

Mosby Mountain Community Association

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MEMBERSHIP

Draft Minutes

Date and time: Tuesday, December 2, 2014, 7:00 pm

Meeting location: Berean Baptist Church (South Ridge Christian Fellowship Church)
1284 Sunset Avenue Extended, Charlottesville, Virginia

Note: Notification of this meeting, along with the agenda and all referenced information, was emailed to the membership on Tuesday, November 18, 2014.

Attending:

Members from 11 households

Officers and directors: Preston Miller, President; Matt Althoff, Vice President; Jim Peterson, Secretary/Treasurer; and directors Diego Anderson, Cyril Connaughton and John Garland.

I. Call to order

Mr. Miller called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm

II. Declaration of quorum

Mr. Miller asked the secretary, Mr. Peterson, to report on quorum. With a total of 119 households, representation from 18 households would be required to achieve the 15 percent threshold necessary for action on agenda items V (Approval of December 3, 2013, Annual Meeting Minutes) and item VIII (Election of officers and board members). Eleven households were represented in attendance and 18 proxies were received for a total of 29 households represented. Therefore, a quorum was achieved to conduct all business scheduled to come before the membership.

III. Welcome and introduction

Mr. Miller welcomed everyone and introduced the officers and board members present.

IV. Adoption of agenda

Mr. Miller asked if there were any proposed changes to the agenda.

On a motion by Mr. Michael Hightower, seconded by Mr. Joe Cantu, the agenda was adopted as distributed.

V. Approval of minutes of the December 3, 2013, Annual Meeting of the membership

On a motion by Mr. Joe Cantu, seconded by Ms. Marsha Peterson, the minutes of the December 3, 2013, Annual Meeting of the Membership were approved as distributed.

VI. Year in review

a. President's remarks

Mr. Miller began by thanking all of the members of the committees and noted that Director Jamie Shim has chaired the Architectural Review Board (ARB) but she could not attend tonight's meeting. He also noted that Shawn Brydge has been a member of the ARB since its inception and continues to bring his dedication and insights to this very important function. The new architectural guidelines were three years in the making but now should provide more objective guidance than has been the case previously.

Mr. Miller observed that immediately after the Whittington Development was underway, we were hit with the new Wintergreen Farm development on our other side. He has met with the developer, county officials and our Board of Supervisors member, Liz Palmer, to deliver the results of our neighborhood survey that showed 58 households were against a connection to Hatcher Court and two in favor (see attached survey report). He urged Mosby members to contact Ms. Palmer and let their views be known directly regarding both developments. He also met with a representative from the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) regarding their proposal to tie the Wintergreen sewer into the Mosby Mountain line (which would then enable ACSA to close a sewage pump station located in Redfields and in that way prevent possible spillages into the streams when there is a power failure). Mr. Miller had pointed out to them that the proposed route would cut through our conservation area which is prohibited, and would also disturb our excellent trail system. He suggested to them that they simply install a generator backup on the sewage pump station. With regard to our trail system, Mr. Miller emphasized how just how great our trails are and urged members to get out and walk the trails.

b. Architectural Review Board (ARB)

In the absence of Ms. Shim, Mr. Miller reported that there were six applications processed by the ARB in 2014: three were for fences, one for a water feature, and two for sheds. The ARB also reviewed 11 properties for compliance that were sold in 2014 as part of the process of the preparation of the state required Disclosure Packets.

Mr. Miller said that on the down side we have experienced car break-ins and a house was broken into. Thankfully no one was hurt, but it does dramatize the need for everyone to be vigilant.

c. Common Areas Committee

Mr. Anderson, chair of the Common Areas Committee (CAC), reported that Luke Marshall has been the contractor providing the landscaping maintenance and it has been an uneventful year with regard to the maintenance. A very exciting development has been the successful negotiation with CenturyLink to provide them with a 25 by 25 foot easement adjacent to and behind our entrance sign at Ambrose Commons Drive. The installation of an equipment box there will enable CenturyLink to increase the broadband speed in our neighborhood. As part of the negotiation process, CenturyLink will also provide electric power to our entrance sign for illumination (which the earlier proposal from Dominion Power would have cost our Association \$12,000.00 for access to power), and CenturyLink will pay the monthly cost for electricity forever. Further, they issued a check to our Association for \$3,600.00 that we can use to landscape around the easement or for any other purpose we may wish.

