

Mosby Mountain Community Association
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Date and time: Tuesday, February 17, 2014, 7:00 pm

Meeting location: home of Preston Miller and Debra Mincarelli, 1390 Singleton Lane

Board members present:

Preston Miller, President, 1390 Singleton Lane
Matt Althoff, Vice President, 1372 Singleton Lane
Jim Peterson, Secretary/Treasurer, 1969 Ridgetop Drive
Diego Anderson, Director, 1872 Rhett Court
John Garland, Director, 1365 Singleton Lane

Others Present

None

1. Welcome and introduction

Mr. Miller called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

3. Approval of the November 11, 2013, board meeting minutes

On a motion by Mr. Garland, seconded by Mr. Althoff, the minutes of the November 11, 2013, board meeting were unanimously approved as distributed.

4. Financial Statements

Mr. Peterson distributed copies of the 2013 year-end statements and the January 2014 statements (see attached).

5. Appointment to fill vacant board position

Recruiting for this position is continuing.

6. Committee duties, assignments and appointments

Architectural Review Board (ARB): Mr. Miller reported that Ms. Jamie Shim has accepted appointment as chair of the ARB and that we need to recruit one more member to the committee. Mr. Miller then reviewed the responsibilities of the ARB including the need to conduct a neighbor-wide walk-through twice each year and also the processing of

individual requests, record keeping and the assessment of charges against any member who is not in compliance with ARB requirements.

Common Areas Committee (CAC): Mr. Diego Anderson will serve as the chair of the CAC. Mr. Miller pointed out that most of the common area is designated by the county as conservation area and so the only work for that is to monitor if trees pose a danger due to disease or damage. The remainder of the common area is in grass and trees and we have a 3-year contract for maintenance. The CAC may wish to schedule volunteer work days as has been done in the past to maintain the bridges, signs, etc.

Community Relations Committee (CRC): Mr. John Garland will serve as the chair of the CRC. Mr. Miller listed the activities of the committee including parties (Halloween and Easter) and the spring yard sale. He also suggested that the welcoming packet be updated and distributed to new homeowners which could provide answers to many of the issues that came up in the responses to the survey on electrifying the entrance sign (why we do not have control of snow plowing; that the 50 foot strip on the Mountain Valley side of Ridgetop Drive is not our property and our easement only allows us to maintain the strip, not use it for any other purpose, etc.). Mr. Althoff was a principal in the preparation of the last edition of the welcome packet and he will get that to Mr. Garland so an updated version can be prepared.

Neighborhood Watch Committee (NWC): As was discussed briefly at the annual meeting of the membership held in December, there have been long-standing efforts by some members to make this a vital function for the neighborhood, but the difficulty in securing the required active participation from at least one representative from every street, compounded by cutbacks and changes with the Albemarle County Police liaison, have left the program in a marginal state for years. Also, Past President David Cain had expressed concerns at the annual meeting about the appropriateness of a property owners association serving as the official sponsor of a neighborhood watch program (issues of liability and also the perception of members that somehow the association is responsible for the safety and security of the neighborhood).

On a motion by Mr. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Garland, it was unanimously voted to discontinue the Mosby Mountain Neighborhood Watch Program, but the operation of this could be revisited in the future if members express such an interest. Also, the Neighborhood Watch signs will remain in place.

7. Electrification of the Ambrose Commons entrance sign.

As a follow-up to questions raised at the annual meeting in December asking for the adequate illumination of the entrance sign to Mosby Mountain, Dominion Power was contacted and they provided a proposal to bring electricity under Old Lynchburg Road to the sign at the intersection with Ambrose Commons Drive. The cost would be \$12,219.46. There are sufficient funds in the association's operating reserve to cover the cost of the investment, but given the magnitude of the cost, an opinion survey was sent to the membership asking if they supported the proposal. Of the 119 households, 69 responded to the survey with 30 households in favor, 37 opposed, and two providing

comments only. The entire report on the survey, including all comments received, is appended to these minutes.

Several efforts have been made over the years to illuminate the signs with solar-powered spotlights, but these have proven totally inadequate. Mr. Miller suggested an alternative solution would be to contract with a local vendor to supply and maintain commercial-grade solar-powered floodlights.

