From: jim pearson <pearson_jameso@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2026 8:58 PM
To: greg.selep@universityparkrd.com; Vivian Carvalho <carvalhov@pfm.com>
Cc: jim pearson <pearson_jameso@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: Clarifying the Master Plan Deliverable

ALERT: This message is from an external source.BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any link or attachment

Greg,

Thank you for your response. I would still appreciate you sending me a link to the published Master Plan (MP).

I have a few concerns and observations that I believe you can address.

Existing plan and scope. Is the Board updating the previously approved MP or developing a new one? If it is an update, will the final document show what has changed and why? How will SCS input impact these changes?

Committee deliverables. Before the committees review and approve a new MP, will their specific responsibilities be defined? What is the deliverable(s) for each committee,

what are the expected completion dates, how will the deliverable be measured, and who will decide if the deliverable met the defined goal(s). For example, who will verify that the plan includes a complete and up to date conditions assessment of major facilities, prioritized projects with cost ranges, a five-year financial forecast, and measurable goals with owners and dates? It would help to know when each committee's work is due and how the Board will determine that it is complete. Additional examples could include a rank ordered list of projects and scope, year-by-year capital and operating forecast and funding concerns.

Resident review. I appreciate that residents have already contributed through the survey and focus sessions conducted by SCS. Of course this was done after the board stated a MP already existed. So how will resident input be summarized from these sessions and incorporated into a new MP? Additionally, you described the review and approval process for the residents at a Town Hall meeting AFTER the Board has reviewed it and approved it. The Town Hall meeting should be conducted prior to Board approval so that residents can provide input to the draft plan. Conducting the Town Hall after approval by the Board is too late for residents to have meaningful input.

HOA coordination. How will the HOA participate in the process especially where the plan involves facilities or infrastructure it manages? Potential HOA projects could have a substantial effect on the community's overall priorities and costs. I am asking about coordination and scope here, rather than assuming the HOA must formally approve the RD's plan.

Approval of an updated/new Master Plan. I appreciate your view that the Committees themselves are also key stakeholders and can approve a 'vetted' plan. However, I believe the key stakeholders are the RD Board members. It is their responsibility to set goals for the sub-committees, solicit and incorporate resident input, and deliver a plan that is accepted by the UPark Community.

I hope these questions and observations can help the Board define what "fully vetted" means before assigning responsibility for delivery. I appreciate your willingness to discuss them.

Regards,
Jim

From: greg.selep@universityparkrd.com <greg.selep@universityparkrd.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 27, 2026 7:54 AM
To: jim pearson <pearson_jameso@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: Clarifying the Master Plan Deliverable

Jim
As I stated at the meeting, my definition of "fully vetted" is the review and approval of the Finance, Strategic Planning, Governance committees and then the board. They would be the stakeholders. The plan would then be presented in a Town Hall to the membership.

As you know, we have contracted SCS to help in this effort. So, we are following their methodology. The recently completed survey and focus sessions were the initial steps. The workshop in October is the next step. These become the input to the plan.

Thank you for your questions. It helps. If you want to talk please feel free to give me a call
Regards

Gregory Selep
Board Secretary

From: jim pearson <pearson_jameso@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 26, 2026 1:36 PM
To: 'Greg Selep' <greg.selep@universityparkrd.com>; Vivian Carvalho <carvalhov@pfm.com>
Cc: jim pearson <pearson_jameso@hotmail.com>
Subject: Clarifying the Master Plan Deliverable

Greg,

I attended the last Board meeting and wanted to follow up on your request for a fully vetted and approved Master Plan in early 2027.

My understanding was that the Board stated UPARK has an approved Master Plan as part of the lawsuit. Could you send me a link to that master plan? As a resident, I would like to understand whether you are asking for that plan to be reviewed and updated or for a new plan to be developed.

It would also help to define the requested deliverable before holding anyone responsible for it. What would make the plan “fully vetted” in your view? What work must be completed, how will success be measured, and which stakeholders must review or approve the result?

Clarifying those points at the next meeting would help the Board set a clear and fair assignment and give residents a way to judge whether the January deliverable has been met.

Thank you for helping clarify this.

Jim Pearson
7912 Hampton Court
617-834-5805