Mr. Anderson provided an update on efforts to improve the shoulders along Ambrose Commons drive at the entrance where cars and snow plows have torn up the sod and efforts to remediate the problem--such as reseeding--have proved inadequate. He is working with VDOT to have them install crushed rock along the shoulders.

Finally, Mr. Anderson reported that the committee had planned to do some new planting this year and he has been working with the landscaper to make improvements, but he would like more input from the community with the goal of developing a good plan for landscape enhancements.

d. Community Relations Committee

Mr. Garland, chair of the Community Relations Committee (CRC), utilized a PowerPoint presentation to graphically portray the committee's achievements. A successful yard sale was held on May 17. The neighborhood directory update received 88 responses. County Waste conducted a bulk trash pickup on July 19. The big Halloween event was held on October 31 and once again organized by Nicky Shell and held on Rhett Court. One hundred ninety-five children and adults from 48 households participated.

Looking ahead to next year, the committee is considering holding a run/walk to include both Mosby and Mountain Valley residents. Mr. Garland said that suggestions for other programs are welcome and asked members to email or call him at jhgarland@comcast.net or 434-975-6377.

VII. Financial Report and 2015 Budget

Mr. Peterson distributed copies of the balance sheet as of November 30, 2014, and a profit and loss report of actual income and expense through November (see attached). He also distributed copies of the 2015 budget adopted by the board on September 16, 2014 (see attached). The dues will remain unchanged at \$121.00 per quarter.

VIII. Election of directors and officers

As outlined in the agenda mailed to the Membership on November 18, Mssrs. Althoff, Anderson, Garland and Miller will continue on the board through 2015 as they complete the second year of their two-year terms.

a. Slate of Officers and Directors

- i. Directors (two year terms): Cyril Connaughton Ted Miller and James Peterson
- ii. Officers (one year term): Preston Miller, president, Matt Althoff, vice president, and James Peterson, secretary/treasurer

b. Mr. Miller asked if there were any nominations from the floor. Hearing none, he asked if there was a motion for action on the committee recommendation.

c. On a motion by Mr. Hightower, seconded by Mr. Cantu, it was moved that the nominations be closed and that the slate be elected by acclamation.

IX. Items from the membership

Mr. Campbell addressed the hazard on the road and the destruction of property caused by deer. He suggested that the population of deer could be reduced while at the same time providing venison to feed the hungry. Mr. Miller noted that an archer licensed as hunter by the state lives in the neighborhood. He asked Mr. Connaughton to look further into the matter.

X. Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Ms. Glascock, the meeting was adjourned at 7:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

James R. Peterson
Secretary/Treasurer

Draft minutes posted on mosbymountain.org 12-21-2014



SURVEY OF MOSBY MOUNTAIN RESIDENTS ASKING IF THEY ARE IN SUPPORT OF, OR OPPOSED TO, EXTENDING HATCHER COURT TO CONNECT WITH A NEW STREET TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN THE ADJOINING WINTERGREEN SUBDIVISION.

RESULTS AS OF NOVEMBER 18, 2014

BACKGROUND

The following email was sent to all Mosby Mountain households:

November 6, 2014

Dear friends and neighbors,

This past year we have seen the beginning of the Whittington development that will impact our western side of our neighborhood and now we have heard about the Wintergreen development that will affect the eastern side. While we can not do too much about the Wintergreen development accessing Ambrose Commons across from Ridgetop the county is asking Wintergreen to also connect to us by extending Hatcher into their development. The county is also asking Wintergreen to extend into Redfields. This would effectively interconnect all of our neighborhoods. I don't think that I have to tell you about increased traffic and decreased use of our streets for our leisure activities as we do not have sidewalks. Please review the subdivision plat and proposed letter below and respond to this e-mail on whether you are for, against, or have no opinion on the interconnecting of our neighborhoods. We will tabulate the responses and put the results up on the web site as well as respond to the county. This is important for the future of our community as it may well inform the county as to if insist that we also get a connection to Whittington on Ridgetop - so please take the time to respond today as we have a deadline to respond to the county.