On a motion by Mr. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Anderson, it was unanimously voted to decline the proposal from Dominion Power to run electricity to the entrance sign, but rather to contract with a local vendor for the provision and maintenance of a commercial-grade solar-powered illumination system.

8. Comments on items not on the agenda

Mr. Garland asked if any of the board members had received comments on the new trash collection service. Apparently it had been the expectation of some residents that the trash containers would be larger since there is now only one container rather than two. Some residents have stacked trash alongside their containers, and the additional trash has been picked up.

Mr. Althoff commented on the several communications he has received asking about problems with the snow removal. Some residents do not understand that the streets in Mosby Mountain are owned by the state and VDOT is responsible for the maintenance (including snow removal), and that the association is not allowed to contract for private snow removal. Mr. Peterson will send out a neighborhood email advising the members of the situation.

Mr. Miller reported that Allied Van Lines will have their claims representative within the next few days visit the site where the truck slid off of Singleton Lane into the common area. Ironically, the Allied driver was leaving from Ridgetop Drive loaded with all of the possessions of a member who is moving out-of-state, and the driver was following the GPS directions which takes you off of Ambrose Commons onto Singleton Lane rather than straight down Ambrose Commons to Old Lynchburg Road.

9. Review of the draft “Rules and Regulations and Architectural Guidelines”

Board members will review the latest draft of the proposed “Rules and Regulations and Architectural Guidelines” and then submit any suggested revisions to Mr. Peterson within the next week. Editorial changes will be incorporated into the draft and then that version will be posted on the website for all members to review and comment on the proposed document. The board will then consider the input received and issue the final approved document which will become effective immediately upon its release.

10. Next regular board meeting

The next regular board meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 15, 2014, 7:00 p.m. at a location to be determined.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

James R. Peterson
Secretary/Treasurer

2013 - P & L - BUDGET VS ACTUAL

	Jan - Dec 13	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Income				
41000 · ASSESSMENT INCOME	57,717.00	57,596.00	121.00	100.21%
41500 · Fee Income	180.00			
42000 · DISCLOSURE PACKET FEES	84.00			
43000 · INTEREST INCOME	119.85			
44000 · Misc income	25.00			
Total Income	58,125.85	57,596.00	529.85	100.92%
Gross Profit	58,125.85	57,596.00	529.85	100.92%
Expense				
Write Off (Bad Debt Expense)	8.70			
51000 · ACCOUNTING FEES	4,386.94	4,200.00	186.94	104.45%
51500 · BANK CHARGES	7.00			
51700 · Addition to Reserve Fund	0.00	500.00	-500.00	0.0%
52000 · Liability, D&O, Bonding Ins	0.00	1,000.00	-1,000.00	0.0%
53000 · LEGAL FEES	2,726.00			
53500 · LICENSES AND FEES	25.00	150.00	-125.00	16.67%
54000 · Membership Fees	0.00	150.00	-150.00	0.0%
54500 · MEETING EXPENSE	0.00	100.00	-100.00	0.0%
55000 · OFFICE EXPENSE	968.57	500.00	468.57	193.71%
55005 · Association Events	31.00	1,000.00	-969.00	3.1%
55500 · OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0.00	200.00	-200.00	0.0%
56200 · SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	401.01			
64500 · TRASH COLLECTION	22,829.70	22,880.00	-50.30	99.78%
66350 · INSURANCE - GENERAL	969.00			
71450 · Mailbox Maintenance	6.68			
74200 · MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSE	50.00			
75300 · LANDSCAPING - CONTRACT	22,910.00	21,236.00	1,674.00	107.88%
75400 · LANDSCAPING - NON-CONTRACT	216.00			
75800 · Signage/Sign Maintenance	60.00	500.00	-440.00	12.0%
82500 · LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	0.00	5,000.00	-5,000.00	0.0%
85500 · WEBSITE EXPENSE	287.80			
Total Expense	55,883.40	57,416.00	-1,532.60	97.33%
Net Income	2,242.45	180.00	2,062.45	1,245.81%

