for any items to be recommended for Board consideration is a score above 75% of the total points possible in any given filter process.

GOVERNANCE/ BEST PRACTICE FILTER (Yet to be discussed by the committee)

Tier I – Current Focus

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. The responsibility for this item is undetermined? | Yes | No |
| b. This item needs to be addressed regularly? | Yes | No |
| c. A timely report on this issue would be helpful? | Yes | No |
| d. Regular timely review and or management is needed? | Yes | No |

Tier II- Focus of Committee

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. This item would be best addressed by stated objectives and goals? | Yes | No |
| b. This item would benefit from the input of experts, leaders, residents? | Yes | No |
| c. This item needs to be studied in respect to fiscal impact? | Yes | No |
| d. This item needs to be considered in respect to legal impacts | Yes | No |
| e. The Board/committee needs to report on this matter at least quarterly? | Yes | No |

Tier III – Unmet Need

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Does this item require a unique committee? | Yes | No |
| b. Failure to address this issue in a timely manner will potentially result in adverse consequences. | Yes | No |
| c. Is the nature of the item long-term? | Yes | No |
| d. Does this item have the potential to produce or sustain a best practice? | Yes | No |
| e. Does this item have the potential in improve operational effectiveness? | Yes | No |
| f. Does this item have the potential of improving the quality of life? | Yes | No |
| g. Is this a matter that should be reported to the Board(s) annually? | Yes | No |

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: 16

NUMBER OF POINTS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION: 13

PHYSICAL PLANT/PROGRAMMING FILTERS ELEMENTS

Tier I: Pragmatics

Fiscally Sound

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Is this a long-range project (anticipate lifespan 3 years plus)? | Yes | No |
| b. Is this potentially a capital project (needs dedicated funding)? | Yes | No |
| c. Has potential to reduce annual maintenance/operating costs? | Yes | No |
| d. Is there a potential alternative funding source for the project? | Yes | No |
| e. Does this project have the potential to increase HOA dues? | Yes | No |
| f. Does the project potentially sustain or increase property value? | Yes | No |

Structurally Sound

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. This project will reduce the risk of infrastructure damage that displaces residents. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will reduce the risk of critical safety systems failure. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will enhance safety systems. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will sustain basic sanitary systems, i.e., water, sewer, air flow. | Yes | No |
| f. Project will extend the useful life of a structure/system beyond project depreciation. | Yes | No |
| g. Project addresses an urgent or emergent need. | Yes | No |

Safety

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Project potentially reduce the risk to property in common areas. | Yes | No |
| b. Project reduces the risk of resident and/or staff injury. | Yes | No |
| c. Project cost is commensurate with the potential benefit derived. | Yes | No |
| d. Project increases the safety for residents and their property. | Yes | No |

Tier II: Valued Lifestyle

Quality Amenities

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project/Process enhances the amenities offered. | Yes | No |
| b. Project/Process makes amenities more accessible to all residents. | Yes | No |
| c. Project/Process encourages more friend and family participation. | Yes | No |

Quality Activities

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Project/Process increases the availability of activities. | Yes | No |
| b. Project/Process expands the capacity of activities allowing more to participate. | Yes | No |
| c. Project/Process increases cultural diversity and awareness. | Yes | No |
| d. Project/Process increases the number of amenities. | Yes | No |

Affordability

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Cost for participation will be consistent with resident means. | Yes | No |
| b. Cost of participation reflects actual cost of providing the amenity. | Yes | No |
| c. The amenity will be free of a user fee for participation. | Yes | No |
| d. There is no required annual subsidy. | Yes | No |
| e. The amenity can be sustained without compromising existing amenities. | Yes | No |

Tier III: The Aesthetic

Beautiful Home

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project will enhance the enjoyment of the residents within their living unit. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will increase a sense of neighborhood with the living unit. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will allow for enhanced personalization of living space. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will avoid a negative impact on the neighborhood. | Yes | No |

Beautiful Environment

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Project will sustain the current acceptable standard. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will enhance the curb appeal of the community. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will minimally sustain best practices in respect to natural resources. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will encourage more community involvement and use of amenities. | Yes | No |

Tier IV: Desirability

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Project will sustain a valued element of the community. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will enhance the profile of HGA/HGMD as a state-of-the-art community. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will increase the quality of life/quality of lived experience for residents. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will increase the appeal of HGA to prospective residents/owners. | Yes | No |

PHYSICAL PLANT FILTER

TIER I: Pragmatics (1 point per question) 16 possible points

Fiscally Sound

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Is this a long-range project (anticipate lifespan 3 years plus) | Yes | No |
| b. Is this potentially a capital project (needs dedicated funding) | Yes | No |
| c. Has potential to reduce annual maintenance costs. | Yes | No |
| d. Is there a potential alternative funding source for the project? | Yes | No |
| e. Does this project will not increase HOA dues? | Yes | No |
| f. Does the project potentially sustain or increase property value? | Yes | No |

