



Robert Hix <hixfixg@gmail.com>

Management Company Town Hall Comments

1 message

Robert Hix <hixfixg@gmail.com>

Wed, Nov 12, 2025 at 12:09 PM

To: "C.Mitchell" <c.mitchell@fsresidential.com>, joe.ganino@sunlakescc.com, Bob Walter <bob.walter@sunlakescc.com>, Sandra Gutknecht <sandra.gutknecht@sunlakescc.com>, maryjo.mcelwain@sunlakescc.com, Gary Burkel <gary.burkel@sunlakescc.com>

Bcc: Sequoia Grove Consulting <karen@sequoiagroveconsulting.com>, "C. Martin" <cal.toolsrus@gmail.com>, Jbblodgett <jb@jbblodgett.com>, Randy Robbins <randyllump@yahoo.com>, Raelene Kretchman <kretch48@gmail.com>, waltwfi@aol.com, Ken-Jean Johnson <sunlakes4kenjean@msn.com>

Dear Master Board Members;

We were in attendance at the town hall the Board presented to our community on 11/10/25. We believe it was well structured and orderly. The presentation of the procurement process by Sandra Gutknecht was well thought and articulated. However, it appeared to be reverse engineered to cast the project as a well thought out plan created at the inception of process rather than simply a status report designed to persuade the audience that a credible job has been done. **The following observations are presented for the Board's consideration in future acquisition endeavors and why we are in dire need of a Procurement Advisory Committee (PAC) that is allowed to function according to its charter:**

- Develop a clear understanding of the difference between an "RFP" and an "RFI". The document you developed, supposedly following a CAI template", would much more appropriately be considered an RFI not an RFP. As many members indicated last night among other things, it is completely lacking the requisite Statement of Work (SOW).
- Absent a SOW that provides the scope and performance standards (metrics) expected, SLCC is placed in a seriously disadvantaged position (like it was with the Food & Beverage "RFP") of attempting to intuitively map what the vendors say they can provide in their marketing literature rather than a set of criteria that will be acceptable to SLCC members. A list of questions is not a substitute for an SOW.
- A town hall should have been convened when the Board first resolved by majority decision that at procurement process was deemed appropriate. This would have avoided significant anxiety on the part of concerned members and eliminated unnecessary chaos and perhaps waste of the Board's time and a waste of association funds.
- Do not confuse the amount of time you invested in the process as a reason why you should proceed. Your decision on how you spend your time is one thing, but it is the members of SLCC that will bear the weight of it.
- An appropriately configured task force should have been assembled consisting of no more than one Board member. The remaining 3-4 members should have been selected in an open process by the Board based upon open solicitation of willing candidates with proven credentials.
- It was mentioned that the procurement team consisted of two Board members and two at large community members. Why were the names of the individuals not stated? Knowing the skills and background of the individuals participating is critical to establish community confidence. For example, did it include Mr. Day or Mr. Burkel? They were instrumental in bringing the disaster of Morrison/CCL agreement to us earlier this year.

- Ms. Gutknecht referred to seeking advice from Community Association Institute (CAI) to determine an appropriate procurement process and “template” for an RFP as a means to legitimize the process. Seeking input is generally a good thing, but one must recognize that CAI is not a primary advocate for HOAs. It is supported by the membership consisting of attorneys, management companies, job search, contractors, and etc.. They serve too many masters to have them as an objective resource or to be considered a HOA advisor beyond using them to get a pulse on HOA issues.
- The above compels us to question why the Board did not simply reference the Procurement Advisory Committee (PAC) Handbook posted on the website or consult with previous members for advice. The 2022-23 Board participated in the development of PAC Handbook and approved its use which is why it is posted on the SLCC website.
- Had the project team been aware of this and followed it, you may not be facing a recall or having to contend with the near unanimous show of hands last night who supported stopping the current RFP process. Pause to consider the real reason(s) why there is a need to replace FSR, what benefits a new provider might offer, and creating a legitimate SOW to more objectively guide the prospective candidates and decision process.

Many in our community are aware that several members of the Board stated openly in a cavalier manner their desire to replace FSR as our Food & Beverage provider and once accomplished replace FSR entirely. From an outsider’s perspective, this is not in keeping with being a fiduciary. The history of the Board working effectively with our Management Company (MC) is not good. In particular, there has been an acrimonious relationship between the FAC certain Board members and the MC ever since Dan Comerford was on the Board and Howard Katz served as FAC Chair. The common thread is that the FAC and certain Board members held the belief that they should dictate to and micro-manage the MC all matters. It is not the job of the Board or FAC to demand or micro-manage the MC.

Finally, we were particularly aghast at Mr. Burkel’s misrepresentation of FSR being responsible for costing SLCC a million dollars regarding not obtaining a door-fee as part of the previous negotiations with Spectrum. In the first place, door-fees were not a common item several years ago as they have become recently and to state a dollar amount is irresponsible and slanderous towards FSR. Furthermore, Mr. Burkel’s inaccurate assessment of FSR’s role in the previous Spectrum agreement overlooks the significant value and cost reductions that were included in the agreement. Mr. Burkel was not a member of the Board or FAC during that period which begs the question how does he know what the Board or FSR did or didn’t do? Mr. Burkel’s attempt to shift blame from the Board and our attorney for not having conducted sufficient research is at the heart of our Board’s consistent failure to effectively represent our member’s interest. If Mr. Burkel wants to talk about major failures of others, then he should also own up to the huge financial losses he and Mr. Day perpetrated on SLCC as a result of their irresponsible handling of the Morrison/CCL agreement. It is likely to result in our HOA incurring an additional one million in losses by the time the year is up. Blaming others for one’s own failures is not worthy of a fiduciary. You are entitled to your opinion, but unfortunately it is the members who end up picking up the tab. It now appears that this entire controversy was artificially constructed by certain Board and FAC members as a vengeful act against FSR. The current Board should recognize how toxic this initiative has become and shut it down pursuant to the Delegate Assembly resolution presented to the Board on 11/6/25.

Sincerely;

Bob Hix

Ron Varner