2013 - BALANCE SHEET

	Dec 31, 13
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Checking/Savings	
10300 · Cash - VNB - 6409	14,732.30
10500 · ING Direct Savings	30,109.76
Total Checking/Savings	44,842.06
Accounts Receivable	
11000 · Accounts Receivable	-1,255.29
Total Accounts Receivable	-1,255.29
Other Current Assets	
12000 · Undeposited Funds	121.00
Total Other Current Assets	121.00
Total Current Assets	43,707.77
TOTAL ASSETS	43,707.77
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Equity	
32000 · CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS	2,000.00
3900 · Retained Earnings	18,058.18
39996 · RETAINED EARNING	21,407.14
Net Income	2,242.45
Total Equity	43,707.77
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	43,707.77

JANUARY 2014 - P&L - BUDGET VS ACTUAL

	Jan 14	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Income				
41000 · ASSESSMENT INCOME	15,246.00	14,399.00	847.00	105.88%
43000 · INTEREST INCOME	10.21			
Total Income	15,256.21	14,399.00	857.21	105.95%
Gross Profit	15,256.21	14,399.00	857.21	105.95%
Expense				
Add to operating reserve fund	0.00	420.50	-420.50	0.0%
51000 · ACCOUNTING FEES	0.00	350.00	-350.00	0.0%
52000 · Liability, D&O, Bonding Ins	0.00	83.37	-83.37	0.0%
53500 · LICENSES AND FEES	108.86	12.50	96.36	870.88%
54000 · Membership Fees	0.00	12.50	-12.50	0.0%
54500 · MEETING EXPENSE	0.00	8.37	-8.37	0.0%
55000 · OFFICE EXPENSE	0.00	41.63	-41.63	0.0%
55005 · Association Events	0.00	83.37	-83.37	0.0%
55500 · OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0.00	16.63	-16.63	0.0%
64500 · TRASH COLLECTION	0.00	1,906.63	-1,906.63	0.0%
75300 · LANDSCAPING - CONTRACT	1,746.00	1,390.87	355.13	125.53%
75400 · LANDSCAPING - NON-CONTRACT	150.00			
75800 · Signage/Sign Maintenance	0.00	41.63	-41.63	0.0%
82500 · LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	0.00	416.63	-416.63	0.0%
85500 · WEBSITE EXPENSE	0.00	15.00	-15.00	0.0%
Total Expense	2,004.86	4,799.63	-2,794.77	41.77%
Net Income	13,251.35	9,599.37	3,651.98	138.04%

JANUARY 2014 - P&L

	Jan 14
Income	
41000 · ASSESSMENT INCOME	15,246.00
43000 · INTEREST INCOME	10.21
Total Income	15,256.21
Gross Profit	15,256.21
Expense	
53500 · LICENSES AND FEES	108.86
75300 · LANDSCAPING - CONTRACT	1,746.00
75400 · LANDSCAPING - NON-CONTRACT	150.00
Total Expense	2,004.86
Net Income	13,251.35

JANUARY 2014 - BALANCE SHEET

	Jan 31, 14
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Checking/Savings	
10300 · Cash - VNB - 6409	31,682.44
10500 · ING Direct Savings	30,119.97
Total Checking/Savings	61,802.41
Accounts Receivable	
11000 · Accounts Receivable	-5,177.29
Total Accounts Receivable	-5,177.29
Other Current Assets	
12000 · Undeposited Funds	484.00
Total Other Current Assets	484.00
Total Current Assets	57,109.12
TOTAL ASSETS	57,109.12
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Liabilities	
Current Liabilities	
Accounts Payable	
20000 · Accounts Payable	186.00
Total Accounts Payable	186.00
Total Current Liabilities	186.00
Total Liabilities	186.00
Equity	
32000 · CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS	2,000.00
3900 · Retained Earnings	20,264.63
39996 · RETAINED EARNING	21,407.14
Net Income	13,251.35
Total Equity	56,923.12
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	57,109.12

MOSBY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, INC.
OPINION SURVEY ON ELECTRIFICATION OF ENTRANCE SIGN
REPORT – FEBRUARY 17, 2014