Thank you,

Preston Miller President

RESPONSES

Responses were received from 60 households with 58 responding that they were opposed to the construction of a street connection between the new Wintergreen subdivision and the Hatcher Court cul-de-sac, and two households responded that they were in favor of the connection. The responses shown in the following three pages are in their entirety except that any identifying information that was contained in the comments (names, addresses, ages of children) was deleted. Some households submitted multiple comments, and for these, all comments were included but the household was limited to one "vote."

RESULTS AS OF NOVEMBER 18, 2014

ARE OPPOSED TO A CONNECTING ROAD BETWEEN WINTERGREEN and HATCHER COURT

1	We live at ...and are opposed to the street becoming a through way. I am adamantly against the connection.
2	I am against this proposed connection.
3	I have 2 little children who are riding bikes/scooters on Hatcher ct almost on a daily basis. I am strongly opposed to using Hatcher Ct to connect to a new development .
4	AGAINST. I am against interconnecting the neighborhoods.
5	The ... family do not want any connection of Mosby Mountain to any neighboring neighborhoods on Ridgetop or Hatcher or Ambrose Commons.
6	We at...strongly oppose a connection at Hatcher Ct. There are currently at least 15 children in 5th grade and below who routinely play on Hatcher Ct. The expectation of a cul-de-sac plays a huge role in purchasing a home when you have young children. It is unreasonable for the county to take that away from homeowners.
7	Hi, we are against interconnection of neighborhoods.
8	We are most definitely against the proposed street connection to Hatcher Court. We bought in Mosby Mount because of the design of it neighborhoods and the fact that the County is proposing changes is abhorrent to us. The initial design of Mosby Mountain, as we were told when we were in the process of buying here, was to remain the same.
9	We strongly oppose the connection to Hatcher Court and the creation of a connection between the neighborhoods.
10	My husband and I are opposed to the interconnecting of neighborhoods for the reasons cited by Preston Miller in his letter to Ms. Dittmar.
11	I would be opposed to a connection on Hatcher court. I don't see the benefit for either neighborhood. A walking path connecting at hatcher court might be nice. I am opposed to any connector between Mosby and any of the proposed new subdivisions. I understand the county, for public safety, fire response, etc, wish to have connectors between all neighborhoods. The Mill Creek South HOA was able to voice our displeasure with possible connections with Mill Creek, Lake Reynovia and the now defunct Biscuit Run subdivisions and to this date, no connectors have been made. I think we could argue similarly. Maybe because Biscuit Run fell through that the county did not pursue their plans to finally connect to Lake Reynovia or Mill Creek? Maybe they will eventually? But the points mentioned above are valid and connections for safety or ease of travel do not make sense. Traveling down Old Lynchburg would be much faster to get between the neighborhoods vs going within them. I did notice that part of Wintergreen will only have access through our neighborhood. I find that very odd, but not unprecedented because there is a portion of Lake Reynovia that can only be accessed by going through Mill Creek South. I don't get why subdivisions do this. We should definitely get some proffers from them to
12	We are strongly opposed to having our neighborhood connect to the others. One of the main reasons we chose Mosby Mountain was for the lack of traffic and more serene neighborhood.
13	We would oppose these new roads. Additionally, we would like to chat sometime about these new developments? We received a letter about Whittington over the summer--which we mentioned when we saw you last at our house--which led us to attend one of the most recent hearings about that development. We got there a bit early and inadvertently sat in on the meeting about Wintergreen. Both meetings discussed these new road connections, and I wonder if we have information that might help clarify this process and how it pertains to Mosby?
14	We are against the connection on Hatcher Court. Ideally, there would be no connections between the neighborhoods.
15	I agree with the contents of your letter, and am against the proposed connection to Hatcher Court. I am also against the interconnecting of our neighborhoods. Just do not consider it necessary. We have been lucky having relatively little traffic over the past 7 years. We have a quiet and relatively safe neighborhood. Thanks for asking.
16	I would love to keep our neighborhood separate!
17	We are very much against these proposed connectors.
18	We are in opposition to connecting Hatcher Court to Wntergreen.
19	We vote against the interconnecting of the neighborhoods. Thanks for keeping us updated.
20	I do not oppose the Wintergreen connection of a cul-de-sac (closed) road at Ambrose Commons. I do oppose a connection in Hatcher Court. I do oppose any Wintergreen connection that allows Redfields traffic to flow into Wintergreen and then directly into Mosby Mountain.

