

[Print](#)[Close](#)

Re: Pool financing discussion today

From: **Sue Corliss** (cedars@olypen.com)

Sent: Sun 5/05/13 8:39 AM

To: bbwilbur@frontier.com

Cc: Cathie Harrison (cathianne@aol.com); Tim Dahl (tdahl@shorelinefire.com); Fred Salmon (pheffy@aol.com); Gwyn Staton (gwynstaton1@msn.com); Dan and Lisa Hall (danlisahall@comcast.net); Chris Hendrickson (Hendrickcj@gmail.com); Ed Delahanty (whshed@live.com); Maria Chamberlain (hermitanamaria@gmail.com); Dustin Frederick (dustin@local519.org); Dan Jones (dan_serv@hotmail.com); Suzy Palmer (suzypalmer1@me.com)

Bob and ALL

I am in favor of ALL options being presented to the community. If a person supports the pool I feel that they will somehow figure out the \$ if the community passes. But if we don't give the community ALL the information, then how can they be expected to respond intelligently? If I'm not given complete information, I won't know what the alternatives are, therefore my vote would not necessarily reflect my true feelings about the matter. If we have \$ numbers for remodeling the pool and \$ numbers for demolishing the pool those figures need to be provided. The brochure (voter's pamphlet) can give more detailed information so that the community is aware of the options if they vote to remodel the pool. Because if we demolish the pool, there is still a cost/assessment that the community will have to come up with, albeit less \$.

As to my silence, there was too much counter-productive action taking place, very few of us had the opportunity to speak!

Sue Corliss

On May 4, 2013, at 10:18 PM, <bbwilbur@frontier.com>

<bbwilbur@frontier.com> wrote:

> Sue, I'm sorry you had left I guess at that point, and this came
> about afterwards, in the parking lot, the specifics not being
> particularly relevant. You seemed to be supporting open information
> gathering re the loan, and I guess you were silent or at least
> unheard on feeling that the one-time assessment of \$1500 might be a
> better ballot option than the mortgage route.

>
> So okay, just to be clear, do you prefer keeping that option, even
> if it would force some folks with maxed out credit card payments to
> vote no on the pool even though they supported the pool? Just as
> Maria requested clarity, I am just wanting to be sure we all
> understand because when we discussed killing the one-payment there
> was no opposition at all, Dan being quite adamant that it was dead.
> Maybe that was when you were outside on the phone? I thought you
> were there but makes no big difference because you can clarify now,
> which is why follow-up like this is important. Or else it becomes
> follow-slop.

>
> Sorry if I misrepresented...Bob

>
> -----Original Message----- From: Sue Corliss
> Sent: Saturday, May 04, 2013 9:31 PM
> To: bbwilbur@frontier.com
> Cc: Cathie Harrison ; Tim Dahl ; Fred Salmon ; Gwyn Staton ; Dan
> and Lisa Hall ; Chris Hendrickson ; Ed Delahanty ; Maria
> Chamberlain ; Dustin Frederick ; Dan Jones ; Suzy Palmer
> Subject: Re: Pool financing discussion today

>
> Bob, After I returned from a short step-out, I queried you and Fred
> and neither of you said anything about a 'full' agreement on
> anything. You and Fred indicated that the meeting had resolved
> nothing except continued animosity. When I went in, there was Dan,
> Dustin and Maria. The group appeared to be somewhat 'hostile' to me.
> Like a lot of group and or committee discussions not a great deal was
> accomplished. I certainly would not have agreed that a one time
> assessment would be a losing option. I personally do not like
> mortgaging Tract A. If the community wants a pool, then I feel we
> should fund it ourselves. But I am not against getting outside
> financing information to actually see what a financial institution
> would offer us. I don't feel that a committee has right to withhold
> ALL options to the community and if we are going to do a promotional
> brochure, then it ALL options should be included.

>
> Sue Corliss

>
> On May 4, 2013, at 5:30 PM, <bbwilbur@frontier.com> wrote:

>
>> To the Pool Committee (my takeaway, fyi)

>>
>> Representing the Pool Committee at the strategy gathering on Sat
>> were Bob Wilbur, Sue Corliss, and Fred Salmon. Representing the

>> LR Planning Comm were Dan Jones, Suzie Palmer, Dustin Frederick,
>> and Maria Chamberlain. We found it was hard to overcome old
>> wounds, and there were moments of contentiousness, but we managed
>> to get past those, find reason, and move forward.

>>

>> There was full agreement that presenting a \$1500 one-time
>> assessment on the ballot was a losing option and should instead
>> be displaced by a financing option, which will make the pool
>> rehab more affordable for those who otherwise could not swing the
>> \$1500 hit.

>>

>> There was also concurrence, subject to Board okay, that Larry
>> Salmon (and/or if schedule allows Bob Wilbur) will accompany
>> members of the Board to investigate the options and hurdles
>> related to financing.

>>

>> And we all supported Dan Jones lead on a promotional brochure to
>> inform folks of what a great pool we will have post
>> refurbishment. Any ideas are welcome; send to Dan an cc the rest
>> of us as it may place a good seed.

>>

>>

>