Structurally Sound

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. This project will reduce the risk of infrastructure damage that displaces residents. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will reduce the risk of critical safety systems failure. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will enhance safety systems. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will sustain basic sanitary systems, i.e., water, sewer, air flow. | Yes | No |
| f. Project will extend the useful life of a structure or system beyond project depreciation. | Yes | No |
| g. Project addresses an urgent or emergent need. | Yes | No |

Safety

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Project potentially reduce the risk to property in common areas. | Yes | No |
| b. Project reduces the risk of resident and or staff injury. | Yes | No |
| c. Project cost is commensurate with the potential benefit derived. | Yes | No |
| d. Project increases the safety residents and their property. | Yes | No |

Tier II: Valued Lifestyle: 7 points possible (1 point per question)

Quality Amenities

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project/Process enhances amenities offered. | Yes | No |
| b. Project/Process makes amenities more accessible to all residents. | Yes | No |

Quality Activities

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project/Process increases the availability of activities | Yes | No |
| b. Project/Process expand the capacity of activities allowing more to participate. | Yes | No |
| c. Project/Process increases the number of amenities. | Yes | No |

Affordability

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. The amenity will be free of a fee or use/participation. | Yes | No |
| b. There is no requirement of an annual subsidy for operations. | Yes | No |

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: 23

NUMBER OF POINTS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION : 18

PROGRAMMING FILTER

Tier I: Pragmatics: Safety Section: 3 points possible

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project potentially reduces the risk to property in common areas. | Yes | No |
| b. Project reduces the risk of resident and or staff injury. | Yes | No |
| c. Project cost is commensurate with the potential benefit derived. | Yes | No |

Tier II: Valued Lifestyle: 12 points possible

Quality Amenities

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project/Process enhances the amenities offered. | Yes | No |
| b. Project/Process makes amenities more accessible to all residents. | Yes | No |
| c. Project/Process encourages more friend and family participation. | Yes | No |

Quality Activities

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project/Process increases the availability of activities. | Yes | No |
| b. Project/Process expand the capacity of activities allowing more to participate. | Yes | No |
| c. Project/Process increase cultural diversity and awareness. | Yes | No |
| d. Project/Process increase the number of amenities. | Yes | No |

Affordability

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Cost for participation will be consistent with resident means. | Yes | No |
| b. Cost of participation reflects actual cos of providing the amenity. | Yes | No |
| c. Cost of the amenity will require a fee for use/participation. | Yes | No |
| d. This amenity is a subsidy free operation. | Yes | No |
| e. The amenity can be sustained without compromising existing amenities. | Yes | No |

Tier III: The Aesthetic: ½ point per question: 4 points possible

Beautiful Home

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. Project will enhance the enjoyment of the residents within their living unit. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will increase a sense of neighborhood with the living unit. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will allow for enhanced personalization of living space. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will not have a negative impact on the neighborhood. | Yes | No |

Beautiful Environment

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Project will sustain the current acceptable standard. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will enhance the curb appeal of the community. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will minimally sustain best practices in respect to natural resources. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will encourage more community involvement and use of amenities. | Yes | No |

Tier IV: Desirability: ¼ points per question: 1 point possible

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| a. Project will sustain a valued element of the community. | Yes | No |
| b. Project will enhance the profile of HGA/HGMD as a state-of-the-art community. | Yes | No |
| c. Project will increase the quality of life/quality of lived experience for residents. | Yes | No |
| d. Project will increase the appeal of HGA to prospective residents/owners. | Yes | No |

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE: 20

NUMBER OF POINTS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION: 16

Programming Filter					Score
Tier I: Safety: 1 point each yes answer					
Potentially reduces the risks to property in common areas.	Yes	No			
Potentially reduces the risks of resident and or staff injury.	Yes	No			
Cost is commensurate with the potential benefit.	Yes	No			
Tier I : Score					
Tier II: Valued Lifestyle: 1 point each yes answer					
Quality Amenities					
Project or Process enhances the amenities offered.	Yes	No			
Makes amenities more accessible for all residents.	Yes	No			
Encourages more friend and family participation.	Yes	No			
Quality Activities					
Increases the availability of activities.	Yes	No			
Expands the capacity of activities allow more to participate.	Yes	No			
Increases cultural diversity and awareness.	Yes	No			
Increases the number of amenities.	Yes	No			
Affordability					
Cost of participation will be consisted with resident means.	Yes	No			
Cost of participation reflects the actual cost of the activity.	Yes	No			
Cost of the amenity will not require a participation fee.	Yes	No			
The amenity will not require an annual subsidy to operate.	Yes	No			
Can be sustained without compromising existing amenities.	Yes	No			
Tier II Score:					
Tier III: The Aesthetic: 1/2 point for each yes answer.					
Beautiful Home					
Will enhance the enjoyment of residents within their unit.	Yes	No			
Will increase a sense of neighborhood within the living unit.	Yes	No			
Will allow for enhance personalization of living space.	Yes	No			
Will avoid a negative impact on the neighborhood.	Yes	No			
Beautiful Environment					
Project will sustain the current acceptable standard.	Yes	No			
Project will enhance curb appeal of the community.	Yes	No			
Will sustain natural resources best practices.	Yes	No			
Will encourage more community involvement & amenity use.	Yes	No			
Tier III Score:					
Tier IV: Desirability: 1/4 point for each yes answer					
Will sustain a valued element in the community.	Yes	No			
Will enhance the profile of HGA/HGMD as "state-of-the-art".	Yes	No			
Will increase the quality of life/lived experience of residents.	Yes	No			
Increases the appeal of HGA to prospective owners/residents.	Yes	No			
Tier IV Score:					
Total Score: A minimum of 16 points for further consideration.					
Discussion Notes					