21	We are strongly against the interconnecting of our neighborhood. We purchased our home recently with our two young children, and the quiet streets with minimal traffic were key in our decision to buy the house!
22	We are definitely opposed to all connector roads with Whittington and Wintergreen, for all the reasons you stated.
23	We are against this proposal. No benefit to MM.
24	I am against having interconnecting roads.
25	Against.
26	I am against any connection through our neighborhood other than the one that already exists from Mountain Valley. It is a major traffic and safety issue. Our children play on our streets, we walk our dogs and run and bike on them. All the extra vehicle traffic could be a disaster in a community without sidewalks. I am against interconnecting our neighborhoods. Any of the proposed interconnections would negatively impact our community here in Mosby Mountain. Interconnecting would create serious safety issues for our children and all pedestrians. The neighborhood would be radically changed from being a well thought out community to becoming a thoroughfare. The proposed interconnections are completely unnecessary. Whittington has access to Old Lynchburg Road and Wintergreen has access to Sunset. Any other required access should have been thought out and approved before development was underway.
27	After having carefully reviewed the plat, we, the undersigned, are adamantly against any of the proposed connecting roads between Wintergreen Farm and the Mosby Mountain Subdivision (MMS) -- especially to Hatcher Court. We can't see any benefit that such connecting roads will bring to the residents already living in Mosby Mountain, except for the developers of Wintergreen Farm and some lazy future residents of the proposed development.
30	We agree with the letter and the HOA's position on this matter. Thank you for your work on this.
31	My wife and I fully support this letter and oppose any new Mosby Mountain interconnections with other neighborhoods.
32	We are against connecting the neighborhoods.
33	I am strongly opposed to connecting hatcher court. I built a house on this culdesac street (hatcher) so that my kids could play safely outside with only limited traffic.
34	Against
35	I STRONGLY OPPOSE ROAD CONNECTING HATCHER COURT TO WINTERGREEN FARMS. I purcgased my home at the end of the cul-de-sac with the understanding that we would be the only house at the end of the street. Having this connection is a HUGE SAFETY ISSUE which will increase the traffic in this area. We, the streets of Hatcher and Turnston, have no common areas for the children to play. Being that the Hatcher Court has a flat area with no thru traffic, this is the area in which the children play. We have at times 15-20 children out in the road. PLEASE do not allow this road to connect! I also do not wish to connect any of the other roads from Mosby Mountain to Resfields or Wintergreen Farms. We were surprised to hear that the county is still pursuing the proposed street connection from Wintergreen to Hatcher Court. We are against the interconnecting of all our neighborhoods. We purchased our home and land specifically with privacy and safety in mind. There are many small children on Hatcher Court/ Turnstone Drive which use the cul-de-sac region on Hatcher Court to play. The thru-traffic which will be created by this interconnection will create a safety concern for all of our families. There will be no safe place for our children to play as we do not have a dedicated space in the neighborhood for children. This interconnection will, in effect, take away from our neighborhood
36	I am against any connection of our neighborhood with Wintergreen. For what it is worth, I am definitely opposed to any connection of our neighborhood with Whittington, and hope we are allowed some dialogue with the County before such an intrusion into our community is forced upon us.
37	I am absolutely <i>against</i> this interconnection!
38	I agree the safety for children will be a concern if the connection is made, therefore, I would also oppose this connection.
39	We are opposed. You state the reason in your letter to Jane Dittmar...we purchased our home with the understanding that it was a "closed" neighborhood, and through traffic past our houses will not increase.
40	Our family is definitely against the interconnecting of our neighborhoods. As you mentioned, we don't have sidewalks, and it's already very dangerous walking the dog, riding bikes, jogging, etc. Our streets are already busy and with increased traffic, I'm convinced there will be accidents involving pedestrians and cars. We purchased our house thinking we would be a part of a 115 house close knit, safe community--NOT connected to 1000+ other houses and all the traffic that comes with such a large interconnected community.