In response to the continuing interest expressed at the December 3, 2013, Annual Meeting of the Mosby Mountain Community Association, Dominion Power was contacted and asked to provide a cost to run electricity to the Mosby Mountain entrance sign at the intersection of Old Lynchburg Road and Ambrose Commons Drive, so that the sign could be adequately and reliably illuminated. Ever since 2006, various solar-powered spotlight systems have been installed, first by the developer and then by the Association, to illuminate the sign, but all of these attempts had proven inadequate (the lights were very dim and then would fade out after a few hours). The engineers at Dominion Power developed a proposal to run electric power from the pole across Old Lynchburg Road under the road to the site of the Mosby Mountain entrance sign. Running the line under Old Lynchburg Road was the shortest and least expensive of any other alternative (such as tying into power somewhere within Mosby Mountain). Still, the cost was projected to be \$12,219.4

The board Mosby Mountain Community Association has the authority to utilize funds from the operating reserve to authorize Dominion Power to proceed with the work, but given the projected cost of the project, an email opinion survey was sent out on February 14 asking members to provide their opinion as to whether or not the proposal should be pursued.

Of the 119 households in Mosby Mountain, 69 (58%) responded to the survey. Thirty households were in favor of electrifying the entrance sign at Ambrose Commons Drive, 37 were opposed, and two made comments but did not register a “yea” or “nay.”

Following are all of the comments received (identifying information—names and addresses—have been deleted from the comments):

COMMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL
I am in favor of the proposal.
We are on favor of the lights.
Great idea! This would be a significant improvement and I am in favor.
Our vote "yes." Our suggestion is that the neighborhood association create a plan to budget for future improvements to the sign, hardscape design and landscaping itself. In our opinion, an investment of this amount for power/lighting should support a much higher quality finished product than what exists now.
We are in favor of funding Dominion Power to extend electrical power to the Ambrose Commons entrance.
Yes, I'm in favor of electric lights.
Absolutely. We agree.
We are in favor or anything to bring more light to Mosby Mtn.
While I support this proposal I would ask what about the lights at the other entrance at the intersection with Singleton Lane? I realize this could not happen with this opportunity but feel it should be quoted out and planned for in the near future. Please let me know, but as I said I do support this proposal.
I am in support of running electrical to the entrance sign as outlined below.
Thanks. yes. I am for providing lighting to the entrance signage.
We agree that the lighting should be installed, so please count us in.
Yes to electric sign.
Entrance needs to be adequately illuminated so that visitors and guests of MM residents see the entrance. I am in agreement that it needs better lighting. Ok to use reserve, but not to increase dues
HER: YES! We've wanted this to be done for years. HIM: Seems too expensive. I know where to turn; & have not heard one complaint from evening visitors. The sign itself isn't so attractive to need to be shown off. Has anyone considered alternative reflective lettering so as to use car headlights to reflect "Mosby Mountain"? Another consideration...why not offer those on Ambrose Farm a chance to include their name with ours and share whatever cost is ultimately determined?

I feel adequate lighting at the entrance is appropriate usage of our operating reserve. Otherwise what's it for?! I trust the board in making an informed decision on our behalf and in doing so support this proposal. I do hope some type of entrance lighting is in our near future.

I support the proposal

If there is no expense to us, we say yes.

Our family is in support of having proper illumination for the entrance sign.

I am in favor of doing this!!

I am in support of moving forward with a lighted entrance

I believe adequate lighting for our neighborhood is needed and agree while the solar power is just not sufficient.

Good to know we have the funds to cover this.

I support the light. Make it bright. Probably two spot lights for each sign.

Sounds like a good idea. As long as the funds are from the operational reserves.

We are in favor of lighting the sign.

We support the expenditure.

We support the proposal.

We DO support the lighting project for our community sign.

COMMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSAL

Against illumination. For using funds to install a Mosby Pool.