JOINT LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE WORK CYCLE

Ostensibly the purpose of the Joint Long Range Planning Committee (JLRPC) is to review the current and anticipated needs of Heather Gardens Association (HGA) and Heather Gardens Municipal District (HGMD), determine which needs are of the highest priority and then, on a regular and timely basis, provide recommendations to the respective Boards. In order to achieve this charge, a process that incorporates timely input for various invested parties needs to be implemented to ensure that the recommendations being put forth reflect the broadest and most complete input possible.

As the JLRPC will be dealing with various policy, best practice, physical plant, safety, and community welfare issues, all at different stages of conceptualization, it is essential that there be a method to monitor progress, champion ideas, clarify purpose and intent, and marshal movement, and timely report to the Board's. Allowing a particular project, concept, or policy issue fade from focus potentially leads to lost opportunity, higher cost, and an unfortunate compromise of the quality of life so valued by residents. Therefore, it is of great importance that the JLRPC be an active agent in soliciting input, coalescing information, and monitoring the status of projects and practices across the board.

To achieve its goals and provide meaningful and timely information to the Board's the JLRPC will use a cyclical planning method. Representatives from standing and ad hoc committees will be invited to attend all JLRPC meetings in order to provide timely updates and developments. On no less than quarterly basis existing committees and their associated Ad Hoc committees and task forces will formally report on progress and challenges related to ongoing projects and those under consideration. The JLRPC process will also invite and solicit from department leadership in order to better understand the scope of needs, the progress of projects, and the challenges faced with implementing a particular project or practice.

As the JLRPC engages with standing committee members and departmental leadership, the committee itself will collect information and create project update reports that will be shared with the respective Boards on a quarterly basis. These brief updates will provide Board members with a timely status report on a per project or issue basis. If either Board seeks more in-depth information, the JLRPC committee chair(s) and or the respective committee chair will address the request.

In a sense the JLRPC role is that of a facilitator and does not hold any decision-making authority. As such there are a number of functions that may be utilized to achieve the mission of the JLRPC. Those functions include but are not limited to the following.

Determining Project Placement: Does the project merit a recommendation for consideration as a Long-Range project or is it best addressed in another manner, e.g., an annual maintenance program or Short-term project able to be completed in a couple of years.

Readiness: Is the concept and plan as it relates to the project sufficiently developed to warrant action or are additional refinements or pieces of information needed before a recommendation is to be made.

Championing unique or difficult cause: From time to time the nature of a matter may seem daunting, difficult to conceptualize, or demand more time and focus than available in a typical committee format. In such cases, the JLRPC may recommend a Task Force or Ad Hoc committee be formed to act with specific focus with a time limited charge to bring the matter into focus or produce a recommendation.

Monitoring Progress;/Facilitating Progress: On occasion, matters of importance get bogged down within a committee for any of a number of understandable reasons. The JLRPC through regular monitoring and reporting will be in a position to keep designated Long Range plans and matters under study and development in the forefront or be in a position to offer support to revitalize efforts and promote progress.

Overall, the key to the success of the Long-Range planning process is in keeping the assessing, planning, action, review, and reporting phases of the plan in constant motion. The plan must be current, able to adapt to changes in organizational needs and resources as well as provide the Boards with perspective and recommendations in step with their budgeting and planning cycles. To do this the JLRPC must utilize a structure that will reliably and consistently seek information, allow for the processing of information, and support the reporting out of information useful to the Boards. An example to that structure follows.

JLRPC Annual Work Schedule Example

Demonstrates a 1 quarter cycle (given space limitations) repeats 4x

Meeting Schedule: 2 meetings per month

Standing Committees are represented as CA/CB/CC/CD etc.: Associated Ad Hoc Committees and Task Forces are included.

1/1	1/2	2/1	2/2	3/1	3/2
CA reports	Review Progress	CB reports	Review Progress	C/C reports	Prep Qrtly Report
Dept. report	Filter proposal	Dept. report	Filter proposals	Dept. reports	
Project progress	New considerations	Project progress	New considerations	Project progress	
Review needs		Review needs		Review needs	