41	We concur with the draft letter in opposition to the connecting road.
42	We are strongly opposed to the proposed street connection to Hatcher Ct. Part of Wintergreen Farm will already use Ambrose Commons as its primary access (shouldn't this section be interconnected to the rest of Wintergreen Farm from within the subdivision?) Also, as you know our subdivision already serves as the only entrance to Mountain Valley Farm which isn't even in the County's designated development area so to provide access to yet another subdivision is completely unacceptable. We are not a neighborhood city nor do we wish to become one.
43	We oppose the connection to Hatcher. Isn't it enough that Ambrose Commons will be used to connect the 18 or so houses that will be on the southern side of their development? Add that to the increase in traffic that will eventually come from Mountain valley farm, and Ambrose Commons becomes a veritable freeway!
44	We would STRONGLY oppose a connection to Whittington from Ridgetop Drive. Echoing the sentiments below in Preston Miller's letter to the county, I too would be concerned about the traffic that would cut through our lovely, dead end street. This IS one of the main reasons we chose a lot on Ridgetop Drive (and paid a lot premium to do so!). We have three young children. I would hate for them to not be able to play outside because I would be worried about non-neighborhood drivers. At least now, we know most every car that is coming down the street and know to watch out for children during certain times of the day.
45	We are absolutely against this connector. We vehemently oppose any consideration of a Whittington connection on Ridgetop. It's already dangerous enough w teenage drivers, UPS, FedEx and USPS trucks drag racing to the end of the cul de sac on the long straight away. A connection would be a disaster.
46	I am AGAINST interconnecting the neighborhoods. How would this benefit Mosby Mountain? Should we write protest letters?
47	Against connecting.
48	We see no public purpose for having a connection between Hatcher Ct and the Wintergreen development; this section of Wintergreen has easy access from Sunset. Therefore, we oppose the proposed added connection.
49	I am opposed to connecting Hatcher Court in Mosby Mountain with the Wintergreen development.
50	
51	We are opposed to the Hatcher Court street connector and support the position taken by Mosby Mountain leadership.
52	I am not in favor of interconnecting our neighborhoods.
53	We are AGAINST interconnecting Mosby Mountain to the Whittington and Wintergreen developments. We would for connecting the neighborhoods by walking/biking paths/trails.
54	I am against interconnecting any neighborhoods with ours. I, personally, see no reason to do so.
55	My wife and I are against all proposed connections.
56	Not in favor of interconnecting. Ambrose is a throughway already. However Hatcher and Ridgetop are neighborhood streets with safe culdesacs which hopefully we never lose.
57	I am opposed to the proposed connection to Hatcher Court.
58	We are NOT in favor of extending Hatcher court or connecting to any of the other neighborhoods. We have young kids who enjoy the safety of playing in the cul-de-sac on Hatcher.
59	I vote not to connect the neighborhoods.
60	We are completely opposed to any further connection of neighborhoods.

ARE IN FAVOR OF A CONNECTING ROAD BETWEEN WINTERGREEN and HATCHER COURT

1	I don't see that there would be that much increase in traffic in our neighborhood. I would like the connection as my son could more easily ride a bike over to friends houses.
2	The connection is fine with us.

