

Board Candidate Interview Closing Remarks

The 900 pound gorilla in the ORMA room right now is the new amenity center, the impact on assessments and the process which was used in arriving at the current situation. The board believes that the process was totally open and transparent and that they had been thorough in addressing all of the pertinent issues. Many members, myself included, believe that the process was anything but transparent and did not address all member concerns. Surely, there was a lot of effort put into the open house presentations, which were used as sales pitches as opposed to prompts to encourage feedback from the membership with the goal of defining alternatives.

The board posted an announcement on NABR stating that the amenity center adhoc committee and the board had reviewed the feedback from the members who attended the open house sessions and had based the decision on the scope of the project on that feedback. It is surprising to me that that feedback did not result in a single change in scope. I asked the board when the board would be sharing that feedback with the community. The response from the board was that the feedback was in the form of informal notes which were not in a form for publication. When I pushed back, I was told that they would have to get back to me regarding releasing informal committee notes.

This is exactly the lack of transparency in the decision making process that I have been speaking about during this interview. I find it unacceptable that the RFP that was sent to architectural and engineering firms did not deviate from the open house presentations at all given that some of the feedback received from the open house events was to do something smaller.

On another front, we were sued by the declarant over assessing declarant properties which are defined by the CC&Rs as exempt from paying assessments. We settled the law suit. Why is it that the board did not counter sue to get the declarant to stop collecting and keeping ASC fees that, in my opinion, rightfully belong to ORMA.

While I applaud the signing of the leases for the main entrance and the Old Georgetown road entrances, there is a provision in the lease that states that, should one of the declarants employees or agents be delayed by more than one hour on one occasion due to the access gates, ORMA will be determined to be in breach of the contract. If there are delays of less than one hour on three occasions, ORMA will be in breach of the contract. To me, this represents a substantial risk which needs mitigation plans. Specifically, who is responsible for responding to these situations so that we do not cause these delays under any circumstances, including breakdown of the equipment. We are now two months into the lease and work has yet to commence on the guard house at the main entrance. The declarant has committed to complete the repairs on the guard house within seven months. Who is monitoring progress on the part of the declarant in meeting the commitments of the lease?

All of this shows that the culture of the ORMA board needs to change and I'm the best person to make it happen.