Instead of the electric power for the entrance signs added of Mosby Mountain and the board asking for more Money ("Mosby Mountain Community association board should appropriate funds from the Association's operating reserve in order to bring electric power to our entrance sign at the intersection of Old Lynchburg Road and Ambrose Commons Drive") as a resident of Mosby Mountain subdivision, I would like to suggest we use the \$12,219.46 requested for lighting the entrance signs and reconsider a private company for snow removal. I would like to pass along a note that was e-mailed regarding VDOT and the snow removal process. Without proper removal of snow, it is not only inconvenient for healthcare workers to respond to emergencies that require less than a 30 minute response time, but also is a HUGE SAFETY ISSUE should any family in the community (elderly or with children) that might have an emergency of their own and need to seek medical attention. Necessity should trump appearance. Please see below for correspondence. I do understand that VDOT / State maintains the roads in M. M. As one of the board members has previously stated: "The state and VDOT own and control our roads in the neighborhood, as a result we aren't able to hire someone to plow the roads for snow. VDOT workers or subcontractors are the ones who plowed our neighborhood and unfortunately we have no control of which roads or paths they take". "I do understand how frustrating this can be for you and others in the neighborhood".

Realizing MMCA has the money, it's still a spending of member funds. At essentially \$102/member (\$12,219/120 homes) I vote AGAINST this. In addition, it would add a continuing electricity cost which I'm just wild guessing would be \$2/year/member, but I still don't want to pay it.

Thanks for compiling this and distributing to us. I'm sorry that we missed reply to this earlier, but if you are still taking comments, we would like to add our opinion regarding the electricity for the entrance sign. We think having more light is a great idea, but we are opposed to it solely because of the cost. We moved into the community last year, so we would not know if there have been any accidents or other safety concerns in the past as a result of the lack of light at the entrance. Absent such reason, we would like to see the money used toward something that we can all enjoy together as a community, such as a playground, trail or swimming pool. Lastly, I would like to report that about a month ago, my car alarm went off around 2.30 in the morning. Someone tried to break into the car, and from speaking with some of my neighbors on Hatcher Ct in the morning, apparently break-ins have occurred on the street in recent times. Perhaps it may be prudent to send out an email to the residents to remind them to lock their cars at night.

<p>We've talked about this subject before here at Mosby Mountain. And I recall it mostly dealt with the expense involved for a simple operation. Is Dominion Electric the only company allowed to bid on this? One company, one bid? It's hard to believe it has to cost over \$12,000 to drill and place a wire under a two lane macadam road to power a couple light bulbs. It's something that anyone here in Mosby Mountain could do at their house with an extension cord. Why only under ground? Why not a simple cord strung over the road to another pole for a couple of sign lights? There are plenty of other more essential power cords strung on poles around here. (That shouldn't be.) Or why not tap into the power already here on this side of the road. Just seems like a lot to pay to light a couple bulbs illuminating our sign.</p>
<p>I think the monies can be used for making our neighborhood more beautiful, so our answer is no.</p>
<p>Against the proposal</p>
<p>Hello neighbors. I feel that \$12k is a lot to invest to simply illuminate a sign. What are the perceived gains from this project aside from seeing the sign a little easier? From a cost-benefit perspective, it seems to me there are other projects that \$12k could go toward that would be of greater benefit to our residents. For instance, how about a playground for the kids? The trails in the woods could use a coat of mulch. Or what about putting it toward a larger project like a pool or community center with a gym? Are those possibilities still being considered? If so, it would make more sense to me that the funds be saved for those projects. However, if sign illumination is what the majority of residents prefer, I have no objection.</p>
<p>Thanks for putting this out for everyone to weigh in. We don't see the value. In our opinion, we have road signs, and the only reason to light the sign would be to promote the neighborhood for sales, which could have been important for a developer, but not for an established neighborhood. The value to be received is not worth the cost.</p>
<p>Thanks for the opportunity to weigh in on the discussion on whether or not to spend \$12,000 to electrify one of the signs to Mosby Mountain. Please put us down as a vote against that expenditure. First, we just don't see a compelling need to light up the sign. Not only is it costly to install, but would also entail a continuing expense. We feel the \$12,000 could be better spent spiffing up the trail systems, or perhaps repairing the damage to the curbs that occurred during the huge snowstorm of December 2009. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide our comments.</p>
<p>The cost is too high. Does it matter if the sign is lit up at 4 in the morning. What about the sign at the other entrance on Singleton? It's never lit. I suggest we continue with solar power.</p>
<p>This seems like an awful lot of money and a big mess digging up Old Lynchburg Rd. My vote would be "no." Although it would be nice to have a well lit sign, in the 6 years I've been living here, the lack of lighting has never even once been a problem.</p>
<p>Votes No</p>
<p>I believe it would be helpful to the community to know how much is left within the reserve account and how far this would deplete those funds. I oppose this action.</p>
<p>I don't think this necessary.</p>
<p>I vote not necessary</p>
<p>Please consider this e-mail as a vote against the proposed electrification of the sign for Mosby Mountain.</p>
<p>We don't think the money needs to be spent to illuminate these directly, but whatever the majority chooses is fine, thanks</p>
<p>We feel the lighting is sufficient enough during the hours it is needed most. We vote no.</p>
<p>Would prefer to spend about half that amount to install high-end commercial solar panels and floods .</p>
<p>I do not consider this a desired course of action as it seems very expensive to achieve. Maybe it would be best to find out if there is another cheaper option ? Otherwise, I don't think it worth spending this amount of money on.</p>
<p>I don't think it is worth the money.</p>
<p>I vote against the sign light, as GPS will take people to their destination accurately despite signs. Save the reserve for something that is more important should it arise. Car lights will illuminate the sign in the dark and GPS guides the driver as to where to turn until the destination is reached. Street signs help but we shouldn't need to illuminate all street signs as well, right? I think it is a cost we don't need with new technology such as satellite GPS. I vote that we live without it.</p>