NOVEMBER 2014 - BUDGET VS ACTUAL

	Jan - Nov 14	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
Ordinary Income/Expense				
Income				
41000 · ASSESSMENT INCOME	57,551.00	57,596.00	-45.00	99.92%
41500 · Fee Income	235.00			
43000 · INTEREST INCOME	110.19			
Total Income	<u>57,896.19</u>	<u>57,596.00</u>	<u>300.19</u>	<u>100.52%</u>
Gross Profit	57,896.19	57,596.00	300.19	100.52%
Expense				
Add to operating reserve fund	0.00	4,625.50	-4,625.50	0.0%
Donations	100.00			
51000 · ACCOUNTING FEES	2,326.11	3,850.00	-1,523.89	60.42%
51500 · BANK CHARGES	6.95			
52000 · Liability, D&O, Bonding Ins	0.00	916.67	-916.67	0.0%
53000 · LEGAL FEES	408.00			
53500 · LICENSES AND FEES	133.86	137.50	-3.64	97.35%
54000 · Membership Fees	0.00	137.50	-137.50	0.0%
54500 · MEETING EXPENSE	100.00	91.67	8.33	109.09%
55000 · OFFICE EXPENSE	88.20	458.33	-370.13	19.24%
55005 · Association Events	438.08	916.67	-478.59	47.79%
55500 · OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0.00	183.33	-183.33	0.0%
64500 · TRASH COLLECTION	15,172.50	20,973.33	-5,800.83	72.34%
75200 · FENCING	240.00			
75300 · LANDSCAPING - CONTRACT	19,206.00	15,299.17	3,906.83	125.54%
75400 · LANDSCAPING - NON-CONTRACT	940.00			
75800 · Signage/Sign Maintenance	85.00	458.33	-373.33	18.55%
82250 · FENCING REPLACEMENT	240.00			
82500 · LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	0.00	4,583.33	-4,583.33	0.0%
85500 · WEBSITE EXPENSE	0.00	165.00	-165.00	0.0%
Total Expense	<u>39,484.70</u>	<u>52,796.33</u>	<u>-13,311.63</u>	<u>74.79%</u>
Net Ordinary Income	18,411.49	4,799.67	13,611.82	383.6%
Other Income/Expense				
Other Income				
Other Income	<u>3,600.00</u>			
Total Other Income	<u>3,600.00</u>			
Net Other Income	3,600.00	0.00	3,600.00	100.0%
Net Income	<u>22,011.49</u>	<u>4,799.67</u>	<u>17,211.82</u>	<u>458.6%</u>

NOVEMBER 2014 - BALANCE SHEET

	Nov 30, 14
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Checking/Savings	
10300 · Cash - VNB - 6409	35,597.04
10500 · ING Direct Savings	30,219.95
Total Checking/Savings	65,816.99
Accounts Receivable	
11000 · Accounts Receivable	-138.73
Total Accounts Receivable	-138.73
Total Current Assets	<u>65,678.26</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	65,678.26
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Equity	
32000 · CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS	2,000.00
3900 · Retained Earnings	20,259.63
39996 · RETAINED EARNING	21,407.14
Net Income	22,011.49
Total Equity	<u>65,678.26</u>
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	65,678.26

NOVEMBER 2014 - P & L

	Nov 14
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
41500 · Fee Income	60.00
43000 · INTEREST INCOME	9.91
Total Income	69.91
Gross Profit	69.91
Expense	
54500 · MEETING EXPENSE	100.00
55005 · Association Events	402.08
64500 · TRASH COLLECTION	1,517.25
75300 · LANDSCAPING - CONTRACT	1,746.00
Total Expense	3,765.33
Net Ordinary Income	-3,695.42
Net Income	<u>-3,695.42</u>

