

## Report of the Data Gathering Subcommittee on Other Providers

This subcommittee is charged with the task of reviewing the provision of amenities by other providers.

The subcommittee is composed of Roy Montambeau (chair), Larry Attebury, Rich Fulton, and Bill Marshall.

Our findings are based on visits by one or more committee members to Sun City, Sun City West, Sun City Grande, Sun City Sunflower, Sun City Summerlin and the Henderson Multigenerational Recreation Center.

The following observations are submitted,

1. The offerings across all the communities were typical. There were no smash hit activities which would come as a surprise to our community. However, there was significant value in the experience of these communities as they developed and maintained their amenities. In short it wasn't the things we saw but the people we talked to that was of value,
2. Amenities have proven to be stable over time. None of the Sun City communities experienced a revision of offerings as a function of the aging of the community,
3. Membership count is not as valuable as participant count in measuring the popularity of an amenity. Many amenities build a large membership count while the active participants are much smaller. This has significance for prioritizing amenities based on degree of popularity,
4. A common problem in Sun City communities is how to reconcile desires and costs. The costs are not only money but also the inability to schedule room usage efficiently, the amount of facility space desired and the extent that specialized rooms are provided when a more multipurpose room would do. All of these factors bear heavily on what can be provided at the onset and how it will be financially supported in future years.

The full data gathering team considered our recommendations and where there was a consensus of support, they are included in the report submitted by Ginny Herman.

Finally, the chair wishes to thank the subcommittee members for their efforts, thinking and dedication to unbiased observations and conclusions. While each member had personal hopes for future amenities, at no time was the committee membership used as a vehicle for personal lobbying.

Respectfully submitted,  
Roy Montambeau  
1/23/2003