Our response is a "no". Not very important that the sign be lighted.
Our vote is to not use the money for lighting the sign.
We are against the proposal. For one, there are more pressing issues to deal with. Drainage is big. All the rain water in the neighborhood runs to our yard, and it was never designed to handle the volume of water. So we deal with a massive flood every time it rains, and we spend hours after every rain storm trying to get our landscaping back to normal. Second, why do we have so much money in reserve? Shouldn't we consider reducing our quarterly fees??
We are against using the reserve for this purpose. It is impossible to predict what actual emergency might arise in the future that this money would be needed for.
We are opposed.
We have been living in Mosby Mountain only since July 2013, but so far the fact that the sign at Old Lynchburg Road and Ambrose Commons Drive is unlit has not been a problem for us. When we have guests arriving after dark, they either have GPS or we tell them to turn right where Old Lynchburg Road narrows to two lanes. We do not support the proposal, but would not actively oppose it. An alternative the board might consider would be to install a smaller sign made of reflective material positioned 50 to 100 yards before the turnoff for Ambrose Commons with "Mosby Mountain / 100 yards" and an arrow pointing right. The same thing could be done with a left turn arrow at Old Lynchburg Road and Singleton Lane for the occasional visitor driving northwards towards Mosby Mountain.
What about the second entrance? Also what is cost per home? Our vote is NO.
While it would be nice to have a lighted entrance, I think \$12,000 is ridiculous. So, I vote no. That is my opinion.
While it would be very nice to have the entrance sign illuminated, the proposed cost seems exorbitant and I don't feel a responsible use of such a large portion of the reserve fund. I had the same thought as the other homeowner who questioned whether it would be less expensive to tap into the nearest power transformer on Hatcher Court and then run the line under Ambrose Commons rather than under Old Lynchburg Road? At the current proposed cost, I would vote against this project.
- not Necessary -
Sorry for the late reply, but we wish to vote "no" on this proposal. We think the cost is too high for simply lighting the signs. If the money is burning a hole in the association bank account we'd prefer to see some more trees planted (shade-type trees similar to what was done along Ridgetop the other year).
COMMENTS ONLY
#1: What will happen with the sign for the second entrance once the new neighborhood is finished? Will there be any change to the power routing for that project that we should wait for? #2: There is a house across the entrance with power run underground. How much would it be to tap into that line versus running from across the street? Is that even an option?
What about future costs like maintenance and monthly electric bills? Has some sort of estimate been calculated to consider these (and others of which I may be unaware)?