MOSBY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, INC. -- BUDGET 2015

A	B	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Categories	Code	11 Budget	12 Budget	12 Actual	13 Budget	13 Actual	14 Budget	14 Projected	15 Budget**
Assessment Income	41000	\$ 57,596.00	\$ 57,596.00	\$ 57,649.43	\$ 57,596.00	\$ 57,717.00	\$ 57,596.00	\$ 57,551.00	\$ 57,596.00
Fee Income	41500					\$ 180.00		\$ 235.00	
Disclosure Packet	42000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 70.00	\$ -	\$ 84.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interest Income	43000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 128.51	\$ -	\$ 119.85	\$ -	\$ 120.19	\$ -
Misc Income	44000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Income		\$ 57,596.00	\$ 57,596.00	\$ 57,847.94	\$ 57,596.00	\$ 58,100.85	\$ 57,596.00	\$ 57,906.19	\$ 57,596.00
Write Off (Bad Debt Expense)				\$ 15.57		\$ 8.70			
Accounting	51000	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 3,402.00	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 4,386.94	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 4,126.11	\$ 4,200.00
Bank Charges	51500					\$ 7.00		\$ 6.95	
Liability, DBO, Bonding Ins/ins general 66350	52000	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 886.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 969.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,027.00	\$ 1,000.00
Legal	53000	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00		\$ -	\$ 2,726.00	\$ -	\$ 408.00	\$ -
Taxes and Licenses	53500	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 242.67	\$ 150.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 133.86	\$ 150.00
Meeting Expense	54500	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 100.00		\$ 100.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 100.00
Office Expense	55000	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 894.27	\$ 500.00	\$ 968.57	\$ 500.00	\$ 88.20	\$ 500.00
Website Expense	85500	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 170.83	\$ 180.00	\$ 287.80	\$ 180.00	\$ -	\$ 180.00
Other Services	55500	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 41.41	\$ 200.00		\$ 200.00	\$ -	
Association events/activities 56200	55005	\$ 600.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 732.07	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 432.01	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 438.08	\$ 1,000.00
Memberships	54000	\$ 125.00	\$ 150.00		\$ 150.00		\$ 150.00	\$ -	
Miscellaneous expense	74200					\$ 50.00		\$ -	
Common area maintenance ("contract")*	75300	\$ 19,000.00	\$ 19,000.00	\$ 18,624.00	\$ 21,236.00	\$ 22,910.00	\$ 16,690.00	\$ 20,952.00	\$ 20,952.00
Landscaping improvements	75300	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 3,676.50	\$ 5,000.00		\$ 5,000.00	\$ -	\$ 11,307.00
Landscaping - Noncontracting*	75400					\$ 216.00		\$ 1,415.00	
Drainage / fencing 75200-82250 maintenance	82000			\$ 4,070.00				\$ 480.00	
Signage/Sign Maintenance	82500	\$ 500.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 92.25	\$ 500.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 85.00	
Mailbox Maintenance	75800		\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,565.60		\$ 6.68		\$ -	
Trash Collection	71450	\$ 21,777.00	\$ 22,431.00	\$ 22,431.12	\$ 22,880.00	\$ 22,829.70	\$ 22,880.00	\$ 16,689.75	\$ 18,207.00
Addition to reserve fund - see below	64500							0	
Addition to operating reserve fund - see below	51700							0	\$ -
Snow Removal								\$ -	
Total Expense		\$ 53,202.00	\$ 54,531.00	\$ 57,894.29	\$ 57,096.00	\$ 55,883.40	\$ 52,550.00	\$ 46,049.95	\$ 57,596.00
Quarterly Dues		\$ 121.00							
Addition to special reserve fund		\$ 4,394.00	\$ 3,065.00		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Addition to operating reserve fund		\$ -	\$ -	\$ (46.35)	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,217.45	\$ 5,046.00	\$ 11,856.24	\$ -
Other Income - CenturyLink								\$ 3,600.00	
<i>*Note - categories used by Robinson Farmer Cox</i>									
<i>**Note - adopted by the board 9-16-14</i>									